

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday 1 July 2010**

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (LOOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am aware that other members have matters in private member's time that they wish to debate, so I will be brief as a courtesy to the house. This bill seeks to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This is the same or similar to a bill that I introduced prior to the election, but it was defeated. This bill seeks to bring in aggravated penalties for certain offences under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Specifically, I am trying to introduce aggravated penalties for those people who loot premises affected by fire or in a fire prone area when an emergency has been declared or when there is a day of extreme fire danger.

The principle is this: when the CFS go out and say to the people in a certain area, 'Your homes and businesses are at risk; put in place your bushfire action plan', which for many people will mean leaving the district, that is publicly broadcast, and those who have a criminal mind therefore know that in those geographic areas a large number of people are likely not to be home. Because of that, it exposes those areas to a higher level of crime at that point. The public need better protection from the criminal element at that time.

Also, post-fire—we saw this in the Victorian experience and we have seen it in other bushfire experiences—in the immediate aftermath of a fire when all the authorities are naturally worrying about the basics of life, that is, rescuing people, food, water, shelter and those sort of emergency provisions, some low lifes take it upon themselves to go out and loot the properties and take furniture and belongings out of the affected homes or properties. We should be sending a message to those people that it is totally unacceptable and they should attract an aggravated offence; they should attract a higher penalty through its being an aggravated offence.

I know the government opposed this before the election. I say to the government that my bill may not be perfect. I am open to amendment if the government can make it a better bill, but I think the principle of this bill is right. I think the principle is right. If a bushfire occurs and premises are ruined, people who then go in and rob at that point need to be sent the strongest message possible that they are preying on people in their time of need and they should be dealt with more severely under the law. I think that principle is right.

If the government or other members wish to consult with me on amendments I am open to amending the bill, but I think the principle of the bill is right. The reasons for this bill are in *Hansard* from the previous debate. It is a simple bill in that respect and I hope the government and other members can see their way clear to support the bill in this form or an amended form. With those few words I seek the support of the house in due course.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (BUSHFIRES COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This is again a bill that I moved prior to the election. I am re-moving it, in the same form as I moved it previously. The reason I am moving this bill is that I believe the public and the parliament of South Australia would be well served by having a standing committee that looks at all matters relating to bushfire. I know we are at the start of July and it is a cold, wet winter but come summer we all will be focused on bushfire matters—there is nothing surer.

The history of bushfire throughout Australia is very simple. There always have been fires and there always will be fires. When there is a really bad fire the government of the day expresses great sympathy. Quite rightly, it throws resources into helping those in need as a result of the fire and to rebuild communities. I do not criticise governments for doing that at all.

If it is a really bad fire the government will set up an inquiry, the inquiry will make recommendations and, at that point, governments of all colours have fallen down; that is, once an inquiry reports it is open to question how many of the recommendations are actually implemented and how well the parliament tracks the implementation of the recommendations.

I do declare that I live in an area and represent an area that are high bushfire risk. My local CFS brigade tells me that Mitcham Hills is one of the worst, most-urbanised bushfire areas in the world. I believe the parliament through its membership over decades has become more urbanised. There are fewer regional seats and more city seats. I think the parliament has become deskilled in understanding issues relating to bushfire—and that is no disrespect to the parliament. I think it is just a matter of course because more people in the city have not lived, breathed and dealt with bushfire in their backyard.

The issue for me is this: I think that the parliament has a duty to the public to make sure that we are the best prepared we can be for bushfire, for the prevention of bushfire, the reaction to bushfire and the rebuilding after bushfire. And the only way we can be best prepared, in my view, is to have a parliamentary committee oversighting it so that we can keep track of worldwide developments and keep quizzing the agencies to make sure that we are as best planned as we can be. That would hold the agencies to account to make sure that our preparation is the best it can be. It would also educate the parliament about the most current issues, whatever they may be, at the then time about bushfire issues.

The parliament may say, and some members may say, 'Well, the parliament doesn't need a stand-alone committee into one topic.' We normally have broad committees, such as economic and finance, or we have natural resources. Other parliaments have taken this step to have a standing committee into things such as road safety, and they look at cross-agency issues in relation to road safety. I say that South Australia, given its high urbanisation of some areas, the tragedies that have occurred in the electorate of Flinders (around the Port Lincoln area over time) and fires in the South-East from time to time, is a high bushfire state.

I would put road safety and bushfires on at least equal footing—if not bushfires possibly even on a higher footing, given where I live. I think that there is a solid case for the parliament to put in place a standing committee on bushfires because it is a complex issue. It goes to public education; it goes to building design; it goes to transport and evacuation routes; it goes to the funding and training of emergency services; it goes to relationship with media and the media's role in times of emergency in bushfire; and it goes to planning issues about zoning and where you can build and what you can build.

Virtually every agency in government touches on bushfire response or bushfire planning in some degree. It goes to the question of safe havens. Is the government going to nominate safe havens? Should we, as a policy, nominate safe havens or should we not nominate safe havens? What is the role of local government? Bushfire is a very complex issue, and while it may be a topic that is narrow within government, across every agency it is a very broad issue. Now that the election is out of the way and the government is looking through this bill through a different prism, a different light, if you like, because an election is not imminent, I hope that the government can relook at its position and see that there is actually merit in having this committee set up, because I think the bushfire issue is an important one. It will not go away.

Are we really going to wait and have a press conference after the next major bushfire, saying, 'We're going to have an inquiry into why this didn't occur, why the communications network didn't work,' or whatever, when we could have done all that planning before the disaster? We could have probably ticked off a lot of the problems and solved a lot of the issues prior to the fire happening. I think that we should be proactive, not reactive. That is the motivation for this bill. With those few words, I seek the support of the house in due course.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Eynesbury College, who are guests of the member for Adelaide. I understand they have been

doing English studies and that they are about to go to university. Welcome, and we hope that you enjoy your time here.

VALUATION OF LAND (NOTIONAL VALUATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Valuation of Land Act 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will be of interest to members who have sport and recreation clubs in their electorate. The motivation for this bill comes from the Flagstaff Hill Golf Club, which is actually in the member for Fisher's electorate but one street outside of my electorate so a lot of my constituents play golf there.

As a result of the sale of the Cheltenham racecourse, the Valuer-General revalued sport and recreation grounds on the basis of the new valuation of open space. For the Flagstaff Hill Golf Club, that ended up being an increase in valuation from \$2.675 million to \$4.65 million, an increase of around \$2 million. The golf club has not changed: the only thing that changed was that Cheltenham racecourse was sold and therefore the Valuer-General decided to flow the valuation process through to other areas of open space.

Needless to say, the increase in valuation increased the cost of operating the golf club because there are lots of taxations and rating systems based on the valuation of the land. In the Flagstaff Hill Golf Club situation, this resulted in an increase in council rates of \$7,000 per annum and increases in other rates such as the emergency services levy and the club's water and sewerage bills, etc. The Flagstaff Hill Golf Club was hit with a total annual increase of over \$11,000 in costs, all because the land valuation had changed, and the reason for that was the Cheltenham racecourse had been sold.

Currently, land tax is not charged when land is used for the purpose of playing sport or for horseracing, dog racing, motor racing or other similar contests. It is not charged land tax if it is used for recreation and sport for the local community. What this bill does is very simple: it gives an instruction to the Valuer-General that he is to value the land based on its notional value, not its development value. The effect of that will be that the valuation of the land will drop considerably. It means that council rates charged to the land will drop, water rates will drop and emergency services costs will drop. It will mean that the sporting clubs affected by the latest change in the valuation process will essentially be near enough to reinstated to their old rate base—their old valuation base—so their costs will drop.

So the house should be crystal clear that this bill seeks to make sport and recreation clubs more viable by changing the way the land they sit on is valued. If this bill is successful, the land that the sport and recreation facilities use will be valued at a notional valuation, which means they will have reduced charges to sport and recreation clubs rather than increased charges as has occurred in the last couple of years. As I say, in the Flagstaff Hill Golf Club's case, the cost is \$11,000 extra per year for doing nothing different, except that the Valuer-General revalued the land. That is the bill. I look forward to the debate and hope the government can see its way clear to support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 June 2010.)

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (10:51): The Voluntary Euthanasia Bill 2010 allows voluntary euthanasia for a limited number of people in very restricted circumstances: competent adults who are in the terminal phase of a terminal illness and who are suffering unbearable pain. In view of the differing and deeply held views on voluntary euthanasia, historically, each party—certainly the Liberal Party and the Australian Labor Party—has granted its members of parliament a conscience vote when an issue has been raised through a private member's bill. This bill, too, is likely to be a conscience vote.

The following outlines the current legislative position in South Australia. Under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, it is not an offence to commit or attempt to commit suicide; however, a person who aids, abets or counsels the suicide of another is guilty of an offence. While the Consent

to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995 does not support euthanasia—as specified very clearly—neither does it advocate that anyone should be allowed to suffer.

The act allows for individuals to express anticipatory refusals of medical treatment under prescribed circumstances. It enables a person over 18 and of sound mind to decide in advance and commit in writing the type of medical treatment they do or do not want in the future if they are in a terminal phase of illness, a persistent vegetative state or incapable of making decisions about medical treatment.

The act ensures that a refusal of life-saving medical treatment does not amount to an attempt to commit suicide. It specifically prohibits administering medical treatment for the purpose of causing death or assisting the suicide of another. Medical practitioners and those administering treatment under medical supervision are protected from civil and criminal liability if they administer treatment to relieve pain and distress, even though the incidental effect of the treatment is to hasten death.

Many models have been discussed for voluntary euthanasia. I have had the opportunity to talk to doctors and civil servants who have been involved in administering voluntary euthanasia in the Netherlands. During my most recent opportunity to do that, it was interesting that I received not only a briefing but also a regional euthanasia review committee report 2006 from the Netherlands government.

I want to outline some of the issues in that report. It seems to me that, while most of the population say that they support a provision or a choice of voluntary euthanasia, part of the difficulty with introducing legislation—and I certainly have to commend Dr Such on his efforts to try to bring this matter before parliament and introduce legislation to enable the choice of voluntary euthanasia—has been not only the drafting of the legislation but also how that legislation would work in reality. I guess this is in stark contrast with what we have been trying to do in South Australia.

Certainly, the Hon. Sandra Kanck (former member of the Legislative Council), the Hon. Anne Levy (former Labor member of the Legislative Council) and, more recently, the Hon. Mark Parnell in the other place, have tried to introduce legislation that they think will satisfy some of the concerns that people have with regard to euthanasia but which will also, I think, make the practical administration of that particular legislation fairly difficult.

In stark contrast, when you talk to people in the Netherlands who are either regional doctors who have assisted people to commit suicide or have actually made sure that they have acceded to their wishes of proceeding with voluntary euthanasia, the actual discussion is between the person and the doctor. There is not a bureaucratic system surrounding the choice of voluntary euthanasia. It also seems that in the Netherlands, and to a certain extent in Oregon, where assisted suicide is available, the power actually lies with the person who is making that choice, not other people, not public servants, not a whole medical team, and not people who are in the family, who wish someone to exit early. So a lot of the hysteria about having the choice of voluntary euthanasia is dispelled.

As I said, I have before me a report from 2006. The health system in the Netherlands is broken up into regions, and for the period January 2006 to 31 December 2006, there were 1,765 cases of euthanasia. 132 of these cases were assisted suicide, and 26 cases involved the combination of both. In 1,692 cases the notifying physician was a general practitioner, in 151 cases the medical specialist working in a hospital, and in 80 cases a physician working in a nursing home. So as you can see, like South Australia, there are different cases of where people end their life, some in hospital, some in nursing homes, some in care places.

The statistics for the Netherlands say that 1,528 cases were people who died at home, 145 cases in hospital, 79 cases in a nursing home, 79 cases in a care home, and 92 cases elsewhere, either a hospice or the home of a relative. The conditions that were involved in that year were: 1,656 people had cancer, 55 people had cardiovascular disease, 105 neurological disorders, 58 pulmonary disorders other than cancer, 45 other conditions, and combinations of conditions 6 people. So again we can see that, certainly in the Netherlands, there is a number of different illnesses that people have had, and these are the decisions that they have made at the end of life.

So, in summary, with the short period of time I have to speak on this very important issue, I support the legislation that is being presented to us today by Dr Such and commend him on his ongoing work in this area, but do have major concerns about whether this legislation, if it did become an act, would work in a practical way, and would protect the choice of the person

concerned, not anybody else, to actually exercise that choice in a way that was not going to be really difficult and bureaucratic and then make it maybe not happen because of those steps being put in place.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

ELECTRICITY (WIND POWER) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 June 2010.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (10:59): I wish to support the member for Finniss in the introduction of this bill, and I know that it has been an issue, particularly in his electorate. There is a very innovative fellow there, I think, who has designed some amazing bit of technology that is not large in size but seems to manage to capture wind very efficiently and generate electricity.

There is no doubt that, in these challenging times, there are a lot more people in the community who want to make sure that they become more self-sufficient. They are prepared to invest in that, but they have an expectation of a bit of a return on the excess electricity they are able to generate and the compensation they receive from the electricity suppliers. The member for Finniss has obviously identified an issue that is quite important in his electorate, and it is certainly very important to a lot of other people who live in regional areas, too, who might be challenged when it comes to electricity supply.

The member for Finniss has put his case very strongly to the party room on this, and I know his hope is that the Rann Labor government actually decides to support this bill. As we understand it, there are no negatives attached to this; it is a positive move and one that the community at large want to see. It is going to allow for additional investment to occur on innovative solutions to electricity supply and ensure that those people who invest—quite often quite large sums—on this level of infrastructure have an ability to get a reasonable rate of return on the surplus electricity that has been generated.

I know that the bill is relatively short, but it targets a specific area that needs to be addressed. The parliament has a responsibility to ensure that it considers this matter very carefully. I know that the opposition supports the bill very strongly and I would hope that, in any consideration the government has on this bill, they come out quite strongly, support it and recognise the bipartisan nature in which the member for Finniss has proposed it. He has targeted an issue that we think that the community—as it goes forward and more people want to invest in this level of infrastructure—are turned off a little bit when it comes to the consideration of what level of return they are going to get.

We know that grants exist to assist in some of the photovoltaic cells that are being introduced onto people's homes. I am not sure if this technology is different from wind capture, but it allows innovation to occur—and that is what our economy should be based around. I think all would acknowledge that some of the traditional areas of our economy are struggling. We need to ensure that we provide an impetus and an opportunity for the innovative examples in our economy and the technology that exist in our state to move forward. This bill will only support that, so I hope that it has the support of the government, that the minister responsible and the Premier come out very strongly in support of it and that it has a swift passage through the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SURROGACY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill was passed in the other place on 12 May. The original bill to amend the legislation in South Australia to allow gestational surrogacy was passed last year by this parliament. This issue is a conscience vote. It took many years (I think it was 3½ years) to get through the other place. As a consequence of the protracted delay in getting the legislation through both the other place and then, finally, through this house, the particular individual who motivated this legislation is five years older and we now need to amend the legislation. The legislation was passed in this place on 19 November 2009 by 31 votes to seven as a conscience vote; it was passed in the other place (on the voices) on 18 June 2008—so there was a 15 month delay there alone.

The original move to amend the legislation was brought about by the plight of Mrs Kerry Faggotter and her husband, Clive, and other parents of surrogate children. To be able to have a child is an absolutely wonderful gift, and people who are able to have children through altruistic gestational surrogacy should be given every opportunity to then acknowledge that those children are legitimately their children in every sense, if not 100 per cent biologically. That is usually the case, because it is usually a fertilised egg that is put into the gestational surrogate—the mother (and I use the term 'mother' because that is how people would look at the person carrying the baby)—but the actual biological mother is the person who cannot carry the child in her uterus. Obviously, the whole intent of this legislation is that we need to overcome that issue.

The problem is that the young chap who was born as a result of Clive and Kerry's dilemma through gestational surrogacy is nearly 10 years old. Clause 1(4) of the transitional provisions in the original legislation provided:

An application cannot be made under this clause if a child has been born as a result of the relevant pregnancy and the child is more than 5 years old on the day on which this clause comes into operation.

It took the Hon. John Dawkins 3½ years to negotiate with the government to pass this legislation. As a result of that delay, the young man is nearly 10 years old. So, that is what this amendment does. It is a very simple amendment. It does not change the intent at all of the legislation that was agreed to 31 to seven in this place last time around. Clause 1(4) now provides:

An application cannot be made under this clause if a child has been born as a result of the relevant pregnancy and the child is more than 10 years old on the day on which the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill 2010 comes into operation.

So, it is just changed from five years old to 10 years old. It is as simple as that. The intent of the legislation has not changed and the sympathies are exactly the same. I hope that the vote in this place shows similar strong support for altruistic gestational surrogacy in South Australia. With that, I commend this bill to this house.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:09): I will speak very briefly to this bill. I certainly support this administrative amendment. We did have debate in this house quite some time ago regarding the issue of surrogacy, and I know there are very strong views for and against surrogacy. I am one who supports the fact that we need to support people who go through this process and not make life difficult for them in trying to achieve their goal of having a child. My concern—and I raised this the last time we debated this matter—is that, with regard to surrogacy, we are not extending the rights and the responsibilities to same-sex couples, and that seems to be completely ridiculous as we have been through the debate in this house about how same-sex couples should have the same rights and responsibilities as other couples.

The Social Development Committee is looking into the rights and responsibilities for same-sex couples with regard to being parents. At the moment we are happy for same-sex couples to be foster parents but we are really concerned about same-sex couples having the opportunity to adopt, for example. We are also saying, I think quite illogically, that same-sex couples should not be able to go through the process of surrogacy. With that reservation, I would like to commend the Hon. John Dawkins for the work that he has done, in particular, and, obviously, in this house our minister (John Hill) and Duncan McFetridge for making sure that this issue has some legal basis and that people who want to go through the surrogacy process (which, I would imagine, would be extremely difficult) get legal support for doing that.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (11:11): This was a private members' bill introduced by the Hon. John Dawkins in another place. The government bent over backwards to cooperate with the bill, which was a controversial bill and was decided on conscience lines. Owing to Mr Dawkins' infelicity with drafting he managed, by the effluxion of time, to exclude the principal beneficiary for whom he designed the bill from its provisions. We are asked here to amend the bill to accommodate his infelicity. I object to the Hon. John Dawkins putting out a press release in the election campaign which sought to blame me (as attorney-general) and my conscientious objection to surrogacy for his own incompetence in drafting the bill and moving it through parliament. I want to record that the reason why this boy is not covered by the bill is down to John Dawkins and John Dawkins alone.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:13): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker—and it is good to see you in that position. Actually, we do have a very good Speaker in the member for Giles. Regarding the comments made by the member for Croydon, I understand his passion about this subject and his passion for many things in life.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: I will not enter into an argument with the member for Croydon now. I am very keen to see that this young man (whoever's fault it might have been, and I am not attributing blame to anybody here) should be allowed to be recognised as the legitimate biological child of Mr and Mrs Faggotter. I thank the house for its attention to this small amendment and I look forward to the bill passing through all stages.

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

EDUCATION FUNDING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (11:15): I move:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its concern regarding the Federal Opposition's intent to cut funding for computers in schools, cut trade training funding for schools and cut funding for initiatives to improve teaching quality; and
- (b) calls on Members of the State Opposition to lobby their Federal counterparts to prevent South Australian schools losing this vital funding.

It has long been my experience that when Liberals are in government, children in poor areas lose education. In 1992 in South Australia, 92 per cent of children reached Year 12. By 1994, after the Liberal government, this was down to something like less than half. Unfortunately, clawing back those losses has been very difficult and we still have not anything like reached the Year 12 retention rate that we had in 1992. I am reasonably sure that that is the figure, because it was 92 per cent in 1992. I think I have got that well in my head. It won't be very different.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: I see the member for Goyder looking in alarm at these figures, but it is pretty right, member for Goyder, I can assure you. It will not be wrong by a great margin of error. I think we have only now got up to somewhere around 75 per cent.

When John Howard was prime minister, I heard him many times talk about how it was not necessary to go to university to succeed in life. Did this change the university attendance rates of people in Bragg, Davenport, Waite, etc.? Not an iota. Did it make university more remote for families in communities where university has not been part of their family experience? It certainly did, especially in the older tracts of suburbia and the outer North and the outer South, where large suburbs were established to support families working in the manufacturing area.

Many of them were migrants who had been through pretty horrible experiences themselves in relation to education, particularly those who had been through the dreadful experience of the eleven-plus in Britain, where they were told pretty well that they were dumb and education was not for them. So, when those families come to Australia, take up work in a manufacturing area and keep on being told by their prime minister that going to university is not necessary to succeed in life, this makes it pretty hard for them and their children to think about going to university.

My experience in my electorate is that, in fact, fewer children are now going to university than they were some time ago. Christies Beach High School produced Greg Mackie. It produced—the famous music person whose name I suddenly cannot remember at the moment, the one who appears on Carole Whitelock's show on a regular basis. It produced doctors. It produced lawyers, but not recently. Christies Beach High School goes to incredible efforts to support just a few children to get to university. A Liberal government is always a danger for education. We can be confident, absolutely, rock-solid confident, that any Liberal government led by Tony Abbott will follow that wondrous record. We know this from what was said in his address-in-reply to the budget recently.

Currently, the state is benefiting from a number of initiatives that have been entered into jointly with the commonwealth government. We have been fortunate to have a real injection of funds. In Julia Gillard, we had a minister for education who was absolutely committed to the transformational power of education, the ability to escape poverty through education. She did it, I did it, quite a few people in this room did it. The minister, like—

Members interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: I see a little bit of hilarity over on the other side. My father was a cleaner and my mother was a telephonist; I escaped poverty through education.

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: The echoes from behind me mean that I need to repeat that a number of us on this side did it. It is not the only way to escape poverty, but it is better than boxing, and it is the most constructive way and the most likely path to escape poverty—not the only way but a very good way. It brings all sorts of intrinsic benefits as well: an ability to improve our understanding of the world, an ability to better manage our health, and an ability to support our families both emotionally and financially. Education enables us to see ourselves and others in a completely different way.

We need to do more to improve outcomes for children in our schools. The education social atlas shows very clearly that children in outer suburbs, in particular, are not benefiting from education and the way that will open up their lives. There are important joint programs that will help us particularly support those children and, while many of them will bring universal benefits to children in all our schools, the impact will be far greater on children in areas where they are not currently making it to year 12, let alone university—and let alone TAFE, in fact, because these days many of the trades require year 12 in a way they did not.

There are three particular areas that the leader of the federal opposition targeted, and I will now mention some of the benefits we are currently receiving and what is at risk should a Liberal government be elected. Under the national partnership agreements with the commonwealth, South Australia has been provided with substantial funding to improve teacher quality, to provide trade training in schools, and to roll out computers for all year 9 to 12 students. They are great examples of the South Australian and commonwealth governments working together to improve the education of our young people, but all of this is under threat.

In its response to the federal budget, the federal opposition made clear that it would cease funding under these agreements for teacher quality training, trade training centres, and computers in schools. This will do nothing but harm young people, particularly those who are not in the affluent schools. So, I urge members in this house to do all they can to ensure that this does not occur, being generous and asking members of the state opposition to lobby; however, my commitment is to make sure that an Abbott government is never elected.

Clearly, Mr Abbott does not understand the importance of teacher training, when the evidence is that the quality of our teachers is a major factor in the quality of education every child deserves to have in our society. For some time the emphasis has been on class sizes, but more recent research, particularly the Grattan report, indicates that the quality of teachers is the single most determining factor in outcomes for children in schools.

So, in partnership with the commonwealth, the state government is developing and supporting leadership in our schools, improving and supporting the quality of our teachers, attracting and supporting our best teachers, and attracting and developing leaders to Indigenous and remote rural schools. For instance, South Australia will establish centres of excellence to support teachers. These centres will support teachers and mentor them through difficult periods. We will establish a pathways program to support Aboriginal community education officers to become teachers; Aboriginal children will benefit from stronger education leaders and quality teachers.

The state government is working with leaders across the Independent and Catholic systems and all sectors of education, and working very strongly with tertiary sectors to improve teacher placements and pathways into teaching. All this will be put at risk without commonwealth government support. Then there is the issue of the foreshadowed abolition of funding for trade training centres, which makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. It would mean fewer opportunities for children to learn skills using modern equipment, fewer apprentices and, in the longer term, a less skilled workforce at the very time when industry is demanding people with higher skills and higher qualifications.

Over 90 of our state secondary schools have successfully gained funds from the commonwealth trade training program, which is an \$87 million investment in our schools. Children and parents to benefit recently from the Trade Training Centres in Schools program include: over \$1 million for Coober Pedy Area School, to offer qualifications in the construction industry; over \$1 million for St George College in Mile End, to build an industry-standard commercial kitchen for training in the hospitality industry; and over \$6 million for Quorn Area School, to upgrade and refurbish equipment and provide training in electrical, engineering, rural operations and construction.

Mr Abbott also has the provision of school computers and technology in his sights. The federal government's Digital Education Revolution is a \$2 billion program to provide computer access to every year 9 to year 12 student nationally by the end of next year. It has an interim target of one computer for every two students in year 9 to year 12 in South Australia by 31 March 2011. South Australian schools will benefit from this massive investment in technology, giving students and teachers access to a world of possibilities in education.

This is a universal program, but its impact is felt particularly in those areas where children have no access to computers in the home. In my area, for instance, in the 2006 census, only one in three households had access to the internet—and I do not even know whether they are households with children. I know a lot of the senior members of my community do have internet access so they can talk to their grandchildren. This contrasts greatly with the more advantaged communities, many of which are represented by members opposite, such as Waite, Bragg, Devonport, etc.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: I think the figure was over 80 per cent of families had computers connected to the internet. I will have to check that, but it is something like that. An investment of 39,056 computers will be made in South Australian schools. Any cut to funding would damage South Australian students' capacity to learn, live and work in a digital world. As I have said, it will especially damage those children who, for various reasons, are already struggling in life and often already struggling at school, which is again demonstrated by the Understanding Educational Opportunities and Outcomes: An Atlas of South Australia.

Clearly, a vote for Mr Abbott is a vote for cuts to education. All Mr Abbott offers in the way of education policy is a shaky future for our teachers, fewer skilled young workers and fewer computers for children. So, I urge all members to think about their local communities and schools and consider what sort of damage this foreshadowed decision would cause. I call on all those opposite to do all they can to influence their federal colleagues to change this damaging decision in education, which will impact negatively on so many school students and families, and the future of Australia in terms of developing a highly skilled, 21st century workforce. It will increase social divide, as those with less education become sicker and poorer. We also know that social division includes increased social disruptions. It is a small amount of money that Mr Abbott wants to cut, overall; it is a large amount of money in terms of the impact it will have.

Time expired.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:30): If I may speak briefly to the member for Reynell's motion, I respect the way in which she has delivered the concerns of the community that she represents, and I have a great level of respect personally for the member for Reynell. I understand that education is the key to our future; it is very important. Interestingly, I had a school tour yesterday from my own community, a year 7 group, and in this very chamber (on the floor; not all the way in, but just up there) I enforced upon them, at grade 7, the need for them to complete their year 12 studies to ensure that they have the opportunity to make a choice as to whether they go on to university education or trade training areas, but, importantly, it gives them the flexibility to ensure that their lives can be all that they possibly have the opportunity to achieve.

I am interested in the member for Reynell's contribution. A lot of information was provided, and I thank her for that detailed contribution. Firstly, regarding the 1992 compared to 1994 comment on the number of young people who are completing year 12, I am somewhat amazed that the issue that flowed through from that was that the Liberal Party, upon coming to government in 1993, was responsible for that significant drop quoted by her as being from 92 per cent completion of year 12 down to some 50 per cent.

After a 12 month period of being in government, I am not sure how a government can be held to account for such a significant drop. There must be a lot of issues involved in that. The member for Reynell has spoken about the fact that, even now, it is only back up to a 75 per cent completion rate, and I support her fully in the fact that that is disappointing. It demonstrates that our young people are not being sufficiently motivated to ensure that they do go to that effort to complete their year 12 studies to give them every opportunity in life.

However, the member for Reynell needs to reflect upon the fact that she has been part of a government for the past eight years that has presided over that achieving of a 75 per cent rate. It is a challenge for governments of all persuasions—there is no doubt about that—to ensure that our young people get the education opportunities provided to them, because we need really talented young people out there to pursue university and to pursue trade training areas, to ensure that our

economy has the flexibility, through a skilled workforce, to reach its potential and not be held back by a lack of skill development.

I also take up the issue of trade training, and in this area I reflect to the house that my son is a third year apprentice electrician. He always wanted to be an electrician, ever since he was about 10. I was very pleased that after completing year 11 and after doing a six month TAFE course in general engineering, I think it was, he was able to take up an apprenticeship opportunity in the city and he works for really good people.

We need to reflect upon the fact that it was the Howard government that actually put funding in place to establish trade training skills. There were three colleges, I think, intended to be established. It is federal Labor that has actually withdrawn from that commitment. I know that in the member for Reynell's area, I think at Christies Beach, it is the Catholic education system that has actually had to take that over.

Ms Thompson: Right, because Howard's model didn't work.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I know that in the northern one there are some 300 students (I believe) who are going through that, and job outcomes are very strong from that. So, it is an example where there have to be principles and policies in place from all governments to ensure that those young kids have that chance.

The member for Reynell has also spoken about the investment by the federal government in the construction of buildings. This is very important, not just as part of the stimulus package that was prepared to ensure that Australia did not go into a recession, but I think some \$16.8 billion has been committed over the three or four years of that program. However, an inquiry is being undertaken into the cost implications of many of these projects. Constant media attention is being devoted to examples of relatively small buildings. I agree that some of these are in remote locations, but often they are in large centres where the costs have been enormous—

Ms Chapman: Three times.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Three times, the member for Bragg confirms to me, in some cases—and the outcome is certainly not what the school and the children require. It is easy to make accusations across the chamber about the withdrawal of support, but there is also the need for governments to ensure that dollars are spent appropriately, especially in this case where it is borrowed money. These examples are terrible. They were on the front page of *The Australian* constantly for weeks. The investigator that the now Prime Minister has appointed has a lot of work to do to ensure that those monies have been spent appropriately.

I do believe, based on the briefing that I have had from DTEI, who have coordinated the construction activities in South Australia, that it has been a far more efficient method of delivery. So, I sit comfortably with that, but in other states there are great concerns. The opposition is fully supportive of education opportunities for our children. It does recognise that in difficult economic times it is very important to still invest significant dollars and a significant proportion of the budget in this key area. Health, education and law and order are the key issues that any political party take as part of their policy development into an election period and, importantly, must deliver upon.

We are approaching a federal election, potentially not that far away, depending on what all the media reports might be. This is an issue about young people either learning or earning. I understand that, yes; that is Rann government policy. I personally support that very strongly also, because we need to ensure that none of the young people fall by the wayside, fall through the cracks. I want to ensure that every teacher that operates in all of our schools, public or private, is motivated towards making a difference to young people's lives. That is where support for teacher training is important too. Let us hope, as we work towards a federal election, that both political parties really continue the very strong support they have for education, because education will determine the future of our great nation.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:37): This motion is interesting in that I do not believe the federal opposition can do anything in relation to cutting funding. It says, 'intent to cut', but they will have to put that to the people and the people will make a judgement at the next federal election. As we know, if you have been around a while in politics, if you do not have your schools on side you run the risk of not being in politics.

In terms of computers in schools, there has been a significant advance. Obviously, they are an important tool, an important aid, but we still need to encourage creative thinking—that goes

along with the use of computers. I think some people see computers as a substitute for creative thinking, analysis, and so on. They are not.

Trade training is something that I have had a particular interest in for a long time. I am aware that two of my local high schools are putting considerable effort into improving trade training options. We know that students at high school now can participate in a trade as well as attend secondary school.

Aberfoyle Park High is in the process of converting a building into a technical studies area, building on what they have. It has been a wish of mine for a long time that Aberfoyle Park High, which has been and still is a great high school, does have a greater offering in terms of technical training. So, I am delighted that, finally, Aberfoyle Park High is getting some additional resources and facilities to facilitate technical training.

Likewise, Reynella East High School has been very active in providing technical training. In fact, they have become so popular with technical training that they cannot accommodate all the students who want to do technical training there. That is a welcome change from a few years ago, when everyone seemed to have an aspiration to be a lawyer, or something like that. Nothing against lawyers, expensive as they are, but we need tradespeople, we need all sorts of people.

The program, for example, at Reynella East, which has been supported by the state government and, one would hope will be supported by the federal government, can be expanded because there is a great demand. As I said, the recent expansion has been in the area of metalwork. There is CAD/CAM (computer assisted design)—all the possibilities are there—and the school, as a result of its success and the quality of its programs, is battling to accommodate all the students who want to go there and do technical-type training.

One of the related aspects of that—and I used to work for what is now the University of South Australia—is when they got rid of the Underdale campus (which is still a sore point with me) for a measly \$30 million, and also got rid of the Salisbury campus, in order to create a facility in the city and for other reasons that are probably questionable. At Underdale they destroyed trade training facilities for technical teachers, facilities that were excellent.

They had parquet flooring, which is not the most important thing, but they had all the machinery, properly ducted for dust and everything, and it was all bulldozed; likewise, the home economics facilities, which cost a lot of money to create with ovens and all the other facilities which are critical as part of hospitality training, were all destroyed by the University of South Australia. I have reminded them, in a letter to the Vice Chancellor, Professor Peter Høj, of what happened. He is not to blame as he was not there at the time. It happened when Denise Bradley was supposedly running the show.

If someone wants to be a technical teacher now, they have to do their theory at Mawson Lakes and then find somewhere to do their practical, which is probably in TAFE, and that is not anywhere near as good as what was available before. It is totally inadequate compared with what used to exist and was destroyed for the sake of a few pieces of silver by the University of South Australia.

The then minister for education, Malcolm Buckby, should be criticised, too, because he allowed the university basically to do what it liked with the Underdale site, and we lost not only teacher training facilities for home economics, hospitality and technical areas but also the nursing building, one of the best in the state, was bulldozed. It was a disgraceful act and the University of South Australia will forever stand condemned for doing that, as will the minister at the time for allowing it to happen.

People now wanting to promote the training of technical teachers are hampered in this state because we do not have a one-stop shop, one location where it can be done; likewise for home economics and hospitality training for people going into teaching. That is a very sad commentary on what has happened in the past.

In terms of trade training, we saw the Howard government create an alternative to TAFE. This has been raised before, but it was done purely because the Howard government did not like trade unions or the AEU, which represented people in TAFE who were involved in technical-type activities. The criticism and fear of those unions was unfounded and unwarranted, and as a result now we have the creation of some additional alternative facilities to TAFE, when the resources should have gone into TAFE to build up what I used to call South Australia's best kept secret, that is, TAFE SA.

I know that TAFE has taken a whack around the ears in recent times, but it is a critical part of trade training, and it is also important in terms of its linkages to schools and the relationship it has with schools. I was intending, as minister at the time, for TAFE to sponsor its own technology high schools, but sadly that did not come to pass.

In relation to teacher quality, to its credit Flinders University has just decided to revise its approach to teacher training. I think it is long overdue. I spent most of my working life before I came here training teachers. It is absolutely critical that the teaching profession has the best training. It is the mother profession. If you do not have top quality, properly trained teachers, who get not only theory but also practical experience, then you will not have the teachers you need to work in our schools. There has been a revision lately, particularly at Flinders University, of the way in which they train teachers.

I have had criticism from teachers in the field, saying that there have been a lot of shortcomings in the teacher training program. In one case a teacher told me that 13 different teachers had written negative reports about a student teacher but that person was kept on; and they failed to see how that could possibly be the case.

In terms of the final part of this motion, the federal Liberal opposition would be crazy to go to the people of Australia without having a commitment to boost funding for schools. It is vital that we see proper funding for state schools. Out of the BER, state schools got basically tin sheds, while private schools got better facilities. The private schools were allowed to manage the funds and got the best value for the dollar, but the state schools got tin sheds because they were not trusted to commission their own architects and building designers, and so on, and you can see the result around the state.

Hopefully, it will not happen again that we get an ad hoc approach to facilities in schools. We should allow the schools to run their own affairs through the governing council, the principal and staff so that they can deliver what is best in the interests of their children—as happens in the private school sector.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (11:47): I thank members for their contributions and I will respond to a couple of points that were made. The member for Goyder said that he does not understand why there was a sudden collapse. The message from the Olsen government emphasised the fact that young people would have a hard time in South Australia. The member for Goyder may recall the massive migration of young people from South Australia. People who were traditionally looking to manufacturing, etc., for employment interpreted this as, 'Well, there is nowhere to go and nothing will happen.' Young people told me that the message they got was that there was no hope for them and there were not any jobs for them, so they might as well get out of school and not get in the way of kids who looked like they would have a chance for a job.

This is a subtle way of operation, but many young people told me when I started campaigning in 1995 that that is what had happened to them. They believed that there was no chance for them, so they might as well go on benefits and get out of the way. Why it has taken so long to rebuild that is a mystery. If I knew more about it, I would have been urging more strongly the Minister for Education to rebuild it. I know that former ministers Lomax-Smith and White were really concerned about it. For instance, former minister Lomax-Smith commissioned the new SACE as a way to address it. It took a long time to develop it because it was necessary to engage in wide consultation with the education community, the industry, parents and children in order to try to develop a new SACE; and we are hopeful that the new SACE will address it.

In fact, the member for Goyder was not here in 2002 but the first act passed by the Rann Labor government was to increase the school retention age. We then amended the school retention situation again by requiring that children had to be learning or earning. We did not just say that as an open-mouth operation: we entrenched it in legislation and we backed it with dollars to ensure that young people were constructively engaged in learning for their future. This is part of our commitment to social inclusion; it is part of our commitment to education.

One important thing that did happen under, I think, the Olsen government by the time this happened was that the then minister for education, Malcolm Buckby, cut the school year by a week. He was very happy to deprive children of one week's education per year. This accumulates quite a bit: 12 years' education, 12 weeks' less opportunity for learning. That indicates the Liberal's commitment to education: 'We will just save some money, save some electricity'—that was one of the justifications given—'cut the school year by a week, it doesn't matter; the kids don't learn anything much in that week in any case.' But, of course, the final week of school still exists. It does

not matter when it is held. It could be held at week two. If it is the final week of school, there would not be much going on.

I have been able to check the internet access figures in the interim, and in the areas that go through the electorates of Waite, Davenport, Heysen, Bragg and Norwood, across that area, fewer than 11 per cent of homes have no internet access compared with the one in three in some of the other areas. The trade training centres introduced by Mr Howard were not a model that worked. They only took in students in years 11 and 12. By that time children had already made their decisions about where they were going. They need exposure to trade training well before that so that they can develop their learning paths and make their choices.

The member for Fisher talked about the BER and continued the mythology about the fact that the outcomes are not good in the state school sector. I can assure members that most of my state schools in the area are getting the best buildings on their campus as a result of the BER. They are getting model buildings that have been built before at places such as Linden Park. They never had buildings like those at Linden Park. They have beautiful buildings coming, and they are very proud of them and very happy about them.

Motion carried.

FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES DEPARTMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:52): I move:

That this house calls upon the Minister for Families and Communities to publish regular waiting list data concerning services within all of her portfolios on the Department for Families and Communities website, including disability support and equipment lists and Housing Trust waiting lists.

The situation at present is that, once a year, the department publishes a number of these lists. They also appear in the annual reports of various entities under the minister's control, including the annual report of the South Australian Housing Trust. There are other reports for which she is responsible, again, which canvass this on an annual basis. Often when we receive this information it is a year out of date and sometimes much more. However, the state government has commissioned Monsignor Cappo to undertake a report within his social inclusion responsibilities, to report back by 1 July next year on the questions of unmet need (both assessment of the problems and, hopefully, finding some solutions) for the funding and provision of services and accommodation for the disability area.

He has done one on mental health. We have numerous reports that have undertaken assessments in respect of our public housing. There is absolutely no reason why we, as part of the community, should not have readily available, via websites, a monthly update of each of these lists, because they provide to the community a regular assessment for people to understand the extent of the requirement and for advocate groups to be able to present their case, and for the government to know where on earth it is going in these areas is also critically important.

I point out to the house that, after some considerable lobbying by the opposition and other groups in the health area and sector (both the government and non-government sector), they were able to announce that they would provide their health waiting lists, which include access to elective surgery, on a monthly basis on the website. I have subsequently been concerned at the delay of how quickly the monthly website published material appears. Usually it is about three months in arrears. However, at least they accepted responsibility to do that; and, whilst they might be tardy in attention to it they have at least committed to do it. I simply say that it is able to be done, it should be done and it must be done if we are to assess properly the situation and be able to plan accurately for the future.

The specific areas I have highlighted in this proposal are for disability support and equipment lists. Members would be aware, I am sure, because they would receive as many letters as I do, of people who are suffering from or have a family member who has a disability and who is not able to access adequate services. For a number of years prior to coming into this place, I served as chair of the Home and Community Care Board, and the allocation of funding and resources, limited as some would argue they were—and I think that is fair comment—were to be distributed to the high level of need in this area. It became clear to me that there was a massive unmet need, and I think that is universally accepted now.

At the federal level the productivity commissioner is looking into the assessment of the problems that we have in the provision of services, including the provision of equipment for people who have either intellectual or physical disabilities. That is also to report on 1 July next year. In

particular, consideration will be given to what has been described nationally as a disability insurance scheme. I think what is being proposed is something different to that but, basically, instead of a Medicare levy on income taxpayers, the proposal is for a DISACARE levy, payable by income tax payers.

Consideration needs to be given to distribution to people with a disability, and the extent, and who is going to be in and who is going to be out; and whether we are going to include all people with a disability or exclude those who have a disability through the workplace or who have had a motor vehicle accident and can recover through the motor accident commission, or whether we have only those who are unable to access other private or independent funds. Then the question will be what services will be provided—whether housing is in or out. I have seen one very detailed submission that suggests that housing should not be in and it should just be for services and people waiting for physical aids for disability.

They are all the challenges we have as to future requirements. But, at the very least, let's have the data. The minister, on behalf of the department, is the only one who otherwise has access to this information and, if we truly work towards resolution, we must do this properly. In respect of the disability and access to services and lists, there is clearly an overlap in the concerns about the people who are waiting to get on the waiting lists. There should be also a full and frank disclosure of those who are waiting to be assessed for the purposes of getting on those lists, whether they are for aids or services.

One example came from a woman who wrote to me whose daughter at age 14 years of age had a significant disability. She wrote to me a couple of months ago to tell me that her daughter was in the intensive care unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital after sustaining very severe burns. She now has more disabilities, very significant disabilities, as well as the ongoing and very expensive healthcare costs. This woman recounted to me what few direct services she had had in the past and how, when she moved interstate and came back and put in a request for equipment and other services, she went to the bottom of the list. We have absurd situations like this, so we need to know who is on the list and all of the people who are waiting to get on the list, and the categories they are in.

This woman has highlighted the absurdity of a government having to pick up, through another minister's responsibility, namely health, the significant economic cost to the state if this is not properly attended to. It is a very tragic case, and this woman is now on another waiting list for a lifter. If she had had the bathroom modifications to her home in the first place, perhaps her daughter would not have been tragically burnt in the first place. This woman just needs basic things, like a headrest so that she does not have to try to prop up her daughter's head with pillows. The absurdity of this situation and the cruelty of denial of access should make the minister appreciate the importance of having regular lists.

Another case I have referred to in this house is of a 21 year old woman who has been in the psychiatric ward at Flinders Medical Centre. This motion gives me an opportunity to update members about this young woman with a disability. It is important that people with disabilities have access to health services when they need them, just like able persons. However, this young woman has clearly had her medical treatment and she has been waiting all these months to get disabled housing—and I have told the parliament about this before.. We do not know, of course, how many people are waiting for disability housing because the government's policy now is to amalgamate the housing lists, so everyone is lumped in together, which is another clever way of trying to keep us ignorant of the real situation.

This poor girl has at least had the Public Advocate on her case for a number of months but, on my understanding, it is still a problem. Knowing the history of this girl, particularly that she had been a victim of sexual abuse for an extended period when she was only 15—which is shameful in itself—both Disability SA and the Flinders Medical Centre placed this young girl in an unlockable room on a locked ward with demented men.

Most recently, one of the other patients had come into her room naked on a number of occasions and, only in the last couple of weeks, had come next to her bed and urinated. The matter was brought to the attention of the nursing staff and, obviously, they promptly attended to the matter. But here is the incredible thing: when the young woman's relative—who, as her co-guardian, is also desperately trying to get this child into proper care—complained, she was told, 'Everything is okay. There is nothing to worry about; he didn't rape her.'

That is the level of concern there must be out in the community that we, as members of parliament, get the tragic and very distraught requests from people in the community who are waiting for equipment and told that they are going to be put onto another list and that they are going to be attended to. Years later, they are ringing, writing and asking for assistance for the most basic amenities, yet the government will not even regularly tell us what the position is in the community. We on this side of the house accept—as I am sure others in the community do—that there is no endless bucket of money and that there are not endless resources of skilled people to be able to assist people with disabilities, as in health and other things.

We understand that there will always be limitations. Whether we come up with a national insurance scheme or other things, there will always be limitations on the very large cost in providing for people in the community with a disability. I personally believe that we have an obligation to fellow South Australians to ensure that we here in this parliament make provisions and make them to the best of our ability. So when I hear that there is a disgraceful waste of resource in another portfolio, or that we are taking up, as I have explained to this house before, a bed facility in a hospital at thousands of dollars a week cost when we can provide that same service for hundreds of dollars a week at cost, then it just makes me weep to think that these people cannot get services.

I refer to the housing position. This is not just the accommodation for high needs people. We have an obligation, and, for example, we keep housing trust lists of the people who are waiting for facilities. Whether they are disabled, leaving prison, a domestic violence victim, have a mental health issue, have a physical disability, these are people who are very high need, and sometimes we allocate for our refugee and immigrant community extra high levels of need. If you get into category one, you have a chance of getting into government-provided housing, or community housing through charitable and benevolent organisations. That is terrific, but if you are on the rest of the list you might as well not even be on it, to be honest. Let us have some transparency from the government with this list as to what is happening.

I just want to bring to the attention of members the very latest letter that I have written to the minister. I know that we all write letters to the minister saying, for example, 'Why is this happening? What can we do for this particular case? There is an urgency about this because of a child protection issue'. A very simple case came to my attention the other day, where a woman's husband was killed, I think actually under some mischievous circumstances, but I do not understand her to be a suspect. In any event, he died. They were the occupants of a housing trust property. Possibly this had something to do with the young children witnessing what happened, but it is in the interests of this family, the mother and her children, to leave the property and to get another facility. She has been told by the housing trust that she has to go back on the waiting list and actually reapply at the bottom of the list. It is just absurd. We have these ridiculous situations. We must have that information and we must have it regularly, so that we can ensure that the provision is there.

The other thing is, we need to do it to make the government accountable. We had the minister just this week come into the parliament and refer to the Tanya Plibersek money, from the national housing funds that the federal government has allocated under its nation building stimulus plan, of which the federal government had provided the money to build public housing, and of which, for this year, as of to 30 June yesterday, they had received \$51.9 million to build nearly 250 dwellings to be finished by yesterday. The minister came into the parliament the other day, just before 30 June, to proudly say, and I quote: 'We have been given a tough target of 173 homes by today, and I am thrilled to report we have accepted the 204th house this afternoon.' She has not even reached that target! So, let's be honest about this in relation to the government: let's have the full, accountable, on time information.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (12:08): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete the existing paragraph and replace with:

That this house congratulates the Rann government on its transparency and notes the ongoing commitment of the Minister for Families and Communities to publish regular waiting list data concerning services within all of her portfolios.

I provide some information to indicate to the house why I consider it necessary to move that amendment. The Department for Families and Communities has a commitment to transparency and accountability, and there are already a number of reporting mechanisms on services that DFC provides, which are published in the public arena. Some of these reporting mechanisms are managed by DFC itself, but also external agencies review DFC's service delivery and activities.

This means there is both internal review and external review. The Australian government's Report on Government Services is a good example of this.

For instance, disability unmet need figures are published on the DFC website and updated every six months. This provides information about the number of people with a disability who are eligible and waiting for Disability SA services. This includes supported accommodation, which includes: personal in-home support, community access, community support and respite services. It should be noted that some of the individuals on the list may be registered for more than one of these services. The list was first published by DFC in response to a commitment made in 2008 to provide open and transparent information about the extent to which people are waiting for disability services. Only a few other jurisdictions publish disability waiting list information, and then only for certain programs and services. This government's commitment to transparency and accountability is steadfast and beyond the norm.

The unmet need data that is published on the website is part of a report entitled, *The Provision of Disability Services in South Australia*. The most recent data relates to the December 2009 quarter. This was published on the website on 6 May 2010. It is important that people recognise that the concept of a waiting list is not merely a sequential order of service for individuals. DFC waiting lists, by their nature, servicing those with the greatest need, are most fluid. Positions change according to the changing needs and changing priorities of needs of clients. This fluidity can, and often does, occur on a daily basis.

Similarly, the waiting list for Housing SA accommodation is segmented by basing service delivery on need. The number of applicants within each category adjusts as households move through the segments. Applicants approved for highest need categories are reviewed regularly and new households are assessed daily. As a result, the waiting list for each category is similarly fluid—frequently changing as existing applicants' circumstances change and new household needs are assessed. Housing SA waiting list information is published annually in the South Australian Housing Trust Annual Report, the Housing in Focus report and the Australian government's Report on Government Services. Total waiting list figures, as at 30 June, are published in the annual report and comparison is drawn against the previous financial year. The number of new applications received throughout the year is also published and, in addition to this, allocations data is reported.

This whole picture provides the reader with some sense of supply and demand across the financial year. Publishing annually and contrasting with the previous year's data allows for an informed analysis of the demands in the housing sector. Analysis of waiting list data more frequently than on an annual basis may lead to a distorted interpretation due to the ebbs and flows of vacancies and allocations that occur from day to day. Other reporting mechanisms include the Housing in Focus report and the federal government's Report on Government Services. Briefly, the Housing in Focus report presents social housing trends, providing the reader with a range and depth of information on Housing SA activities. It enables comparison across time and shows trends related to sociodemographic shifts as well as changes resulting from policy and program developments.

The Housing in Focus report also includes a breakdown of the waiting list by application category: category 1, category 2, category 3, low demand, and pending. Commentary contained in the report provides the reader with sociodemographics of the waiting list, such as household composition and age. Allocations information is also reported in detail in the Housing in Focus report, along with information on the length of time applicants wait prior to being allocated a property. Coupled with the federal government's Report on Government Services, these measures—all within the public arena—provide an accurate picture of the waiting lists for disability and housing services in South Australia.

In regard to the equipment service of DFC and its waiting list, in July 2008 the Department for Families and Communities created a single equipment program (known as the DFC equipment program) for clients of Disability SA and Domiciliary Care SA. Domiciliary Equipment Service (DES) is the business unit of Domiciliary Care SA and manages all provision of equipment and home modifications on behalf of DFC.

The major outcomes of an integrated equipment service include: consistent, equitable and simple access to equipment regardless of age, need or location; consistent assessment and priority systems; the development of demand management systems and accurate waiting lists; a service that supports retention of equipment and portability of transitioning between systems or age groups; stronger governance and enhanced risk management; savings due to appropriate

refurbishment of equipment and bulk purchasing of equipment; and more stringent project management of home modifications.

Over the past 12 months DFC has been working on this, and it is envisaged that some aspect of this data will be published in the next annual report. Of course, as time goes on data will be refined and become more accurate. The end result will be an accurate picture of the demand for service. No one service provided by DFC is the same, and not every service has a wait list. There is no wait list, for example, for Seniors Cards. Customers can be issued with one on the spot and be eligible for support.

The Hon. S.W. Key: You have to be 60.

Ms THOMPSON: As the member for Ashford points out, the only waiting is—

The Hon. S.W. Key: The age.

Ms THOMPSON: the age—and I don't know how many of us are in a hurry to get to those ages. DFC provides many other services without any delay. DFC's commitment to speedy and responsive customer service is resolute.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: Some of us here aspire to getting to the age to be eligible, and some of us are not interested. Comparing the wait of a family for public housing with an individual's wait for a piece of equipment provides no real insight into the pressure of demand and need that DFC faces. Similarly, looking at waiting lists from week to week will offer little. The Department for Families and Communities and this government are committed to openness and transparency. The department liaises regularly with members of parliament, journalists and researchers in the efforts of transparency and accountability.

When questioned on this matter by the member for Bragg during last year's estimates hearings the minister provided an answer in detail for the house. This included the equipment service waiting list data, as the member requested, as at June 2008 and June 2009, to help assist the member understand the trends and pressures over a yearly period. The Department for Families and Communities' commitment to openness in government will continue into the future under this government's watch, but one must focus on the fact that what we are trying to do is provide services, not keep stats. This government is committed to the provision of appropriate and early services, using taxpayer money wisely, and at the same time providing regular information sufficient to allow the community to monitor the progress of the government in its objectives.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (12:22): I rise to support the amendment that is being proposed by the member for Reynell and to endorse her comments about the importance of making sure that the Department for Families and Communities can get on with its work. Certainly, the Public Service Association, in particular, has talked about the workload levels and the case load levels that workers in that area have. I think we all understand and agree that some of the work that is done by employees for the Department for Families and Communities is extremely difficult and complex and also very stressful. To add the requirements that I know for good reason the member for Bragg has raised seems to me to be something that is not a priority.

While there are records in those departments—and certainly in the housing area—of the need, and also of the people who are supported and are provided services in that area, the government does not feel that the provision that the member for Bragg has moved is necessary. On that basis, I support the amendment being put forward by the member for Reynell and, as I understand, seconded by the member for Bright.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:24): I will address this motion on the basis that the amendment has been put in the first instance and then cover a few matters in response. First, I thank other speakers for contributing to the debate on this matter. The member for Reynell has moved an amendment, and I simply indicate that the opposition opposes it. In particular, as the mover of the motion, I do not accept the amendment nor will I be supporting it. This is not an amendment. This is the complete opposite of what has been proposed.

The motion clearly identifies a request for a minister of the Crown to do certain things in the publication of information regarding waiting lists in her portfolios. This amendment, as presented, is a congratulatory motion concerning issues of transparency and the commitment of the minister in respect of what information she currently provides. It is not amendment at all. It is a complete rewriting and, in fact, a direct contradiction of the motion.

In addition, it raises other issues, including some alleged basis upon which congratulations should be given to the government on its apparent transparency. That is an entirely different matter, but even if you were to accept that it is consistent in subject matter, it is a direct contradiction of the motion. Therefore, I ask the house to reject the amendment and to vote on the original motion. In relation to my original motion, other speakers have highlighted the need to publish waiting lists and other data regularly. The member for Reynell suggests that, the number of publications provided to this house by the minister from her department should be adequate and, indeed, the honourable member suggests that that needs to be rewarded with some congratulations.

Quite frankly, I am stunned at that, because she must receive, as we all do, complaints from constituents who say, 'I have no idea where I am on the list. I have no access to who else I am competing against. I do not even know whether I am on the list or whether I am on a waiting list to go on a waiting list.' She knows full well, as do other members, that we are a year in arrears in receiving this information, if we are lucky. Sometimes the reports come even later. Yesterday, I read a report of the Aboriginal Lands Trust which was the annual report for the year ending 2008. I received it on its two-year anniversary, as other members did, meaning it was two years out of date, and further, it reports data collected the previous year.

Clearly, the member for Reynell must acknowledge that this is not a timely provision of information. We cannot possibly advise and support our constituents, or come to this house to debate legislation or support policy that is going to show the direction for the provision of resources for people who need help, without this information. I am talking about the hurt, hungry and homeless in our community who need serious help. We must have this information. It is critical to our deliberations and the debates in which our constituents expect us to participate.

The South Australian community who either need the services at any one time or have carers, friends and relatives who are desperately trying to support them in the meantime need to have this information from time to time. We owe it to them to make sure that we have that information. I find it extraordinary that anyone on the government's side would not support this motion as it currently stands. It is not a motion condemning the minister for not doing it: it is a motion calling on her to do this, and I would have welcomed a chorus of support.

Time expired.

The house divided on the amendment:

AYES (23)

Atkinson, M.J.	Bedford, F.E.	Bignell, L.W.
Caica, P.	Conlon, P.F.	Fox, C.C.
Geraghty, R.K.	Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	O'Brien, M.F.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, T.	Portolesi, G.	Rankine, J.M.
Rann, M.D.	Rau, J.R.	Sibbons, A.L.
Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G. (teller)	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wright, M.J.	

NOES (20)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.
Pederick, A.S.	Pegler, D.W.	Pengilly, M.
Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R.	Such, R.B.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Venning, I.H.
Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.	

PAIRS (2)

Foley, K.O.

Redmond, I.M.

Majority of 3 for the ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The house divided on the motion as amended:

AYES (23)

Atkinson, M.J.	Bedford, F.E.	Bignell, L.W.
Caica, P.	Conlon, P.F.	Fox, C.C.
Geraghty, R.K.	Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	O'Brien, M.F.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, T.	Portolesi, G.	Rankine, J.M.
Rann, M.D.	Rau, J.R.	Sibbons, A.L.
Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G. (teller)	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wright, M.J.	

NOES (20)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.
Pederick, A.S.	Pegler, D.W.	Pengilly, M.
Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R.	Such, R.B.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Venning, I.H.
Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.	

PAIRS (2)

Foley, K.O.

Redmond, I.M.

Majority of 3 for the ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

ROAD TOLL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this house:

- (a) notes with concern, the continuing road toll in South Australia and urges a full investigation into the reasons and causes why so many South Australians are losing their lives;
- (b) instructs the government to publish statistics to indicate to what degree road conditions, speeding, alcohol, drugs, fatigue and age profiles of drivers and the type of vehicles contribute to these accidents and fatalities; and
- (c) condemns the government for taking the credit for the previously reduced road toll in 2008 and for failing to take effective measures to curb it further.

(Continued from 24 June 2010.)

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:40): I will continue my remarks that I started last week in relation to the road toll. An investigation into the reasons and causes that so many South Australians lose their lives on the roads each year must be undertaken so that strategies and measures can be put in place to lower the number of accidents and fatalities. I know that police investigate fatal accidents, but I believe that more information about the causes of such accidents should be made publicly available soon after the accident occurs.

There is a need to look at what factors contribute to fatal crashes, not only alcohol, drugs and speed, but the road conditions, fatigue, the age profile of drivers and the types of vehicles involved in fatal accidents. I know that some of these details are outlined on the Department of Transport website and also on the SAPOL website, as well as being replicated on the Motor Accident Commission's website.

However, the statistics are not very specific. The age and sex of the person involved is quite clear, but other details such as the type of vehicle are not, and some statistics are only presented as a percentage over a whole year. For example, the South Australian Police website states that 'in 2009, 35 per cent of people who died had a blood alcohol concentration of 0.05 per cent or higher'. I think such information should be released on an accident by accident basis, not as an average over the whole year. I know and realise the sensitivities involved here, so maybe it could just be said to be driver impairment.

The type of vehicle and the road conditions should also be made public, not just whether it was a four-wheel drive or a sedan but whether it was a high-powered supercharged V8 or a turbo charged sports car. Was the road full of potholes or the verge crumbling and falling away? I believe it is important to release all the details that contribute to a fatal accident.

At the risk of being controversial, I believe that too much emphasis has been put on speed only and not on other contributing factors as well. The compilation and publication of statistics and data indicating what factors contribute to fatal accidents would assist the public to be more aware of the causes behind road deaths and may result in altered driving conditions and behaviours and, therefore, prevent more fatalities in the future.

It would also assist the government by highlighting areas that need more focus so that targeted measures—legislation, driver education programs and whatever—can be implemented to reduce the toll. For example, it is interesting to note that the age group that is over-represented in our state's fatalities at the moment is 40 to 49 year olds, an age group that you would not traditionally think would be the highest level of fatalities.

Mr Pederick: I'm in it.

Mr VENNING: The member for Hammond says he is in that, so let the member be warned that, statistically, he is at high risk. I do not know why this aberration is there, I have no idea, but it ought to be explained to us why it is and how it happens. Is there any correlation between this and younger driver behaviour? When you think about it, many learner drivers would be taught by drivers in the age bracket of 40 to 49. Are our young people getting the best driver education by being taught by these people?

Mr Pederick: Absolutely.

Mr VENNING: Are they learning bad habits? 'Absolutely,' I heard the member for Hammond say. In 2008, the road toll was reduced to 99 deaths for the year, a result the Rann Labor government took much credit for. However, it rose again last year to 119, and the number of deaths so far this year leads to predictions that the road toll will again be near 110-120 fatalities, which is pretty sad indeed.

There is a need for the Rann Labor government to take further measures to curb the road toll. The Motor Accident Commission recently called for its own road safety curriculum for schools, as a large proportion of deaths on South Australian roads are of young people. However, the Rann government's response to this has been to say that it will expand the existing Metropolitan Fire Service's Road Awareness and Accident Prevention Program so that 90 per cent of year 11 students undertake the program, compared with 44 per cent currently. The Rann government has not given any time frame for this expansion.

I think the German experience is something that we could learn from. In Germany, learner drivers are taught to handle cars at speed, and they practise driving on their autobahns, with up to 130 km/h speed limits on them, before they obtain their licence. European governments are also channelling more resources into making their roads safer, especially divided highways. In South Australia, we should be spending much more on dualling our troublesome busy highways—absolutely. The road to Victor Harbor should be a dual highway, at least as far as Mount Compass in the short term, so should the Sturt Highway (eventually all the way to the state border) and Port Wakefield Road to at least Port Pirie in the short term. The Dukes Highway from Murray Bridge to Bordertown should be dualled immediately.

You can see what is happening as they open up the Northern Expressway at the moment. The new dualling is just fantastic, and I congratulate all those involved. It is so much safer because you cannot run into cars coming the other way, because there is a piece of land between you and the oncoming cars—and these highways are busy. The question remains: is too much emphasis put on speed alone and not more on these other factors? Does this government care more about

placing cameras in areas for revenue raising to fill its coffers than they do about implementing other measures that would have an impact on reducing the road toll?

There is a strong opinion out there that this is the case. I believe that all money raised from speeding fines should be directed into road safety. Surely that makes sense. New strategies and measures need to be implemented to reduce the road toll, as the current measures are clearly not working at all, yet the Rann Labor government has failed to implement any new initiatives that may result in a reduction in road deaths.

I was moved to move this after driving to Adelaide the other day. Coming through Clare, in the 80 km/h speed area, I noticed a police car on the other side of the road had picked up a driver—the flashing light was going. Of course, I automatically slowed down. I was driving at the speed limit, anyway, but you do that automatically. It was not 30 seconds later, when this car came up behind me and screamed past me like I was standing still. It was a Subaru WRX, and the age of the driver was 16 or 17. What sort of a brain is that, with a police car just down the road?

It really upset me. I should have taken the number of the car. There is another statistic waiting to happen. It is just all about driver education. Lads like that should not have a car like that. They are showing off because they have got this invincible attitude: 'It won't happen to me'. When I first came into this house, I was lucky enough to represent the Port Broughton area. The Port Broughton secondary school had a motor car on campus, and all the students undertook driver training from a professional driver training instructor. I think we should see that idea returned.

I wanted to raise these matters, because we have a fight here. It does cross the political line. We are trying to address this, but we are losing the battle. More and more of our young people are losing their lives. The cost to the community, the state and the government as a result of this loss of life is a massive amount of money. If we decided to put more money into our road infrastructure, we would certainly save that money. It would be a commonsense move.

We would all appreciate being able to drive safely on the roads. When a car is being driven along a road, you just presume that that person is in control of the car, it is a roadworthy car, the driver is not drunk or under drugs and will not hit you or your family. I urge the parliament to consider this motion. It is not a moved along a political line at all; it is common sense, and I hope that you will support it.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:49): I will speak very briefly because it would be good to have this motion dispatched. The first point to make about the road toll is that, while in recent years the road toll has fluctuated—going down to under 100 a couple of years ago, but recently climbing back up again to the 111 mark, which is disappointing—one has to keep in mind that, when this government came to office, the road toll in 2002 was 156. So, what we have seen in the eight years of the Rann government is a 30 per cent reduction (about a third) in the road toll—a massive reduction. If the member for Schubert had done his homework, perhaps he might have realised that.

The reduction in road fatalities is one of the things that this government can point to as one of its greatest achievements. That achievement has not come about from the government sitting on its hands and doing nothing. It has come about because the government has been willing to introduce a number of important reforms which, in the face of criticisms from the opposition, the government has pushed ahead with and which have resulted in serious reductions in both the number of fatalities and the number of serious injuries on the road.

In the past five years South Australia has had the greatest average annual decrease in the number of fatalities of any state—a 5.3 per cent decline. This decline is in the face of ever increasing numbers of road users. So, we have a greater number of road users, yet we are still able to achieve a reduction in fatalities. Although the figures for 2009 showed an increase in fatalities, there was a reduction in serious injuries in the previous year. It is important, when looking at the road toll, to focus not just on the fatalities but to look at the whole picture and keep in mind the number of serious injuries.

Since 2000, serious injuries have decreased each year, except in 2006 and 2007. In 2009 the total reached 1,101, a 10 per cent decrease from the 2008 total and the lowest yearly total of serious injuries since systematic recording began in 1968. If we think about the amount of traffic that would have been on the roads in 1968, it is amazing to think that we have the lowest

number of serious injuries on the road. Despite probably a quadrupling of the number of road users, we have a huge reduction in the number of serious injuries.

Regarding the points made by the member for Schubert about data being produced, all of this information is already available; it does not require a direction from this house to the government. The Centre for Automotive Safety Research (CASR) undertakes research on a variety of road safety issues, and I commend the CASR to anyone interested in the issue of road safety. We are very lucky to have that unit here in South Australia, and a range of reports have been published and are available on the CASR website. It is the only research organisation in Australia that conducts 'at scene' crash investigation, enabling the collection of crucial data about the causes for crashes for in-depth investigation, and reports of these in-depth investigations are available on the CASR website. If the member for Schubert googles the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, he will find that his motion is entirely redundant.

The other information the government produces is through the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. Up-to-date fact sheets, monthly reports and road crash fact booklets are available on the DTEI website, including the road safety progress report published by DTEI each quarter. I commend to members that information, which is readily available. We do not need a motion in this place directing the government to produce data that is already readily available. One only has to hop onto the internet, google the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, or look on the DTEI website, and one will find that all that information is readily available.

With regard to the road toll, sure, in the last couple of years we have had unfortunate increases. It will be nice to get the road toll back down to under 100, as it was a couple of years ago. That was a proud achievement of this government, and I pay particular tribute to the Hon. Carmel Zollo, who was minister at the time, and to the work of the Road Safety Advisory Council as well. A lot of the initiatives they put in place were responsible for an all-time low in the road toll. It is unfortunate that the road toll has crept back up, but even so it is still significantly lower than when this government came to office in 2002.

My other message is to look at not only the road toll but also serious injuries as they are a good indicator of what is happening out there on the roads. This government has been prepared to take tough action—difficult political action—to make sure that our roads are safer and that fewer kids, fewer young people, fewer adults are killed and harmed on our roads. That is why I say that this motion should be resoundingly defeated in the chamber.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:54): I would like to make some comments in relation to this motion. As the Minister for Road Safety has pointed out, the road toll is tragic—the loss of any life on the road is tragic—but it is now less than a third of what it was 20 years ago. It would be great to get it down to zero, but that is a challenge. While it is still significant in terms of personal tragedy it has dropped dramatically. I believe that is because people in the main have been wearing seatbelts. For some reason which escapes me, some people, particularly in rural areas, do not wear seatbelts; I cannot understand why.

The other important issue is that modern cars are better designed. Sadly, South Australia has the oldest car fleet in the nation outside Tasmania. In particular, many young people are getting around in cars which should have been pensioned off. I have argued to the federal government that we should follow the German, French, British and, in part, American experience of assisting people on low incomes to update their motor vehicle because it will help to save lives.

In relation to the question of painted speed limits on roads, I have spoken informally to the minister about this. In New South Wales they have had it for 20 years. I met the head of the road safety section of the Roads and Traffic Authority (Michael de Roos), who said that it is not a problem for motorcyclists over there. It does provide information. It is on the road surface. They are not everywhere because they cost about \$1,000 each and last about seven or eight years. He said that motorcyclists in New South Wales have no problem with the speed limit painted on the road, but what they do not like is the full cover of the road near crossings and schools—but that must happen.

There is no mention in the motion of pedestrians and cyclists. I would like to see the Motor Accident Commission fund a reflective singlet or reflective armbands to give to cyclists. Apart from the tragedy of a cyclist being killed, the cost to the community is about \$1 million for every road death. In relation to pedestrians, I think there needs to be a review of pedestrian crossing light times. If people have to wait, they do not wait but, rather, cross—and that is incredibly dangerous. I ask members to try the crossing in Grenfell Street near Adelaide Arcade and other crossings

around the city and they will see that people do not wait because they have to wait too long. We need better roads. Some of the separation of carriageways can be done relatively inexpensively, using the steel cable (as is being done in parts of the state). I think that is a good move. A lot of other initiatives are happening in that regard.

I am very sensitive about this issue because my nephew was killed by someone speeding. Up until the allegation in 2008—and I won't go into detail—I had never had a speeding fine, demerit point loss or accident while driving since the day I turned 16. I take this matter very seriously. I believe that, while there has been a reduction in the number of people killed on the roads, it is a work in progress—and I am sure the minister would agree with that. I think there are some things we can do, including better driver training. Too often people blame the roads when, in reality, it is the person behind the wheel.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:58): I thank members who participated in the debate and, in particular, I want to address the issues raised by the minister in relation to what has happened and how the road toll has fallen. We can do a lot with figures. Many would say that the road toll has a lot to do with statistical aberrations; in other words, acts of God and things that just happen. People are people and they make mistakes, so things will always happen. We should do anything we can to make it better and safer for people.

I remind the minister that he was a bit liberal in what he was saying. Who introduced the first drug law into this place? I did—or at least I intended to—and for almost two years the government denied the house passing the drug law. Eventually, they did defeat it and then a few weeks later introduced their own bill. We could have had drug laws in this state two years before we did. Liberal governments over the years have consistently outspent Labor governments on the road network. I will give the former Bannon government an accolade—

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Madam Speaker, I assume the house will allow the matter to be resolved beyond 1pm by the order of a few minutes. I do not know what the technical motion would be.

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, one minute.

Mr VENNING: I thank the honourable member. I remind the house that Liberal governments have consistently outspent Labor on our road infrastructure. Also, I have accessed information on the internet, and you see that too many young people are killed. The data is there but it is not specific. I want to see data after every accident, specifically showing what happened in that accident. Anything we can do has to be agreed to and I ask the house to support the motion.

Motion negatived.

[Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00]

GO RED FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER (14:00): First of all, can I thank all honourable members who are wearing their red hearts today for the Go Red for Women campaign. I think it is most appropriate as we had the election of our red-haired Prime Minister last week. Go Red for Women is about heart disease, so I thank you for wearing the flashing hearts today and showing the world that heart disease is a major problem for women.

KANGAROO ISLAND MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 936 residents of Kangaroo Island requesting the requesting the house to support the permanent maintenance of Obstetric, Anaesthetic and surgical services on Kangaroo Island.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Minister's personal staff, Appointments—Public Sector Act 2009 Report

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

Response to the Environment and Resources Committee Report No 65 entitled Public Transport

NORTHERN EXPRESSWAY BRIDGES

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) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This morning I announced the naming of five northern Adelaide bridges along the \$564 million Northern Expressway, the single largest road project undertaken in South Australia in the past 50 years, of which the Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure is justly proud. The Northern Expressway is a new 23-kilometre road and is a joint initiative by the Australian and South Australian governments under the Australian government's Land Transport Investment Program. In keeping with the state government's commitment to healthy living, a recreational cycle and pedestrian pathway will follow the expressway. The bikepath, when it is opened, will be named after Stuart O'Grady. The 110 km/h expressway will slash travelling times and provide a boon to the northern regional economy, while cutting the impact on suburban areas from freight transport.

The naming of the five bridges acknowledges and serves as a tribute to those brave Australians who fought valiantly during the battles of Hamel, Tobruk, Kokoda, Kapyong and Long Tan. We consulted with the Veterans Advisory Council, including the RSL, on the naming of the bridges, and I am grateful for the advice and support they provided. I particularly thank Sir Eric Neal for his guidance. The bridge at the Penfield Road interchange will be known as the Hamel Bridge. The battle of Hamel in France was fought on 4 July 1918 during World War I. It commemorates the significant and strategic gain to the allies and was the first time that all Australian divisions had fought together under an Australian commander (Lieutenant General Sir John Monash). The battle was spectacularly successful and all objectives were achieved in 93 minutes.

The bridge at the Heaslip Road interchange will be known as the Tobruk Bridge. This marks a notable military achievement in North Africa during World War II. The siege of Tobruk took place from 10 April until 27 November 1941. The allied forces were besieged by Rommel. For much of the siege, Tobruk was defended by the reinforced Australian 9th Division. Instructed to hold the fortress for eight weeks, the Australians held it for over five months. Maintaining control of Tobruk was crucial to the allied war effort and marked the first time that the blitzkrieg of the German Panzers had been brought to a halt. In a telegram from then British prime minister Winston Churchill to Australian Major General Leslie Morshead, Churchill wrote, 'the whole Empire is watching your steadfast and spirited defence of this important outpost of Egypt with gratitude and admiration'.

Further honouring our diggers during World War II, the bridge at the Curtis Road interchange will be known as the Kokoda Bridge. This honours one of the most significant battles fought by Australians in World War II, with more than 600 Australians killed and more than 1,600 wounded during the Kokoda Track campaign in Papua between July 1942 and November 1942. The campaign consisted of a series of battles fought between Japanese and Australian troops along the Kokoda Track, a single file track that crosses some of the most rugged and isolated terrain in the world. The aim of the Japanese was to capture Port Moresby to give them a base from which to prosecute their attack on Australia, and the campaign was a series of heroic stands by Australian soldiers, assisted by what became known as the Papuan fuzzy wuzzy angels as they staged a controlled withdrawal until reinforcements allowed the Australians to halt the Japanese advance.

The bridge at the Angle Vale Road interchange will be known as the Kapyong Bridge, honouring those who fought the battle of Kapyong in South Korea from 22 to 25 April 1951 during the Korean war. This year is the 60th anniversary of the commencement of hostilities of that conflict, which some still regard as 'the forgotten war'. The battle was fought between UN troops (primarily Australian, Canadian, Chinese and North Korean forces). The 27th British Commonwealth Brigade, which included the 3rd Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment, was ordered to the valley of the Kapyong River, where they established a blocking position on a key route south to the capital of Seoul. Regarded as one of the most famous battles fought by the Australian army in Korea, the 3rd Royal Australian Regiment was awarded a US Presidential Citation.

The fifth bridge at the Two Wells Road interchange will be known as the Long Tan Bridge. The Long Tan Bridge commemorates those who fought in the battle of Long Tan on 18 August 1966 during the Vietnam War. A total of 108 Australian and New Zealand soldiers battled more than 2,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops in a rubber plantation near the village of Long Tan in torrential rain. Commanded by Major Harry Smith, most of the battle was fought throughout the hours of darkness. In all, 18 Australians lost their lives and 24 were wounded in what was the largest casualty impact of a single operation during the Vietnam War.

The naming of the five bridges best reflects the most important conflicts in which Australia has been involved. It honours every Australian service man and woman, not only those who served in the campaigns and battles mentioned here but any man or woman, past or present, who has offered their life in the service of our nation. This way, anyone who uses the Northern Expressway will get a visual journey through our nation's military history from World War 1 to Vietnam over a distance of 16.9 kilometres. They are battles which helped define our character, as well as define the sacrifice that gives us the way of life we enjoy today.

LAND TAX CONCESSIONS

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) (14:08): I seek leave to make another ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This government is committed to helping the most vulnerable in society and helping mum and dad investors and working families. That is why, from today, we are increasing concessions and implementing cuts to land tax. A number of new concessions to be introduced today will provide eligible seniors with some real financial relief. Today, energy concessions increase from a maximum of \$120 a year to \$150 a year in 2010-11. This will be further boosted with a 5 per cent rise in 2011-12 and another 5 per cent increase in 2012-13. There will also be a 5 per cent increase in the maximum and minimum water concessions, complemented by another 5 per cent increase each year to the 2012-13 financial year. There will also be a 5 per cent increase in the sewerage concession and a further 5 per cent each year to 2012-13.

Eligible seniors will also get an added break with a 5 per cent increase in the emergency services levy fixed property concession, followed by another 5 per cent each year until 2012-13. These initiatives continue Labor's proud record in delivering concessions to South Australians for more than three decades. It is a great contrast to the Liberals' achievements in this area. It would appear that the only concession—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —they have ever produced to seniors was on a new tax they introduced—the emergency services levy—and only after being forced to do so through this house. I am pleased to inform the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop and member for Davenport!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The competition is on. It might not be a beauty contest among the members opposite, but the competition is on; you can see vim and vigour. Who is going to be the next leader of the opposition? Will they please stand up?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is a great contrast to the Liberals'—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —achievements in this area. It would appear that the only concession they have ever produced to seniors was on a new tax they introduced.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: That's not true; you'll have to correct that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Well, if I'm wrong, I will correct it; don't you worry. In fact, I will correct it now, if I am wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to inform the house that, for the first time from today, the energy and emergency services levy fixed property concession will be extended to include eligible low income earners. Using the rates applicable from today, the combined maximum payments provided by both the state and commonwealth governments to support aged pensioners who are homeowners will have grown from \$519.40 per annum in 2002 to a maximum of \$2,019.50 per annum for couples receiving maximum water use remission and maximum pension supplement, or to \$1,223.50 for couples on minimum water use remission and minimum aged pension supplement. This is a growth of between—wait for it, breaking news—214 per cent and 434 per cent in support for utilities, telephone and other household costs—a massive saving. Let me give you those statistics again: 214 per cent to 434 per cent.

More announcements today. On top of that, land tax cuts coming into effect today will ensure that nearly 75,000 of the 121,000 investors who currently pay land tax will from today no longer be liable for land tax in the 2010-11 financial year—none, zip, zero; no land tax from today. The main beneficiaries will be predominantly mum and dad investors and small businesses, the people that the Liberals do not care about. The cuts will see almost two-thirds of those currently paying land tax no longer having to pay anything at all this financial year. I will just go back to that. From today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —almost two-thirds of South Australians currently paying land tax will no longer have to pay any land tax at all this financial year. From today, we have also increased the tax-free threshold from \$110,000 to \$300,000. This will provide a major boost to small investors and business, and will assist them to build on their growing confidence in the South Australian economy. This is in addition to payroll tax reforms that also come into force today that make South Australia's payroll tax rates among the most competitive in the country.

TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

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) (14:14): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement containing another exciting announcement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members would be aware that Brian Cunningham recently resigned as Chief Executive of the Department of Trade and Economic Development. I want to formally thank Brian for his work in heading up the Department of Trade and Economic Development and, before that, as head of the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology. In both these roles, Brian has helped us make the most of our economic opportunities and helped to ensure that we have the workforce to meet industry needs, particularly in the growing defence and mining industries. I wish Brian all the very best for the future.

I wish to inform the house that Lance Worrall has been appointed as the new Chief Executive of the Department of Trade and Economic Development—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —working with the Minister for Industry and Trade. For the past two years, Lance has been the Chief Executive of the Public Sector Performance Commission, overseeing an overhaul of the state's Public Service. Prior to that, he was my economic policy adviser, where he played a key role in reshaping the state's economy, working closely with Robert Champion de Crespigny and the Economic Development Board on the state's major push to grow our defence and mining sectors. He played a significant role in our push to secure the air warfare destroyer contract and establish Techport, as well as being involved in establishing the PACE scheme, which saw a massive increase in mineral exploration. On a broader front, Lance played an

important part in developing South Australia's Strategic Plan, which has become the blueprint for shaping the state. Lance—I think 20 years ago—was previously director of the manufacturing advisory council. Lance's deep knowledge and understanding of the South Australian economy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —industries and Public Service makes him eminently qualified for this position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MURRAY RIVER WATER ALLOCATIONS

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:16): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The 2010-11 River Murray Drought Water Allocation Decision Framework has been developed to share and allocate the limited River Murray water resources received in South Australia, during this extended and ongoing period of low water availability. The framework, which is effective from today, aims to optimise the allocation and use of River Murray water that progressively becomes available to South Australia during the water year, to meet our key objectives of:

- securing South Australia's critical human needs for 2011-12;
- providing sufficient water to the environment to, at a minimum, mitigate against further environmental degradation and, where possible, arrest the decline of environmentally significant sites along the River Murray, particularly Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert; and
- providing the irrigation community a sufficient share of the available resources to enable them, as a minimum, to keep permanent plantings alive and, where possible, to produce viable crops.

Under previous approaches, all River Murray improvements received in South Australia to the end of September were allocated to irrigators. This new framework, I believe, will provide an effective balance in the current circumstances for meeting our key objectives, as allocations of improvements in River Murray inflows to South Australia are made throughout the water year.

Under the new framework, monthly water resource improvements will be shared between critical human water needs, irrigators and the environment from the start of the water year, in the following proportions:

- 50 per cent going towards critical human needs; and
- of the remaining 50 per cent, 65 per cent going towards general allocations (principally irrigators), with the remainder being allocated for environmental purposes.

This will ensure that the water required for critical human water needs in 2011-12 is secured earlier from improvements during 2010-11 and that this government's commitment to securing a 170 gigalitres Lower Lakes Environmental Reserve for 2010-11 is achieved.

Notwithstanding the change to the framework for distributing available water, the opening allocation for 2010-11 for irrigators, as announced earlier today, is 21 per cent, which is substantially higher than the 4 per cent opening allocation for 2007-08 and the 2 per cent opening allocations for 2008-09 and 2009-10.

In addition, irrigators will have access to 100 per cent of carryover from 1 July 2010 and will continue to receive a share of the improvements according to the new framework until the end of November this year, at which point the framework will be reviewed in the light of the actual and likely availability of water for the remainder of the year. In implementing the new framework, I emphasise to all members that our overarching goal should be to return the river to a healthy state, as only a healthy river system can sustain the livelihoods of those who depend on it.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before commencing and calling on the Leader of the Opposition, I advise members that the Minister for Transport will be answering questions today for the Treasurer, who is required to give evidence in court this afternoon.

WATER PRICING

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question, as it happens, is not for the Treasurer but for the Premier. Why did the government mislead the public during the election campaign by not revealing that water prices would increase further than previously announced?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: I think, from memory, standing order 97 governs the asking of questions. They cannot contain comment. Making a bald statement that the government misled people during the election campaign is pure comment and argument.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. I ask you to perhaps reword the question.

Mrs REDMOND: I will reword the question. Why did the Premier and the government not tell the public of South Australia during the election campaign that water prices would increase further than previously announced? Today water prices have risen by 32 per cent, and yesterday on Matt and Dave's ABC radio program the Rann government water commissioner, the failed Labor candidate and best friend of Julia Gillard, Robyn McLeod—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I must make the point, if the Leader of the Opposition, in her position, refuses to abide by standing orders, members opposite should not be calling points of standing order during question time. Plainly, debate and comment in a question is not allowed.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point too. Have you got further to say, leader?

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, but I would say that the statement that she is a failed Labor candidate is an absolute statement of fact, as is the fact—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You may sit down now; you have not got the call. I know that she is relatively new to the position, but it is not open to her to contest your ruling other than, by the standing orders, by moving dissent. You have ruled and she is contesting it completely, out of order with the standing orders. They have no knowledge of the standing orders on that side.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order. I think we better get back to the—

Mrs REDMOND: I will delete the reference, Madam Speaker. Today water prices have increased by 32 per cent and yesterday on Matt and Dave's ABC radio program the government's water commissioner, Robyn McLeod, was caught out lying by denying that she knew of the commonwealth's expectation that SA Water would take—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker. I mean, I hardly need to make it. There is a procedure for explaining a question in this place and there are procedures for asking and answering a question. What we are going to see from the opposition during this question time is a barrage of points of order about how questions are answered. I just make the point that you need to know the standing orders before you can complain about them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, you wanted to know. Once again, pure comment and debate in a question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order. Premier, I think the question was for you.

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) (14:23): Can I just say that, to the best of my recollections, I remember extraordinary controversy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We can't hear the Premier. I can't hear a word he is saying; there is so much noise from the other side. If we are going to have a disorderly question time I will call it to a halt and we'll leave. Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that when the Leader of the Opposition asks questions the contenders for her post all jockey for positions in seeing who is the loudest in making interjections. Can I just say that I remember distinctly—indeed, my memory has been revered over the years. I remember when the minister at the time outlined the price path that would be involved in terms of water prices with the building, construction and operation of a desalination plant that would guarantee water security for South Australians. It was very interesting that the Liberals in this state said that they were responsible for the desal plant, and then suddenly they don't like it and now say it is not necessary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't know where you stand on any issue because you don't stand for anything. One minute the desal plant was your idea, then you condemn it, then you say it is too big and too costly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The fact of the matter is that the minister at the time outlined the price path that would ensue.

The SPEAKER: The member for Croydon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Croydon, do not respond to their interjections; please ask your question.

GREEK LANGUAGE CURRICULUM

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:25): Will the Premier please advise the house of the terms of his pledge for the teaching of the Greek language in South Australian schools?

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) (14:25): I think members opposite would know that I have had a very strong involvement with the Greek community for more than 30 years and I know that the member who asked the question is someone who has also been honoured for his commitment to the Greek community in this state over many years, not just during his time as, in my view, the best minister for multicultural affairs that this country has seen. He is also someone, of course, who rivals Al Grassby in terms of dress sense.

I am pleased to inform the house that I have today written to the federal education minister (Simon Crean) requesting that the Greek language be included in the new national curriculum. The member for West Torrens, the federal member for Hindmarsh and the state minister for education have all spoken to me about the issue and the importance of ensuring that Greek is included in the Australian curriculum.

The Greek diaspora of the post World War II years has had a lasting and significant impact on Australian culture. Our Greek communities are a vibrant and integral part of South Australia's heritage. Community leaders over more than a century have helped shape our multicultural community and way of life. Their contributions to all aspects of our society have been enormous. It is terrific that the first Greek origin minister in the history of this parliament now sits on the front bench.

From what I know of the Greek community in South Australia, most members consider themselves Australians with Greek heritage and the continuing speaking and teaching of the Greek language allows these people a link with their Hellenic heritage; a heritage, of course, that brought

us democracy as well as many other aspects of philosophy that guide our values. I have urged the Australian government to include the Greek language in the national curriculum to ensure a continuation of these ties between the Australian and Greek communities. Last year, more than 4,500 students in South Australia were enrolled in Greek language programs.

We should continue to support the teaching of a language that is central to the lives of so many South Australians and central to philosophy and history. After all, we are not talking about introducing a new language; we are talking about the continuation of, and support for, a language that has a proven track record in South Australian schools. Schools will still be able to teach Greek, if it is not included as one of the languages in the Australian curriculum, using the Australian curriculum framework.

However, if the Greek language is not promoted through the national curriculum we stand to lose an important part of our national make-up and an opportunity for young people to be enriched. I should note that, while our schools will still be able to teach the Greek language, I am concerned that if it is not included in the national curriculum there is a risk that fewer young people will take on this language and we, as a community, would be poorer for it.

Not only will this have an effect on the number of students studying the language at primary and secondary schools but also within our tertiary sector and, in turn, the opportunities that creates in cultural, business and social activities in a global economy. The Hellenic culture has played a pivotal role in the development of western philosophies and literature. We should recognise the value of young Australians having the opportunity to learn this language as part of what is offered in a national curriculum. I am sure all members will join us in this campaign.

COMMISSIONER FOR WATER SECURITY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Does the Premier still have confidence in Water Security Commissioner, Robyn McLeod, given that she was caught out lying on ABC radio yesterday?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Not only is it comment, it is inflammatory debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is still being heard.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam Speaker I was asking you for a ruling, not the Leader of the Opposition—if that is all right with her. Thank you. Plainly, debate that is clearly inflammatory does not belong here. She may seek leave to explain, but even then she may not debate it. Members opposite cannot expect answers that do not involve debate if they cannot ask a simple, orderly question.

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) (14:30): My reply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—elected as he was with three votes, such is their commitment to democracy—is: walk 30 paces outside and have the guts to repeat what you said about this distinguished public servant outside and in the media.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is very easy to come in here to Coward's Castle and try to absolutely destroy people's reputations because you have no reputation yourself. So have the decency, have the guts and the courage, to go outside and repeat your attack on this woman.

The SPEAKER: The member for Torrens.

ADELAIDE CABARET FESTIVAL

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:31): Thank you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier tell the house about the 2010 Adelaide Cabaret Festival?

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) (14:31): I would like to have had more notice of that question. In the meantime, we are waiting for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to take those steps, but I do not believe he will have the courage or the conviction to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This year the Adelaide Festival Centre presented the 10th annual Adelaide Cabaret Festival, which ran from 11 to 26 June. This festival has grown to become the biggest of its kind in the world. It has been warmly embraced by South Australians, cabaret devotees from around the world and international artists, who clamour to be part of the program. The appointment of David Campbell as artistic director, and his highly successful 2009 event, resulted in attracting ever-increasing attention for this growing event nationally and internationally.

The Adelaide Cabaret Festival received an extra \$500,000 from the state government for this significant 10-year milestone, specifically to support the programming and building of the international reputation of this event and to secure the highest level of local and worldwide artists. The extra funding has assisted in attracting the very best cabaret artists to the festival from around the world for its 10th year birthday celebrations. Singers, storytellers, musicians, dancers, political satirists, actors and comedians from around the world performed in intimate settings at the Adelaide Festival Centre. In total the program offered over 124 performances of some 46 different shows across 16 nights.

Artistic director David Campbell offered an excellent program, with highlights including:

- two Australian-exclusive performances by Grammy award-winning singer Natalie Cole that I understand the Leader of the Opposition and others enjoyed—and we can see that she wears her heart on her sleeve;
- the Australian premiere of Tony award winner Donna McKechnie's show *My Musical Comedy Life*; and
- the Italian performer Ennio Marchetto, who morphed on stage into a range of cultural icons and celebrities through a series of fast paper costume changes. I understand that he is also a great fan of orecchiette.

Many top line Australian artists—including David Hobson, Robyn Archer, John Paul Young and the Allstar Band, Dick and Christa Hughes, Mic Conway's National Junk Band, John Waters, Caroline O'Connor, Marika Aubrey, and David Harris—also featured prominently in the program.

It is pleasing to note that South Australia's own home-grown talent was also showcased. In fact, 44 per cent of the artists involved in this year's cabaret festival, including the musicians, were South Australians. Notably, after a sell-out season at last year's cabaret festival, Hugh Sheridan returned with a show chronicling the life of showbiz legend Anthony Newley, and Adelaide's unusualist Raymond Crowe, who gained worldwide prominence through his hand shadow work based on the Louis Armstrong classic *What a Wonderful World*, was also back by popular demand.

A major initiative in this year's program was *High School Cabaret*, which I attended. David Campbell worked with teachers to develop skills for potential future cabaret artists, with the creative art students of Seaview and Norwood Morialta high schools. Masterclasses, under the guidance of virtuoso artists, offered a glimpse behind the cabaret curtain and a songwriters' workshop for those wanting to hone their cabaret skills. There were plenty of free offerings in the Piano Bar, including the ever popular *Sing Your Own Musical* and talented New York pianist Mark Nadler. In addition, the South Australian Performing Arts Collection mounted an exhibition in the Festival Theatre foyer of gems from its extensive early collection of music hall, vaudeville, burlesque and variety show posters, photographs and memorabilia.

The Cabaret Festival opening night Variety Gala Performance—a red carpet event offering a tantalising sample of performances—sold out early, and Bass processed \$68,000 worth of tickets immediately following the program announcement, with ticket sales continuing to be very strong throughout the festival. I am delighted to inform the chamber that the 10th Adelaide Cabaret

Festival was the most popular on record. It broke all previous box office records, achieving a 26 per cent increase in net box office income compared with 2009—26 per cent up on the previous year's which was regarded as the stand out.

The Festival Centre was buzzing. Total attendances to ticketed and non-ticketed festival events reached over 80,000, which represents an increase of 67 per cent on the 2009 figure, due to a combination of new programming, improved food and beverage offerings, and free events. There were 33,097 tickets sold and 50 performances were sold out. I congratulate everyone involved. I congratulate David Campbell. Congratulations to the sponsors; sponsorship support increased for the event. Congratulations to the Adelaide Festival Centre for its excellent organisation of this event. I just hope and pray that the Adelaide Cabaret Festival is not the next subject of attacks by the Liberal opposition.

An honourable member: It was our idea in the first place!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That won't stop you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WATER PRICING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question again is to the Premier. What price increases can SA Water customers expect on top of a 32 per cent price increase occurring this day after revelations that the water security commissioner knew before the election that the commonwealth expected a reduction in SA Water's River Murray take in return for their \$228 million contribution towards the desalination plant? The government either faces an additional cost of \$228 million or running the desalination plant more often to make up for reduced pumping from the River Murray. Both cases will require additional revenue to recoup the additional costs.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:38): I thank the twice failed candidate for the deputy leadership and now successful candidate for the deputy leadership—the Steven Bradbury of South Australian opposition politics.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Not at all; we communicate.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: It was 4.2. The South Australian government has been transparent about the price increase—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Kaveil!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —in respect of water over the next several years. We have done so on the basis that we have the most significant infrastructure project that has been undertaken in South Australia, the \$1.8 billion desal plant. Of course, the reason that we have built that desal plant is to secure water supplies that are independent of climatic change and rainfall. With respect to the deputy leader's question, we have been transparent about water prices. I have said, and I will say again, that we are in discussions and continue to be in discussions at the political level with the commonwealth in respect of reducing our reliance on the River Murray, as opposed to the—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: The only weasel in here is a person who decides to lay a bit of crap on people without going outside—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: What I would say, Madam Speaker, is that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has ample girth but no intestinal fortitude, otherwise he would go out there.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, Marty was at least a person of his conviction. We are in discussions with the commonwealth, and they will be ongoing with respect to reducing our reliance on the River Murray. I can tell members that the commitment that was given by the commonwealth with respect to the funding of \$228 million, in addition to the \$100 million to transfer, or, if you like, change, our desalination plant from a 50 gigalitre capacity to a 100 gigalitre capacity, was based on the fact that we would supply electricity, renewable energy, to that; that we would reduce our reliance on the River Murray and, of course, we are working through that. I am very confident—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: How long did it take?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It took her four minutes.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Four minutes. We were saying earlier, Madam Speaker, that it was exceptionally quiet before the member for Bragg got in here. It took four minutes to hear her shrill comments across—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: That is a record, isn't it? Four minutes. We will continue to discuss this matter with the commonwealth to get a satisfactory outcome, an outcome that is satisfactory to the people of South Australia. Unlike the opposition, which would probably suggest that we go over and give someone a headlock or, indeed, sit on them, or whatever it might be, we will do it in a mature way because we are a government that can work in a mature way with the commonwealth government.

MENTAL HEALTH

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. How will the new state Mental Health Act, which takes effect today, assist the government's reform of the mental health system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:41): Completing the multimillion dollar overhaul of South Australia's mental health services is a key priority for this government in this third term. In its second term, the government commissioned the Social Inclusion Board to review the provision of mental health services in South Australia; and I think it is fair to say that our services in this state were, and had been for many years, below par.

The result was the Stepping Up report, the key recommendation of which was to provide a stepped system of care—giving people the ability to step up into services if they become unwell and to step down into intermediate support as they get better. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate, again, Monsignor Cappo, the Social Inclusion Commissioner, and his board for their report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Madam Speaker, the government accepted the recommendations in this report and has since committed more than \$300 million—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will be heard in silence. This is an important issue. Members are constantly asking questions about it; listen to the answer.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I must say, Madam Speaker, that I am not saying anything political or controversial; I am just going through the facts as to the work that is happening in this state at the moment in relation to mental health. We, as a government on behalf of the tax payers, on behalf of the community, have committed over \$300 million to reform and rebuild our mental health system.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: The question was specifically how the new Mental Health Act, which comes into effect today, is going to assist people in South Australia. So far, all we have heard is a list of claims by the premier about what he has done in mental health.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order. The minister might answer the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, I shall. I certainly will, Madam Speaker. It is very hard to separate the reform and the actions that are happening because they are very much interlinked. I do thank the member for Bragg—obviously, she has premiership issues on her mind—for calling me the premier, but she has got it wrong: I am actually the Minister for Health. We are building a brand-new Glenside Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are building a brand new hospital, which replaces the Victorian era asylum that is there. The Mental Health Act that comes into place today, the Mental Health Act 2009, puts into place in South Australia a 21st century mental health policy framework and replaces the Victorian era, if you like, policy framework that existed until yesterday. It provides the legislative framework for the Stepping Up reforms.

The act changes the approach of the public health system to mental health patients by recognising that they are people who require medical treatment, as opposed to being people who need to be isolated from society. Unfortunately, it is still very current in political discourse in our state and nation that people who are mentally ill tend to be categorised as people who need to be locked up and the public protected from them. Sometimes that has to occur but, generally, that is not the case. While the safety and wellbeing of patients and the community are always paramount, the act seeks to ensure that patients are able to retain their freedom, dignity, rights and self-respect.

The new act provides for community treatment orders, enabling patients to be treated, where appropriate, in the community rather than in an institution and, while acute hospital care will always be available to those who need it, it should not be the first and only form of treatment. Less restrictive treatment methods enable a level of care that is catered to a patient's needs. Detention and treatment orders available under the act also enable early access to care and treatment when a person's mental health deteriorates to the point where admission to hospital is the only option, but it should be the last option; we should always try the other approaches first.

There will also be limited treatment centre beds in country areas for the very first time. This is consistent with the government's broader policy of reducing the amount of travel country residents have to undertake to receive health services. Information-sharing between patients and their carers or family will be made significantly easier under this act as well. I am sure many members of this place know of parents who have been to see them on behalf of their children who are mentally ill and they have not been able to be told what the problems are, when they will be released and when they are coming home. This legislative change will allow that communication to happen, and I think that is a very good outcome of this act.

The act enhances the rights of people with mental illness and their families and engages patients and service providers, allows for early access to assessment treatment and care and provides for greater accountability through its monitoring and reporting requirements. The act also, for the very first time, introduces a new position of chief psychiatrist for South Australia. That person will be charged with monitoring the operation of the act and reviewing the standard of psychiatric care provided within our state. I take this opportunity to congratulate Dr Margaret Honeyman, who starts today as South Australia's very first Chief Psychiatrist. She is an eminent—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: A New Zealander.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —very experienced person—latterly from New Zealand and Scottish by birth. I also thank Dr Honeyman and Mr Derek Wright, who has been through the same history—also from New Zealand and Scottish born—and also those past and present in the Department of Health who have worked tirelessly in realising this act.

This is a major reform that the government has undertaken. It has taken time and a lot of commitment and energy. I also acknowledge the work of Mr Ian Bidmeade, who led the review of the Mental Health Act of 1993 and led the drafting process for this new act. The mental health

community has also played an important role in the development of the act, including people with mental illness and their carers; and, of course, we should also pay tribute to the late Dr Margaret Tobin, the former director of the Mental Health Unit in the Department of Health. The new act goes some way to realising her vision for mental health reform in this state.

As members would be aware, the act has been a long time coming, and I thank, and acknowledge the work of, my predecessors in this portfolio under whose stewardship the act was advanced. I believe this is an exciting time in the reform of our mental health system in South Australia. The commencement of the act today is an integral part of the government's \$300 million reform of the mental health system and further reinforces this government's commitment to delivering better services to South Australians experiencing mental illness.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier, or his department, begin negotiations for additional bailout funding with the Carnegie Mellon University to prevent the university announcing a pullout from Adelaide prior to the state election on the understanding that they would be granted additional funding after the election, should Labor win? The Premier told the parliament on 17 June 2008 that the funding for Carnegie Mellon would be capped at \$19.5 million and would cease in 2010. The opposition has been advised, however, that the head of the Premier's Carnegie Mellon Unit was approached for more funding by representatives of Carnegie Mellon before the election.

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) (14:50): Everyone would know that Carnegie Mellon University, along with University College London, which was also established in Adelaide, are two of the world's great universities. University College London, for instance—

Mr Pisoni: Talk about Carnegie Mellon. That's what you did last time on the radio.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pisoni: You're asked about Carnegie Mellon and you talk about some other college.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'Some other college'—University College London is rated number four in the world, after Harvard, Cambridge and Yale. For the first time in nearly 200 years that it has gone anywhere else in the world it's to Adelaide.

Mr Pisoni: Talk about the Adelaide office.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: And of course, Carnegie Mellon. Alexander Downer, Robert de Crespigny, the Economic Development Board—we commissioned some distinguished leaders in universities to point us to which would be the best fit for South Australia. What we saw with landing Carnegie Mellon here is a commitment by Carnegie Mellon for the long haul, and that has been confirmed by its president, Jerry Cohen.

BARKUMA

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Disability. How are the state and federal governments working to improve facilities for people with disabilities at Barkuma?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:51): I thank the member for Torrens for her question and put on record that she has been a very strong advocate for services for people with disabilities here in South Australia. Barkuma is a fantastic not-for-profit organisation that provides a range of services to assist people with disabilities to live and work in our community. It was established in 1967 by a group of parents in Adelaide's northern suburbs. Barkuma has grown to employ more than 140 staff across metropolitan Adelaide. Barkuma also provides valuable services to over 1,000 people with disabilities here in South Australia, making it one of our largest disability organisations.

In recent times, the Rann government has been working with Barkuma to address a number of structural issues at the SAPAC facility at Campbelltown. Back in January, the Rann

government gifted to Barkuma a \$1.05 million parcel of land that houses the SAPAC facility. On top of this, a further \$200,000 was provided by the state government to assist with renovations. This morning, federal Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Children's Services, the Hon. Bill Shorten, visited Barkuma's SAPAC factory. I am delighted to advise the house that the federal Labor government has committed to providing \$700,000 for the refurbishment of the SAPAC factory. With this additional commonwealth support, the facility will grow and provide better opportunities for workers with a disability.

SAPAC provides a supported work environment for over 60 people with an intellectual disability, giving them the opportunity to develop their skills and confidence and to experience—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —the increased self-esteem associated with earning a wage. As well as providing supported employment options, Barkuma offers employees a wide range of vocational and personal development training, including accredited TAFE courses that result in nationally recognised qualifications. These improvements mark an excellent example of the two governments working together to make a difference in the lives of South Australians with a disability. I agree—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That you were going to fix.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That you were going to fix with a lousy \$10 million over four years. That was your total commitment. Your face should be as red as your jacket, and we know that you need that flashing heart, because there sure isn't one beating under your jacket.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. The air seems to be going out of the member for Schubert.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: If only \$10 million over four years, as promised by the Liberal Party, would fix all of the pressures in the disability sector. If only. What a joke!

I agree with the comment made by Bill Shorten this morning, that a lack of work opportunities is one of the main barriers that stops people with a disability fully participating in our society. However, Barkuma is not alone in South Australia in providing excellent employment opportunities for people with a disability through Australian Disability Enterprises. Organisations such as Bedford, Minda, Orana, Phoenix and regional employers like Barossa Enterprises do a wonderful job and employ nearly 3,000 people.

I encourage companies to get behind the products or services provided by these organisations. They not only offer outstanding quality but also promote equality for people with a disability. It is fair to say that this is a truly inspiring sector and I am always amazed by the innovation, flair and dedication that the staff at all levels put into their work and the great pride that the employees put into their work as well.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:56): My question is to the Premier, because the Minister for Further Education has said he has no idea. Did the Premier, or his department, know that the Carnegie Mellon University Entertainment and Technology Centre had abandoned their Currie Street campus, prior to granting Carnegie Mellon University a further \$3.8 million in grants in April of this year? If so, what conditions, if any, were linked to the extra \$3.8 million granted to Carnegie Mellon after the election?

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) (14:56): We have talked about this question. The state's first agreement with Carnegie Mellon University—the 2005 assistance agreement—undertook to establish Carnegie Mellon University's H. John Heinz III College Australia (known as CMU Heinz Adelaide) in Adelaide. The 2005 assistance agreement, with a maximum value of \$19.65 million for the establishment of CMU formally concluded on 30 April 2010.

A new agreement to support the role of Carnegie Mellon University as a permanent institution in South Australia has now been negotiated between CMU and the government of South Australia. The new agreement is linked to the continued efforts by Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh and CMU in Adelaide to attract increased enrolments in CMU courses, reflecting the state's objectives of enhancing Adelaide as an educational centre of excellence—I want to praise Alexander Downer for his leadership in this area—with CMU as a permanent and self-reliant institution.

The new agreement is exempt from public disclosure under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet circular 27 'Disclosure of government contracts'. The term of the new agreement is for 4 years ending on 30 June 2014. With regard to the current status of CMU, as Australia's first overseas university, CMU has made significant contributions, both domestically and internationally. It has been the cornerstone of the state's international university precinct, attracting Cranfield University and University College London—'some college', I think the member for Unley referred to it as.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Harvard first. Harvard is in America, Cambridge is in England, then Yale in America, University College London, then Oxford, and they have chosen Adelaide as their first offshore location.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It has been the cornerstone of the state's international university precinct, attracting Cranfield University and University College London, and seeding the establishment of the Torrens Resilience Institute, founded in partnership with our three local universities, which will assist the federal and state governments to achieve foreign policy and humanitarian objectives by developing resilient national capacities in the countries of South-East Asia and the Pacific Rim.

In recognition of its unique status as Australia's first overseas university—strongly supported by Brendan Nelson, John Howard and the Liberals in Canberra—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: I am sure that this is an interesting answer to a question, but it has no relation to what the member for Unley actually asked.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It reminds me of a television program in the 1970s, but I am too kind to say which one. In recognition of its unique status as Australia's first overseas university, CMU has been supported by the commonwealth through the provision of AusAID scholarships. A high inquiry ratio from AusAID approved countries indicates that CMU is a popular choice for AusAID applicants.

The scholars admitted to CMU are of the highest calibre. A number of AusAID graduates, upon completion of their degrees, have moved into significant positions of influence since returning to their home countries, including overseeing the use of foreign aid in development programs. Locally, CMU has contributed to the South Australia's Strategic Plan targets relating to increasing public sector performance, increasing our state's share of overseas students and increasing the state's proportion of higher education students, and CMU currently has over 120 enrolments.

To date, 135 students have graduated and CMU will graduate its largest class in August this year. Enrolments have been increasing consistently at a rate of 20 to 30 per cent each year. I am told it has hired 25 local faculty and staff. CMU's faculty and students have contributed more than 20,000 hours of pro bono project work in South Australia, including a variety of business and community improvement programs. As a result of its successful establishment, CMU has now committed to a phase of consolidation and growth for its campus for the term of the new agreement and has appointed a new executive director, distinguished Professor Dr Terry Buss, whose appointment was effected from 7 May.

State commitments under the new agreement: the total maximum potential value of state commitment is up to \$3.8 million. The majority of the state's support under the new agreement is linked to scholarship enrolments. CMU will benefit from state scholarship support only as enrolments are realised. As CMU was established for less than the original \$19.5 million grant, there is a residual amount of approximately \$1 million remaining from the 2005 assistance agreement, which forms part of the maximum potential \$3.8 million value of the new agreement. This residual amount will fund both scholarships and the Carnegie Mellon Support Unit until 30 June 2011. The support unit will continue to monitor the state's contract with CMU and assist the university as it invests in the continuing growth of its Adelaide campus. Scholarship funding of up to \$2.8 million, additional to the residual of approximately \$1 million, will be made available for realised enrolments over the four-year term of the new agreement.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:02): My question again is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his comments in the media on 16 June 2010 and quoted in *The Advertiser* the next day that Carnegie Mellon University's enrolments in Adelaide have been increasing by 35 per cent per annum? According to the Premier's own media release on 30 May 2006, 71 local and international postgraduate students were enrolled and there was strong demand for places. The Premier's 35 per cent growth per annum figure would see 236 students enrolled at present, based on that initial number of 71. This year's media reports and the commonwealth department of education confirm that current enrolments at Carnegie Mellon are between 95 and 110.

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) (15:03): The information I gave you is the information that I have received from the department.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:03): I ask a supplementary question. Can the Premier confirm that there are less than 20 students enrolled at Carnegie Mellon for the 2010 midyear enrolment?

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary. I will count that as a question.

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) (15:03): I will bring back a report for the honourable member.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:03): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier advise why the Adelaide campus of Carnegie Mellon's Heinz College is not accredited in China, the largest potential market for overseas students to study here in South Australia? The two degrees offered by Carnegie Mellon's remaining Adelaide campus are not accredited by the China Ministry of Education and Training. This is despite members of the Premier's Carnegie Mellon Support Unit travelling business class to China with Carnegie Mellon staff and staying in five-star hotels to drum up business.

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) (15:04): Recent reports in the local media relating to travel expenses incurred by public servants on business to promote Carnegie Mellon University are, I am told, inaccurate. In the article 'Costs of uni venture "hidden"' in *The Advertiser* the government is accused of hiding expenses relating to DPC travel costs seeking support for CMU overseas. The cost quoted in the article is \$225,000. The actual cost of overseas travel for CMSU staff from the beginning of the contract with Carnegie Mellon to the close of the 2008-09 financial year was, in fact, \$124,424.

In the *Independent Weekly* of 18 June the Hon. David Pisoni MP stated that \$98,000 was spent on public servants for Carnegie related businesses. DPC annual reports for the financial year 2004-05 lists an amount of \$98,207 relating to multiple agenda for state business travel not exclusively related to the promotion of CMU; \$47,532 of this sum was spent directly on travel for CMU negotiations during this period—\$47,532.

Basically, they want people to fail. You are addicted to failure because that is the story of the Liberal Party—divide, divide, sack. Look at them yesterday: all of them standing up and calling for people to be sacked—people who were sacked themselves by their own members. They are addicted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr PISONI: Point of order of relevance, Speaker: it is quite clear that the Premier has chosen to ignore the question regarding accreditation with China.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Your logic does not follow there, member for Unley, but I do uphold the point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Previous information that he put out to the media was incorrect. It is a bit like his role in the dodgy documents affair. He cannot handle the truth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of Order.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: relevance, Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is relevant to your integrity, it is relevant to your honesty, it is relevant, as it is to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who will not—because I know the media will ask him to repeat—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Speaker: is the Premier going to answer the question?

The SPEAKER: That's not a point of order, member for Unley. Premier, have you finished your remarks?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand that His Excellency the Governor has some information relating to the accreditation in China, and I look forward to reporting back to the house.

BARLEY EXPORTING ACT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can the minister advise the house what action has been taken in response to the review of the Barley Exporting Act 2007?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: the ghost of defamation past, the member for Croydon, is briefing the media during question time—in the box up to my right. I understood that was out of order during question time. I understood the media staff could drop press releases off and leave but that it was out of order for members of parliament to be there briefing the media during question time.

The SPEAKER: I am not quite sure how the member understands that he is briefing the media. He may be having a pleasant chat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold that point of order. It normally applies to staff; however, I can't see a thing up there, I don't know what's happening, and I hope that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: However, he has become the centre of attention—which I am sure the member for Croydon will wallow in. The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs)

(15:08): I thank the member for Little Para for the question. As most members in the house are aware, barley is our second-largest broadacre crop—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the Minister for Agriculture.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Mr Bankrupt is a bit noisy today. Yesterday represented a milestone in the history of the barley industry in South Australia. Yesterday the Barley Exporting Act expired, effectively ending regulation in this state except for provisions of the Trade Practices Act and related commonwealth legislation. This was a recommendation of a review into the 2007 Barley Exporting Act undertaken by Grope Hamilton Lawyers, based on extensive consultation with industry. The 2007 act followed an earlier review of barley marketing arrangements in 2006-07 which recommended deregulation but the industry asked for a safety net during the transition. I thought that was a commendable call. This transitional period was intended to allow growers time to consolidate their risk management and grain marketing skills, and my understanding is that most of them have done that.

During the transition the Essential Services Commission assessed the fitness and propriety of applicants intending to export barley, and issued licences. At no stage during the three year period were there any breaches that required the commission's intervention, and I think that was a welcome outcome. There was general agreement from all sectors of the industry that the barley market should be deregulated; however, the review identified two issues for consideration. These related to market power and information sharing. In relation to market power, the Productivity Commission is currently investigating wheat export marketing arrangements—and I think a number of members on that side of the house are aware of those proceedings—and those findings will have ramifications for the broader grain industry.

In relation to information sharing, I held discussions with growers, the South Australian Farmers Federation and Viterra. I met twice with Michael Schaefer, chairman of the SAFF grain committee, including once at Buckleboo—in your electorate, Madam Speaker—and I made a number of public statements calling for negotiations to resolve the issue so that deregulation could occur without obstacles remaining. I indicated to major grain traders that the government supported the view of growers that more information should be available to ensure a well-functioning market—and economists on that side of the house would be aware that one of the prerequisites for a fully competitive market is the free flow of marketing information.

I am pleased to advise the house that, on Monday, Viterra announced that it would be making more information publicly available regarding commodities that are managed through its grain network. This includes access to information about warehousing stocks, grain quality, and shipping. I am satisfied that the company intends to strike the right balance between sharing information to help growers make informed decisions and protecting its commercial interests in a competitive market.

I met with senior executives from Viterra on Tuesday, and they expressed satisfaction with how the government had handled this issue. Effectively, we went in to bat for growers, and the Rann government achieved the result that SAFF wanted in a manner that brought credit to all parties to the discussion. Also on Tuesday, the South Australian Farmers Federation issued a statement welcoming the outcome.

Viterra has acknowledged the value of transparency and communication, and I expect that there will be ongoing dialogue between Viterra and its clients to fine tune the details of the information to be disclosed and how it is provided. I was pleased to note that the South Australian Farmers Federation also welcomed Viterra's announcement in relation to shipping. There is no intention from the state government to further investigate the barley industry in relation to deregulation.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:13): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the names of the three start-up companies claimed by a spokeswoman from the Premier's office to have been using the campus abandoned by Carnegie Mellon's Entertainment Technology Centre free of charge for two years under the business incubator program; and can the Premier further advise what incubator scheme that was?

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) (15:14): I will get a report for the honourable member.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:14): A supplementary question while we are waiting for the report.

The SPEAKER: I question 'supplementary'. I will call it a question again if it is not.

Mr PISONI: Can we also—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I would suggest it is literally impossible to have a supplementary question.

The SPEAKER: I think it probably is.

Mr PISONI: Can we also have the names of those three companies, Premier, and what they are doing now?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rest my case, Your Honour.

The SPEAKER: I think you had already asked that.

KANGAROO ISLAND MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister explain—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Watch it on Facebook, mate. Can the minister explain to the house why, after eight months, there is still no resolution to the dispute between Country Health SA and the Kangaroo Island Medical Practice to provide after hours emergency on-call services by local doctors rather than by locums at considerable taxpayer expense?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for the question. I am disappointed that he has not pointed out his own potential conflict of interest in asking this question. I understand a member of his family actually works for that clinic—

Mr Pengilly: It's on the record in the house and you know that.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, maybe you should make it plain every time you raise a question about this, because you do it frequently.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order. The minister is reflecting on the member and impugning the motive of the member in this question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I do uphold that point of order. The minister is getting very close and he needs to be very careful. I refer you back to the question, minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I take your advice.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, good on her. I thank the member for the question. I am happy to provide a very full account of the negotiations in relation to the doctors on Kangaroo Island. This may take some time. In February this year, the state government and the Rural Doctors Association of this state reached a groundbreaking agreement on a new deal for country doctors who provide services in country hospitals. The RDA has described the deal as 'currently the best statewide agreement across Australia for rural GPs'.

In the past, there had been ad hoc arrangements in place across country health—different deals; different arrangements in place. Doctors, by and large, did not support that arrangement. They wanted a common deal, and so we negotiated that deal with rural doctors. To this day, I am advised, under the deal, general practitioners would receive a 93 per cent increase in payment for on-call medical cover for local hospitals—and that cover includes emergency, obstetrics and anaesthetics. That is a 93 per cent increase in their pay for just being on call.

This deal increased the annual payment for each service roster covered by a general practitioner for emergency, obstetrics and anaesthetics to \$135,000. For each on-call shift in particular, general practitioners would receive a payment of \$220 on weekdays for being on call—not for being in attendance but for being on call—and \$550 on weekends for being on call—not for being in attendance but for being on call. That is, \$550 a day to be at the end of a phone!

General practitioners had until the end of the financial year to accept this offer, which was negotiated by—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: General practitioners had a deadline of 1 July to accept this offer, which was negotiated by their peak representative body. I am advised that, about two weeks ago (I have not heard a more recent figure), over 307 doctors across the state—that is about 73 per cent—had signed up, and I expect more would have signed up by the end of the financial year. Doctors signing up will receive a payment of the new rates backdated to the beginning of the year. So, it is a good deal for doctors, and most doctors obviously—

Mr Pengilly: But you haven't fixed this one up. That was the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You will get the answer. This new agreement provides a fair and consistent approach for general practitioners providing services in country hospitals. On Kangaroo Island, local general practitioners have agreed to provide on-call obstetric and anaesthetic services as part of the new agreement.

Let me put that in context. What they have agreed to do is to accept \$135,000 year to be on call to provide obstetric services. On average, there are somewhere between 25 and 35 babies born on the island a year. Let us assume about half of those babes, or even a third of those babies, are born during normal office hours. That means they are being paid \$135,000 to be on call and to be called in approximately a dozen times a year. I think that is a pretty fair payment for those doctors. A \$135,000 package has also been accepted by the doctors to be on call to provide anaesthetic services for a very small number of cases that they are actually called in for.

They have agreed to do that and they have agreed to the obstetrics. The contract dictates that general practitioners providing these services will be on call and must be able to reach the hospital within 40 minutes of being contacted about an emergency patient. If you sign up to be on call for obstetrics, anaesthetics or one of the other services, you have to be within 40 minutes. So, you can go a certain distance but you cannot go a long distance. In the negotiations over the obstetrics—

Mr Pengilly: The emergency on-call locum is down the other end of the island, because he was told by your department that he could go down there. Come on, John.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Are you finished?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Question time has finished, so we will allow the minister to finish his answer and then we can all go.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you. I will try to do it without the interruptions, Madam Speaker. In the negotiations over the obstetrics and the anaesthetics contract, one Kangaroo Island doctor indicated that the general practitioners would prefer to be within 60 minutes of the hospital and the patient rather than the 40 minutes that all the other doctors across South Australia had signed up to. The doctor described the 40 minute requirement as, and I quote, 'a deal breaker', as it would mean that he and his colleagues, and I quote the doctor, 'couldn't go to holiday homes, go bushwalking, go surfing, go fishing or watch footy.'

So, what they wanted us to do was to pay them \$135,000 a year to be called in on the small handful of occasions when a baby is born. They did not want to be within 40 minutes of the hospital because that would interrupt with their bushwalking, surfing, fishing or footy. That is what the doctor on Kangaroo Island said to us. Fortunately—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —Madam Speaker, the general practitioners did agree in the end to the 40 minute requirement. They have also now agreed to provide general emergency on-call services on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays under the current contract arrangement. Through this arrangement, each general practitioner who covers on call will receive \$550 a shift. That means that, if they are on call, they have to come in within 40 minutes, so that they can wander, go bushwalking, fishing or anything else they would like to do as long as it is within 40 minutes of being in attendance at the hospital. This is to be on call, not actually to do any work, but to be on call.

On top of that, if the general practitioner sees outpatients during this time, they are able to bill Medicare and a gap payment to the patient. Unfortunately, the local doctors have indicated that they will not provide on-call services on weeknights because of the \$220 payment. They have requested that they should receive the same payment that a locum would be paid to provide that service. All the other doctors across South Australia have signed up to the—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The majority of doctors across South Australia have signed up to the \$220. The Rural Doctors Association—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I said 'the majority'. The majority of doctors signed up to the \$220. The Rural Doctors Association has agreed that this is a reasonable package; and, in fact, I have been encouraged by other doctors not to give in on this particular issue because it would undermine the contracts everywhere else in South Australia. I would say to all the other members who represent rural communities, if we give into the blackmail that is being put to us on Kangaroo Island, all the doctors in your communities would want the same thing and the system would fail. We provide locum services where we—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This is a serious issue, and I think the catcalling from the other side indicates their lack of real interest in it. All you are interested in is the politics of the issue, not the provision of services to people.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You are very vocal.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The unsubstantiated claim by the former deputy leader of the opposition is just outrageous. We cannot close down the Kangaroo Island Hospital; it is obviously absolutely essential to the people on Kangaroo Island to have a health service there because of the remoteness. The reality is that we will do everything we can to make sure that we are able to provide cover. If the local doctors are not prepared to put their hand up to provide cover for the going rate, as are the majority of doctors around South Australia, we will put in locums to cover the times when they will not do it, and that does cost more money.

What we will not do is pay local doctors locum rates to provide the same service, because that would undermine the locum service if we were to pay existing doctors who live in the community, who do not have the inconvenience of being called in from a remote place, to go without permanence of employment to a situation. In the longer term, we will attempt to look at long-term options for on-call hospital services on the island, including establishing a collocated general practice clinic which would be situated within the existing hospital facilities. Country Health SA is also open to further discussions with the local doctors should they decide to participate in the emergency on-call roster in the future and on the other days in the week.

I stress that we have been trying desperately to get a deal with these doctors based on the arrangements that have been put in place across country South Australia with the same pay rates that apply everywhere else in the state, which 73 per cent of doctors two weeks ago had signed up to. If we were to break our arrangements with the doctors on KI we would undermine the arrangements everywhere else, and the problems on KI would transfer to every other part of South Australia. If that is what the opposition wants, then it should keep calling for us to back down in relation to KI. I can assure them we will continue to negotiate with the doctors on KI in good faith, but we will not give in to their blackmail.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:26): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the WorkCover Corporation made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Paul Holloway.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE**CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY**

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:27): Today, the opposition asked some questions about the financial viability of Carnegie Mellon University. If we go back to 2004, we see a press release by a very excited first-term Premier telling the people of South Australia that he has brought the very first international university here to South Australia. We note the Premier, throughout his entire career as a politician, has liked to associate himself with the rich and famous and those with credibility, hoping that some of that will rub off on himself. So, it is no surprise that in that press release we see names such as Alexander Downer and Robert Champion de Crespigny being mentioned. Then it goes on to talk about Baroness Susan Greenfield, the Rt. Hon. Mike Moore and Margaret Jackson (the chair of Qantas). All these people, of course, are named in the Premier's press release about this exciting deed signing that he was boasting about at the time.

Of course, it was part of the plan of being re-elected in 2006 and, as we know, this government has a reputation of saying anything before an election and changing its mind afterwards. Of course, the Premier will throw those names back at us when we question the viability of the state's \$43 million investment—so far. I encourage members to go to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet annual reports from 2005 through to the latest one, 2009 (of course, we do not have one later than 2009 tabled yet), where, on every occasion, they will see specific references to funding resources from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to Carnegie Mellon University.

Let us have no doubt about it: this is the Premier's baby. The Premier has his DNA all over Carnegie Mellon. It is no wonder he is refusing to answer questions about Carnegie Mellon on the radio. When he is asked on talkback radio about Carnegie Mellon he talks about Cranfield University. When he is asked in parliament about Carnegie Mellon he talks about London university. The concerns that we have on this side of the house relate to the financial management of Carnegie Mellon under this Premier. Others came together to bring Carnegie Mellon to Adelaide. It is this Premier who managed it and, on the numbers that we have seen so far, it appears as though it is not working. The Premier was so desperate to protect his own reputation regarding Carnegie Mellon that he entered secret negotiations with Carnegie Mellon before the election. Carnegie Mellon said that it could not continue with these enrolments. Carnegie Mellon itself confirmed that there were only 110 enrolments this year.

In its latest report on South Australian university enrolments, the Department of Further Education and Training states that there have been only 40 commencements of students in 2009, 95 in total. The Dean of Carnegie Mellon has confirmed to media sources that there are, in fact, only 109 enrolments this year, I think. We have been advised that the midyear intake is now less than 20. That is unsustainable, for several reasons. We also note that Carnegie Mellon cannot offer its students permanent residency, and that is costing Carnegie Mellon opportunities with India, in particular. We also understand that Carnegie Mellon—which runs programs for government employees—does not, in fact, have accreditation with the Chinese Ministry of Education and Training.

Consequently, when Chinese students go back to China after graduating here at Carnegie Mellon—my understanding is that there have been only four who have graduated—their qualifications are not recognised by the Chinese government. How very disappointed were they, after spending \$A65,000 to get a postgraduate degree in public policy, to find that they were not recognised by the Chinese government. This has been a comedy of errors, managed by the Premier. The Premier has his name all over the Carnegie Mellon project. He is desperate to prop it up, and that is why we saw secret deals done before the election to prop up Carnegie Mellon by another \$3.8 million over four years.

PLAYFORD ROTARY CLUB

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:32): I rise today to say a few words about the good people of the Rotary Club of Playford. Recently, I had the good fortune to attend the handover lunch of the Rotary Club of Playford and the Two Wells club at the Central Districts Football Club. I

know that all members are very proud of these types of service organisations in their areas. They are relatively small groups of very active and very committed community members. They are sometimes not immediately visible, but their loss would be keenly felt in all of our communities. They really do amount to more than the sum of their parts.

It is testament to the high esteem in which the club is held in the community that so many of our community leaders came out for the handover lunch. These included the member for Taylor; the federal member for Wakefield, Nick Champion; the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of the City of Playford and, of course, the larger business and Rotary community of Elizabeth and surrounds, including Lea Stevens and Mike Stevens who, this year, assumes the presidency of the club.

I have had some involvement with the Rotary Club of Playford over recent years, and I have always been impressed by its commitment to both the local area and to the various causes it supports both here and overseas. These include the ongoing campaign for the eradication of polio, shelter boxes to provide assistance for victims of storms and other natural disasters and, locally, the support of the Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden Program at my old school, the Elizabeth Downs Primary School. The Kitchen Garden Program, as most of us will know, involves establishing both garden and kitchen facilities at a local school to teach kids about healthy eating, cooking and educating them about where healthy food actually comes from.

The kitchen garden idea is important, because it has applications across the primary school curriculum. It is not simply a home economics course, nor is it simply an attempt to get kids eating more healthy, natural food, although this, of course, is an important aspect of it. The kitchen garden concept—and this has worked exceptionally well at Elizabeth Downs Primary School—is one which children can apply across the curriculum. It takes in sciences, it enhances concepts of hard work and commitment and it involves creative areas, such as English and visual arts. This is just one example of the excellent work done by Playford Rotary. Although it is a relatively small group of people, they are having a significant impact on the life of my local community.

Playford Rotary was born out of the Rotary Club of Elizabeth and was instigated by one of Elizabeth's great volunteers, Mr Bill Hall. Thirteen years ago, Bill saw the need for a breakfast Rotary club to reach out to more people, particularly people who work in the area but have families and are therefore unable to regularly attend the traditional evening dinner meetings. This year, sadly, for the first time in 13 years, Bill did not stand for the board of Playford Rotary. He indicated at the handover dinner that it was time to let go of the reins and let others guide the club into the future.

Mr Gardner: Great loss.

Mr ODENWALDER: Indeed, it was a great loss. He was duly honoured at this lunch, and I would like to add my personal congratulations to Bill and his wife Sheila for their service to the community. I know that commitment has not come to an end. I want to more broadly pay tribute to all members of the Rotary Club of Playford, including Lea and Mike Stevens who work so hard towards the club's objectives, particularly on the Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Program.

Mr Venning: She was a good member.

Mr ODENWALDER: She was a good member. What are you implying?

Mrs Vlahos interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, I know—almost word for word. I beg your pardon, Madam Speaker, I was rudely interrupted. Bill was not only instrumental in forming the Rotary Club of Playford, however. He was also the inaugural chair of the management committee of Midway Road Community House, a post which I recently held. Midway Road Community House is an important feature of Elizabeth East and the surrounding areas, providing many important services: affordable child care, basic and continuing computer skills, adult literacy, counselling, training and many other voluntary community services.

In 1980, Bill and others saw the need for a child care service in the Elizabeth East area, to service young mothers and families. Over the years it has grown in leaps and bounds and is now a vital and professional service to our whole community. As an aside, having spoken about Bill Hall, I cannot let Midway House go by without mentioning its tireless long-term director, Glennys Lehmann. Along with her husband Ray, she goes way above and beyond to make sure that disadvantaged people in Elizabeth and the surrounding suburbs are helped and given chances which would otherwise be unavailable to them. As much as I am sure she would hate to be mentioned in this place, I want to put on record my admiration for her quiet and tireless work.

NEWTON ROAD/GRAVES STREET INTERSECTION

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:37): I rise to discuss the issue of road safety in the Morialta electorate, in particular the intersection of Graves Street and Newton Road in the suburb of Newton. This is an intersection that has traffic problems which I have discussed in this house on one other occasion already, but it is a very sincere problem, which is why I bring it to the attention of the house again. In particular, I draw the attention of the Minister for Road Safety this issue to, who I wrote to a couple of months ago, reminding him of commitments made by the former Labor member for Morialta and the work done by others previous to my arrival in this house.

To put this into context for members, the intersection of Graves Street and Newton Road is outside the front of the St Francis of Assisi Catholic Church, which is a very significant institution in the Morialta community. It plays host to many of the festa processions and festivals that grace the calendar in the Morialta community, which bring to them many thousands of people from around Adelaide and, indeed, from around Australia.

It is also the site of the St Francis of Assisi school, and I pay particular tribute to its principal, Mr Paul Forde, and the parish priest of the St Francis of Assisi Catholic community, Father John Cooper. Father Cooper, along with the committee at St Francis of Assisi, wrote to the Minister for Road Safety with the support of the previous member and the Hon. Carmel Zollo, in 2009. They did so with a petition signed by over 700 constituents in the seat of Morialta—380 from the parish and 361 collected by the St Francis of Assisi Primary School.

The issue is that there are no traffic lights at this intersection and Father Cooper himself was nearly the victim of an unfortunate traffic incident. The intersection is dangerous. Many, many elderly members of the congregation who live nearby, walk to the church to worship each week, as well as many hundreds and thousands more who come to that intersection when there are festas on. The lack of traffic lights and road safety for people at that corner is of great concern, quite apart from the great inconvenience that it causes residents in Newton, when they are trying to deal with traffic problems.

What is more remarkable is that there is a pedestrian crossing 100 metres away that is inconveniently located for the elderly residents and congregants of the church, for many of the students walking to school and for many other people who use that area for their various needs. Further, there is another set of traffic lights about one kilometre down the road at the corner of Playford Road that used to service an old school site when it used to exist there, but of course it no longer does—it is an inconvenience.

There are two sets of traffic lights that are superfluous to needs, but there is one intersection where they are needed. This is relevant to the Minister for Road Safety, because the previous minister for road safety, who is now the minister for agriculture, wrote to the St Francis of Assisi Catholic community on 4 January this year stating:

I can advise that DTEI has commenced work on a draft Road Management Plan (RMP) for Newton Road and St Bernards Road. It is anticipated that the draft RMP will be available for public comment by the end of June 2010. The issues you have raised will be considered in this process.

On 3 March, in the midst of the election campaign, the former Labor member for Morialta wrote to every resident in Newton pointing out that she had seen a draft of the Road Management Plan, that the next stage was going to be public consultation and, as long as everybody was on board, this would be in place soon. I sought the Minister for Road Safety's commitment that that would take place. I asked him for an opportunity to view the RMP that was promised by the end of June and I am yet to hear back from his office, other than an acknowledgement of the receipt of my letter.

Now that we have reached 1 July and the end of June time line is up, I seek the opportunity to see the Road Management Plan and a commitment from the government that it will deliver on its election promise of traffic lights at this dangerous intersection, and I hope that the Minister for Road Safety will get back to me in the near future so that I can alleviate the concerns of the constituents in Newton and the people who use the facilities at St Francis of Assisi School and the Catholic church.

GENERAL MOTORS HOLDEN

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:42): I rise to speak about an industry that is very important to me and many South Australians. The recent announcement that the Holden plant at Elizabeth will resume a second shift in November is absolutely fantastic news for all South Australians, including many constituents who live in my electorate of Mitchell. The cancellation of the second shift

occurred in May 2009 as a direct result of the global financial crisis. With a drop in demand for Holden exports of around 50,000 cars, this was an extraordinarily difficult time for the sector, following the closure of Mitsubishi just one year before.

In a step to bridge the downturn, unfortunately, many Holden employees had their hours and pay reduced. This was a unique example of large employers working together with unions and employees to retain skilled workers through an economic downturn and protect jobs in the long term. Each and every one of the workers who have hung in there through the difficult times deserves our utmost respect and admiration. There is now a light at the end of the tunnel, beginning on 15 November when these workers can return to full-time employment. The faith and loyalty they have shown the company over the past 12 months will now be rewarded.

This story is great news not only for the 2,500 workers at the Holden plant and their families but also for the thousands of other workers across the state who benefit from the employment created either directly or indirectly from Holden's operation at the Elizabeth plant. Workers in the components sector, supplying everything from car seats to brakes and fuel lines, will see increased job security as a result of this announcement. Companies such as Futuris and TI Automotive have already announced that additional jobs will be created when the second shift comes on stream. In fact, Futuris has announced an additional 200 jobs.

Then there are the indirect benefits to the economy through the service and retail sector. There is also a lot of confidence that comes out of full-time employment and there is a trickle-down effect through the broader community. Automotive manufacturing is an important industry for South Australia, employing around 7,000 people and with exports valued at approximately \$1 billion in 2008-09.

Furthermore, the benefits are not limited to the northern suburbs, as some might assume. Many workers commute from the south to take advantage of the secure employment, decent wages and focus on workplace safety that are offered when working in the vehicle industry. Furthermore, the concept of the automotive manufacturing sector being classified as blue-collar, low-skilled work is highly outdated. Automotive manufacturing now utilises cutting edge technology from the manufacturing processes through to assembly and through warehousing, sequencing and quality control.

As a review of Australia's automotive sector in 2008 revealed, it is a major investor in innovation, accounting for nearly 17 per cent of all manufacturing business expenditure on research and development. The Bracks review confirmed that other manufacturing is dependent on the skills and expertise found in the automotive components sector. The automotive manufacturing sector is, therefore, crucial to our wider community, providing well-paid, highly-skilled jobs for all South Australians. I celebrate the return of a second shift at Holdens and congratulate the company and its employees on their return to sustainable growth for a long-term future.

TRINITY GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL RED-LIGHT CAMERA

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:46): I rise to speak on the important pedestrian safety issue arising at the Trinity Gardens Primary School. The Trinity Gardens school was established in 1899 and was initially known as the Wellington Road School, named after the road now known as Portrush Road. In 1999 the school was renamed Trinity Gardens Primary School. The school boasts the Steiner Stream, an alternative and internationally lauded schooling system, alongside mainstream primary education. It also incorporates the St Morris Unit, a special learning centre for students with severe and multiple disabilities. It also incorporates an early learning centre and will soon host the establishment of the Children's Centre, designed to provide support, education and social interaction for children from a very young age.

Trinity Gardens Primary School is very ably led by Principal Vicki Stokes and her Deputy Principal, Roz Green. I have visited the school twice since I have been elected, and it is a great school. Both staff and parents of students at Trinity Gardens Primary School have been very concerned with the main pedestrian thoroughfare across Portrush Road. They have witnessed numerous incidents of near misses with children nearly being hit by passing traffic. They have also repeatedly witnessed passing traffic failing to stop on the red light at the pedestrian crossing.

Concerned parents, including Monica Moss, Anna Ziersch, Sharon Gillson and Sally Wuttke, have aired their concerns about the danger of this crossing. They have contacted and written to the state government on numerous occasions. On 3 June, Mrs Wuttke wrote to the education, police and road safety ministers highlighting this issue. I commend these parents on their interest and persistence in pursuing this matter.

Last week I presented to this house a petition with 162 signatures calling on the government for immediate action to install a red light speed camera on the pedestrian crossing on Portrush Road opposite Trinity Gardens Primary School. The petitioners' concerns have been echoed by the Principal of the Trinity Gardens Primary School, Vicki Stokes. In response to their concerns, the Minister for Road Safety announced that the crossing would be upgraded with an extended masthead with the aim of making the traffic signals more visible to motorists. This response is completely inadequate.

Both the St Ignatius and Loreto colleges, both also situated on Portrush Road, have red light cameras installed as part of their pedestrian crossings. Both schools are within a very short distance of the Trinity Gardens Primary School and both had these cameras implemented as a response to growing concerns for student safety on the respective pedestrian crossings. The parents and school community at Trinity Gardens Primary School have been respectful and patient in their requests for upgrading safety measures for the school's Portrush Road pedestrian crossing, but their patience is wearing thin.

On 8 June this year, the minister responded to a letter by Dr Ziersch (a parent of the school) confirming that, whilst a masthead would be fitted to the crossing, installation of a red light camera was not on the agenda. In the Messenger newspaper this week he justifies his rejection: first, crash data from 2004 to 2008 for the pedestrian crossing on Portrush Road recorded only a small number of crashes; and, secondly, that the number recorded is significantly lower than other intersections and well below the average for intersection crash data used to select safety camera sites.

The minister has completely missed the point. First, it is not an intersection, so I am not sure why he has even brought that up; and, secondly, he refers to crash data, but the whole purpose of this exercise is not about avoiding vehicle crashes but about protecting the safety of students at this school. My personal belief is that this state government is far more concerned with revenue raising than improved road safety. The installation of a red light camera at the Trinity Gardens crossing is simply and irrefutably an effective measure to increase pedestrian safety. It was deemed appropriate by the government for St Ignatius and Loreto school crossings, and I cannot imagine why it would not also be suitable for the Trinity Gardens Primary School.

Therefore, I call upon the Minister for Road Safety to visit the site to witness firsthand the danger that parents and students go through every single day simply to cross this main arterial road to go to school. I have done this, and am appalled that safety improvement measures have not been undertaken sooner. We need to focus on child pedestrian safety, not revenue raising. The minister's response to this issue has been at best ignorant and at worst completely indifferent to the safety of these children. What will it take for the government to take action? Does a child need to be seriously injured? I urge the Minister for Road Safety to get out of his chauffeur-driven ministerial limousine and visit this site, and then also revisit his previous decision on this issue and sensibly resolve this important road safety matter.

ADVANCE DIRECTIVES

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:51): I rise today to speak about the issue of advance directives. Advance directives are directives that people can make to appoint others to make decisions for them in the event that they lose the capacity to make those decisions themselves, and to express their wishes over decisions in respect of their health, residential and other lifestyle issues, and the management of their finances.

At present in South Australia there are four types of advance directives that a person may make, and these are provided for in three different acts. First, the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995 contains provisions for medical powers of attorney for anticipatory directions through which people can make advance directives for health and medical treatment decisions. There are also provisions in the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993 for people to create enduring powers of guardianship in respect of health and lifestyle decisions. The third act is the Powers of Attorney and Agency Act 1984, which contains provisions for people to appoint enduring powers of attorney for financial decisions to be made.

As members of this house would be aware, our electorate offices and ourselves are often asked to assist constituents to witness forms needed for them to make advance directives. As members would also be aware, many people need help in completing advance directive forms. They often find the forms confusing and complicated. People are also confused as to what type of advance directive or directives they should be completing for different purposes. This is an issue

that is particularly important to me because people need to have some assistance when they are making end-of-life decisions or decisions for their future. It seems to me that we need to bring back the campaign for plain English and plain process so that people can understand and have some choice over the decisions they make.

However, I am pleased to report that the Rann government has been looking into this issue of improving the process and simplifying the South Australian advance directives regime through an excellent review committee it appointed. This committee was chaired by the Hon. Martyn Evans, and included Public Advocate John Harley, former public trustee Judith Worrall, and the Executive Director of Aboriginal Health April Lawrie-Smith, as well as people with extensive experience in palliative care, legal and medical nursing, and the risk management professions.

It was supported by an expert advisory panel that gave the committee access to expertise from a wide range of relevant sources. In October last year, the government released two reports. The first report makes recommendations for changes to law and policy and, in particular, recommends four different types of advance directives to be consolidated in one advance directives act. It proposes that the Powers of Attorney and Agency Act 1984 be renamed the Advance Directive Act and that the provisions for advance directives contained in the guardianship act and the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act be removed and transferred to a new advance directives act.

The review committee also recommended that health and personal advance directives be amended so that they are better aligned with the advance directive provisions in the guardianship act. There was also a second report in relation to implementation and communication strategies. It was recommended that forms be simplified and the guidelines be easy to read for their completion. Certainly something that I really endorse.

The committee made extensive use of international research and conducted wide community consultations in South Australia that found that the success of a new advance directive regime will require an integrated and ongoing campaign to better explain to the community—and I would say probably members of this house—how this new advance directives process will work. There is also a recommendation that ongoing professional education be available to ensure that health, aged care, financial and community care professionals understand the new scheme for advance directives. I commend the government for initiating and supporting the work of the Advance Directives Review Committee and look forward to a speedy introduction of relevant legislative amendments.

STAMP DUTIES (PARTNERSHIP INTERESTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:57): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The need for this Bill arises as a result of the decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia in *Cyril Henschke Pty Ltd and Ors v Commissioner of State Taxation* [2009] SASC 148 (the 'Henschke case').

The Full Court found that a partner's interest in partnership property is not an interest in the underlying assets held by the partnership, but is rather a chose in action entitling each partner to their share of the profits derived from the assets and the value of the partner's share of the assets upon dissolution.

Therefore, although upon retirement, a retiring partner may agree to sell his or her chose in action to the continuing partners, a retirement may also occur with no transfer. Rather, the retiring partner may simply leave the partnership taking cash representing the value of his or her proportionate share in the partnership property, without there being any transfer of the underlying partnership assets.

The decision of the Full Court has significant implications for stamp duty assessments as they relate to partnership interests. The judgment has left the way open for any partnership, wishing to effect a retirement of a partner or partners, to effect such a retirement by adopting the method used in this case, and consequently significantly reduce their stamp duty liability.

The potential revenue that may be lost is considered to be significant. Partnerships are a popular way to structure business enterprises in South Australia and therefore it is possible that partnerships may seek to effect any retirements of partners in the same way, and therefore avoid any stamp duty liability.

Leave to appeal the decision of the Full Court to the High Court of Australia has been obtained. However, the Government is nevertheless moving to amend the Act in order to ensure that the revenue base is protected regardless of the outcome in the High Court.

The Bill will ensure that partnership transactions continue to be taxed in the same manner that they were taxed prior to the Henschke case, thereby protecting the revenue. The provisions will apply both prospectively and retrospectively.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

3—Insertion of section 71AB

This clause will insert a new section in the Act that specifically deals with the imposition of duty on transactions relating to interests in partnerships. In particular, the provision will make it clear that any transaction affecting an interest, including an interest consisting of a right to a proportion of the surplus property of a partnership if assets were realised and liabilities discharged, will be subject to duty. A transaction within the ambit of the section may be subject to duty even if there is no transfer of assets or change in the ownership of an equitable interest in the partnership.

The provision also reflects the current practice in relation to the assessment of duty, in that land is assessed according to its unencumbered value and all other assets are assessed on their net value.

Given the application of the new section to any instrument that may effect or evidence a relevant transaction, the provision makes it clear that if 1 instrument relating to a transaction is duly stamped, any other instrument relating to the same transaction will be exempt from duty to the extent necessary to avoid the imposition of double duty.

The section will operate both prospectively and retrospectively.

4—Amendment of section 71E—Transactions otherwise than by dutiable instrument

This clause makes a corresponding amendment to section 71E of the Act in relation to transactions within the ambit of proposed new section 71AB that are not effected by instrument.

5—Amendment of section 91—Interpretation

In a manner consistent with the proposed new section 71AB of the Act, it is intended to ensure that the Act applies so that an interest of a partner in a partnership will be considered to constitute a beneficial entitlement to a proportionate share in each and every asset of the partnership.

6—Amendment of section 95—General principle of liability to duty

Section 95 of the Act imposes duty with respect to transactions that relate to the acquisition of significant interests, or of increased interests, in land rich entities. Subsection (4) is to be amended to reflect the fact that these provisions extend to transactions that relate to changes in the interest of persons as partners in partnerships that hold relevant interests in land rich entities.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

This provision will allow the Commissioner of State Taxation to reassess duty on the basis of the amendments that are to be effected to the Act. However, the Commissioner will not be able to impose penalty duty on account of a reassessment under this clause and the measure will not affect a liability for duty with respect to the Deed that gave rise to the Supreme Court proceedings in the matter of *Cyril Henschke Pty Ltd v Commissioner of State Taxation*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

MARINE PARKS (PARLIAMENTARY SCRUTINY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:59): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Marine Parks Act 2007. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In accordance with provisions of the Marine Parks Act 2007, on 29 January 2009 the outer boundaries of 19 marine parks were proclaimed by His Excellency the Governor and released by the Minister for Environment and Conservation for public comment. During the public comment period some community members indicated a preference to increase the scrutiny of any future amendments to management plans and associated zones to provide greater certainty and security to activities and industries operating in the marine environment.

The act requires that the minister responsible for marine parks must lay initial management plans before both houses of parliament. In addition, section 15 of the act requires that, after the Governor authorises amendments to the management plan, the plan is then referred by the minister responsible for marine parks to the Environment, Resource and Development Committee (ERD) of the parliament. The ERD committee must then consider the plan within 28 days of receiving it and may resolve not to object to the plan, suggest amendments to the plan or object to the plan.

If the ERD committee resolves to object to a plan, copies of the plan must be laid before both houses of parliament. Either house may then disallow the plan. Key stakeholders who use the marine environment sought the security of additional parliamentary scrutiny of the process to amend management plans. As a result, the government determined to provide this security by amending the act. The Marine Parks (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Amendment Bill (the amendment bill) provides that amended marine park management plans are referred to both houses of parliament and are subject to the process of parliamentary scrutiny that applies to the making of regulations under sections 10 and 10A of the Subordinate Legislation Act of 1978.

Section 14 of the act has been amended to require the minister responsible for marine parks to cause copies of a management plan to be laid before both houses of parliament within six sitting days after it is declared rather than 12 sitting days. This amendment provides consistency with provisions of the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978. The bill has the effect that, if a resolution for disallowance is passed in pursuance of a notice of motion given within 14 days after an amended management plan is laid before the parliament, the amended plan will then cease to have effect.

Initial marine park management plans with multiple-use zoning arrangements are expected to be authorised in 2012. These plans will set out strategies for achieving the objects of the act and also establish zones within marine parks and will be the product of contributions from the full range of community members with interests in South Australia's marine environment. The introduction of this amendment bill is the culmination of government working with community to provide more certainty about future amendments to marine park management plans and the zones within them. I commend the bill to members, and 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

2—Amendment provisions

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Marine Parks Act 2007

3—Amendment of section 14—Procedure for making or amending management plans

Section 14(9) of the principal Act provides that within 12 sitting days after the declaration of an initial management plan for a marine park, a copy of the plan must be laid before both Houses of Parliament. The proposed amendment would result in all declared management plans (not just initial management plans) being laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after the declaration.

4—Substitution of section 15

Section 15 of the principal Act provides that all management plans, other than initial management plans (as these are laid before both Houses of Parliament under section 14) are to be referred to the Environmental, Resources and Development Committee of the Parliament. The proposed amendment results in management plans

no longer being referred to the ERD Committee but instead being laid before both Houses of Parliament with sections 10 and 10A of the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 applying to them as if the management plan were a regulation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

TRUSTEE (CHARITABLE TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:04): This is a very important piece of legislation, but we will not keep the house very long. It is a minor amendment legislatively to the Trustee Act. However, what it does is of vital importance to many of our country communities and country hospitals. The bill to amend the Trustee Act was introduced on 23 June. This bill makes amendments to the Trustee Act 1936 that will rectify an oversight—some people say a failing—when the government introduced the Health Care Act in 2008. On introducing the health care legislation, the government saw but was unable to correct an issue with the health advisory councils that they would not be allowed to continue to hold and receive tax deductible donations and bequests in trust for the local hospital. This was previously allowed, as these gifts, bequests and donations went to the hospital through the hospital board.

When the government scrapped local hospital boards, country hospitals then came under the umbrella of Country Health SA. As a government body, Country Health SA is not able to get deductible gift recipient status. I understand there are now millions held in trust by Country Health SA for various country hospitals, and I am told many non-government organisations, such as Red Cross, hold money in trust for country hospitals. The Trustee (Charitable Trusts) Amendment Bill 2010 will ensure that a gift fund established to hold donations or other gifts for the benefit of a government instrumentality, such as a public hospital or ambulance service, can hold the donations or gifts in trust for the purposes of the Australian Taxation Office.

The legislative change will enable HACs to be considered as charitable organisations, despite their connection to the government, and allow DGA endorsement for gifts and donations to funds utilised for the benefit of the local operations of Country Health SA hospitals and SA Ambulance Service Incorporated. I wish the bill a speedy passage through the rest of its stages.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:06): I thank the opposition for supporting this legislation. This brings to fruition a commitment that was made by the government to country communities that we would ensure that the health advisory councils (HACs) were able to hold and look after donations that had been given to them and, in particular, to ensure that they could receive gifts which the giver could seek a tax benefit from. This is a sensible thing, and I am glad the opposition supports it. In concluding my remarks, I thank the departmental officers who have assisted me, particularly Rob Smetak from health and Kellie Tilbrook from the Attorney-General's Department, and also parliamentary counsel Annette Lever for her assistance. I commend the legislation to the house.

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

MENTAL HEALTH (REPEAL OF HARBOURING OFFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

NORTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:10): There are two subjects that I want to talk about this afternoon. Yesterday, I raised in this house the issue of the pressure that the rock lobster fishery in South Australia is under, particularly the northern zone. I am very concerned about what is going on in relation to the fishery. I urge the minister to meet with representatives of the northern zone rock lobster fishery. There seems to be an orchestrated and calculated attempt by the bureaucracy to weasel more money out of less income for these fishermen on the surmise that the fishery is under threat. That fishery is not under threat. It is not under threat in any way, shape or form. Indeed, the biomass over the last year or two has been terrific; it has picked up substantially.

Bureaucrats sitting in their offices, shuffling pieces of paper and writing things down and jostling figures tend not to understand how things work in the real world.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that was something that the former member for Stuart referred to frequently, member for Finnis.

Mr PENGILLY: You are getting my time, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, he may well have done. However, the reality is that whether you farm on the sea or farm on the land, it does not much matter; you have good seasons and you have bad seasons. If our fisheries in South Australia had been absolutely thrashed for the last 50 years, I could understand this desire to further limit the restrictions on the lobster quota in the northern zone. I understand that the Hon. Mr Pegler also has deep involvement with the rock lobster fishery in the southern zone.

Why should I have to have cray fishermen coming to me—and they are more than welcome to come to me—bemoaning the fact that the fisheries department is simply not listening to what they have to say. They are juggling figures, they are writing things down, but they do not understand the fishery. They are not out there on the boats, they are not harvesting the catch from the sea, and they do not know how seasons work from one year to another. So, it is absolutely outrageous that the department is looking at a further cut in quota for the northern zone rock lobster fishery. It is absolutely outrageous. It will put families out of business, it will put people out of work, it will impact on the economic circumstances—in this case, the towns and Kangaroo Island businesses, fuel suppliers, bait suppliers, the whole lot. It is absolutely outrageous.

I would hope that the government (and it is a vain hope) and particularly the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries—or whatever he is called today; it seems to change fairly regularly—would get hold of these people and say, 'What is the real truth?', because I can tell you that the real truth is not coming out. We have to have industry. We have a wonderful fishery across South Australia. Whether it be prawns, rock lobster, squid fishing, scale fishing, net fishing, or whatever, it has all been run particularly well over a number of years, and the fact that they are still in business is indicative of the way they have managed their industry in conjunction with, in the past, reasonable people in the fisheries department.

I do not know who is puffing wind in the wrong place at the moment, because I do not believe that the department does know what is going on. My suspicions are that it has been told by the Sustainable Budget Commission that it will have to save money or find more money to operate fisheries. What is happening is that they say, 'We will put the charges and the licence fees up for fishermen and, while we're at it, we will cut quotas again.' There has been a 34 per cent quota cut this season just finished and, if there is another quota cut, we will have a lot more people going to Centrelink looking for money, because it is not at all sustainable to cut quotas. It would be absolutely nonsensical to do so. If there were no biomass improvements—as there have been—I could understand it.

I am disappointed that the fishermen feel the way they do. We went through the cockle fishery expedition with the former minister, the Hon. Rory McEwen. The member for Hammond and I actually worked on a committee to fix that up; and we did fix that up. There was more sense used and they actually listened to us. The fisheries officers from the department that were involved there, were most helpful and useful in that they listened to us. However, in this particular case with the rock lobster fishery, they had better start listening, and I hope my colleague, the member for Mount Gambier, will possibly pick this up on his own as well, or the member for MacKillop even, because they both have coasts that are associated with rock lobster.

On another subject, this afternoon in the house, I asked a question in relation to the Kangaroo Island doctors and the situation with the contracts. I cannot believe the manner in which the doctors on Kangaroo Island were treated this afternoon. They were twice accused of blackmail by the minister. I think it is absolutely outrageous to accuse them of blackmail. Conveniently, the facts have not all come out on this, but they will come out now—trust me. What will now happen is that I will come back into this place and produce for the house evidence of what has really happened with some of the incompetencies that have been carried out by some—and I say some—locums who have been operating on the island.

I will come back with that and I will read it into the house, so that the house knows the real story. For the minister this afternoon to accuse the KI doctors of blackmail is an absolutely

scurrilous attack on their integrity. It will go down like a lead balloon in the community, and I am sure that the Rural Doctors Association will not take it lightly. For them to have some of their colleagues referred to as blackmailers is absolutely unbelievable. It is not in the best interests of the medical future of country South Australia; it is definitely not in the best interests of the health services on the island.

I take great pride in the Kangaroo Island health service and have done for many, many years. We have had a succession of good operating managers there for a long period of time and I have had a deep involvement in it. I intend to put the full story on the record for the house when we next sit, and I will leave nothing uncovered. In saying that, in my view, the minister should apologise to those doctors. He should have the courage of his convictions to come back and apologise for calling them blackmailers, because they are not blackmailers. They are simply trying to provide a service for a community, at a reasonable cost.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: If the minister wants to speak, I suggest he return to his seat. If he wants to interject, he should do it from his seat. Trust me, this has not finished.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to apologise to the member for Finniss for taking possibly 10 to 20 seconds out of his time, but it was true that the Hon. Graham Gunn had a great dislike of what he called civil servants. What were they called?

Mr Pengilly: Parasites.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not parasites, member for Finniss! 'Sir Humphreys', he called them.

JONES, MRS L.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:18): In the two minutes left of adjournment time on this side of the house, I want to briefly pay tribute to somebody who has given a great deal of her life, over four decades of service, to the Liberal Party, in particular, but more broadly, to people across many electorates. I am talking about Mrs Lenore Jones, who has been a staffer in many different roles for members going back as far as Heini Becker, Jennifer Adamson, John Oswald and other previous members, most recently the Hon. Trish Worth, the former federal member for Adelaide, and the Liberal Party's administration.

After 40 years of service to the public of South Australia, particularly through those Liberal members, Lenore is now retiring from full-time employment. I think that we all owe our staff a great deal for making us look good when we otherwise would not. With that, I thank the house for its indulgence and the opportunity to recognise the service of Mrs Lenore Jones. As a previous work colleague of hers, she taught me a great deal, and both I and the Liberal Party are very grateful for her service.

YOUNG ADELAIDE VOICES

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (16:20): I rise to speak about a wonderful performance I attended last Sunday at the Adelaide Town Hall with my daughter, on behalf of the Premier and minister Hill in the arts portfolio, of Young Adelaide Voices (YAV), formerly known as the Adelaide Girls Choir. YAV have broadened their base in the last couple of years to include young boys up to the teenage years. The group involves nearly 155 families with a variety of different choristers and age groups.

The choir masters do a wonderful job. There was a performance on Sunday where they had 55 young children on stage that were being conducted to sing a variety of songs such as *Quack Quack Little Duck* with hand movements, and a variety of things, which was very entertaining. One person had to organise those 55 children to behave, sing, be on stage, and she does this largely on her own, with up to another 22 children each week, as they train for their performances which occur twice a year.

The group is particularly keen to secure sponsorship in the forthcoming years from the corporate sector, the community and grants. They showcased their performances to family and friends, grandparents and siblings of the people who were performing on Sunday, and they did a wonderful job. One of the most interesting things I discovered about the event, which the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place attended with me, was that Peter Combe is the patron of that organisation and has been involved with the group as a patron and parent since its formation some 27 or 30 years ago. He is equally as passionate about the group today as he was then, as Greg von Einem, their chairperson of council, was informing me.

YAV have a variety of choirs, including Aurora, which is about to leave today or tomorrow for a tour of Canada. Aurora comprises adult women who have often been with the choir since their childhoods. They were very impressive and entertaining, performing a Ben Folds' song *Adelaide*. Desiree Frahn of the junior choir performed a solo from *Pirates of Penzance*, which was very entertaining. There was an intermediate choir and a second concert choir, and joining the group on Sunday for a special performance was the Festival Statesmen Youth Choir, which is a barbershop quartet that specialise in that style of music. They were very entertaining and performed a number of songs from the musical genre, including *West Side Story*. That was an excellent performance as well. Next was the first concert choir and then, to conclude the event, there was the combined YAV choirs and then the combined YAV choirs with the Statesmen. This was a very impressive way to conclude the event, which went for about two hours.

If you have the opportunity to attend one of their concerts and see them perform, it is a very worthwhile thing. My daughter and I learnt a lot about the capacity of those children to perform with a very small amount of tuition once a week, and for very little cost.

At 16:24 the house adjourned until Tuesday 20 July 2010 at 11:00.