

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 May 2011

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PRISONER COMPENSATION QUARANTINE FUNDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 October 2010.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (10:31): This bill aims to quarantine damages awarded to a prisoner following an incident in prison and subsequent legal action against the state. The funds would then be made available to victims who successfully apply for damages for a criminal act of the prisoner, or to creditors, subject to any other statutory provisions that might apply to the money.

I note, and the government notes, that this bill is an improvement on an earlier, similar measure proposed by the member, which the government found to be unworkable. However, flaws remain, preventing the government from supporting this new bill.

To summarise: the bill restricts compromises of claims by prisoners against the state. This can only occur where (a) the court approves them and (b) the medical expenses are specified and the costs are agreed at the time of settlement or to be later taxed. It also requires that a judgement in favour of a prisoner and against the state must specify the amount of the medical expenses and legal costs unless costs are to be taxed.

The bill also limits the cases in which the court can approve or award damages by reference to the proportion of the total payment that is due to medical treatment costs or legal costs. The prisoner's award, if over \$10,000, must be paid to the CE of the Department of Correctional Services. The CE then advertises the existence of an award. A person who is the victim of a criminal act of the prisoner can apply for more information, which the chief executive can then choose to give to the victim.

A victim of a criminal act can then litigate against the prisoner over the criminal act. If the victim wins, they are entitled to be paid the damages out of the money held by the chief executive. A creditor of the prisoner can also claim payment from this money. Both claims are subject to statutory provisions about the money, for example, tax debts or child support debts.

The government has several difficulties with this bill. First of all, there is no definition specifying who is a victim of a criminal act by the prisoner other than a statement to the effect that if one person is a victim, then all the members of his or her immediate family are also victims. That does not assist if one does not know who is a victim in the first place. A definition is crucial because the chief executive is only able to pay money to a person claiming under proposed section 81J if the person is a victim.

Putting that aside, another difficulty is that the bill is unclear about whether victims can claim from the fund repayment of their legal costs associated with suing the offender. This depends on whether the costs are part of the award against the prisoner. 'Award' is not defined but 'award of damages' is defined, the latter in such a way as to suggest that perhaps costs are excluded, although this is not absolutely clear. The bill should say one way or the other whether the victim will get back their costs of pursuing the prisoner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: —because in many cases that will make a difference to whether or not the victim is willing to sue the prisoner.

It is also problematic that the bill gives persons who think they are victims no legal right to find out how many other victims and creditors are claiming on the fund, who they are or how much they are claiming. The chief executive can choose to disclose this information if he has it, but he does not have to. Unless a victim knows about the other claims on the fund of money, they cannot

make an informed choice based upon the probable compensation and whether to incur the expense of pursuing the offender by legal action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much background noise.

Ms Bedford: Absolutely! I can't hear him and I am beside him.

Mr ODENWALDER: The member for Florey cannot hear my dulcet tones. There is also uncertainty about what prisoner awards are captured. The prisoner's claim must arise 'out of and in connection with the prisoner's detention in the correctional institution', but it is unclear what this will include. If a prisoner is assaulted by another prisoner in circumstances where the state is found negligent, does this arise out of and in connection with detention? It is arguably not a necessary consequence of being incarcerated that other prisoners will assault you. What relationship must be shown between the detention and the harm done to the prisoner?

It is also unclear who will decide this question. Someone must, because only if the award arose in this way is the chief executive of Correctional Services entitled to quarantine the fund. The bill does not attempt to answer this question, no doubt leaving fertile ground for dispute between prisoners and the chief executive.

Another problem is to know who will ultimately decide whether the award of damages that a victim has obtained relates to a criminal act. Only if a victim is entitled to damages for a criminal act can the victim claim on the fund of money. The bill stipulates that it is not necessary to convict the prisoner, so there will not necessarily be a certificate of conviction to settle the question.

One cannot rely on the prisoner admitting to the offence, since it will not be seen in his or her interests to do so. It is not necessary for the court to decide this when determining whether the victim is entitled to damages, since a civil action does not depend on this. Does the chief executive simply take the victim's word for it? Can the prisoner then sue the chief executive, seeking to prove that the event for which the victim sued him was not a criminal act?

The bill also requires the victim to maintain secrecy about the amount of the award to the prisoner against the state, and other matters that the chief executive might disclose, on pain of criminal penalties. The benefit of this secrecy and why its preservation is worth putting the victim at risk of a criminal penalty of up to \$10,000 is not disclosed.

There is also some uncertainty about the position of creditors. They are entitled to claim on the fund of money, but the bill does not say whether they can claim even after the time to pursue the debt has expired, or whether they can claim even if the prisoner has gone bankrupt. If this is not clarified, it will leave the chief executive in some difficulty administering the fund.

The instruction in new section 81L(4) and 81M(4) that in the case of the fund being insufficient to pay all the entitled persons in full the chief executive must make payments on a 'pro rata basis having regard to any priority of payment required by law' will also create difficulty. If there is a law prioritising one of the payments over the others, the chief executive should apply that law. That will prevent a pro rata distribution. If there is not such a law, then it is reasonable that the amount in the fund be shared by all claimants in proportion to the amounts due to them by the prisoner. You cannot do both.

A final concern that I will raise I believe is best illustrated by an example. Say, for example, an inmate is a member of gang X and is imprisoned for an attack on a member of gang Y. Other members of gang Y are already locked up in the same prison.

Putting aside the concerns that I have already outlined about the definition of a 'victim', this bill might create a situation where there would be a retribution attack by members of gang Y on the gang X member—whether or not this might occur anyway is beside the point.

This bill could create something of an incentive for the retribution attack to occur as not only would there be the gang revenge but also the gang Y member, who is the initial victim, stands to claim compensation on any money that the gang X member receives should he be successful in a claim against the state.

The potential for state government funds to effectively be paying off gangland debts is clearly not acceptable to the government. Other faults can be found with the bill, but I will not further delay the house. The government opposes this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (MEDICAL DEFENCES—END OF LIFE ARRANGEMENTS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:42): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice for the rescission of a vote of this house on this bill forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of members is not present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:44): I move:

That the vote on the second reading of the bill be rescinded.

Motion carried.

Second reading.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (10:45): I rise to speak on this bill with a heavy heart because I can well imagine circumstances where the terminally ill would seek relief and circumstances in which they would seek assisted suicide as a pathway from their pain. I think every member of the house can envisage circumstances—and many will have been personally engaged with those circumstances—where, as an act of compassion, one might wish upon a loved one a passing, if only to relieve them of their agony and suffering.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Madam Speaker, can I just seek—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is this a point of order?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Point of order. Can I seek a clarification? Given the process that has happened, can people who spoke before in the second reading speak again?

The SPEAKER: No, that is not possible. We have gone back to the second reading stage, but if you have spoken that is it.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Having said that, I signal that I will be opposing the bill because I think it opens a Pandora's box. I have spoken on this matter in regard to an earlier bill on 17 May 2001. I do not want to repeat the arguments I raised on that occasion, but I will make a few points. Firstly, I draw the house's attention to the declaration on euthanasia adopted by the 39th World Medical Assembly in Madrid, Spain, in October 1987, and also the 44th World Medical Assembly in Marbella, Spain, in September 1992, which stated the following—

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Waite! There is too much background noise and it is very difficult to hear the member, and this is a very serious issue, as we have taken a serious step. Can we have less noise, please.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I quote:

Physician-assisted suicide, like euthanasia, is unethical and must be condemned by the medical profession. Where the assistance of the physician is intentionally and deliberately directed at enabling an individual to end his or her life, the physician acts unethically. However the right to decline medical treatment is a basic right of the patient and the physician does not act unethically even if respecting such a wish results in the death of the patient.

I also draw the house's attention to references to this matter in the House of Lords, in its session of 1993-94, and the Report of the Select Committee on Medical Ethics, Volume 1—Report, page 10, and later debate within the House of Lords on the subject. I again draw the house's attention to the Australian Association for Hospice and Palliative Care and its comments on the matter that have been made in the past.

I can envisage a multitude of circumstances where one might seek assisted suicide. First, as has been pointed out during this debate, there are circumstances in which people find themselves in extreme pain and find they are undergoing extraordinary suffering with inadequate palliative care and medical relief, and they simply feel they cannot go on. This is acute and concerning and would strike at the heart of every person here.

But the bill ultimately suggests that the way out of that situation is assisted suicide. I think there are other alternatives. I think advancements have been made and that further advancements

can be made in palliative care, but I think, too, that these are matters largely for families and the suffering to address, not the parliament.

A second reason why people might want to commit suicide is that they feel alone. They feel unloved, they feel unvalued, and they feel as though they are a burden on their family. They feel as though the world would be better if they were not still in it, that there is no point in going on. Again, I think these situations are best left in the hands of families.

A third situation may be that they wish to commit suicide because they feel clinically depressed. They feel that their family, as I mentioned, would be better off without them, that they have fallen into a state of complete and absolute despair and that they are putting their loved ones through a unendurable ordeal and that the world and their family would be better off without them. Again, I feel these are circumstances that are best dealt with by families and not by this parliament.

There are no right or wrong answers to this terrible question, but I would say simply this: in my own family experience, I have seen, on the one hand, suicide, and, on the other hand, a teenage cousin within a week of death from leukaemia suddenly go into remission. She is now a happy mother with two children and living a bountiful life but, had this act been passed prior to her condition reaching that extreme point, I am quite certain she would be dead. Everyone has their own stories to tell in regard to this matter.

I am also very concerned about efforts a parliament might take to codify this question of assisted suicide. I know advocates of the bill do not like the term 'suicide', but that is what we are talking about; we are talking about assisted suicide. If you codify these things you take away whatever discretion exists at present under current arrangements.

No-one is talking about turning the machines off and letting nature take its course. We are talking about active intervention, and just like a bill of rights, just like attempts to change the constitution, once you codify things if it is not in there then it is out. If it is not legalised by the law, then it is outside the law. You bog down and clog up whatever fluidity there is in arrangements between families and the medical profession at the moment to make compassionate decisions on behalf of their loved ones who are in such agony.

The other thing is that my experience as a lawmaker tells me that once you open this threshold moral issue and legalise assisted suicide and murder, you will start the path down a slippery slope. Soon people will be arguing on the basis of discrimination that their mental illness or their condition is equally painful and equally distressing as that determined by the bill at the outset, and they will be saying that they are discriminated against, that they have their right to select and opt for suicide just like the other person who is in agony. You will get into all these arguments about what does or what does not constitute a medical condition or a mental condition sufficient to require or enable legalised suicide.

It is a slippery slope. I do not know where it ends. I do not know whether it ends in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, I do not know whether it ends in a place where other regimes have taken us in the past in history, where we seek to get rid of the mentally ill, the physically deformed, and those who are not fully fit and well: the Spartan ethic. I do not know where it takes us, but I do not want to start a legislative process that ends at that point.

Claims for popular support for this measure, I think, are thin. I doubt if this issue would survive a national referendum once the electorate was fully informed. I would say this: society already authorises killing. We understand that at times it is necessary for our soldiers to fight on our behalf, to fight for freedom, and to kill. We have just had Corporal Robert Smith awarded the VC and describe his acts of killing on our behalf serving his country. This parliament and other parliaments in this country already endorse murder in certain circumstances and that is one. However, it is another step to authorise legalised suicide.

I read in the paper today the story of Mr Ramazan Acar, who killed his beautiful daughter, Yazmina, with a knife for the purpose of getting even with his wife. This man is scum. I will never introduce legislation into this place to authorise the death penalty, but I hope that no-one else does because, when I read cases like this, I would be challenged to vote against a death penalty bill because I think there are circumstances where, as with our soldiers, we might authorise the taking of a life to eradicate this community of evil.

I will not be introducing a bill, and I hope that no-one else does because I do not want to have to make that terrible decision. To me, however, this is a separate issue: authorised suicide. It is a moral dilemma. I suspect many of the advocates of this would oppose the death penalty while

supporting euthanasia. I understand the compassionate basis upon which this bill has been introduced, but I will be opposing it with a heavy heart.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:56): I have been thinking long and hard about this bill, as I am sure all members have. This is the third bill introduced into the parliament since my election in March last year that has sought to allow for a process under which someone in suffering may be able to access euthanasia. Whichever way any of us votes on these matters, we will disappoint as many people as we will satisfy.

I know that I will disappoint a number of people when I say that, while there may be value in exploring issues at the committee stage, I cannot see myself at this stage supporting the bill as it stands at the third reading. The focus of this contribution is to put my views on the record for the benefit of those of my constituents who might be interested. I will do so in relation to the broader issue of euthanasia as well as this specific bill.

We are obliged on matters of conscience to consider all the arguments at length, to listen to the views put to us by our constituents, as well as anyone else who takes the trouble to approach us in good faith to put their case, and we must reflect on our own principles. I would like to begin by thanking the many constituents and others who have taken the time to contact me to share their views on the matter. I have read many compelling arguments.

I am also grateful to those whom I have sought out, particularly from the medical and legal professions, as well as some of those who ply their trade in this building and others, who have been willing to give me the benefit of their expert advice and answer some of my questions.

Our core beliefs in relation to these matters cannot help but be shaped by our upbringing. I grew up in a family that placed great value on personal sovereignty, freedom of choice and scepticism of any government intrusion into one's own decisions. If euthanasia was a topic for discussion at the dinner table, there was never any question from my parents that individuals should not be forced to suffer the indignity or the pain of an intolerable death if that was not their wish.

In my late teens, I came to Christianity, or perhaps that is the wrong way round: it is better to say that I was found. I was baptised in the Lutheran Church and exposed to the argument that the immutable sanctity of human life should supersede one's personal choice about how one's own life might end. In relation to these bills, some have approached me on the basis that, because the church to whose theology I subscribe is opposed to euthanasia, I therefore should necessarily vote against any voluntary euthanasia legislation in this place.

In my maiden speech, I explained that my faith is a personal matter and that I abhor any suggestion that the government would ever seek to stop me or anyone else from practising their faith or from living life by any other principles they hold dear. In the debate on the euthanasia bill that was unsuccessful in the other chamber late last year, the Hon. Stephen Wade articulated the point well in explaining why he was not universally opposed to any such legislation, although he was voting against that particular bill for a range of reasons. He said:

While my Christian faith teaches me that it is not an option that I should see as available to myself, in a pluralist society and as a Liberal I accept that others make other choices so, I do not rule out euthanasia being made legally available to South Australian adults...

Most members who have spoken on this issue have very appropriately shared with the house their own personal experiences that have informed the views they hold about matters to do with the end of life. I am very grateful that I have never had to, as others have, suffer the incomparable pain of losing a parent, sibling or a child. I have lost my four grandparents across the decades of my life.

Delivering the eulogy at my grandmother's funeral was a much more difficult speech than any I will ever deliver in here, and we lost my dad's dad at the beginning of last year in the weeks before the 20 March election. Grandpa was strong willed and opinionated. Some called him obstinate. He was passionate and courageous. Starting from a modest background, he worked as a policeman in England and he served in the Second World War. After the war he brought his family to Australia to build a new life in a brave young country.

He lived to what some might term the ripe old age of 95, although particularly for the last two or three years of his life he did not call it living as his body refused to cooperate with his strong mind. He received excellent treatment for a wide range of problems. He felt little physical pain as his body deteriorated, but he suffered mental anguish of great duration. Other members of my

family have agreed that he would have been pleased for me to talk about him in the context of framing my views in support of the principle of this sort of legislation.

It was barely a week after his passing that I and other candidates from Morialta who were present at the candidates forum at Campbelltown City Council were asked what our views were on the issue. As I recall, the Greens candidate expressed his firm support, and the then Labor member expressed her heartfelt opposition to any such legislation, instead arguing in a most compelling manner for a greater focus on palliative care.

At that forum I gave much the same description of my position as I am giving today. I also pointed out the importance of appropriate safeguards necessary to ensure that the legislation is not open to abuse. This sort of legislation would be much easier to deal with if there were not those in our society who are willing to act in appalling ways.

I agree with the Minister for Health, who made an excellent contribution to this debate in preferring a model that allows for a statutory defence under the criminal law rather than the more bureaucratic statutory voluntary euthanasia schemes that have also been proposed, although I do not necessarily rule them out. Minister Hill describes them as 'the establishment of a state mechanism which would be appointed by the health minister and which would be responsible to the health minister'.

But a statutory defence proposal should include significant safeguards such as would ensure that some of the nightmare scenarios that have been suggested could not take place. The law should also be clear in order to provide clarity for the courts and those who serve in them, including the juries. I am not satisfied at this stage that the bill in front of us delivers in relation to that aspect. If we reach the committee stage I will listen to the ensuing debate about those matters and any potential amendments, but this is the basis of my objection to the bill.

The bill also deals with issues of aiding and abetting, and providing support and civil liability, but in the brief time available I will focus on the guts issue: the proposed framework between doctor and patient. The bill essentially lists four safeguards in a new section 13B of the act, which reads:

Criminal liability in relation to end of life arrangements:

1. It is a defence to a charge of an offence against this division, arising out of the death or intended death of a person, if the death resulted or was intended to result from the administration of drugs to the person by the defendant and the defendant proves, on the balance of probabilities, that:
 - (a) the defendant was at the time of the conduct to which the charge relates, a treating practitioner of the person;
 - (b) the defendant believed, on reasonable grounds, that the person was an adult person of sound mind who was suffering from an illness, injury or other medical condition that irreversibly impaired the person's quality of life so that life had become intolerable to that person (the qualifying illness);
 - (c) the conduct to which the charge relates occurred at the express request of the person; and
 - (d) the conduct to which the charge relates was, in all the circumstances, a reasonable response to the suffering of the person.

The Law Society and others have expressed some serious concerns about terms like 'reasonable grounds' in paragraph (b) in relation to both the finding that the patient must be of sound mind and that life was intolerable. They also expressed concerns about the use of the term 'reasonable response' in paragraph (d)—that 'the conduct to which the charge relates was, in all the circumstances, a reasonable response to the suffering of the person'.

These are subjective terms and ones which provide too much ambiguity about the sort of process that we are proposing that the courts should allow. The bill also falls down on what is a threshold issue for me, in that it does not require that a second opinion be sought about either the diagnosis or treatment of the qualifying illness, in order to establish the irreversible impairment that is required; and nor is any psychological assessment demanded to ensure that the apparently intolerable quality of life afforded to the patient is not the result of a treatable state of depression.

Finally, there is the issue of consent. This is an issue on which I would not have thought ambiguity was an option, yet the obligations on the doctor to demonstrate that the conduct to which the charge relates occurred at the express request of the person are undefined. I imagine that these questions may be approached in the committee stage, along with many others, and I look

forward to the responses to the bill's proposals. However, as I have said, at this stage I will not be voting for this bill in this form at the third reading.

I look forward to hearing the contributions that other members have to make. I have been informed somewhat in my own deliberations by the contributions made so far. I believe they have been made in the best of spirits and I appreciate the contributions of those members.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan) (11:06): I welcome the opportunity to speak on this bill and I thank the members for Ashford and MacKillop for their organisation and cooperation. I will say at the very start that I have no doubt at all about the goodwill and intention of everybody involved in this debate—and the compassion of those involved in this debate. This debate is being approached from both sides by people of goodwill and good intention and compassion, and I do not have a problem with that. It will not come as a surprise to anybody at all in this house that I will be opposing the bill. I do oppose the bill and come down on that side of the bill, but I want to say very firmly at the outset that I accept the goodwill on both sides.

The first point I want to make very clearly is that this is a euthanasia bill. There has been some attempt to say that it is not, that it is a change to the criminal code and so on, which it is, but let's be quite clear that this is a euthanasia bill. A patient can ask a doctor to kill them, and that is euthanasia. So let's have the debate—we are having the debate—but let's be clear about what we are debating. We are debating euthanasia. Let's not pretend otherwise. Let's not get into semantics; let's not have a debate about dictionary definitions. This is a euthanasia bill. This is a bill allowing people, with the assistance of their doctor, to kill themselves.

If you are going to have a euthanasia bill, it seems to me that this is the very worst sort of euthanasia bill you could have because it essentially has no regulation whatsoever. The house should be quite clear: it would not matter if it came in a very well regulated euthanasia bill, I would still oppose it. But if you are going to have one, it should be well regulated. I think that is a fair point to make. You could argue very clearly that there are varying degrees of effectiveness and varying degrees of public good in different bills, and a bill that has no regulation or very little regulation is, in my opinion, going to be a lot worse than a bill that has a much greater and more rigorous regulation.

I think the problem with regulation is that it gets overly bureaucratic, you have basically a death committee who would then feel it is their duty to work out whether people can live or die, but we will get to that when we get to another bill because I am sure there will be another bill at some point. The second point I wanted to be very clear about is that this is a euthanasia bill that has almost no regulation, almost no control about it.

The doctors' defences are fairly open. There is not a lot required for them to mount their defence, so essentially it can come down to a matter of a doctor's word against someone who is not there any more. In fact, it could be the doctor's word against someone who may not have even been in the room. You come down to taking the doctor at their word that the patient was of sound mind, that they were a treating practitioner which could be, for the purposes of this, someone just saying, 'Yes, I asked him to treat me yesterday.'

The situation could arise where 'I know that doctor will give me the injection I want, therefore I asked him to treat me, therefore he is my treating practitioner.' There is not a lot of beef behind any requirements or any defence that is required. In the event that it even goes to court—which I think this bill makes a much less likely scenario—it is going to be, 'Were you the treating practitioner? Yes. Were they of a sound mind? Yes. Did they request it? Yes.' Who can dispute that? It would be a very difficult thing to do.

It should go without saying that human life is incredibly important. One of the key roles of a state—which it accepts through a number of other statutes, most notably the murder laws—is to defend and protect life and to protect the safety of people in this state. When we start introducing laws like this, it waters down the commitment of the state to protect life. That is an important point for this house to consider. Do we want to water down the role of the state in protecting life?

Many people argue that this happens anyway. In fact, I have been talking about euthanasia with a young doctor. I said, 'What worries me is that this will make it easier for doctors to kill patients so they can get the bed that they need for another patient.' He said to me, 'We do that all the time already.' That is one doctor in conversation with me. Maybe he was being a smart-arse—it

would not be the first time that I have been involved in a smart-arse conversation—but anything that makes it easier is wrong.

We have seen incidences of doctors who can be quite callous about these things. The most egregious example, of course, was Dr Death. Obviously he was out killing people. It is much easier for a prosecution to say that he was out there to kill people, because he killed so many people. You could quite possibly have someone out there—a doctor—killing patients and then saying that they asked for it, and it would be very difficult to prove otherwise. So, this is a concern. The other concern is about medical practitioners. It is probably my own ignorance of the bill but, on my reading of it, it does not need to be a medical doctor for those purposes. Does it say that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the speaker get back to his comments, and members on my right, please behave.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: It was actually very useful, Madam Speaker. They clarified the point that I was about to make; it would have been erroneous. I read minister Hill's description of the death of his sister. Without dwelling on his personal circumstances too much, his argument, to me, seemed more like an argument for increased or improved palliative care. When she actually received some decent palliative care, she was much happier, much more comfortable and it was actually, in fact, a beautiful death—the so-called beautiful death that euthanasia seeks to be.

Even minister Hill himself mounted an argument for better palliative care, and I would very happily support any move for greater and better palliative care that might come before the parliament. I come back to the point that I am trying to make: this is an unregulated euthanasia bill. It is a bill that puts doctors in a position I do not think they should be in. I do not think it should be the role of doctors to kill people; it should be the role of doctors to protect life and make people comfortable.

I am comfortable with people withdrawing medication. I am comfortable with people making the decision to receive no further treatment and letting the natural processes take their course, but I am not comfortable with allowing doctors to administer a lethal dose to patients to whom I believe they have an obligation to try to improve their life and their lot. The most notable and most effective way of doing that is through palliative care.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:15): I had not expected to speak on this bill today but, as I will be away on the next sitting week, I will place on the record my thoughts on this topic. When I was younger and in my 20s, I took the view that euthanasia should be legalised. I have changed my views over a period of 20 years with the more life experience I have had and with both relatives passing and seeing partners' parents die slow and torturous deaths, sometimes through their own choices about medical treatment or non-medical treatment. I will share some of those today with you.

I will be opposing this bill, and the other bills before the house on this topic, for many reasons. Firstly, I trained in health administration and coded the death and cancer records of many patients as a health information manager—a record coder in both public and private hospitals in the state—before I became involved in politics and worked in this area. I saw the treatment regimes, and I have seen the changes that palliative care has effectively made to people's lives and how it has improved their experiences. Over time, palliative care has become more sophisticated, it has become more compassionate, and it has been a good thing for many families, not just the individual.

The second reason I will be opposing this bill is that I have a deep and underlying concern that the growth of individual desire to control everything in society and everything in one's life is a risk to the broader society. Sometimes an individual's desire to end their own life through assisted suicide does not take into account the people surrounding them. I think people are also prone to being influenced in an untoward way, and I am particularly concerned about elder abuse.

I have spoken to many people and thought about this topic long and hard, particularly since I was elected in March 2010, because I knew this topic was likely to emerge in this parliamentary sitting period. The issue of elder abuse, particularly, was raised with me by a cancer specialist, and I have spoken to several specialists. I have visited palliative care sites and heard about the difference that palliative care makes to people at the end of their life.

The one underlying concern I had when I spoke to this person—who had no particular religious perspective and did not work at a palliative care hospital that was of a religious nature—

was his view that there are relatives and friends involved in people's lives at these very difficult, end of life transition points, who say 'I am going on a holiday.' I know this sounds simplistic, but this person actually thought it was true, and I sincerely believe—when I see some of the constituents in my electorate who are vulnerable in their caring positions—that people may wish to say, 'Well, this is the day that this is going to happen.'

I do not think our society should be comfortable with that. There are frail and elderly people. I would much prefer our society discuss the end of life matters with advanced directives, improved palliative care and a more humane and civil way of actually protecting people who are in vulnerable situations. That is the way I will be voting on these matters before the house. For the record, I lay on the table that I am a Christian, but that has not come into my decision in this matter.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (11:19): I think it will come as no surprise to the house that I oppose this piece of legislation. I want to address a few issues that have arisen over the course of the debate and the wider debate on the issue. The first thing I want to take issue with is this claim that euthanasia is something that is happening anyway: the doctors are doing it but in a completely unregulated way without oversight and, whatever the numbers are, many hundreds of people are euthanased by their doctors unlawfully all the time. That is an absolute nonsense.

The fact is that in the 1990s the previous Labor government introduced legislation which provided doctors protection should they administer palliative care and pain relief and as a foreseen but unintended side effect the person died. For many years—in fact, even before the legislation—it was always considered not to be murder: but, nonetheless, the law has been crystal clear in South Australian legislation that a doctor can quite lawfully administer pain relief to a patient in the knowledge that that pain relief might be administered to the extent that the patient may die and, if the patient does die, that is not considered homicide or murder under South Australian law.

That practice of providing pain relief, even up to the point where it might kill the patient, and in that knowledge, is all part of good clinical practice and good palliative care. It is not new and it has long been an understanding in the law, certainly since the 1990s. In fact, it came about as a result of a very far-reaching inquiry into death and dying that was chaired by my former employer, Martyn Evans, who went on to become a minister for health, and it is all part of good clinical practice.

The report that the select committee came up with was a far-reaching report into all the issues associated with death and dying. It resulted in an excellent piece of legislation, and members should go back and look at that report and piece of legislation, which addressed many of these issues very well and in a very well-thought-out, well-considered manner. The simple fact is that to claim that administering pain relief to the point where it kills someone is somehow akin to euthanasia is completely wrong and a complete misunderstanding of the true nature of palliative care.

My concern, of course, is that, like the Minister for Recreation and Sport, I am an opponent of euthanasia, full stop; and it would not matter how good the regulations were able to be formulated in a piece of legislation because I would always oppose the legalisation of the killing of South Australians. However, my greatest concern about this piece of legislation is that it removes any safeguard whatsoever. I acknowledge that, at least in previous legislation that has been introduced both by the member for Ashford and the member for Fisher, and other legislation that has been introduced in this house previously, there has been an attempt to provide a regulatory framework in which euthanasia might occur.

The Minister for Health (and I think the member for Ashford had a part in it as well) quite correctly identified how difficult and, I think he would argue, impossible it is to come up with a regulatory framework to provide for euthanasia with all the necessary safeguards, and I completely agree with the Minister for Health on that point. It is incredibly difficult, and that is one of the big reasons why many members of parliament over the years, while in principle supporting the personal autonomy arguments with regard to euthanasia, nonetheless have voted against it, making the argument that it is impossible to provide an adequate regulatory framework for euthanasia that provides all the requisite protections for the most vulnerable in our community. The Minister for Health, I think, correctly identified how difficult that was and the problems with the regulatory framework that was being put forward in the member for Ashford's previous piece of legislation, as well as, I think, the member for Fisher's previous piece of legislation.

However, in identifying the difficulties in that, instead of saying, 'Well, I don't think it's a good idea that we have euthanasia because it's too difficult to regulate,' what he suggested and put forward was, 'Well, look, this is too difficult an issue. Let's have euthanasia but without the regulation. In fact, let's leave it to the court to decide what might be the appropriate conditions upon which euthanasia might be lawful.' This piece of legislation essentially provides a defence to doctors who perform euthanasia, so that should a doctor be charged with a homicide, having given a lethal injection to a patient who was in the final stages of a terminal illness, that doctor would be provided in a court with some form of defence.

The problem with that essentially is that, if we were to pass this piece of legislation, we would be ignoring our responsibilities and leaving it up entirely to a court to make a determination about the circumstances in which euthanasia might be lawful and the circumstances in which it might not, and I think that is entirely unsatisfactory.

As the member for Newland, I think, correctly pointed out, if we must have a euthanasia bill, if we must debate a euthanasia bill, if we must pass a euthanasia bill, at least let the parliament decide what the conditions might be in which euthanasia might be lawfully administered. Let us not just leave it to a court and the personal predilections of an individual judge to make decisions which are going to be incredibly profound for South Australia as a whole.

We should not just be leaving it to the personal predilections of an individual judge to make such a determination and to make important decisions about the circumstances in which euthanasia might be lawful and the circumstances in which it should not. That is the reason for which we are elected, and we should be making determinations about those sorts of conditions that might apply.

But, having said that, of course I will always oppose any piece of legislation which attempts to make lawful the killing of South Australians. Essentially, this piece of legislation, I believe, is dangerously open-ended, and we really do not have enough before us in order to make an informed decision about which way we might vote on this piece of legislation. This piece of legislation, I believe, is dangerously open-ended.

Having spent some time on the specifics of this legislation, I will just address the issue of euthanasia overall and why, in principle, I think that euthanasia should continue to remain unlawful in this state. The proponents of euthanasia argue essentially from a principle of personal autonomy; essentially, 'It is my body, I should be able to decide what I want to do with it. If in certain circumstances I am threatened with a painful death, well, then, I should have the right to request a doctor to administer me with a lethal dose.'

I should point out that what we are talking about with euthanasia is not suicide. Suicide for many years has not been unlawful in this state. What is unlawful is for a person to assist someone in a suicide in some way; and, of course, what is unlawful is for someone to commit a homicide by administering some sort of lethal injection. We should make sure that we distinguish between suicide and euthanasia. Suicide, of course, can be prevented, but people who attempt to commit suicide, thankfully, are no longer prosecuted. The reason why I—

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Thompson.

WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:30): I move:

That on the 125th anniversary of the Women's Christian Temperance Union this house:

- (a) recognises the South Australian branch's work from the early days of settlement in this state, its work on women's enfranchisement and personal safety; and
- (b) commends its continuing work on exposing the dangers of alcohol and substance abuse.

Founded in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1874, the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) is the oldest continuing, non-sectarian women's organisation in the world. Here in Adelaide, for 125 years the organisation has trained women to think on their feet, speak in public, and run an organisation.

Over the years the WCTU has proposed, supported and helped to establish the protection of women and children at home and work, women's right to vote, shelters for abused women and children, the eight-hour work day, equal pay for equal work, founding of kindergartens, increased funding for education, stiffer penalties for sexual crimes against girls and women, prison reform, the

appointment of women police officers, homes and education for disadvantaged girls, promotion of nutrition and preventative health, legal aid, union activism and passive demonstrations, as well as that ever-wanted quest of world peace.

The WCTU has opposed and worked very hard against drug trafficking, use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs, white slavery, child labour and army brothels. WCTU members choose total abstinence from all alcohol and illicit substances as their lifestyle, and adopt the following definition of temperance, which according to Xenophon, the Greek philosopher of circa 400 BCE, can be defined as 'moderation in all things healthful and total abstinence from all things harmful'.

The organisation is noted for conducting training seminars for teachers and those interested in alcohol, tobacco and drug education. Today the WCTU is still concerned that the wide availability of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs combines with other social problems to the detriment of our society.

The WCTU was started in Adelaide in 1886, with 57 members meeting on the afternoon of Thursday 8 April in the rooms of the YMCA, then located in Gawler Place. The meeting was chaired by the inspirational American missionary, Mary Clement Leavitt, who died at the age of 81 in 1912. I am indebted to the current World WCTU President, Sarah Ward, for the following information on Mrs Leavitt, prepared for her booklet printed in March this year at the suggestion of SA WCTU President, Dawn Giddings.

Mrs Leavitt was a gifted and inspiring speaker and after a distinguished contribution to the WCTU, which among other things saw her organise the first Boston branch, and at the behest of Frances Willard (whom she met in 1877), Mrs Leavitt was the WCTU's first round-the-world missionary.

At the age of 54, in November 1884, with only \$35 in her pocket, she set out for Honolulu. For eight years she relied on the assistance of like-minded persons and travelled the world, starting WCTU branches after seeing first-hand the power of colonialism and the global trade in alcohol and corrupt morals and encountering particular local customs and more pervasive social, economic and political practices that demeaned and subjugated women regardless of national affiliation.

Another meeting was held in Adelaide the following day and it was then decided to form a local union, with the rules and objectives outlined by Mrs Leavitt to be adopted. It was during that first visit to Adelaide by Mrs Leavitt that Elizabeth Webb Nicholls first took an interest in the ideals and objectives of the WCTU. She, Catherine Helen Spence, and Mary Lee, widely acknowledged as the leaders of the South Australian suffrage campaign, are a constant inspiration in this chamber, depicted on the tapestry created in 1994 to commemorate the centenary of women's suffrage here in South Australia.

Elizabeth joined the WCTU three months later and went on to become the first state president of the organisation, serving from 1889 to 1897. By 1899 membership of the various branches numbered over 1,100. Elizabeth was appointed the Australasian president of the union from 1894 to 1903 before going on to serve a second term as state president from 1906 to 1927. In these roles she attended conferences in Paris, London and Edinburgh in 1906, and, in 1920, the 10th world convention of the International Women's Suffrage Alliance in Geneva. Under her leadership, the WCTU took an active role in the campaign for women's suffrage in South Australia and, speaking on the passing of the bill in her presidential address to the Australasian branch of the union in 1897, Mrs Nicholls said:

The dire results prophesied by opponents of women's [suffrage] have not come to pass, and you can see in this convention real live women who have voted in a parliamentary election and remain much the same women as before. We have not heard of any domestic quarrels or neglected children as a result of the new departure and dinner was cooked on Election Day the same as usual. There were no disorderly scenes at the polling booths, the women did not grow nervous and afraid, and there were fewer informal votes than usual. I say, unhesitatingly, that the results were in favour of morality and temperance to a greater degree than in any previous election.

Born on 21 February 1850 at the family home in Rundle Street, Adelaide, Elizabeth Webb Nicholls was the oldest daughter of Samuel Bakewell, a grocer, and his first wife, Mary Ann (née Pye). When Elizabeth was three, her mother died and Elizabeth spent several years in England with relatives. Her father married his sister-in-law, Eliza Hannah Pye, in 1854 and the family resettled in Adelaide.

At a young age, Elizabeth longed for 'the will and the power to be useful', and this was soon fulfilled. Both her father and uncle, William Bakewell, became members of the House of

Assembly. She married fellow Methodist Alfred Richard Nicholls on 2 August 1870 and they had a daughter and four sons, as well as raising two orphaned relatives.

A councillor of the Women's Suffrage League, through the WCTU, Nicholls helped to gather 8,268 of the 11,600 signatures for the 1894 suffrage petition to parliament, which I hope will soon be on display in this place. Before the election in which women voted, which was 1896, she prepared the 'Platform of Principles' and noted:

They were not like women who lived in a harem, they were going to decide for themselves and not follow any one party blindfolded.

Nicholls was a member from 1909 of the Women's Non-Party Political Association founded by Lucy Morice. She was its president in 1911 when she led a deputation to premier John Verran stressing the need for women jurors, justices of the peace and police matrons, and for sex instruction for young people. Later, Mrs Nicholls was a life vice president of the League of Women Voters.

Described as a 'lucid and forcible speaker', when Nicholls entered conventions everyone stood. She seemed to have relished conflict, managing it with humour and tact. She also led women in South Australian government appointments, in 1895 to 1922, as a member of the strife-torn Adelaide Hospital board, in 1906 as a member of the royal commission on the treatment of inebriates and, as a justice of the peace, she often sat in the children's court. Mrs Nicholls advocated similar female appointments for other states and argued for prisoner reform and separate juvenile courts.

She sought improvement of conditions and wages for working women and was a shareholder in the women's South Australian Co-operative Clothing Company. Her major concern, however, remained the WCTU, and in 1915 it won a major victory when its six o'clock closing platform succeeded in the state's referendum on hotel hours. Nicholls justified all reforms on the grounds of temperance and social purity.

She died at North Adelaide on 3 August 1943 and is buried in Payneham Cemetery. Her portrait hangs in the WCTU headquarters in Adelaide and shows a benignly smiling Elizabeth with a firm, square jaw, white hair and rosy cheeks.

At the recent celebrations held here in Adelaide, minister Gail Gago hosted a morning tea at Parliament House, which was attended by the member for Ashford and other members here. I attended the WCTU's 125th anniversary lunch. South Australian President, Dawn Giddings, and WCTU members provided a wonderful meal and had on display marvellous ephemera, including many handwritten letters from Elizabeth Webb Nicholls and some even from Catherine Helen Spence, looking as new as the day they were written. Many dedicated WCTU committee members were involved in the preparation of the celebrations, and I congratulate them and thank them for their work and hospitality.

World WCTU President, Sarah Ward, whom we had the pleasure of meeting both here at Parliament House and at the lunch, gave a marvellous address on the luncheon day through which I became aware of the 1897 words of Elizabeth Webb Nicholls that I quoted earlier in this contribution. Sarah has been gracious enough to invite me and the member for Ashford to visit the WCTU museum at our earliest opportunity, and I know that there is a great deal we could learn from an organisation that remains vibrant so many years after its inception. During the Adelaide celebration lunch, it was also my honour to meet Dr Don Nicholls and his wife. Don has every reason to be proud of his extraordinary grandmother, whose work remains important and inspirational.

Just this week, the sobering results of the European Prospective Investigation of Cancer—one of the largest ever studies into the links between diet and cancer—have been released. The study involved more than 360,000 men and women aged between 35 and 70. In a nutshell, it found that one in 10 cancers in men and one in 33 in women across Western Europe are caused by drinking, promoting the Australian Cancer Council to begin television advertisements highlighting this link.

In light of this new danger and the continuing problems involved with the abuse and irresponsible use of alcohol, ranging from foetal alcohol syndrome, the culture of binge drinking in our young, the injuries caused by drink driving and alcohol-related violence, the message of the WCTU remains as relevant today as ever.

The dedicated women of the WCTU became active to change their community to make it a better and safer place for all. The lesson we learn from history and their commitment is that we can

change laws and circumstances and become active in working for change. This is the lesson and the continuing legacy of the WCTU. I commend this still active organisation and the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (11:41): I move:

That this house sends a message of congratulations to the President of the Republic of Italy on the occasion of the 150th celebrations to mark the unification of Italy on 17 March 1861.

This year marks the 150th anniversary of the unification of Italy. The unification was a protracted chain of political and military events from the Congress of Vienna in 1815, following the defeat of Napoleon, culminating in a united Italian peninsula called the 'Kingdom of Italy' under King Victor Emmanuel II in 1861.

These events can be categorised in five stages: pre-revolutionary, revolutionary, the Camillo di Cavour policy, the role of Piedmont, Giuseppe Garibaldi's campaign in Southern Italy and, ultimately, the creation of the Italian kingdom.

During the first half of the 19th century, the cause for unification was confined to aristocrats, intellectuals and the upper middle class. Initially, the masses showed little concern. Nevertheless, people with a passion for unification started to form secret societies, most notably the Carbonari. Although at first they only demanded more rights from their respective government, the cause began to gain momentum. By 1820 the Carbonari were involved in numerous failed revolutions against the Kingdom of Two Sicilies, the Kingdom of Sardinia, Bologna and other Italian states.

The soul and spirit of the Carbonari and the revolutions was Giuseppe Mazzini. Mazzini's vision was for a united Italy with a republican form of government. In 1831 Mazzini brought the campaign for unification into the mainstream when he created 'Young Italy' to spread the ideas of unification, revolutions and republicanism. In 1846 a liberal pope, Pius IX, was elected, who enacted numerous reforms. Shortly thereafter, other states followed, but these reform movements were not enough. A series of uprisings, known as the Revolution of 1848, occurred throughout Europe, including France, Germany, the Austrian Empire and Northern Italy.

The revolution also occurred in the Kingdom of Two Sicilies, where the King signed a constitution. In the Papal States, radicals took over Rome, causing the pope to flee. In the absence of the pope, Garibaldi and Mazzini created the republic called the Roman Republic.

In 1852, Camillo di Cavour became Prime Minister of the Piedmont, the Kingdom of Sardinia, and by leveraging personalities, pitting great powers against each other, war and political cunning, Cavour was able to unite Italy in a short time.

Although Piedmont was a small state, it had considerable influence based on military strength, conservative philosophy and admirable political leadership. In addition, Victor Emmanuel ruled in conjunction with the parliament, thus establishing a legitimate stable form of government and not giving cause to an internal revolution.

The main enforcer in Southern Italy was Giuseppe Garibaldi, who is revered as a national hero and admired for his skill at rousing the common people, combined with his military conquests, which made the unification of Italy possible.

In his 20s, he joined the Carbonari Italian patriot revolutionaries and fled Italy after a failed insurrection. Garibaldi took part in the War of the Farrapos and the Uruguayan Civil War leading the Italian Legion, and afterwards returned to Italy as a commander in the conflicts of the Risorgimento.

Interestingly, while exiled in Peru, he captained a clipper, the trading vessel *Carmen*, to the Far East and returned to Lima via Australia and New Zealand in 1852-3. Garibaldi sailed through Bass Strait in 1852 and visited Three Hummock Island which sits off the coast of north-west Tasmania. During the latter part of the 19th century Garibaldi was admired by Australian colonial liberals, as he represented for them the strong points of contemporary Italian society—that is, a democratic impulse, with cultural traditions and scientific prowess. In fact, his son, Ricciotti Garibaldi, lived in Melbourne from 1874 to 1881.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: My Italian pronunciation is not good because I am a southern Italian. In 1860—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I am not an imposter, no.

Mr Gardner: You should get the member for Unley to give you some lessons.

Mr PICCOLO: No, he is not a real Italian: he is a northerner. In 1860—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The member for Light was reflecting on the member for Unley—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He was reflecting upon whom?

Ms CHAPMAN: —in a most adverse and unpleasant manner.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bragg, he was reflecting upon whom?

Ms CHAPMAN: The member for Unley.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No!

Ms CHAPMAN: Indeed. On Mr David Pisoni in most unparliamentary manner. It was reflection on a member: disparaging about his northern Italian descent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would you like to withdraw that, member for Light? I will be quite honest: I did not hear that, but that is because I was engaged in discussion.

Mr PICCOLO: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not sure if the point of order is as tongue-in-cheek as my comment was, but the fact remains that I was born in Italy, the member for Unley was not. I rest my case.

Mr Pengilly: How do you know?

Mr PICCOLO: He said so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just to make things easier, member for Light—

Mr GRIFFITHS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do understand the reply from the member for Light, but very clearly I heard that he reflected that people from northern Italy are not real Italians. That was the intent that I took from his words.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. So that would be casting a reflection upon the member?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Upon the member for Unley in saying that his family—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But on all the northern Italians.

Mr GRIFFITHS: —is from northern Italy, and indeed upon all people from northern Italy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Goyder. Member for Light, would you like to explain?

Mr PICCOLO: I would. I am happy to explain it. Madam Deputy Speaker, it actually takes a person with an Italian background to understand the rivalry between the north and the south, and we continuously throw barbs at each other without offence.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I said 'Italian origin'. Anyway, I do not have any problem with what I said, and I am sure the member for Unley would not have any problem either because he often refers to southerners in an equally disparaging way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Light, I have been advised by the learned colleagues that, in fact, it was not unparliamentary. It is perhaps for the member for Unley to come in and make some sort of objection to this statement. However, that aside—

Mr GRIFFITHS: A point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I haven't finished speaking yet. That aside, member for Light, so that we can get on with this most interesting motion, perhaps it would be a good idea to withdraw any intent to offend those of northern Italian descent.

Mr PICCOLO: I do, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excellent! Marvellous work. Let us carry on.

Mr PICCOLO: Having said that, this motion is an important one which hopefully we can get back on track. In 1860, General Garibaldi landed in Sicily with his famous 1,000 volunteers, determined to March on Rome and liberate the city. After a brutal battle on the Volturno River, he held plebiscites in Sicily and Naples, and then gave the whole of southern Italy to Cavour, proclaiming Victor Emmanuel king of a united nation.

The unification efforts of much of the 19th century were ultimately realised in 1870 when, during the Franco-Prussian war, France abandoned its positions in Rome in order to keep the large Prussian Army at bay. Italy benefited from Prussia's victory against France by being able to take over the papal state from the French authorities. Italian unification was completed and, shortly after, the capital was moved to Rome. Rome itself remained under the papacy for a decade and became part of the kingdom of Italy on 20 September 1870, which is the final date of Italian unification.

Since 1861, Italy has made its mark as a significant nation with a population now nearing 60 million people. The Italian economy has evolved since the end of World War II. From an agriculture-based economy, Italy has developed into an industrial state ranked as the world's seventh-largest economy. It is a member of the European Union, the OECD and the G8 and G20 economic forums. Italy is ranked sixth among OECD countries and fourth among European countries for gross domestic product.

Italy has always been a cultural centre, with iconic cities like Rome where ancient landmarks meld with the present, and Venice, which is crisscrossed with gondola-lined canals. The art and science of the Renaissance remains buoyant and visible in Florence while the Vatican City's Sistine Chapel still attracts an endless line of visitors to see Michelangelo's brushstrokes which adorn the ceiling. Italy is a fashion industry icon. In the 1950s—

Ms Chapman: In the north.

Mr PICCOLO: Madam Deputy Speaker, I take offence at that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Light, I will say this: you may well take offence at that; however, you did, most unfortunately, respond to an interjection by the member for Bragg, which you are not really meant to do.

Mr PICCOLO: I should ignore her, shouldn't I?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, yes.

Mr PICCOLO: Yes, I should; you are quite right, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will just note for the record that the member for Bragg has insulted all southern Italians. Italy is a fashion industry icon. In the 1950s, Italian designers such as Nino Cerruti and Valentino led the world in creating stylish fashions. Additionally, Armani, Versace, Gucci and Prada have become internationally recognised.

Australia and Italy enjoy a warm and long-standing relationship, underpinned by strong community ties. Trade and investment and the development of cultural and educational links continue to grow. According to the 2006 Census, 852,418 Australians claimed Italian ancestry, with 199,124 Australian residents having been born in Italy. At least 30,000 Australians currently live in Italy. Italy also has a special relationship with South Australia. The Italian peninsula is an important link into Europe for our state, and South Australia would like to become a strategic hub for Italy in the Asia-Pacific region. The Australian government is committed to its engagement with Italy, and has been since former premier John Bannon signed the first MOU with the Campania region—which is a great southern region of Italy—

Ms Bedford: In my area.

Mr PICCOLO: And mine as well—in the 1980s. Since then, MOUs have created joint scientific research projects in areas such as photonics, water management, robotics, intelligent transport systems and satellites. In the year to July 2010, South Australian exports to Italy were \$18 million, with imports from the food and fashion industries totalling \$162 million. From 1861 to 1985, more than 26 million people of Italian origin have emigrated across the world, and I am proud to say that I am one of those, coming to Australia in 1963.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: Sorry? I did not hear what you said.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is because you do not react to interjections. Just carry on, Member for Light.

Mr PICCOLO: While I was honoured to be granted Australian citizenship in 1979, I am nevertheless proud to acknowledge my Italian heritage, and I continue to celebrate it through my work as the inaugural national convener of the Forum of Italo-Australian Parliamentarians. I wish to take this opportunity to convey my message of congratulations to the President of the Republic of Italy on this special occasion, and I seek the support of the house.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (11:55): I rise to support the motion that the house sends a message of congratulations to the President of the Republic of Italy on the occasion of the 150th celebration to mark the unification of Italy on 17 March 1861. This is an important milestone of very great nation.

I do not think that it is widely known that before 1861, Italy did not exist as a nation-state according to its modern incarnation. Prior to this time, individual states or regions had their own discrete identity, customs, food and culture. Naturally this persists today. I have been fortunate enough to spend much time during my working career in Italy, both in terms of purchasing manufacturing equipment from the north of Italy and then most recently with Michells, that iconic South Australian wool exporter. Our office was in Treviso, a very beautiful part of Italy, which has a long history in the textiles industry.

I have always been impressed with the ability of Italy to maintain the individuality of its regions. When we think of fashion, we think of the Milan area. When we think of textiles, we think of Biella and Prato, and manufacturing equipment up towards Bassano del Grappa. With Rome, of course, we think of the great history of the world—Pax Romana—and my favourite part of Italy, the Marche region, which is famous for the olive ascolane.

Italy is very fortunate to preserve this individuality whilst combining all of these regions to achieve one of the most advanced and modern democracies in the world today. South Australia is very fortunate to have a significant number of Italians living here and we benefit from that most substantially. I, myself, am very grateful to be the member for Norwood where we have a significant number of Italians living in our area. I have four Italian clubs in my area: the Altavilla Irpina Sports and Social Club, the Inter-Italia Sports and Social Club on Sydenham Road, the Sicilia Club, and the San Giorgio La Molara Club.

I would also like to announce to the house today that the Acting Consul of Italy in South Australia, Orietta Borgia, will be hosting a special gala event at the Hilton Hotel on 25 June 2011. This is being held specifically to celebrate the 150th year of unification of Italy. It is being run in conjunction with CIC, the Coordinating Italian Committee, and was put forward by the President, Angelo Fantasia. It is an excellent initiative to commemorate this incredible milestone, and I certainly support the mover with this important motion.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:59): I rise to indicate my support for the member for Light in sending this message of congratulations to the President of the Republic of Italy. It is important that we also recognise on this occasion, and in sending this message to the President, that in Australia, we appreciate the significant change in Italy. In sending our congratulations to the President, we should also recognise the important decision that has been made in Italy in recent times about how they are going to provide energy for their country. Notwithstanding I think a nearly 20-year ban on the use of nuclear power in Italy, they have decided to overturn that ban and introduce nuclear power as a power source for their country. As we know, across Europe there has been a high dependence in many countries on the use of nuclear power.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: This is to do with Italy and the decision that they have made. I think the mover of the motion is concerned that the motion only be of congratulations for the celebrations to mark the unification, as everything should be seated back in 1861, and I am concerned that he should have that view because this is a momentous decision for Italy to have made. For all the reasons referred to in his motion, it is necessary to continue the industry to provide the energy and power sources. I wish to also convey to the President congratulations to him on ensuring that their country will be able to continue to move forward and enabling their country to be able to fulfil the fruits of the history that they have enjoyed in the last 150 years. I wish them well in that endeavour.

Mr PICCOLO: I have a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The member for Bragg indicated that this is a motion to the President, not the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is head of government and the President is head of state. He would not get involved in nuclear power policy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we all know who Mr Berlusconi is. The member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:02): It gives me great pleasure to support this motion that this house sends a message of congratulations to the President of the Republic of Italy on the occasion of the 150th celebrations to mark the unification of Italy on 17 March 1861.

Indeed, Italy's is a great, rich, deep and longstanding culture, and one that adds a great deal to our community here in South Australia today, for reasons that others have mentioned. It does seem, however, somewhat strange to be talking about the 150th celebrations of a country which has built on the culture of a civilisation that goes back more than 2,700 years. Those members who have not known me for longer than my time in this house might be interested to know that my first interest before politics was in the study of classical history and, in particular, the Roman empire and its antecedents.

I was always interested in the tales of Aeneas fleeing Troy in 1182 BC and he and his descendants founding the city of Alba Longa, some of whose denizens, Romulus and Remus, ended up founding the city of Rome in 753 BC. The discussions between the members for Bragg and Light left me thinking about the constant wars, the going back and forth between the citizens of Rome and the citizens of Veii, or the Romans and the Marsi and the Sabines. So, I understand where the member for Light was coming from in his good-natured banter with the member for Unley; nevertheless, I maintain he was wrong.

The Italians in Australia are a significant group. In South Australia, we are privileged to have over 100,000 South Australians who identify as being of Italian heritage. As the member for Light pointed out, 30,000 Australians are in Italy. In Morialta, in particular, I am very happy to represent an area that has so many people of this background. I think that the last census data indicated a figure of something like 9,000 South Australians whose grandparents were born in Italy (many of whom, of course, themselves would have been born in Italy) living in the seat of Morialta.

While the member for Norwood laid claim to those four famous Italian clubs in his electorate, I am very proud to have the Marche Club in my electorate, which hosts a great number of cultural functions and which provides great services and support for that community.

The level to which the Italian culture is adding to our culture in Australia and melding with that culture in South Australia really came home to me on ANZAC Day. After I was finished with the dawn service and the things that go along with that in Magill, my next function I went to later that day was, of course, at the Campania Club in the seat of Florey, where I was pleased to be with the member for Florey, the member for Norwood and some members of the other place as we celebrated the opening of the new bocce courts at that club, together with several hundred members of that South Australian Italian community.

It was a fantastic barbecue and a fantastic day. It was not the way in which I expected to spend my ANZAC Day, but it certainly added a great deal to my day before I headed to the footy. I should also point out that, in addition to the significant function that the member for Norwood talked about that is coming up, the Acting Consul—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: The footy game was the traditional ANZAC Day clash: the grand final replay at the Adelaide Oval, which very, very sadly—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The doggies were too good for you!

Mr GARDNER: —Central District defeated the mighty Redlegs.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, Ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order—

Mr GARDNER: And then—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Morialta. A point of order, member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Morialta is actively supporting the member for Light's motion, and he is getting constant interjections from the member for Croydon and the member for Light when he is actually trying to assist the member for Light and his motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would take that point of order a little more seriously if, during the initial motion, you yourself had not been quite so vocal. So, one in the glasshouse should not cast the stone, etc. Thank you. The member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. We are all enjoying the opportunity to encourage each other in this debate on this important motion. I just wanted to draw the attention of members, particularly those who do not have anything in their diaries yet on 2 June, to the Festa della Repubblica that will be celebrated at the Fogolar Furlan club in—

Mr Piccolo: Felixstow.

Mr GARDNER: —Felixstow, thank you—with the Acting Consul Orietta Borgia. I think it is worth noting that it is unfortunate at the moment that we have an Acting Consul rather than an official Consul of Italy in South Australia. I hope that this motion will actually go some way towards prompting those in decision-making positions in the Republic of Italy to encourage them to reaffirm the position of the Consulate of Italy in South Australia, so that the work that Orietta Borgia (and Dottor Tomasso Coniglio before her) and all those consuls do to support the excellent South Australian/Italian community, particularly those who need services from the consulate.

I know particularly that Ms Sara Potenza and the Acting Consul, Orietta Borgia, do a fantastic job, and what our community would really like is confirmation that their services will continue and that our South Australian/Italian community will not be required to seek consular assistance from Melbourne or Sydney.

We have 100,000 South Australians of Italian heritage, and I would hope that this excellent motion supporting excellent relations between South Australia and Italy on the occasion of its 150th anniversary celebrations will contribute to some positive outcome for that community. I urge all members to support the motion.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (12:09): I was not going to participate in this debate, but I have been inspired to do so by the member for Bragg. I want to note some of the achievements of the Italian nation since it has been unified, and also to thank the Italian community in South Australia for the difference that they have made to our way of life.

I think that people, when talking about Italians in South Australia, will immediately recognise the huge contribution that has been made to our culinary life. I understand that there was a survey not very long ago in which young people decided that the national dish of Australia was spaghetti bolognese. Of course, in my youth there was no such thing as spaghetti bolognese. I do remember the first time my mother decided she would make it: it included garlic, which I had never really tasted before, and sultanas, which I do not think are traditional in the Italian version. It was very aromatic in a way that I had not previously experienced, and it left interesting tastes behind in a way that I had not previously experienced.

There is no doubt that the Italian community has changed the way we eat in Australia. It has changed the vegetables that are grown, it has changed our approach to eating, in that we now eat on pavements. When I first went to Europe and saw people eating on the footpath, I thought, 'Poor people—can't they afford a house?' Now we complain about the fact that we are not always able to eat in comfort on footpaths because of people who are smoking—but that is a separate argument.

Another way in which I think the Italian community has changed the way many of us live in South Australia is how we mark deaths in our family. The first time I saw a photo of somebody in the death column in *The Advertiser*, I thought what strange people they were to put a photo of their loved one in a very comprehensive death notice. Having an Irish Catholic background, our notices were very short, very sharp, and we could not afford too many lines in any case—we could not afford too many lines in the birth notices, even less so in that situation.

The way the Italian families marked somebody's death was quite different from what we had done. As we started seeing crosses along the side of the road to mark the place of a road death, my understanding was that it was something that also came from the Italian community and to some extent, I think, from the Greek community, but it seemed to be a very Mediterranean practice. Now it is common practice in Australia to mark deaths with a memorial at the side of the road. There is debate about whether this is good or not, but there is no doubt that the Italian

community has changed the way we see death, and it is quite common for photos to be included in death notices. Another issue was the inclusion by the Italian community of the one-year notice, and again that is something that, with my Irish Catholic background, I had never previously seen, but now it is adopted by many people, not just the people with Italian backgrounds in our community.

I also want to note a particular achievement of the Italian government that has long gladdened my heart, and that is the fact that, while Australia has only just got a system of paid maternity leave, the Italian people have, on a rough recollection on my part, had paid maternity leave for at least 15 years. I have been arguing for paid maternity leave for more than 15 years, and it is my recollection that for at least that amount of time I have been able to cite Italy as one of the countries that provides that freedom to women.

I think it might also surprise people to know that the Italian workforce is not as gender-segmented as the Australian workforce; in other words, women are represented in a far wider range of jobs to a far greater extent than in Australia. The Italian nation, as a unified nation for the last 150 years, has indeed been able to produce progressive outcomes for its citizens, and I think that over here we often see it as far more conservative than it actually is, particularly from the perspective of the role of women in the workforce and in the community. I am very happy to join with others in sending congratulations to the Italian President on the celebration of their 150 years as a modern nation.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:14): It is my great pleasure to add my comments to this motion, and in doing so I would like to congratulate the member for Light on his very hard work in establishing the Italo-Australian MPs forum. It has been an absolute pleasure to be involved with this group and meet MPs all over Australia and share with them constructive work, especially in the areas of retaining the Italian language here in Australia and in work with aged care. As we have heard, there are a great number of Italian people in Australia, people of Italian origin, and their care of their older family members is something we could all take a lesson from.

In my own particular case, some people may wonder why I am even involved with that forum but my mother was born in Australia, from Italian parents who came here in the early 1920s in the first wave of Italian migration. In a great sadness for me, my mother passed away when we were little so I have no language which is why I am so particularly interested in the retention of the Italian language, although I must say I have only got up to disc 5 in the car and I am not doing terribly well.

That does not mean that I am going to give in, however. I do a lot of travelling in the car, so one day I may get past disc 5 but I understand you have to practise the language so I am very keen to be absorbing as much of the Italian culture as I can, which I am able to do in my own electorate of Florey because the Campania Club is located there. I have watched it grow from a small building to a very large building and now an even larger building, as was mentioned by the member for Morialta, when he and the member for Norwood and other members were involved in the festivities to open the new bocce courts.

The members of the Campania Club are to be commended for their very hard work in making sure there is a place for Italian people to come together for very large functions. Although many members of their club come from other electorates, I am always made very welcome and I can attest that the food is fantastic. I urge all members to have a think about going there. They have a community pizza night and I can certainly attest to the value of that evening.

In closing, I would just like to mention that on behalf of the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, I attended a service on Sunday with the Italian community in the church on Marian Road, where the cemetery is, to remember the Italian military people who were lost in the battles for Italy. I attended a luncheon afterwards at the Fogolar Furlan Club on Briar Road. It was a very moving service and many of the people there had lost relatives in the conflicts they were remembering. I again commend the motion and thank all the Italian people who have given so much to the culture of Australia and know our messages of goodwill will travel overseas.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:17): I also rise to support this motion and to pass on my very best wishes to the President of the Republic of Italy and to all Italians—Italians who live in Italy and those who have moved to South Australia and their descendants. As the father of a son who is a quarter Italian, I see that it is great the way South Australia is a multicultural society and that so many great things from so many different countries have been brought together to the mix of what we love about South Australia, and that is, the multiculturalism.

I was in Turin late last year. Turin was the original capital of the Italian Republic, and they were already gearing up for their big 150th anniversary celebrations then. There were big rallies out in the square and all the political parties—of course, Italy is famous for its many and diverse political parties—were all out there with their little stalls. I found it fascinating to get around and listen to different points of view and to see the pride that the city of Turin took in its place in history as being the first capital of the Republic of Italy.

South Australia has a very close link, of course, with the city of Turin given that Colonel William Light lived in Turin before he came to Adelaide. When you go to Turin, you see that it is a city laid out in a grid formation with squares and parks, and it was the inspiration of Turin that was involved in Colonel William Light's plans for the city of Adelaide, and that is why we have a city with its squares and its grid formation.

In the electorate of Mawson we have a very strong Italian community and I was very pleased to inform the Italian community and the wider community of McLaren Vale, just a week or so ago, that the government is putting in even more money to the Piazza della Valle, which is a public space in the main street of McLaren Vale. Last year the government tipped in \$750,000 and there is another couple of hundred thousand going in out of the Places for People funding which is a fund that developers pay into if they do not meet the minimum requirement of open space in development. The money is then taken out of that fund and used for places that people can enjoy.

In the main street of McLaren Vale we are going to have a beautiful square, and it will be for everyone in McLaren Vale and for the tens of thousands of tourists and visitors who come to our area each year to enjoy. It is also a tribute to the Italians who came and planted the vines, grew the grapes and helped to pioneer the wine industry in our part of the world.

I was at the bocce club last Saturday night. On the last Saturday of every month they have a pasta night down there. I was a little disappointed that it was not a piano accordion karaoke night; sometimes they have that, and it is fantastic to have the man going around with the piano accordion, and we all jump in and sing *Hello Dolly* and some great old favourites like that.

Members interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: I tell you, we are multicultural. We are multicultural, member for Fisher. It is fantastic. I want to thank people like Vicki Vasarelli, and Joe and John Petrucci, great stalwarts of the Italian community in McLaren Vale, for keeping it alive. I also thank everyone who has been involved in the committee to get the Piazza della Valle going. It has taken a lot of work. It started out as a very small concept, and no-one was sure where it would go. The group, which includes Vicki Osland, Richard Bennett, Vicki Vasarelli, the Petruccis, the Scarpantonis, and many other families and individuals, has worked tirelessly over the last four or five years. So, we are really looking forward to having that piazza opened later in the year.

I am sure that when the President of the Republic of Italy reads all these comments he will be very impressed to know how much that little bit of Italy permeates through our entire society here in South Australia. I know that most members could get up and talk about some sort of connection that their part of South Australia has with Italy. It is something we are all very proud of. I wish Italy the very best for its 150th anniversary, and I commend the member for Light for his tireless work in recognising Italy's contribution to South Australia.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (12:22): I would like to thank all members who have made a contribution to this motion. I hope our debate today has helped our community get a better understanding of Italy's history. I make a small correction, member for Mawson: the Republic of Italy was formed in 1946, it was the Kingdom of Italy in 1861, when we threw out the monarch after World War II. One day we may have the same thing in this country.

I would like to thank members for their contributions, including the member for Croydon—not always helpful, but I would like to thank him for his contribution.

Motion carried.

STATE GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:23): I move:

That this house congratulates Premier Ted Baillieu, Premier Barry O'Farrell and their respective Liberal Coalition teams on their election to government.

It is with pleasure that I rise to move a motion that this house congratulate Premier Ted Baillieu and Premier Barry O'Farrell, and their respective Liberal Coalition teams, on their election to government. Australia now knows and has celebrated the victory of the Victorian team late last year and, more recently, that of the New South Wales team this year.

I have been acquainted with both Mr Baillieu and Mr O'Farrell for a number of years before we all came into parliament. They have made a fine contribution to their respective political parties and spearheaded the tsunami that is going across Australia of fallen Labor governments and now celebrated in Victoria and New South Wales.

Just this week, the Victorian government, led by Mr Baillieu, brought down their first budget. This is nearly a \$50 billion budget in Victoria. In their widespread support for the budget in Victoria, the business community, led by the Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry Chief Executive, Wayne Kayler-Thomson, indicated that they considered the budget to be responsible and safe. They certainly made comment that they would have liked to have had some more support for their area. But interestingly, a telling support of the important budget decisions that were made is that, notwithstanding decisions of the audit commission (which is similar to our Sustainable Budget Commission inquiry in South Australia), the Community and Public Sector Union Victoria Secretary, Karen Batt, who had called for an end to the audit commission, said of the budget:

(Mr) Baillieu has completely rejected (the commission) and clearly believes in Victoria being a society as much as an economy.

That is a very strong endorsement, I suggest, even by those leading the union movement, and indicates the support for the first budget brought down yesterday.

I was pleased to see that Mary Wooldridge—a colleague in the Victorian Parliament who had covered areas for humanitarian services and support, particularly in the housing, health and welfare areas, disability, ageing and the like, which is now shared with Wendy Lovell in the new government—and others in the government had brought down financial commitments in the budget to underpin the promises they made during the election. They are to be commended for that. It sets a stunning example and is a very important first step of a government to maintain those commitments.

I was interested to note a commitment by Peter Walsh, the new agriculture and fisheries minister, for extra funding in the budget for support of recreational fishing opportunities. So while they have some marine park arrangements in Victoria, they are actually putting money into the lifestyle and livelihood in respect of recreational fishing and coastal communities, rather than crushing it as in South Australia. They are providing an extra \$16.2 million for improvements in fishing infrastructure such as artificial reefs, fish-cleaning tables, access to jetties and the like.

I also read that they are even proposing the development of stocking of trout cod, other perch and catch fish, and other fish in suitable waterways, installation of fish ladders to improve fish migration and production, opportunities to improve access tracks and upgrade existing boat-launching facilities for recreational fishing, an increase to the fishing patrols on weekends and public holidays, and the undertaking of research and implementation of other measures to protect spawning fish stocks near river mouths.

They are putting their money where their mouth is, supporting an important lifestyle activity and livelihood activity for people in their state relating to fishing and, indeed, looking to commit extra funding to their fishing intelligence reporting line. We have one in South Australia still; we have little else left in the department of fisheries, I have to say. It has pretty much been stripped from the line, but nevertheless the first budget of the Victorian government is one of which they can be very proud. We look forward to seeing their leadership in bringing that state back into a very secure financial position.

It is true that Labor governments all around the country openly brag that they maintain AAA credit ratings while they allow their states to fall into decay, their budgets to go into deficit and the debt to accumulate. These are unacceptable situations, but in South Australia we have seen demonstrated even this week again how the government is prepared to remove obligations in respect of infrastructure for hospitals off the budget bottom line, remove it from the eye of those who make assessments such as AAA credit ratings, and take those debts away so that they cannot be judged in the financial mismanagement that they are undertaking. Good luck to Ted Baillieu and his team for the work that they have already started.

I now turn to Mr O'Farrell in the New South Wales election. I have great delight in extending our congratulations to him. He has a massive job to undertake in dealing with the financial and impecunious circumstances of the state, particularly with the infrastructure fiascos that have gone on.

I am not here to reflect on the former Labor government in that state in respect of the changes in leaders and all of the things that rack that particular cabinet but, whatever the distraction was, whatever the reason for incompetence was, the reality is that a premier state of this nation which had started with its settlement—even having the responsibility for New Zealand—is now in a crushing situation, under a level of financial difficulty, exacerbated by recent weather events which, of course, have added to the nightmare in New South Wales.

First, I wish to acknowledge Jillian Skinner, who was the deputy leader of the opposition and is still the deputy leader of the Liberal Party in New South Wales. She is the new Minister for Health in the New South Wales parliament, which got underway this week. She had certainly been a great adviser to me when I was shadow minister for health, supporting the provision of information and guidance on how one acts in opposition. She is a sterling example to many. She along with Chris Hartcher, I think, were in the former Liberal government of John Fahey. Chris was then the minister for environment and I think he now enjoys the role of minister for energy. I am sure that both of them—being the only ones, I think, in the new government who were under the last Liberal government—will provide valuable advice to their new colleagues.

As to the new colleagues, I especially acknowledge and congratulate Gareth Ward, the new member for Kiama. Gareth is a young, energetic member whom I have met on occasion. He has been to South Australia during previous elections and has assisted with election campaigns. He was certainly always keen to saturate himself with an opportunity to broaden his experience in political campaigning. He was elected to the state parliament in New South Wales at the last election, with a massive 57.5 per cent two-party preferred vote. That is particularly encouraging given that he had won the seat with less than a 50 per cent primary vote, with a massive swing to him in second preferences. Gareth Ward, you are to be complimented, and we wish you well in your political career.

I also acknowledge here in our parliament the success of Leslie Williams, who won the Port Macquarie seat for the National Party. Leslie was formerly Leslie Uren. She is a first cousin born on Kangaroo Island, the daughter of my father's sister, Alison, and her husband, John. Alison herself has given to the community on Kangaroo Island in particular throughout her lifetime, dedicating herself to community service. She has made an outstanding contribution. It is not surprising that it would run in the family. Leslie has also committed a substantial part of her working life to organisations—in both paid and voluntary positions—in the Northern Territory and in New South Wales.

She comes to the state parliament in New South Wales with a quality which, I think, is very important when it comes to representation and leadership. She comes from a family of siblings with two sisters and a brother. Her brother, the youngest in the family, was born with a severe disability, and continues to reside with my aunt and uncle, Alison and John, who are full-time carers for Phillip.

It is not only an outstanding personal effort but it reflects a very growing problem in Australia where ageing people with severe disabilities are continuing to live in households where the carers are having to make serious decisions about how their child will be provided for in the future. Leslie grew up in this household; she understands the challenges; she understands the importance of responsibility in positions of leadership to provide for those who cannot provide for themselves. I have absolutely no doubt that she will make a sterling contribution to the parliament of New South Wales.

It was a tiny bit disappointing that she stood for the Nationals but it is absolutely explosively exciting that she whacked out an Independent within the federal seat of Mr Oakeshott. The Independent member in this instance, lined himself up as a mate of Oakeshott's as his slogan to win the seat, and it became a death knell during the last election.

So, congratulations to you, Leslie. You proudly follow with distinction, women of substance in your family: your mother, grandmother, great-grandmother—Granny Dayman to all of us, a powerful Port Adelaide supporter, born and bred in Port Adelaide, and if she were here today she would be very proud to see her great grand-daughter successfully sworn in to the parliament.

All those good wishes go to both Premier Ted Baillieu and Premier O'Farrell with their respective teams. They have a massive job to undertake to rebuild their states. We wish them well. We look forward in South Australia in 2014 to joining them, together with Western Australia, and we would hope by then, Queensland, so that we have a complete tidal wave across Australia to bring in a wave of Liberal blue.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (12:37): This parliament considers many things. It considers things like the Mt Barker Development Amendment Plan, parliamentary allowances and talks about a series of bills, the voting age, euthanasia, but have we come down to congratulating our own political parties on their success?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think in comparing the mass migration to South Australia of Italian migrants to a party-political partisan victory in New South Wales and Victoria, quite frankly, the member for Bragg's priorities are a little askew. Wasting the parliament's time with patting ourselves on the back for a victory which she had nothing to do with is a bit rich. I also notice that she has another motion in the house congratulating the UK Conservative Party. So now she wants to congratulate foreign governments on their victories. Really! Is this what the parliament is about now, is it? This motion says more about the member for Bragg than it does about those two victories in New South Wales and Victoria.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:38): I will take a pure political line and have a bob each way on this one. I would like to make a couple of points that were relevant in terms of the election of both of these people, Premier Ted Baillieu and Premier Barry O'Farrell, and it relates, as members know, to a hobbyhorse of mine. Premier Barry O'Farrell made a commitment (and he has carried it out) that, contrary to what the police in New South Wales want, that is, to bring in zero tolerance for speed cameras, he would not allow it to happen. That has been implemented, so I commend him on that.

I think that people have to understand that there is a difference between operational matters for police, like investigating a crime, and general policy approaches. The government here has said traditionally that that it is an operational matter and we cannot get involved.

That is not true when it comes to general policy matters relating to policing. It is a bit like the Minister for Health: he does not get involved in operations at Flinders Medical Centre, as far as I know, and neither should he, but he does have a major input into the policies administered in places like Flinders Medical Centre.

In relation to the government of Premier Ted Baillieu, they made a commitment prior to the election that they would, if elected, in the light of enormous public concern about the use of speed cameras in Victoria and the way they were being used (which, incidentally, is being challenged in the courts there by police officers), introduce the equivalent of an ombudsman to look at complaints and issues relating to speed cameras. That has been done and I commend them on that. The other thing they have done (and I have seen the evidence of it) is make a commitment to publicise the location of every mobile speed camera in Victoria.

I think there is a lesson in what has happened in New South Wales and Victoria for the major parties here, that is, there is an underlying concern—not about people endorsing, for example, speeding but people wanting a system that is fair and transparent. That is what happened in Victoria and New South Wales, and the coalitions in both Victoria and New South Wales should not underestimate the significance of that in delivering government.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:42): I was somewhat astonished at the response of the Minister for Correctional Services in his contribution to the motion. It has been a hallmark of the way the Minister for Correctional Services has performed in this parliament to attack the person, to attack the man and not the issue, attack the man and not the ball. If he had anything constructive to say in relation to the motion—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member is imputing improper motives to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give the member the benefit of the doubt for the time being, but I will listen carefully to what he is saying from now on.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, but I just want to make the point that it has been a hallmark of the performance of the minister in this place that he pursues personal attacks and does not look to the issue that is before the parliament. However, having said that, I congratulate the member for Bragg for bringing this motion to the house to congratulate Premier Ted Baillieu and Premier Barry O'Farrell on their outstanding victories in their respective elections.

We witnessed some outstanding results, particularly in the New South Wales election, where some seats that had never been held by the Coalition since their formation were won by the Liberal-National Coalition. In particular, I refer to the polling that we witnessed in the electorate comprising Broken Hill. I understand from reports that not one booth had ever been won by the Coalition in the history of that electorate, and in the most recent election the Coalition won every booth, I think some on primary vote. That is a clear indication of the tide that swept the Labor government out of office and the Liberal-National Coalition into office. I note that—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Tom, you can keep jabbering away there, mate; no-one pays any attention to you. You're irrelevant. You are irrelevant, mate.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How's your preselection?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it's fantastic, fantastic.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I note this week that the newly-elected Victorian Liberal Coalition government brought down its first budget on Tuesday. It released some very important initiatives in its budget, particularly in relation to its support for emergency services. I have taken particular note concerning these matters, given the fact that I have the responsibility for emergency services on behalf of the opposition.

Significant moneys have been provided to further support the volunteers within the CFA (Country Fire Authority), the SES and other emergency services in Victoria, and I will just read from the transcript:

The coalition government has provided \$67 million to fast-track CFA stations; \$67 million in building 60 new and upgraded Country Fire Authority stations; and roll out 101 new firefighting vehicles within the next 12 months.

That is an outstanding initiative, I think, from the newly-elected Victorian government. Also, it will invest significant moneys—\$5 million—in the 20011-12 year in the first stage of the retreat and resettlement policy of non-compulsory land acquisitions as part of the government's commitment to accept all the bushfire royal commission recommendations.

Furthermore, the Victorian Coalition government is providing unprecedented funding and more than \$38 million to the Victorian State Emergency Services. It outlined its support for emergency services as part of the budget, including \$9.3 million for the SES funding over the next four years, which will ease the pressure on hardworking volunteers to enable them to continue supporting their Victorian communities.

There are some really, I think, outstanding announcements just this week from the Victorian Liberal Coalition government in terms of its budget announcements supporting its emergency services volunteers. Can I contrast that to the way in which I believe this government has treated its emergency services volunteers—particularly the CFS volunteers—over a number of years. I know that the Country Fire Service Volunteers Association has made a submission to the government for this year's budget, which the house is about to hear next month (in June). The release of this year's budget—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order. Member for Kavel, sit down.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The motion is that this house congratulates premiers Baillieu and O'Farrell and their respective Liberal Coalition teams on their election to government. The hapless member for Kavel is now talking about CFS funding.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not asking your opinion. The honourable member is certainly using this as an opportunity to comment on all sorts of issues, so I suggest that he gets back to the thrust of the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will not delay the house anymore. I just want to commend the member for Bragg for bringing the motion to the house congratulating both the Victorian and the New South Wales Liberal coalitions on their election victories.

They have an enormous amount of work ahead of them to restore the economic and financial credentials of those two respective states. Certainly, we face that same challenge if we are successful in the 2014 election campaign. The Liberal Party here in South Australia will have an enormous job in rebuilding this state as a consequence of this Labor government's extremely poor management over all its responsibilities.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:49): I was not going to speak, but the member for Bragg inspired me to say a few words, and the reality is that I endorse the motion of the member for Bragg in congratulating Premier Ted Baillieu and Premier Barry O'Farrell on being elected to government. I would particularly like to pick up on the member for Bragg's comments about Mrs Leslie Williams being elected to the position of member for Port Macquarie. It is very, very relevant.

My view is that if the member for Bragg coaches the new member for Port Macquarie in New South Wales, the Labor Party will be taken to pieces over there as they are by the member for Bragg in South Australia; so I look forward to that with interest. She comes from extremely good stock, as the member for Bragg said. Her parents and the rest of her family are terrific people. John and Alison have done a sensational job in raising their family and particularly in looking after Philip, as they have for so long and as they will continue to do. So, Leslie's contribution in the New South Wales parliament will be one to watch.

The reason that both these governments have come to take their place leading their states is diabolical mess that both these states are in. We saw it earlier in Western Australia, where we congratulated the new premier over there some time ago, and now we have this taking place in Victoria, where Ted Baillieu put on a spectacular performance to become premier of that state and will be doing great things after he has cleaned up the almighty mess left by his predecessor.

What we have witnessed in New South Wales, with Barry O'Farrell coming to government in such a massive landslide election in both the lower house and the upper house, is a sign of what the population of that state has done with an absolutely toxic, septic Labor government. You only have to look across the other side of this chamber to see where they are going to end up here.

The reality is that people are not fools and they will not be taken for fools all the time. When they get the opportunity to chuck a government out they do. My view is that in 2014, when the South Australian community has the opportunity to vote, there is every chance that they will do that again. Mr O'Farrell, in particular: they had every sort of activity in the previous New South Wales Labor government that people just could not stand, all sorts of activities and scandals taking place, and it was just something to behold. What we are seeing in South Australia with the total chaos on the other side of the house, both here and in the other place, is indicative that when governments go bad, they go bad in a big way and the electors in the various states turn around and change that.

So we just have to wait now until 2014. Quite frankly, the member for Bragg has moved in an appropriate manner to put this motion up to the house. You have heard what people have had to say—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: If the minister wants to get up and make a contribution, let him go.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I said it.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, but it wasn't much, was it? Let's face it. I genuinely believe that the member for Bragg acted in the best interests of South Australians when she moved this motion to support the new governments in Victoria and New South Wales, because I believe that in a few short years you will have the government in New South Wales and the government in Victoria—and possibly Queensland if there's an election and a change there—all up making good motions about supporting the election of a Liberal government in South Australia.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:54): I was not going to speak, but I think I have been inspired by the mover and indeed the members on this side. It really gives one great heart to realise that governments and states can turn these states around and make decisive decisions like this. In relation to Premier Ted Baillieu and Premier Barry O'Farrell returning Liberal governments to both Victoria and New South Wales, it is certainly welcome on this side of the house, but I think we should also at the same time consider how well Western Australia is doing under Premier Barnett. We are seeing a resurgence right across Australia of people waking up and saying, 'Hang on, we want to return to economic sensibility, economic success.'

We know that Victoria, particularly, thrived under the last Liberal government, the Kennett government. A lot of tough decisions were made back then; one I remember was the family tax he put on to get Victoria out of debt. Most people in Victoria accepted it, and Victoria got out of its debt malaise very quickly under Kennett's direction. They made a lot of good decisions and the state was really thriving. We were all amazed when he lost that election subsequently, and I think most Victorians do regret and rue the day they did that. It is similar in New South Wales.

Regional Australia does poorly under Labor whether it is state or federal, and when you have federal and state Labor you have double trouble because they seem to somehow affect the productive sector of the community, particularly when they target the rural sector. When you start targeting the productive sector, you then start to target the economic status of your state. All of a sudden people are working out that things start to crumble.

In New South Wales, we saw the transport sector completely fall over because of very poor management, and we are seeing it here in South Australia. We are seeing it right now with the hospital. I am sure that if we had a poll, the people of South Australia would not go with that option now that it has been flagged that the cost is going to be what it is and how much it will cost us over, say, the next 50 years. If you held a referendum, I think South Australians would say resoundingly, 'No, we will go back to the other option of refurbishing the Royal Adelaide right where it is.'

Queensland is in trouble. Whoever would have thought that Queensland would be in serious trouble with the resources they have? Tasmania is in trouble. South Australia—well, I do not think the word 'trouble' is a strong enough word because of the polls. Hearing the government in this place yesterday, you would think that there was nothing wrong, but there are certainly very serious structural problems within our government in South Australia and, if that is not enough, the factional problems that are in there with it makes it twice as bad, particularly when you hear members criticising each other publicly—no names! That is unheard of, but it may be justified. Yes, I think it is, but we cannot wait for three more years to see what is going to happen.

It is sad to know because there are some good members on the other side—not many, but there are some—and they are going to pay a price. What has happened is not their fault because some of them have not been here very long, but to leave the parliament after one term or even two terms is not justice, but you pay the price for a cabinet that has not governed very well. I have been lucky to represent a seat where, ever since being elected in 1990, I have been here with a reasonably strong majority, but I do feel for those in marginal seats. There is still time for these backbench members and previous ministers on the back bench—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order!

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have a great deal of affection and admiration for the member for Schubert, unlike others. He is now talking about South Australian election results. The motion clearly concerns congratulating premiers Baillieu and O'Farrell.

The SPEAKER: Yes; he certainly has digressed from the motion. I will uphold that.

Mr VENNING: Madam Speaker, so would I, actually. I agree. I cannot contain myself, but it is serious. We are seeing a change right across Australia. We all know that the pendulum swings, but it is unwise to be all one way and then all the other. It is not smart to do that. I think it is good to have a mix of both.

I am a strong believer in the two-party system—everybody knows that—I really am. If we are not in government, I believe the Labor Party should be, and if you want consistent government that is what you should do. We certainly are seeing a change, and again I congratulate the member for Bragg for bringing this to the house today. I do wish both premiers Baillieu and O'Farrell all the best in the task they have in front of them. It would be fairly daunting to take on the debt they have with an economic climate that is very difficult indeed.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Premier's Climate Change Council—Government's Response to the Council's advice on Climate Change Targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan Report January 2011

WOODVILLE WEST URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Today I joined the member for Cheltenham at the first concrete pour at the site of the \$130 million Woodville West Urban Renewal Project. This is a significant milestone in this Housing SA project that will revitalise the former public housing-dominated precinct of Woodville West. Today's pour is not just the foundation of a building. It is the foundation of a new community—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —with new types of housing, new types of support and a greater mix of people, all located next to transport and services. The first stages of the development will include two apartment buildings with 45 units and will create The Square, which will be a multipurpose open space at the heart of this development. A further 24 properties will be constructed, including townhouses, cottages and loft apartments.

These buildings and capital works will be at the leading edge of sustainability and design, and over a third will be affordable sales and 15 per cent will be social housing. Twenty-two will have class C design features including wide doors, stepless entries and special bathrooms to make them fully adaptable for older people or those with disabilities.

This development has achieved a platinum rating against the SA Age Friendly Environments and Communities development guidelines. This will be a community that you can call home, and keep calling home, as your age or circumstances change.

Eight of the units will also showcase the latest in technology-based care systems for people with physical disabilities. For the first time in South Australia's history, these apartments will be wired to provide remote, in-home support that will boost the independence of the residents. All homes—

Mr Pengilly: It sounds like the Rocky Horror Show!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, doesn't that just show it. The member for Finnis says this is like the Rocky Horror Show.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It was very audible. I heard the member for Finnis, and I hope he wasn't casting aspersions on the house.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, on this really important development, Madam Speaker. All homes will have a minimum six-star energy rating, and the development will include the latest in rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling, in conjunction with the Water Proofing the West initiative. Apart from housing, the central square will be surrounded by services, so that residents can walk or ride to their destinations—to school, to shops, to sport, perhaps even to work. There is a railway station that abuts the development, and the location also provides easy access to the city, AAMI Stadium and the beach.

Woodville West was made up of 184 homes, 143 of which were former Housing Trust properties. The project aims to deliver at least 428 new dwellings from apartments to family homes. Like the UNO apartments, Woodville West will create a mixed community—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —with social housing, affordable private rental, affordable purchase, and approximately half of that will be open market sales. This is a clear demonstration of the government's commitment to the vision of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide to create mixed-use, high density developments with a greater mix of housing types and forms located along key transport corridors.

In what is a clear indication of the success of previous projects, interest has already been registered by about 200 prospective buyers, and off-the-plan sales are due to commence in the very near future.

SOUTH EAST SOUTH AUSTRALIA INNOVATION AND INVESTMENT FUND

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As many members of the house are aware, on 25 January 2011, manufacturing company Kimberly-Clark Australia (KCA) announced it would be cutting jobs from its Millicent and Tantanoola plants. While both state and federal governments were disappointed to hear this move by KCA, the company was adamant there was nothing that could have been done to reverse the decision.

Following the announcement, the state and federal governments acted swiftly to ensure that workers at the factory would be supported and investment in the state's South-East remained. A \$17 million package to support new investment and create long-term jobs in South Australia's South-East was established. It was named the South East South Australia Innovation Investment Fund (SESAIIF).

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Every time we help workers, a little part of you dies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Norwood!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Today I am pleased to announce that, in conjunction with the commonwealth government, the fund has now officially been launched and is available through a grants program. This fund will not only offer support to those directly and indirectly affected by the job losses, but it also aims to attract new companies, opportunities and jobs in the South-East.

This government is strongly committed to supporting manufacturing in regional South Australia. We will not stand idly by and see families and communities struggle through circumstances—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop and the Leader of the Opposition! You are making too much noise.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This government is strongly committed to supporting manufacturing in regional South Australia. We will not stand idly by and see families and communities struggle through circumstances beyond their control. The \$17 million fund includes \$5 million for a labour adjustment program which involves skill assessment and reskilling workers.

I know that the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education is committed to this project and I commend him for his efforts so far. Key elements of the labour adjustment program include resume and job search assistance, career advice, training in part or full qualifications, and other funded training such as licences and tickets. The remaining \$12 million will

be awarded to projects that will bolster the local economy, stimulate industry innovation and generate jobs growth in the South-East.

The fund work in a similar fashion to the successful \$30 million South Australia Innovation Investment Fund (SAIIF) which was created following the closure of the Mitsubishi plant. The South East SAIIF will be available over the 2011-12 to 2012-13 financial years and will be delivered through AusIndustry. Advertisements in local media will advise of information sessions to be held.

The economic prosperity of South Australia is all about increasing jobs, and it is very important to increase jobs and activity in regional South Australia, in particular the South-East. While we are doing all we can to help, I want to encourage employers in the South-East who are thinking of expanding to give KCA workers a go.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:09): I bring up the 402nd report of the committee on the Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Treasurer. Before Macquarie Bank issued their prospectus seeking private investment in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, was Macquarie Bank required to get government sign-off on the project's financial details to be put into that prospectus?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:10): I cannot imagine why they would, but I will happily—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, you are on your second warning.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —check and come back to the house and report.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:11): Can the Premier outline to the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Police!

Mrs GERAGHTY: Can the Premier outline to the house the support still needed to ensure that the planned redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval goes ahead?

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) (14:11): That is a very good question. There is a lot more work to be done. It was heartening to see the forces of negativity standing aside to let the vast majority of SACA members have their say last Monday night and overwhelmingly support the planned Adelaide Oval redevelopment. More than 80 per cent of those 12,000 or more members who voted want this development to go ahead. They not only voted in favour of the future of cricket surviving and thriving at the Adelaide Oval, they voted in favour of revitalising this fantastic sporting asset and breathing new life into the heart of our city centre.

Everyone who understands the importance of transforming a vision into reality supported this redevelopment, people such as the former prime minister of Australia John Howard; the former foreign minister of Australia, Alexander Downer; the former defence minister and now chairman of SACA, Ian McLachlan; the former Liberal premier and now SANFL chairman, John Olsen; the

former Liberal premier, Rob Kerin; Christopher Pyne; the former test cricketer, Greg Chappell; the former test cricketer Greg Blewett; the former test cricketer, Stuart MacGill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the former test cricketer, Wayne Phillips; the former cricketer, football umpire and commentator and South Australian legend, Ken (K.G.) Cunningham; the former Sturt football and cricket player, John Halbert; the former Port Adelaide captain, Warren Tredrea; the former Crows captain, Mark Ricciuto; the former Aussie Rules legend, Barrie Robran—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the former Aussie Rules footballer, Bob Hammond; the chief executive of the MCG, Stephen Gough; the head of Business SA, Peter Vaughan; the former head curator of the Adelaide Oval, Les Burdett, who is now a consultant to SACA; and the current head curator, Damian Hough, who believes the standards of the all-important pitch will not be compromised—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —by having football played all season at the oval. Now, they do not want to hear this—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Norwood!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I note the comments of Liberal grandee and former foreign minister Alexander Downer last month calling on South Australians, writing in *The Advertiser*—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will behave!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The fact that they catcalled John Howard, they catcalled Mark Ricciuto, they catcalled Greg Chappell, they catcalled John Olsen, they catcalled Christopher Pyne, they catcalled Rob Kerin. I am going to tell you what Alexander Downer said, writing in that journal of record, *The Advertiser*. He said that if the Adelaide Oval project failed to proceed, and I quote:

It will be proof of the fear many of us have that Adelaide simply can't move forward. It is rigidly locked into the inertia of crippling conservatism. Nothing new should ever happen. Everything has to stay as it was.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Just wait for it. Alexander Downer goes on to say:

For me, the politics of this issue are over. At the last election, the Liberals offered a brand new facility while Labor promised to upgrade the Adelaide Oval. Whatever your preference—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is your Alexander Downer:

Whatever your preference, the election's over. Labor won and so the Adelaide Oval redevelopment it is.

He goes on to say:

This is a project which transcends politics. It is a project which lays down a challenge to South Australians. Do we want to move forward or do we want to fester in the inertia of petty disputes.

That is what Alexander Downer said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The longest serving Liberal foreign minister in Australian history. The longest serving foreign minister, whose father and grandfather were premiers of this state. He has the guts and the substance to put this state before Liberal petty politics. So does John Olsen, so does Rob Kerin, so does Christopher Pyne.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No. It seems that the only people we have heard from who are maintaining—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Davenport and the member for Norwood!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —is the Leader of the Opposition and some of her front and backbenchers, but, of course, we know there are deep divisions within the Liberals on this. We know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Finniss, member for Schubert, member for Kavel. You have had too much red cordial. Behave!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sixteen Liberal leaders and deputy leaders while I have been the leader of the Labor Party. What does that tell you about their divisions? We know there are deep divisions within the Liberals on this.

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order. I have been sitting here patiently waiting to hear the answer to the question about how the oval has been developed and I have not heard one mention of the sale of the forests.

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

Mr Williams: Tell us about the forests, Mike?

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop—behave!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know. I can see a log when I see one; and I know a log when I see one. He is going to China, but he wouldn't go to Penola when they needed him. We know the member for Waite, who supports the redevelopment, for instance, has been gagged from saying anything positive and that is because he is aligned with the many enlightened Liberals, many of whom I have just named, who support it. I am now calling on the Leader of the Opposition to show us she can be magnanimous and do what Greg Howes has done and say, 'Okay, the majority of people have said yes, so let's move on.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Is she big enough? Is the Leader of the Opposition big enough to do the right thing by our state? Is she big enough to put our state before petty partisan issues? Is she big enough to fill the shoes of John Olsen? Is she big enough to fill the shoes of Rob Kerin? Is she big enough to fill the shoes—

Mr PENGILLY: I rise on a point of order: standing order no 98. The Premier is clearly debating and hasn't even attempted to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The Premier can answer the question as he chooses. It was a very open-ended question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay, so will she now show—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You keep interjecting and I'll keep going. Will she show true leadership and now swing her support behind this redevelopment that so many people so obviously want? Is the Leader of the Opposition prepared to put South Australians' interests before the interests of the Liberal Party? Will she support our legislation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to ensure this project goes ahead? Because that is the next step. Before the winter recess, the Minister for Infrastructure will introduce into this parliament legislation to make this project happen. Where will you stand? Will you stand with John Howard? Will you stand with John Olsen? Will you stand with Alexander Downer? Will you stand with cricket and footy and the 80 per cent who voted for it, or will you continue to knock and white-ant this project? If not, will she tell us what she would do as the supposed alternative premier? Where is her plan B? Where would she site a plan B? And, more importantly, how would she pay for a plan B?

The leader cannot tell us that because she does not have a plan B. They were so cocky they believed that the yes vote would only get about 71 per cent. It was a woeful campaign for the no vote but you thought you'd get a minority that would stop it and you could say, 'Don't blame us, blame SACA.' Now you are wriggling on a stick, the lot of you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I presume that the media have asked you: where will you stand?

Members interjecting:

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

Mr PISONI: Point of order: the Premier must address the Speaker, Madam Speaker.

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Madam Speaker, with respect, it is time for the leader to tell us her plans, her vision but, most importantly, her decision on whether she will support our enabling legislation to enable the Adelaide Oval redevelopment to go ahead.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Where do you stand? Are you going to support the legislation or aren't you? It is time for them to put up or shut up. In doing so, let me remind the leader of what this development is all about.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You have to sort out your divisions. Go and sit down with John Howard, John Olsen and the rest of them, because before the winter break we will introduce the legislation into this parliament and you will be required to vote one way or the other. You cannot continue to play games. This is too important for our state for you to knock.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This development is not some kind of mirage in our city. It is a development whose time has come.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let us remind the leader what the development is all about. According to the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, having cricket and football played at Adelaide Oval year round would add more than \$100 million in additional economic benefit to the city each year—\$100 million a year of economic activity. It is about tourism and jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The better and more centrally located facilities will attract more interstate visitors to Adelaide and enhance our ability as a state to attract major sporting and cultural events. This will become part of the works that will bring together the developments currently planned and underway in the northwest of the city, including the \$394 million Adelaide Convention Centre and Riverbank precinct entertainment strip; the \$200 million SA Health and Medical Research Institute; the new Royal Adelaide Hospital; the Torrens River footbridge that will unite the city—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley be quiet.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —by joining the Festival Centre convention precinct with Adelaide Oval; and, of course, just along the way we will have the Bowden development. Having worked hard to get our economy moving again, it is our intention to keep the momentum going with projects like this that deliver long-term jobs and economic benefits. We need an opposition in this state, and an opposition leader who understands the need to give bipartisan support to developments that matter most in this state. It is not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, just like we did. Have a look at our figures of support on critical issues like Olympic Dam—the fact that we factored it in. It is not about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sometimes, just sometimes—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Davenport!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Look at him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Swear words—you know, prepared to use this childish behaviour. Oh, but, you have heard their interjections; are they fit for office?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order, member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I believe that the Premier must address the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I think he is. He is a little bit cross-eyed. Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It's the noise that is making him cross-eyed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —final message to the opposition: do not turn your backs on the majority of South Australians. Put our state before your pettiness. It is time to make up your mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, you are on your second warning. You will get one more and you are out. I hope that, in that last question, you were able to vent all your spleen for the day and we might have an orderly question time from now on, because I am going to start warning people and naming people if you do not behave. The Leader of the Opposition.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier seriously expect the public to believe that the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the health minister and the Treasurer are the only four people not to have seen the Macquarie Bank document mailed to them on 3 May, which clearly states that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will cost \$2.73 billion?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier.

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) (14:27): I am not sure which one of you posted it; and I know that the member for Unley has had a bit of a problem with documents in the past, which cost—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —his former leader his job.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley, point of order.

Mr PISONI: Standing order 98, debate.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is answering the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Struth, have a look at the court documents! Have a look at the defamation case. I just want to say this: apparently, a document has arrived in my office, and it has been sent today. Apparently, whoever you sent down the road maybe just did not put enough stamps on it, and maybe that document—or at least—has been slightly 'doctored', can we just say. But the point of the matter is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I don't care what any document says—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't want to hear, do you? I don't care what any document says. We will not be paying \$2.7 billion for the construction of—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Norwood! I warn the member for Norwood.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the new hospital. So, thank you for that. I will send it to Macquarie Bank, and I think that they will be able to tell you who sent it to you. I think it was 'doctored' along the way.

CITY STADIUM

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Is the minister aware of comments regarding a stadium for football and cricket in the city, and can he tell the house of them?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:28): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I hope—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I haven't said anything yet. I do hope that the opposition will show some courtesy because I am going to do them the courtesy of telling the house about their comments on a stadium for the city. Of course, we go back to that former leader, Martin Hamilton-Smith, who we have to say—

Mr Pengilly: The member for Waite.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —the member for Waite—has always been a strong supporter of this concept. He said, way back on 27 October 2008:

I think this is an idea whose time has come. There's an overwhelming demand for it from the people—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: These are your words, please have the courtesy of listening to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

There's an overwhelming demand for it from the people who go to see sport, not just soccer but Aussie rules, concerts, a range of codes, World Cup rugby. Sooner or later we're going to have one. It's my vision that we have one by 2018 and that's what we're committed to doing and it just must be done.

Of course, the former leader was handed the exploding cigar by the member for Unley, and so no longer is in that position, but by April 2009 the new leader had put out the Liberal plan for Riverside West. It said:

Our vision...involves a cultural and entertainment precinct that would transform the city. This must include a world-class stadium, either by renewing Adelaide Oval or, if this proves untenable, by creating a new purpose built facility. Both of these options will deliver a world-class stadium beside a new and exciting city pulse. Every other mainland state has created such a place. Why can't we?

Why can't we, indeed? She went on to say, 'It is not a question'—this is Isobel Redmond, the Leader of the Opposition—'of whether—'

An honourable member: What was the date?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: April '09.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I want to save the minister from both embarrassing himself and misleading the house. The current Leader of the Opposition was not the leader in April 2009.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, he is obviously using a dodgy document that he has got from somewhere.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They may have misdated their own document, but I assure you it is theirs. She went on to say this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If they think I am misleading the house they can take the point. The document went on to say this, 'It is not a question of whether we should have a world-class stadium, it is a question of when.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'This infrastructure—'

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am wondering what responsibility the minister has for an obviously doctored document to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They go on to say that what was in their Liberal document—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'This infrastructure—'

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will be quiet! I can't hear a word.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'This infrastructure project,' they said, 'is important to the state's long-term economic future.' We admit that the Liberal Party does not always get along with itself or see eye to eye on issues. That is why—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, wait for it. That is why the man with three votes—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Davenport!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is why the man with three votes said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam Speaker, I am not extending question time for this rabble if they continue to interject.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What did the man with three votes say in July 2009? He said:

I think Martin did get sucked in a little bit on the stadium, insomuch as I don't know that the Liberal Party ever had a policy that we were going to build a stadium.

I have to say, that is becoming clear, isn't it? Of course, by December 2009 Isobel Redmond was back believing that you needed it, but she no longer believed in Adelaide Oval. Why not? Because we proposed to put football at Adelaide Oval, so it was therefore no longer a good idea. She said instead on 4 December 2009, 'We have reached a conclusion that Adelaide Oval needs to—'

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Davenport!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You knew it was coming.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You knew it was coming.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport, you are warned for the second time.

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

We have reached a conclusion that Adelaide Oval needs to remain as a viable working oval...but there needs to be an inner city roofed stadium close to public transport.

They went to the election with that, but why wouldn't they support Adelaide Oval? They said, 'The fact is, the Rann government was panicked into action on a stadium—'

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —no, no, wait for Nostradamus over here—'and has forced football into a deal it doesn't want and looks unlikely to ever come to fruition.' My God! You would take her stock tips, wouldn't you? You would take her stock tips! Nostradamus! In June 2010, still, this incredibly important project for South Australia they need to have a stadium. She said:

...why isn't it better to actually leave the Adelaide Oval intact...and build a purpose-built stadium for football which is FIFA-compliant? Because bear in mind this new oval will not be still FIFA-compliant—

which is another one of their lies. Basically, the opposition relied on its fond hope that, firstly, they could derail it through football—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is now clearly debating his answer. He has given a 10-minute answer for which he has no responsibility to the house. He is abusing question time and now he is debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The minister can answer the question as he chooses, and I am sure he is getting towards the end of his time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: With the greatest respect, I am merely saying things that you people have been saying.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was very open.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He says it is debating for me to say that they relied upon the fact that they didn't believe football would agree. Here is what Iain Evans said in February 2010, 'It's pretty obvious that the two parties still can't agree after 15 months—'

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order. The member for Stuart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Two points of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: You can't have two points of order; you do one at a time.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 123: it is the fourth time the minister has used a member's name rather than addressing them by seat.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I would direct the minister to address people by their seat.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Davenport, one of the welter of former leaders—

The SPEAKER: Order! The second point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 104: he should be addressing you, and he knows it very well.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he also is slightly cross-eyed.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam Speaker, I address my comments through the chair. The member for Davenport, who as I said is one of the welter of former leaders of the opposition, said this in February 2010:

It's pretty obvious that the two parties still can't agree after 15 months. I guess it goes to show you that when you try and remarry the same party after a 40-year divorce, it's going to be pretty difficult.

First, they relied on the fight between football and cricket to undermine this idea. Then they relied on a SACA vote, campaigning against that.

They said that the reason they wouldn't support it is because football didn't like it, it wasn't the right thing and you needed an inner-city stadium, but what do we know now from the opposition, because the most recent comment from the member for Davenport—again, not entirely correct, or some would say not honest, but I will just stick with 'correct'—says the government is still not justified by its pouring more than \$600 million into two of the richest sports in this state. This is what we need to know, because now apparently the position of the opposition is no money for no stadium for football, after telling us that it had to be done and it was not a question of if, it was a question of when.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I'm sorry—apparently it's a waste of money—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, what do you say then? Should we have a stadium?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Member for Davenport, should we have a world-class stadium—simply, yes or no? Come on, you weaklings. Yes or no?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The people of South Australia deserve to know—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Bragg, you are warned.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The people of South Australia deserve to know if the opposition has deserted its longstanding platform of an inner-city sports stadium, because apparently the latest position, cricket having done the right thing, football having done the right thing, everyone wanting to go to Adelaide Oval, is that it is a waste of money to spend money on the stadium. So, what is their position?

Can they explain why 'it had to happen'? 'Why can't we?' they said. Why can't we have one? What is their position? Will they support this or will they build another one or are they now saying, 'To hell with football, to hell with cricket, let them suffer, let them die because we will not do anything that gives the Labor Party a win, and that is what it is all about'?

The SPEAKER: Point of order, the member for Finnis.

Mr PENGILLY: I am unsure whether the minister has finished his diatribe, but quite clearly he is debating. The question related to statements that have been made and every now and then we are getting a small statement and then we are getting a heap of absolute—

The SPEAKER: Alright, you made your point, sit down.

Mr PENGILLY: —what the Premier referred to on the radio.

The SPEAKER: Sit down, you're debating the point of order. Minister, have you finished your answer?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, thank you, ma'am.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital at its opening will be \$2.73 billion and that the ongoing maintenance and non-clinical service costs are additional to this?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:39): I thank the member for her question. The issue is simply the same issue as I canvassed yesterday in this house. The document that the opposition is relying on, which was leaked to the media yesterday—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: She has been doing that all day, ma'am.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Twenty-four or 25 times, I think—and 13 times before question time, I gather, during ministerial statements. The issues were—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It doesn't make any sense. It's an interjection without any content, so it's just noise for the sake of it, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pisoni: Ignore it then and answer the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I can't—you're interrupting me. He is a buffoon, Madam Speaker, a complete and absolute buffoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I ask that the minister withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The member is offended, I understand, then I would ask the minister to—

Mr PISONI: I understand that the minister has referred to a member on this side as an animal.

The SPEAKER: No, I didn't hear any—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: It's unparliamentary to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm not sure what a 'buffoon' is, but I don't think it is an animal. However, the member hasn't indicated any problem, so—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: I am offended, Madam Speaker. I do ask—and I'm a very gentle, delicate man—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the cap fits, wear it, is it?

Mr PISONI: I do ask that the minister—

The SPEAKER: Sit down. You are now debating the point of order. Sit down. The Minister for Road Safety.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: On the point of order, I believe the member for Unley may be referring to a mythical animal—a combination of a baboon and a buffalo.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. That's no point of order. The member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was merely going to point out that you hadn't made a ruling on the previous point of order. No wonder question time falls into this—

The SPEAKER: Order! I don't think that was a point of order either: you were asking for something. Attorney-General, perhaps you can bring some sanity back into this.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I hope so, Madam Speaker. I am wondering if the honourable member for Unley could assist all of us by spelling the name to which he has taken offence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That was a frivolous point of order. I won't accept that one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I don't know who the buffoon was, but I can think of many people who fit the bill. However, minister, have you finished your answer and we'll get on with it? Did you withdraw the term 'buffoon'? I think you should because obviously people on my left are terribly sensitive.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It's interesting, the double standards that are applied, Madam Speaker. I am happy to withdraw the term 'buffoon'.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Now finish your answer.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I wasn't aware that it was an animal. Perhaps the member for Unley can give a demonstration later on to all of us. I tell you what, Madam Speaker, it may not be an animal, but I do recognise a buffoon when I see one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am happy to withdraw the remark, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I'll just get back to the question now. The question was: how much are we paying for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and will I confirm the particular amount at the time of opening in 2016? What I can confirm is that the finalisation of the contract with the party we are dealing with, which will construct and manage the hospital, has yet to be completed. As I have said all along, I cannot confirm anything until that occurs.

What I can confirm, though, is that as a government we don't pay any of the costs until the hospital is completed and then, when it is completed, we will pay them a fee, which—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Finniss. I hope you have a point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: I am having a great deal of trouble hearing the minister's response because of the noise emanating from his colleagues to his right, some of whom are from the left.

The SPEAKER: I think that is the understatement of the day, member for Finniss, considering the noise that is coming from your side. However, I would ask people to be quiet. I can't hear either.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is my gentle voice, Madam Speaker. I will try to project in a more robust way so that even the member for Finniss can understand what I am saying. I was making the point that I cannot confirm any costs until they are finalised, and that will happen in the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg! And the member for Finniss, you are warned.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The members opposite say they cannot hear and, as soon as I start answering, they start talking over what I am saying. People everywhere must understand the hypocrisy of those opposite when they behave in that way. I withdraw that, Madam Speaker, before they get up and object.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: What I will confirm is this: the basis of the deal is that we do not pay anything until the hospital is completed and we occupy it.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have got to this stage in my answer, I think, about four times and, every time I get to the next part, the Leader of the Opposition or one of the members opposite tries to provide the answer. If they think they know the answer, I am not sure why they bother asking the questions. Let me complete my answer; you may have a different answer, but let me complete my answer. We—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will listen in silence.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Once we have occupied the hospital, we are then responsible to pay money to the company with whom we have contracted, and that will be done on an annualised basis—I think every quarter, from memory. It is a regular amount we pay, and that figure takes into account the construction costs. We established yesterday that the Macquarie document that they were relying on for their leak says that the construction costs are in the order of what we said as the government—about \$1.7 to \$1.8 billion. In addition to that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —we have to pay the costs associated with the finance of the project and the costs associated with the running and maintenance of the hospital. In fact, what we are doing is putting on the table—bringing to the book, if you like—the real costs associated with the non-clinical aspects of running a hospital for 35 years. That is something which will give the taxpayers of this state a very clear understanding of what it really costs to run a hospital.

Hospitals are very expensive institutions to run. All of those costs now are being paid in relation to all of the other hospitals we have in this state, but you do not know how much those costs are because they are caught up in other budget lines, so there is no specific budget line for finance for hospital infrastructure, there is no specific line for various elements of maintenance, repairs, cleaning and a whole range of other things. All of those costs will be brought onto the table—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is warned.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Every time I try to get the detail. I am actually trying to provide information to the house; I am not trying to hide anything. All of that information will be made available and people will be able to see clearly whether or not they are getting a good deal. But on the issue of whether or not we are getting a good deal, can I say that the jury is not out on this issue. We, as a state government, are absolutely committed and certain that the PPP arrangement for this hospital will be a good deal, but it is not just us who say that the PPP is a good deal. Infrastructure Partnerships Australia, which is the nation's peak infrastructure body, commissioned—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Is that right? Infrastructure Partnerships Australia commissioned a major independent report that undertook the first ever comprehensive national analysis of the outcomes of projects delivered by government and those delivered through partnership with the private sector. That report concluded:

Public-private partnerships are the best method available to Australia's governments to deliver large, complex and expensive projects, achieving significant savings in both time and cost.

The RAH is one of the most complex bits of infrastructure ever built in Australia. It is one of only a handful of hospitals of that size that will have been built in the world over the last 50 years. Another key finding of that report included:

Our overall conclusion is that PPPs provide superior performance in both the cost and time dimensions, and that the PPP advantage increases (in absolute terms) with the size and complexity of projects.

The report further concluded:

In contrast to commonly held perceptions about the relative transparency of PPPs, we found that PPP projects were far more transparent than traditional projects, as measured by the availability of public data for this study.

So, that point is the point I make.

Mr Pisoni: Tell us how much it costs, then.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We will, member for Unley, once the contract is signed and we have the details.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is acute conceit to ask us to tell the price of something before it is completed and before it is finalised. Once it is finalised, we are absolutely committed to giving all of the detail to the house, and then we will work out where the egg is placed.

I just need to make one other point, which was not included in any of the questions asked by the opposition. The reality is that, during the last election campaign, the Liberal Party said that they would rebuild the RAH on the existing site. When asked how they were going to fund that, they said they were going to do it through a public-private partnership arrangement. The deputy leader of the time, the member for Hammond, at 7.30 on the eve of the election, said—and this was an interview, and the question was, 'But you're only spending a fraction on some of your major commitments: \$10 million for the redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital over the next four years,' to which the then deputy responded:

That's important to emphasise. That will be a public-private partnership as the Labor Party proposal is for a public-private partnership.

So, if the Liberal Party won office at the last election and were to have built the RAH on the existing site, they would have had it built using a public-private partnership, the exact same device that we are using. The hypocrisy smells. You can smell the hypocrisy from over here.

An honourable member: It wasn't the member for Hammond.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I said the member for Hammond. My apologies to the member for Hammond. He would not have made such an error. The member for Goyder.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finnis!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member for Goyder told the truth. That is the problem for him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that under the new Royal Adelaide Hospital PPP the profit paid to investors in the project averages about \$54 million per year for 30 years?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:52): I cannot confirm that at all because the details are yet to be completed. Of course—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Can I just make this point: profit in any enterprise is not guaranteed. I am sure that the member for Unley would understand that. You cannot be certain if you embark on an enterprise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —you cannot be certain—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I congratulate the member for Unley for being interested in small business. He started off with a big business and he worked his way to a small business—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, good on you.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am sure it will still be there for you in due course. Sorry, I should not make reflections on the member for Unley's problems. The reality is that nobody can ever guarantee a profit on an enterprise. Profit is a reflection of risk. The more risk you take, the more the profits might be, but the more the losses might be as well. In relation to the prospectus that I understand members opposite were talking about yesterday, as the Premier said, we got our copies today. It was obviously part of a conspiracy to make sure we got it late, but we will talk about that later if I am asked a question about it. I would like a question on that.

There is no guarantee of profit, but the prospectus yesterday was looking for some equity investors. They are looking for high wealth people who are prepared to take the highest part of the risk of the project. That is about 10 per cent of the enterprise, and that 10 per cent is a high risk element—the equity element. The rest is debt. As members would understand, I assume that the debt has a lower risk associated with it so the element that is at the higher level would attract a higher rate of return if the project is able to be delivered by the contracting parties successfully and on budget over the course of that 35 years.

If there are things that occur which mean that they cannot deliver it on time and they cop a loss of some sort, that will be borne by that group of people first off. Those people they are trying to attract into it are obviously the ones who are prepared to take the risk and who can afford to take the risk.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg for the second time!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Obviously Mr Katsaros is in that category. I find it interesting that Mr Katsaros has campaigned against this, and yesterday he said on radio that he actually has a copy of the prospectus. Presumably he wants to invest in this project because, despite what he says, he understands that it is a good project and he thinks it's worth putting his own money into.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I wouldn't want to reflect on him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I wouldn't want to reflect unduly on Mr Katsaros. I assume he got the prospectus so that he could consider making an investment in it. Nonetheless, profit, of course, is

something that may or may not occur in the future, and those who are prepared to invest in a project and put their money on the line are entitled to profit. The reality is, of course, that if you do something through a public-private partnership the private sector expects to make a profit. The further reality is—

An honourable member: That's called privatisation.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, it's not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, it's not. The further reality is that they take the risk and the government transfers the risk to the private sector so that we get the hospital we need for the price that is fixed, and we know it can do what it is supposed to do, and if there is no profit to be made then they don't make any profit. I can point to a number of PPPs around the world where that has been the case and that's because the government has properly entered into an arrangement where they are protecting the public's interest and the private sector takes the risk. That's why it's a good deal.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that under the new Royal Adelaide Hospital PPP the total profit paid to investors in the project will be about, interestingly, \$1.7 billion over the life of the contract?

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) (14:56): Madam Speaker, I don't think the member listened to what I said in any way at all. The two points I made are: (1) I can't confirm anything because the contract is yet to—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I don't think she understands what a prospectus is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Two points: the first point is that we haven't signed the contract so nothing can be confirmed at this stage until that contract is signed; the second point—and the point I was making in the previous answer—is that you can't guarantee a profit. If you could guarantee a profit, it wouldn't be a profit, it would be something else. It would be a secure income stream or some other such. The reality is that that consortium wants to make a profit. If we were to go out and procure a hospital in a normal way, we would engage a builder to build that hospital and we would engage architects, and they would all want to make a profit because that's the way our system works. When you buy a television set for a government office, the person who sells you that set—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Makes a profit.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —makes a profit. Every element of every project—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —that is procured through whatever mechanism includes profit. The socialism that is inherent in the heart of the question by the Leader of the Opposition is just a fantasy. Those on this side of the house worked that out some decades ago. Sadly, the Liberal Party is still pursuing the socialist objective in this place.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that under the new Royal Adelaide Hospital PPP most of the equity funding for the project is likely to come from offshore investors and, therefore, most of the profits paid to investors won't end up in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Foreign investment!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:58): Well, if the likes of Jim Katsaros and his friends sign up, then I imagine a fair bit of the equity—I don't know how much equity Mr Katsaros wants to put in or the other investors—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: We have bonds that are bought offshore.

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Police!

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not sure who is answering this—the Minister for Police or the Minister for Health. Minister for Health, I would like you to continue. I gave you the call.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you very much. My knowledge of international finance is perhaps not as great as my colleagues here, but I will do my best. We are in a global market and we like investment from overseas in our country. I thought that was one of the things that the Liberal Party was supposed to be keen on—overseas investment in Australia. If overseas investment thinks it's a good investment to invest in an Adelaide hospital, I think that's a good thing.

What they know is that they are backing one of the very best hospitals in the world. And why is it going to be a great hospital? It is because it will provide the very best health services to the citizens of our state. I am very proud of what this government is doing in this space. Unfortunately, the opposition keeps knock, knock, knock, knocking. That is all they know how to do, Madam Speaker.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister outline the expected benefits for grassroots sports from the Adelaide Oval development?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan) (15:00): As minister for recreation and sport, as well as a proud South Australian, I have a keen interest in the flow-on effects of the proposal to bring football back to Adelaide Oval in a new redeveloped stadium. Amid the huge level of current public interest, I thought it important to share with the house the benefits for sport itself, not just the SANFL and SACA.

The SANFL CEO, Mr Leigh Whicker, has advised government that football involves more than 100,000 participants and more than 1,500 staff, and drives more than \$100 million into the state's economy. Of course, there are also positive benefits for communities, for health and for the social good. These benefits are conditional on the ongoing financial success of the SANFL—a level of success the opposition leader, the deputy leader, the member for Davenport and the member for Adelaide are currently trying to destroy.

Mr Whicker has informed government that, through a number of factors, the brand of AAMI Stadium has been destroyed to a point where it is almost beyond repair. He advises that the financial strength of football throughout the state is dependent on the revenues of the Adelaide Crows, the Port Adelaide Football Club and their stadium revenues. Mr Whicker said:

In turn, the ability of the Adelaide Football Club and the Port Adelaide Football Club to not only survive but also to succeed and compete on a level playing field in the AFL competition is totally reliant on their playing at a stadium which is accessible and has facilities which meet current requirements. Sadly, AAMI Stadium does not now meet these criteria and cannot do so without an expensive upgrade which would require the expenditure of between \$200 million and \$250 million.

I am astounded that the member for Davenport would be so opposed to the ongoing success of football. Mr Whicker went on to say:

The SANFL, the Adelaide Football Club and the Port Adelaide Football Club are convinced—
yes, convinced—

that the future base of football and the playing of AFL games in this state should be at a redeveloped Adelaide Oval and request that the government finds a way for it to proceed.

In terms of economic impact, the increased revenues from the move to Adelaide Oval will provide more money for grassroots football. This has been said time and again by former premier John Olsen and Mr Whicker. Similarly, the Adelaide Oval will provide more money for SACA to spend on grassroots cricket around the state, and this has been supported by country cricket chief, Mr Ian Ravenscroft.

The government's involvement in Adelaide Oval frees SACA of \$85 million in debt and frees up \$18 million in the first two years to be spent on cricket. There is also a revenue uplift of between \$2 million and \$4 million for cricket each year based on these new facilities.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Goyder!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: These benefits are massive for cricket around the state. It is a financial position that is going to benefit small teams, big teams and the development of young cricketers. In SACA's own words, it means more resources for clubs, regional development centres, youth and school programs; more resources for elite cricket programs; construction of a new, larger, world-class indoor cricket training centre at Adelaide Oval; the resurfacing and enhancement of Adelaide Oval No. 2; and the retention of year-round cricket training at Adelaide Oval.

I suggest every Liberal member goes and tells the football, cricketing and community-based families in their electorate why they think this Adelaide Oval redevelopment should not go ahead. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition explain to the Mount Lofty football club (the member for Davenport's beloved mighty Mountain Devils) why they should not get access to more money for football; that the member for Davenport should explain to the Coromandel Valley cricket club why they should not get access to more money for cricket; that the member for Schubert should explain to the Nuriootpa Cricket Club; that the member for Kavel should explain to the Nairne Cricket Club; and that the member for Goyder should explain to the Sunbury Cricket Club (affectionately known as the Lords).

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:04): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer confirm that, on top of the 12 to 15 per cent return paid to investors in the new Royal Adelaide PPP, there will be an additional margin paid to Macquarie Bank?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:04): Well, I would say to the member for Morphett the same as I said to the Leader of the Opposition: we have yet to conclude the contractual arrangements with the parties, so we cannot confirm anything. Of course—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —there is a profit involved in the commercial enterprise otherwise they would not do it, and, of course, those who provide services get a fee otherwise they would not do it.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: There is a big difference between the rate of return on the equity investment—which is, I understand, around about 10 per cent of the total sum—and the debt, and the equity investors who take the highest risk are offered a higher reward if the project is able to come in on time, on budget and so on. That is when they get that high reward. If it does not they do not get anything—in fact, they might lose money.

The debt is established in a different way and at a different rate. Of course, everyone gets paid, but the reality is—and that is the point made by Infrastructure Partnerships Australia—that, even with the profits going to these organisations through it, you get a better outcome because the planning of the project is such that you have got better life-cycle cost arrangements in place, so it is cheaper in the long term for the public to do it this way, and, of course, the risk is transferred from government to the state.

Companies that build these things are used to building complex buildings. State governments—when was the last time that we built a hospital of this size? Well, never. If we were to build a hospital of this size and this level of complexity there would be a whole range of risks that we would get wrong and the cost would blowout.

Say the price of steel went up, say there was a strike on the waterfront and we could not get materials in. Projects would run over cost and then the state would be wearing those risks. Through this arrangement all those risks are transferred to the private sector. That is why it is a good deal.

It is important that they get a profit because they are taking the risks, but we know in advance exactly how much it is going to cost and how much we have to pay and we can factor that in. If you compare it properly, like with like, it is a good deal. Sometimes, PPPs—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, I am not.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Strange that you should say that. Infrastructure Partnerships Australia says exactly that. Let me quote them again:

Public private partnerships are the best method available to Australia's governments to deliver large, complex and expensive projects, achieving significant savings in both time and cost.

So, it is not only me that is saying that: that is what the industry is saying about it; that is what Infrastructure Partnerships Australia is saying. There is always a question: is a particular contract that is being offered to the state good value? Some might be, some may not be. In this case, this is a good value contract, and all of the details will be available to all the members opposite and the media and everybody else in the world to examine and to make their decision, but we do not have that available to us now because we have yet to sign the contract. I know that this is a difficult thing for the opposition to accept, but that is the reality.

HISTORY FESTIVAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:08): My question is to the Premier in his capacity as Minister for the Arts. Can the Premier outline some of the events taking place this year to celebrate South Australia's rich and diverse history in this significant year of 175 years of European settlement in the state?

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) (15:08): I thank the honourable member who has a strong history in history, and I will talk about that in a minute. On Tuesday night the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts launched History SA's History Festival. With the assistance of the government, History SA has extended this fascinating festival to a month-long event to commemorate 175 years of European settlement in South Australia.

We have provided a grant worth \$229,000 to History SA to establish a community grant program to commemorate our state's 175th anniversary of European settlement and to support the expansion of About Time: South Australia's History Festival. The grant program is investing in a large range of community-led events and initiatives across the state. I am confident that this history festival will be a success. Members would have received a program in April, and I encourage all to attend as many of the events over the month as possible. The program is substantial and covers the whole state. Importantly, in commemorating 175 years of European settlement in SA, we must also acknowledge and celebrate the significant and ancient Aboriginal culture that predates this settlement.

It is pleasing to see that there are activities both within the festival and throughout the year that acknowledge this important aspect of South Australia's history. One such example includes the creation of an interpretive trail, highlighting the lives of prominent Kurna women, such as Kudnarto, the SA175 community grant program providing funds to Kildare College to assist in the creation of this trail.

As part of SA175 commemoration events happening throughout the year, the Migration Museum will present an exhibition in 2011 exploring population identity and generation changes in our state. Also, History SA has partnered with the Department of Education and Children's Services to present the Bound for South Australia website, a digital re-enactment of the journey made 175 years ago by nine ships that came to South Australia in 1836. The Art Gallery of South Australia will stage an exhibition on colonial art that will open on 4 November 2011. I particularly want to mention one thing—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much background noise.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —that will be of great interest to the member for Florey, the member for Ashford and many others in this place. I am sure, in fact, that they would be very disappointed if I did not mention the events that will be taking place here in Parliament House to celebrate the history of our state's modern democracy, as laid out on page 19 of the program. The activities include extended tours of Parliament House and parliamentary-style debates for school years 5 to 12, as well as a display in Centre Hall organised by the Muriel Matters Society.

Formed to recognise the achievements of Bowden-born Muriel Lilah Matters (1877-1969), the society, with the assistance of the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Assembly, has acquired one of the original 18 sections of the Ladies' Gallery of the House of Commons that Muriel chained herself to on 28 October 1908. Muriel had already voted twice in elections in South Australia—the first place in the world to grant women dual suffrage—when she arrived in London in 1905, and she soon became a full-time organiser for the Women's Freedom League (WFL).

With the kind assistance of the Palace of Westminster, the South Australian parliament took delivery of a section of the ironwork, dating back to the 1850s, in October 2010. This week, with the kind permission of the Museum of London, the original chains worn by Muriel that fateful night, along with the WFL prison badge awarded to Muriel on her release from prison, have arrived to take pride of place in the Grille Exhibition. In conjunction with the exhibition, which will be in place until January 2012, the society has prepared a presentation on Muriel's early life in Adelaide, particularly her association with Lionel Logue of *The Kings Speech* fame, and then her life in England.

The play *Why Muriel Matters* debuted for the centenary of her return visit to Adelaide in June 1910 and will be performed in suburban theatres in early June this year, prior to a regional tour.

The SPEAKER: Order! Too much background noise!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have seen the play and it is outstanding—and also the singing is outstanding.

Finally, I am pleased to announce that History SA is developing a digital exhibition, called Every Street Tells a Story, supported by a grant from the government's new Major Exhibitions Fund. I encourage all members to participate in the many activities throughout our month-long history festival or indeed any one of the events occurring this year.

As for Muriel Matters, I think that, with the Bowden development, we should—and I am sure I get agreement from all ministers involved—given that Muriel Matters was born there, have some kind of recognition of that in the Bowden development. I will not suggest a mural for Muriel, but maybe one of the streets, or maybe some public art, to recognise a South Australian who had a major impact on the world.

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that the Fraser Institute, which he has described as 'influential and respected', has downgraded South Australia's world ranking for mining infrastructure from 18th in 2003-04 to 38th currently? Is that why we now have 16 per cent fewer jobs in the state than we had way back in 1985?

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) (15:15): Isn't it interesting? This is the mindset that the opposition has.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We've gone from four mines under them to approved 16 mines. There are another 25 or 30 coming. We've got the world's biggest mine coming next year. We've also got, of course, the decision this year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the decision this year which has just been announced to open up Woomera, which as the minister said—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —another country chock-a-block full of mineral wealth. More is happening under this government in mining than occurred during the time of every single previous Liberal government added together, but still you whinge. We have got a challenge with infrastructure. It is a challenge we relish, and the Minister for Infrastructure and I were there having meetings in Jinan, Shanghai and Beijing—all of which, by the way, are in China—on the issue of infrastructure with private sector investment for the future, in my view, guaranteed.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert, behave yourself.

HOUSING SA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Why has Shared Services taken over Housing SA's financial services, and I quote from the SA Housing Trust board minutes, 'Housing SA was the only statutory authority—'

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is a courtesy to the house to seek its leave before explaining a question.

Ms CHAPMAN: It's in the question. Would you like me to repeat the question, Madam Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: —just for the benefit of the member for Elder? Why has Shared Services taken over Housing SA's financial services, and I quote from the SA Housing Trust board minutes, 'Housing SA was the only statutory authority that Shared Services requested taking over the financial accounting process.'

The SPEAKER: Member for Bragg, I think you did have your explanation mixed up with your question. However, the minister can choose to answer it. Minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:18): The member for Bragg gives us a quote from Housing Trust board minutes but gives us no detail of those board minutes.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The date? When was it?

An honourable member: We ask the questions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Shared Services was established to provide savings across government in a whole range of management of financial services, and Housing SA is a part of that.

HOUSING SA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:18): I have another question for the Minister for Housing, especially given the last answer. My question is: does the minister therefore support the Shared Services model in which Housing SA now pays 7 per cent more for using Shared Services SA than for those services when provided in-house? The board minutes of SA Housing Trust state:

Housing SA pays a significant amount more to Shared Services than it used to cost for the same in-house services...Housing SA will increase its cost for these services by about 7 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, did you wish to answer that question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:20): It is interesting that the member for Bragg comes in here trying to give the impression that she somehow supports public housing here in South Australia. We know that when they were in government it was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order?

Mr WILLIAMS: Irrelevance and debate. The question was seeking to make—

The SPEAKER: Sit down, there's no point of order at this stage, she's only just started her answer. I will listen and see what she says.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There was debate in the question; if you put debate in the question there's debate in the answer. Minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Madam Speaker, we know they do not support public housing, they never have.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: That is both debate and clearly wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will finish her answer.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They were on the route of decimating—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —public housing here in South Australia. If they had been elected at the last election we know the horrendous things that they were going to do to our tenants.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In relation to the member for Bragg's assertions, I think I will be checking what she says. We know that she has come into this place on numerous occasions and made some wonderful assertions that turned out to be absolute fantasy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —like the day she lost Steve Ramsey, the Deputy Executive Director of Families SA. Apparently he was missing somewhere, but we do know now that he was found at his desk. So, before I respond to assertions that the member for Bragg makes, I will check the validity of her comments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

MINISTER FOR HEALTH'S REMARKS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:21): Yesterday in this place the Minister for Health, John Hill, deliberately smeared the name of Dr Jim Katsaros. There was a clear inference that Dr Katsaros was the source of the leak of the Macquarie Bank documents that have been circulated. This is an outrageous inference.

The police minister, by interjection, said, 'He leaked it, he leaked it,' and when I challenged him across the chamber, 'Say that outside,' the police minister again said, 'He leaked it'—a direct reference to Dr Jim Katsaros. If you doubt my word, go and watch ABC television news last night because you can clearly see what the police minister was doing there yesterday. In the chamber yesterday, and I will read from *Hansard*, the health minister said:

I do not have a copy of the Macquarie document. Unlike Jim Katsaros, I am not a subscriber to the high wealth group who are provided with this document.

How did the minister know who was provided with a copy of this document? How did he know this? Was he making this up? Was this a lucky guess? Did he make this up or did he or one of his staffers contact Macquarie Bank and say, 'Who has got the document?' We know this is 'Retribution 101' by this government. They chase people down, they try and they try, and they run them into the ground.

So, what did he do? There are two choices. He made it up or he phoned Macquarie Bank. If he phoned Macquarie Bank and they gave the minister that information, that is a disgraceful thing for Macquarie Bank to do. The minister, by releasing Dr Katsaros's name as one of a 'high wealth group who are provided with this document', is again slurring Dr Katsaros and is a clear breach of Dr Katsaros's confidentiality if he has subscribed to this document—if he has.

If the minister is making this up, that is an absolute disgrace and he should resign. If the minister has contacted Macquarie Bank or his staff have contacted Macquarie Bank and because of the information acquired from the Macquarie Bank he is then able to slur Dr Katsaros under privilege in this place, he should resign. It is an outrageous breach of Dr Katsaros's confidentiality in this matter that the minister comes in here and continues the slur campaign, which we saw go right back to before the last election. They try and slur and disparage the character of the good Dr Katsaros. We saw it again in this place today.

The minister must explain to this house whether he or his officers contacted Macquarie Bank. He has to come and explain that. He needs to explain to this house how he knows, as he said on ABC TV yesterday, that this leaked document was different from the original document.

The minister said on ABC radio yesterday afternoon, 'It's a refabrication of the original document because it doesn't contain the watermarks which would identify the person who leaked it. I haven't seen either of these documents.' What? Was he told to avert his eyes when his officers said, 'Don't look, minister. We've got the documents. They're not quite the same as the original documents. Don't look. Don't watch. Don't listen.' This is typical crisis management: deny, deny, deny; deflect, deflect, deflect.

The outrageous slur that has been maintained by the health minister and the police minister is completely debunked by Dr Katsaros himself. This morning, I went and saw Dr Katsaros, and I have here a statutory declaration signed by Dr Katsaros this morning. I will read from it:

I, James Katsaros

Of 174 Ward Street North Adelaide South Australia 5006 do solemnly and sincerely declare

That I did not release, leak or divulge information contained in the Macquarie Private Bank document 'New Royal Adelaide Hospital Equity Information Presentation'.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of provision of the Oaths Act, 1936, as amended.

Dr Katsaros did not release this document, so this minister must apologise. He needs to come in and apologise and do it today.

I also spoke to Dr Ken Rollond this morning—another person who has been implicated by this government. I spoke to Dr Ken Rollond and Ken Rollond has not even seen the document. How could he spread this document? He has not even seen the document. Here again, we have this government, this minister and the police minister doing their very best. They come in here and tell lies about people's reputations; they smear, they disparage. It is just an absolute disgrace. The minister either needs to resign or come back in here and apologise forthwith. It is not good enough for him to just walk away, use coward's castle to have a go at Dr Katsaros once again. We know he has a track record on this. He needs to stop it. He needs to come clean with South Australia and admit the fact that there is this massive blowout in this hospital's cost, and we need to make sure that South Australians get the picture.

Time expired.

HISTORY FESTIVAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:27): I would like to thank the Premier for his remarks today drawing the public's attention to the significant contributions that are going to be made towards the History Trust's 'About Time' activities this month. I would like to elaborate.

The Women in Parliament program, which is being undertaken by our Education Officer, Penny Cavanagh, invites South Australians to discover the parliament's unique history in regard to political rights for women in Australia and internationally. People are invited to take an extended tour of Parliament House to learn about innovative legislation passed in this state and to discover different perspectives on South Australia's significant contribution to the history of women in parliament.

I know that we are also hoping to have the monster petition on display at some point, and that is going to be a very interesting thing for people to see. The signatures are already digitised and available to the public, so I hope schools all over the state will take advantage of this being available.

The other activity is being undertaken by the parliamentary library. They will display a selection of South Australiana from the Parliament's rare book collection. The books were not acquired as rare books but for use by early South Australian parliaments for the business of their day and have become rare and valuable over time. I know that Coral and her staff are very keen to look after people who are interested in having a look at our rare book collection. There are many wonderful volumes in our library.

Perhaps most interesting for me, and I hope everybody else, will be the amazing coup that we have been able to achieve here in South Australia by reuniting for the first time anywhere in the world the artefacts involved with the grille protest in the House of Commons in 1908 undertaken by our own South Australian woman Muriel Matters. It was a way that women wanted to draw attention to the fact that they were isolated from the workings of parliament. The grille was seen as a barrier to women's participation in democracy and became a symbol for the votes for women's struggle.

As the Premier said, Muriel had already voted twice before she arrived in London, so it was difficult for her to understand why women were having such obstacles placed before them to be involved in the political process. The interesting thing is that on the night in question, Muriel and another woman had secreted some rather heavy chains, which will be available for you all to see, under their cloaks. They had been secured to their bodies by belts which were under their blouses. This, of course, placed an interesting obstacle in the path of the police and attendants when they tried to remove the women who had chained themselves to the ironwork during a disturbance that had been raised by some friends in the Strangers Gallery. To get the women out of the area, it was necessary to remove the grille from the wall and, by doing so, it actually placed the women on the floor of the House of Commons. That is how we can claim that Muriel Matters was the first woman to ever speak in the House of Commons, and this claim has not been refuted on either side of the equator. So we have great pleasure in bringing this exhibition to you here in South Australia.

Muriel managed to speak for over half an hour, and her words have been kept on record through the newspapers of the day. Interestingly enough, she and the other woman who was

chained—a woman called Helen Fox—were escorted from the gallery attached to the pieces of ironwork and taken down the corridor to a committee room where a blacksmith filed them off the grille. They were not arrested for this particular form of defiance; rather, they were given the opportunity to go around to the front of the parliament where the Women's Freedom League was actually protesting that evening. However, Muriel and her friend, Violet Tillard, were two of the 14 who were arrested that night. They subsequently spent a month in prison.

I guess the most interesting thing has been the work that has been done by the clerk of the house—and we thank him wholeheartedly; through the speaker as well—in working through the paperwork necessary to have the loan of the grille from the Palace of Westminster. Finding and locating the extra portions of grille was in itself an adventure. They are to be commended for their tenacity.

Also, we want to thank our friends at the Museum of London, particularly Beverley and Nikos, who have worked with us and The Board there to arrange the loan of the chains and the prison brooch. As I said, it is the first time that any artefacts of this nature have been lent to us so willingly by other institutions. I know that we are actually the envy of a lot of the institutions here in South Australia, many of whom are quite flabbergasted that we have been able to achieve this. I commend the exhibition to all members and hope they will take an interest in it.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:32): I rise on the question of government honesty and accountability. In particular, I refer to the hospital proposed for the rail yards and the sale of forward rotations of timber from our South-East forests. These two proposals are nothing more than a big, fat privatisation. It is a Labor lie and a broken pledge. How this government or any member of it can complain about the former Liberal government's lease of ETSA and in the same breath claim that this hospital and a forward sale of timber from our forests is not a privatisation beggars belief. How can one be decried as a privatisation and the other held up as sound government practice? It is a Labor lie. They promised there would be no more privatisations and they are merrily going about selling off the farm.

I want to talk for a moment about public-private partnerships. This is the disguise Labor is using to break its pledge to the people of South Australia. On this side of the house we do not object in principle to public-private partnerships, but this government did not honestly tell the people of South Australia the details of their rail yards hospital deal before the election. They misled the people of South Australia, in my view, quite dishonestly.

In my view, there is a need for a special report into how we account for public-private partnerships works by the Auditor-General. I want to outline to the house evidence given to the Public Works Committee this week by the Auditor-General. I was pleased to hear that, once financial close on the hospital has been effected, the Auditor-General will be initiating an audit into the procurement process, the public sector comparator and its use in valuation of the proponents' bids, and the selection of the preferred proponent, including aspects of financial close and contracts.

But sadly, I tell the house, this will not be done until after financial close. It will be too late for us to have this information before the taxpayers are signed up to the deal. I am concerned that the Auditor may need to come back to the parliament if he does not have full powers to order and monitor the public private partnership build throughout the process. This is beyond the actual opening, because it is a privatisation of the hospital and is being built by a private consortia. If he needs to come back for further powers there is cause for concern.

We do not know if the Auditor-General will provide a special report to the parliament or include his findings in his annual report. But sadly it will be after the deal is done, as I have mentioned, beyond the point of no return. The taxpayers of South Australia will have been committed to this multi-billion-dollar farrago over 35 years without having given the government a mandate for it.

The Auditor-General has not ruled out seeking an independent legal opinion on the legitimacy of the government's secret crown law advice that the hospital PPP does not need to come before the Public Works Committee. Any reasonable reading of the act, particularly section 16a(1), sees that this work is a construction where the cost is being met by the parliament or a state instrumentality, and it is being constructed on behalf of the Crown, and it is being constructed on land of the Crown.

Why keep that advice secret? I call on the Auditor-General to obtain that independent advice and provide it to the parliament. The taxpayers of South Australia are looking to him, who the Premier has described as the independent watchdog to keep our money safe, and to alert us of concerns about public works spending, be it on hospitals, desal plants or stadiums that have not been subject to thorough scrutiny. One word from him on this and it would change the entire debate.

The Auditor-General has also raised concerns about whether the stadium deal will be subject to a full audit as a normal public work because the stadium management authority, in his words, 'is a non-government concern that may not be subject to public finance and audit legislation'.

This government has no mandate for this particular public private partnership. All South Australians should now lobby this government not to sign the agreement, and the government must reveal the date and the place of the intended signing. This must become a campaign. This deal must not be signed.

The public sector comparator must be immediately released. The government must present an alternative plan to build the hospital based on a government borrow and build as a standard public work so that we can see which deal is better for the taxpayers. The Premier and the Treasurer must justify why it is necessary that our constituents pay the consortia 15 per cent interest, or more, when we can borrow on their behalf at around five per cent—one third of the cost.

This is Labor madness. There is no mandate for it. It is a privatisation, plain and simple. The deal must not be signed as planned until the business case against the government borrow and build has been made. This should be done both in the parliament and through the Public Works Committee.

My personal view is that members in this house should be asking themselves whether they should pass Supply until or before this matter is openly disclosed. The last time Labor was in government it bankrupted the state through uncontrolled spending by a privately run bank underwritten by the taxpayers. Here we go again. A privately run hospital underwritten by the taxpayers. Up to \$10 billion to \$11 billion to be forked out over 35 years, possibly more. If it goes ahead, this hospital, this stinking, rotting, dud deal will become an epitaph over the political graves of the Premier, the former treasurer, the current Treasurer and this festering Labor government.

Time expired.

DUNCAN, DR G.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:39): As a very proud member of Rainbow Labor, and a long-time anti-discrimination campaigner, I was honoured today to be invited to address a commemoration service for the late Dr George Ian Ogilvie Duncan which will be held next Tuesday, 10 May, at 1pm. The service is being held at the footbridge over the Torrens near the Barr Smith Lawns. Some people may remember that 39 years ago, Dr Duncan, then as a 41 year old, drowned in the Torrens river. I was at the service in 2002, where the Hon. Sandra Kanck, the Hon. Ian Hunter, who was then secretary of the ALP, and I saw the unveiling of the monument erected near the site of that murder.

The memorial inscription really does summarise the need for commemorating Dr George Duncan. It says:

In memory of Dr George Duncan whose death by drowning on 10 May 1972 near here, at the hands of persons unconvicted, precipitated homosexual law reform in South Australia, making it the first state in Australia in 1975 to decriminalise homosexual relations.

The history of this legislation is very interesting as well, and I understand that Liberal member of the Legislative Council Murray Hill introduced a bill in July 1972 to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 that decriminalised homosexuality. It was an interesting approach, I thought, to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The amendment was assented to in November 1972 but I am told was actually diminished in its form, as it only allowed a legal defence—again, another interesting aspect—for homosexual acts committed in private.

In 1972, under the Dunstan government, the Labor member for Elizabeth, Peter Duncan, introduced the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Bill into parliament and it was passed in this house, the House of Assembly. This bill was then defeated twice in the Legislative Council—again, some lessons that can be learnt, I think, from current times. I am advised that on 27 August 1975 the unaltered bill was again introduced, defeated, reintroduced, defeated, reintroduced and, on the

third time, passed. All that happened on the same day, apparently, so I guess we can be grateful for some things. South Australia became the first Australian state to fully decriminalise homosexuality.

The agenda is still with us, however. The agenda today is to address other forms of discrimination based on sexuality, transexuality and also sexual orientation. This agenda includes issues in regard to same-sex parenting rights (which a number of us in both this house and the Legislative Council, particularly the Hon. Ian Hunter, are trying to progress), extending anti-discrimination and vilification rights and, also, the campaign for same-sex marriage rights.

I hope that members of this house will pass a thought on 10 May for Dr George Duncan who, unfortunately by his death, has precipitated great anti-discrimination legislation.

MARINE PARKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:43): On a number of occasions I have spoken in this house about the government's proposed marine park zoning—sometimes known as sanctuary zones, no-go zones or exclusion zones—and members are well aware of the government's draft proposal to introduce these zones pursuant to the provisions of the Marine Park Act 2007.

They have issued a draft. I have canvassed issues in respect of the consultation process; the scientific modelling and data; the adverse impact on coastal communities and families in particular; recreational fishing and the lifestyle aspects in that regard; the adverse impact on food producers, processors and consumers (with, ultimately, higher prices of food); and the adverse impact on the value of land, whether that be coastal land or investment by urban dwellers in holiday homes or equipment, caravans, tents, camping and fishing gear. Whether you own a boat or beach house, this is an issue that affects thousands—hundreds of thousands—of people across South Australia.

Today I specifically raise the question of cost. The state budget is imminent. There have been a number of statements made by the current minister and former ministers as to the question of costs, and I wish to place on the record a number of those statements. First, the former treasurer commissioned the Sustainable Budget Commission report, which has been published. Prior to that being published, a leaked copy of the Sustainable Budget Commission report was made public, and that proposed a cost saving for the development of marine parks over the next three years, being a 40 per cent cut on those costs.

Given the proposed cut and the estimate, the total over four years for the development of the marine parks (that is, to pay people to draw up these plans, consult, advertise, draw up pamphlets and draw up the drafts, etc.) is approximately \$8 million. So, that was the first clue to what has been currently spent before we even implement any zones within marine parks which will need, in some way, some supervision.

The matter was particularly acute after statements were made by David Hall, a former director of fisheries, in the public arena when he estimated a cost of \$250 million per year, as I understand it, to adequately service and supervise a sanctuary-zone process within the marine parks model.

That resulted during April in a number of statements being made, particularly on radio, about this matter. On the ABC on 28 April 2011, Neil MacDonald, the Deputy Chair of the South Australian Marine Parks Management Alliance, answered questions about the projected cost of managing marine parks as a result of a Cambridge University study which suggested that the cost was something like \$2,600 per year per square kilometre to do that.

He declined to confirm whether that would result in costing some \$70 million a year to look after South Australian parks, although it does seem clear that there is a substantial cost in undertaking any supervision, irrespective of the size of the park. Chris Thomas from the department was also questioned by Mr Ian Henschke about this matter, and his answers were along the lines that it is not certain yet as to what that will be because the design phase is still underway, but he acknowledged that there was a \$17.5 million a year cost just to run one marine park (much larger admittedly), the Great Barrier Reef.

We are left somewhat in the dark still about what the costs will be, but, given that it is costing us \$2 million a year just to prepare for having parks, we can expect that, on the information already available, this is going to be a very expensive exercise. That may well be justified in the end, but what I ask is this: what will it cost, when will we know that and who will pay for it? What has happened to date—

Time expired.

OVERSEAS CHINESE ASSOCIATION

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:47): I wish to speak today about an event I attended recently with the Overseas Chinese Association to mark the 30th anniversary of that group in South Australia. At the event I was very pleased to be joined by the Lieutenant-Governor of South Australia and the Chairman of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, Mr Hieu Van Le; Mr John Kiosoglous, Chair of the Ethnic Schools Board; Mr Tung Shen Chin, President of the Overseas Chinese Association of South Australia; the member for Croydon; the member for Wright; and many other community leaders who have an affection for this association and the contribution that it makes to our state.

For over 30 years, the Overseas Chinese Association has been providing invaluable support to the Chinese community here in South Australia and to the newly-arrived migrants from all over Asia. Of course, the history of Chinese settlement in South Australia goes back much farther than that. The Chinese were one of the state's first migrant groups, with settlers arriving to our state in the 1830s. Indeed, if you visit the cove at Robe you will find a memorial to the Chinese who walked from Robe to the goldfields in Victoria.

South Australia would be a very different place today, both culturally and economically, if it were not for the incredible contribution of the Chinese community. The heart of the Chinese community is located in the Central Market, and, of course, that is often said to be the heart of Adelaide. So everyone who visits South Australia, both tourists and locals alike, witnesses the presence and influence of the Chinese community on our state and what a wonderful and fundamental role it plays in our everyday life here.

The state government strongly believes in supporting Chinese business in South Australia, and recently the Premier returned from a trip to China, where he conducted a number of meetings to strengthen this great relationship and trade and economic benefits between both nations.

The Overseas Chinese Association plays a valuable role not only in looking after the elders of its cultural heritage, but also in the young people who will carry the Mandarin language forward for generations to come. Each week, on a Saturday, when you go to visit the site down at Findon at the old primary school there, you will see hundreds of students learning Chinese, both of Chinese background and also of mainstream Australian background, people who have worked abroad and realise the significance that Mandarin will play in the future of their children's economic and work life in our nation, as China is now one of the largest—if not currently the largest—trading partners we have.

The Overseas Chinese Association has provided guidance and support and mentoring, not only to their own community but to the wider Asian community, so I would like to thank them for their support of multiculturalism, for their support of the growth of our state and for their economic ethos of hard work and teaching a new generation a language that is important for our nation and our state's prosperity. From their humble beginnings 30 years ago they have grown into one of the strongest and most active community groups in our state and their contribution has been fundamentally providing hope to many people. I would like to congratulate them and wish them well for many, many years to come and applaud them for their great leadership over the last 30 years.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (TATTOOING, BODY PIERCING AND BODY MODIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May 2011.)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:55): I would like to thank all the honourable members who made contributions in relation to the debate on this matter, and in particular, of course, my learned friend the honourable member for Bragg, whose contribution was as always thorough and in this case, exceedingly thorough, canvassing matters as diverse as fireworks and the consumption of companion animals as mere asides in the matter.

It was very helpful and, actually, I think there were many points made by the honourable member that do warrant serious reflection and consideration, and I will address those now because

I think it is probably as good a time as any. First of all, there were some remarks made about the time that was taken for this piece of legislation to come to this point. I can only say that—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: It didn't take you long once you became A-G.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No. I was elected, as was the honourable member, in the early part of 2002, and I believe that I received permission and, indeed, support from my colleagues to draft a bill in relation to these matters in about March 2002. I did so and I introduced it in private members' time. It went through this place. It then went into the other place, where a particular political persuasion, which is now extinct, formed a view about the inalienable right of all children to mutilate their bodies permanently, and it became cul-de-sac'd in there.

There was then a prorogation of the parliament, and the then Hon. Nick Xenophon (now Senator Xenophon) saw fit after the proroguing of the parliament to reanimate the legislation up there. It eventually came back here with a large number of amendments and then went off to a committee.

The committee was a committee, obviously, of interested members: the minister for primary industries, the Minister for Families and Communities and I were on the committee, as indeed were the former member for Newland—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —sorry—the former member for Morialta and the esteemed and greatly missed former member for Stuart. I can assure the honourable member for Bragg that his contribution throughout the work of this committee was outstanding, and if the honourable member for Bragg had had the opportunity of being there I am sure her head would be nodding. She would have been not surprised by the contributions made by the former member of the Stuart, but she would have been enchanted, I think—enchanted is the word.

The bill has been in and about for a long time and I think, as the honourable member for Bragg mentioned, the member for Fisher had a bill a year or so before mine, and the Hon. Dennis Hood put in proposals broadly along these lines, so there has been a great deal of discussion about this matter around the place.

There are a couple of matters of principle here, and I really gather, from what the honourable member for Bragg and her parliamentary colleagues had to say yesterday, that we are not actually tremendously far apart in terms of our objectives. I think it is a general consensus that there are certain sorts of things that one would hope nobody under 18 would have done to them, and one certainly would not want it to be lawful for these things to be done to them under any circumstances. Speaking entirely for myself, there are some things that I, quite frankly, think there is no call for at all. I accept that an adult person of sound mind probably can consent to any number of things which, perhaps, a prudent person would not, but that is another matter. The predominant thrust of this is to give some protection to minors.

The question as to what material was provided to us by way of the consultation, as I indicated and as the honourable member conceded yesterday, is a matter that has been in the throes of an FOI application, and it is entirely appropriate that it be dealt with in the ordinary course in that way. I can honestly say to the honourable member that the second reading explanation fairly and accurately outlines the range of opinions that were offered in the course of the consultation and does say that there were remarks made about different things.

To give one example, the original bill that was circulated did not permit some of the piercings for minors aged 16 and over that the current version does. The honourable member might recall that the original version of the bill basically had what you could do under 18 and what you could do over 18. A whole range of things were basically moved into the permissible 'with permission' category as a result of the consultation, so the consultation was not a Clayton's consultation. It was one that took into account the views expressed by people making submissions.

However, in saying that, I do not suggest for a moment that every single suggestion made in the course of the consultation was accepted. There are reasons for that and I will, where they are pertinent, try to identify them because that might assist the honourable member and others in understanding how we got to where we are.

There are a number of individual matters that I need to address because they were referred to by the member for Bragg in her submissions. Before I get to those, I will make a couple of comments in general terms about this type of offence. First of all, this is a complaint-driven

offence. It is the sort of offence, unlike most road traffic offences but like most offences, that commences with a person who considers themselves to be a victim of an abuse of the law complaining to the police. Quite clearly, if somebody, who is a minor, is of a mind to have themselves tattooed because they think it is a good idea, it is pretty unlikely that that person will then subsequently complain about the person from whom they obtained the tattoo.

Likewise, regarding these body modifications which are presently not prohibited but if the bill is passed will become prohibited, it would not surprise me if there was not an avalanche of prosecutions because a person who is under 18 and wishes to have an intimate piercing or a tattoo or something is, one would have thought, highly unlikely to subsequently turn around and go to the police station and point their finger at the person who did it and say, 'Prosecute them.' That just does not stand to reason.

Some of the philosophical underpinning of the member for Bragg's contribution about where is the mischief that we are seeking to cure, how many complaints have there been, how many prosecutions have there been and this sort of stuff, is, with respect, in the context of this particular area, probably not a helpful or informative way of approaching the nature or extent of the problem.

The second thing is that the current legislation inasmuch as it refers to anything, and it is only basically tattooing, is quite frankly weak and inadequate. The honourable member, I think, said as much in terms of the remarks she made about the need for the penalties to be increased for these types of things and her general support for that. Again, weak and inadequate legislation, which has to be complaint driven, is unlikely to attract a great deal of attention or effort by anybody, not least of which being the police. Those are some general comments.

The first thing about the prohibition of taking of deposits: the prohibition of taking deposits was the subject of complaint during the consultation process. That complaint was considered, and I think it is fair to say that the tattoo lobby (if there is such a thing) was of the view that their not being able to take a deposit when they have to spend time preparing things and they have to set aside time to their bookings and so on was not a reasonable restriction to have imposed on them. Bearing in mind that the bill that was actually put out for consultation did not contain a cooling-off period, the major driver for the deposit prohibition probably was pretty well gone. We listened to that as a result of the consultation and we took it out, and that is why we took it out.

The question about having a cooling off period: I was mortified by the tongue lashing I received from the honourable member about the ludicrous nature of possibly having a cooling-off period and how it would be strange to compare something like this with the purchase of a car or a house or something of that nature. The honourable member was here yesterday afternoon when the honourable member for Adelaide got up and said it was a pretty good idea. Perhaps I am not the only person who might have strayed into that little thought process. Anyway, we did not consult on that and, aside from the honourable member for Adelaide, no-one else asked us to do it, so we have not included it. There again, we are listening.

That really covers the cooling-off period. I make no apology for this: I started off in 2002 advocating a cooling off period. The honourable member asked why. The reason why is quite simple. To the extent that the folklore about impulse tattooing has any force, it struck me at the time that a person being required to reflect hopefully soberly, at least for a short period of time during the 48 hour period, it may reconsider whether they wish to go ahead with this.

Something about the nature of these things needs to be understood, and this might be a matter where there is not general agreement on this, but quite frankly tattooing, body piercing, body modification, etc. in the Australian context is not an artefact of culture in the sense that it might be for a Maori or for the Brazilian tribes the honourable member talked about who have their lips done and all that sort of business. It is not a traditional requisite of membership of society. What it is is an artefact of popular culture, if that is not an oxymoron. So popular culture, being what it is, is a moving target. I am old enough to remember a time—

Mr Venning: And wise enough.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Wise is a moot point. But I am old enough to recall a time when people like Austin Powers walked our streets. Real people like Austin Powers walked our streets, people going, 'Groovy, baby' and dressed in strange costumes. I know the honourable member for Bragg is a bit too young for this but Carnaby Street, Haight Ashbury, Woodstock, Canned Heat, Bob Dylan—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The Grateful Dead.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Grateful Dead. In fact—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Thunderclap Newman.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thunderclap Newman. The honourable member for Croydon has got them all. This is actually quite good. Who else was at the Isle of Wight?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Joni Mitchell wasn't there.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, she wasn't. Leonard Cohen was at the Isle of Wight. He sang pretty well exactly the same songs on the Isle of Wight in 1969 as the ones he sang in Adelaide a few months ago.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That's what we paid for.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's right. Isn't it interesting that very little that these others have done since they turned 25 has actually added to their body of work. Anyway, we are going off onto another point.

Ms Chapman: Body of art.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Body of art, indeed. In fact, Einstein wrote his last great work when he was in his 20s and spent the next 40 years of his life trying to complete the circle.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I do not think so, but he might have had one of the moon landing things afterwards. I am not sure. I have not explored that particular topic. Anyway, the point is that these things, at best, are artefacts of popular culture, whatever standing that might have. Like bell-bottom jeans, high-waisted jeans—the ones you had to zip up very, very tight, which was uncomfortable for the gentlemen and were best not worn by some ladies—those things are now no longer with us. Witches britches—you have probably never heard of them.

Ms Chapman: Hot pants.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Hot pants.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Witches britches—I will explain them to you later. All of these things were artefacts of fashion and, in their day, were considered the high couture—is that the right word?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Haute couture.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's it, exactly. People would actually allow themselves to dress in these ridiculous costumes and prance around the place, and they thought they were terribly cool. They would be at the Spaghetti Machine, the Arkaba Hotel or the Old Lion, collecting the rubber chicken that they had to pretend to consume in order to still be there late at night. The honourable member knows what I am talking about.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And *Saturday Night Fever*, exactly. Who could forget that—John Travolta's look? The honourable member cannot remember this because she is far too young, but there was a time when men in Adelaide dressed like John Travolta and went out to local hotels and danced around to Bee Gees songs and threw their arms up in the air. They usually were not as good as him. The moonwalk had not yet been invented and the clutching of the groin was not a normal part of the dance routine, but there were some strange things that went on. I know I have gone into this in some detail, but it is important to make the point.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Set the scene.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Exactly; I am setting the scene. The point I am trying to make is this: all of those behaviours, silly though they were, were reversible. I remember friends of mine—I will not name them—whose hair went from being straight to very, very curly, and these were men. And other men—

Mr Venning: Is that why yours is white, John?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, I admit that I have been dying my hair a bit for the last few years, but other men used to dye their hair quite often—changing colours all the time. Again, one might regard this as silly—one won't, but one might—but one could at least comfort oneself in the knowledge that these things were reversible. All one had to do was slip off those—what were those very high-waisted jeans called, where they had three buttons at the top?

Ms Chapman: Uncomfortable.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Uncomfortable. Yes, they were very uncomfortable. Anyway, one could take those off and put on a pair of trackie pants and be sort of normal—just like that. The point is that what we are talking about here are artefacts of popular culture which are not reversible. For example, to have the word 'skins' tattooed on your forehead to demonstrate your affiliation with a particular group of gentlemen might seem like a fantastic idea at the time. The fact that you do it in the mirror to yourself makes it worse because it comes out as 'sniks'. Question: do you wish to do this for the rest of your life and be associated with this for the rest of your life?

The great author, Theodore Dalrymple, in one of his many magnificent books, talks about a fellow who had the words 'no fear' tattooed on his head. When he was taking the medical history from this fellow in prison, he asked him whether he had had any serious illnesses. He said no, but he noticed all these gashes over the bloke's head which had healed up more or less. He asked, 'Have you ever been in a fight?' He said 'Yes.' 'Has anything ever happened to you?' and he said 'Yes, I have been knocked unconscious.' He regarded that as an insignificant medical history. Apparently it had happened to him almost every time he went to the pub because he would go to the pub, order a pint, look at some bloke with the words 'no fear' tattooed on his head and the fellow would say 'No fear, hey?' and he used to get glassed. I think that is the expression for it. This was obviously not a wise career move for this fellow, not to mention making socialisation in public houses difficult.

This is a really simple point: there is a qualitative and quantitative difference between popular culture which you can take on or off or wash out of your hair or let your hair grow or whatever it might be and stuff that is irreversible and cannot be changed and you wind up looking like that lady in that pot and pan ad.

An honourable member: Circulon.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Circulon lady. That is what we are worried about. We are worried about Circulon ladies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As the Attorney-General gives me this space to speak, I would like to point out that we are not in any way maligning any particular brand of kitchen good.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I just wanted to set that scene because it is actually a materially different situation to all these other things. I know that the honourable member has asked why we are bothering to go through all of this stuff. The reason that we are bothering to go through it is because it is a bit more significant than flared pants or a funny haircut. That is the reason, and it cannot be fixed up. I gather there is no argument about tattooing minors; I gather there is no argument about intimate body piercing. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (OFFENCES RELATING TO INSTRUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 March 2011.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:18): I rise to speak on the Controlled Substances (Offences Relating to Instructions) Amendment Bill 2011. I indicate firstly that the opposition considers that this bill should not be passed in its present form, and I will be foreshadowing a number of amendments.

The bill that is before us was introduced by the Attorney-General on 10 March 2011, just less than two months ago, and it followed an election commitment outlined in the ALP community safety policy, which I think was then launched by the Premier. The former attorney-general (the member for Croydon) was apparently responsible for its carriage through the caucus, and it claimed as follows:

South Australia's drug paraphernalia laws will be amended to restrict the availability of material which informs people on how to cultivate or manufacture drugs. By making it an offence to possess such material, it will close the current loophole identified in the existing law. By banning the possession of such material, the proposal will restrict the sale and production of publications that inform people how to grow, cultivate or make illegal drugs. The possession of the material will be an offence under the Controlled Substances Act 1984 section 33LA.

What I want to say about that is that this was a policy suggesting that this will be introduced, if the government was re-elected, to in some way remedy a loophole and some failure to be able to provide protection under the law that then existed. The truth is that the current offence as applied in March 2010 and section 33LA(2)(a) of the Controlled Substances Act 1984 already made it an offence to possess 'a document containing instructions for the manufacture of a controlled drug or the cultivation of a controlled plant'.

The reality, as is now clear from the bill that has been presented to us, is that this was not an attempt to close a loophole but, in fact, to introduce a new and different offence, namely, for the sale and supply of instructions to make or cultivate illicit drugs and to provide, with that, a higher penalty by making the offence a minor indictable offence.

So, we have a situation where there are two types of offence in the act for the provision of controlled articles used in the manufacture of drugs. One is the sale and intent to sell and the second is possession. The third offence, which this bill now proposes to introduce, is supplying those instructions. It has to be, of course, for the purposes of actually producing the illicit drugs but, in any event, what is relevant here is that there are some significant differences now created, if this bill goes through, as to penalties, depending on whether the element that is used for the purposes of manufacturing drugs differs and whether there is actually a sale with intent to supply or possess in itself.

What we end up with is this: we start from the fundamental principle (which is already clear in the law), that is, you cannot make or supply illicit drugs themselves, and there are a lot of rules about that. Over a period of time, there has been the introduction of offences being created in three different categories of the things that are needed to make these drugs. One is the controlled precursors, that is, the constituent elements to make a drug. I am not sure what they are, but there are particular chemicals and/or, presumably, organic product, which are used to actually make the drug.

The second is the equipment in connection with the controlled drugs, and I assume that is the Bunsen burner and the other pieces of glass apparatus that are used to create these liquids or pills or whatever. The third is the instructions that you need to be able to put it together in a way that actually creates the drug in the first place.

Of each of these things, whether that is the precursor, the equipment or the instructions, we then have a set of rules that say that you cannot sell any of these things, and we have an existing law to provide for a number of those. Then we have three different questions as to whether it should be an offence to intend to sell any of those three things, then whether we have an offence to supply to anyone those things, then we have the three categories—one for each—for the possess with intent to supply, and then we have the possession.

What we have at the moment, to try to keep this as simple as possible, in all of these different categories is currently an offence to sell a precursor, sell equipment or intend to sell precursors, but not intend to sell equipment. There is no offence to supply to someone—as distinct from selling—a precursor or equipment. There is no current offence which prohibits the possession with intent to supply a precursor or equipment, and there is currently a law which prohibits the possession of a precursor or equipment.

What this bill does is add to some of those categories an offence to sell instructions, to intend to sell instructions or to supply instructions, but it does not add a category of possessing with the intent to supply (which is rather odd, since we have intent to sell provisions for precursors), and it does not comprehensively cover possession for instructions.

This bill will essentially add in the offence to sell instructions, intend to sell instructions, supply instructions, and add to the possession of instructions, which is adding to some of what we already have, but for some reason does not add any provision for possess with intent to supply instructions. We have this position where it is currently an offence to present and sell precursors and equipment where the salesman has a knowledge it may be used for the production of controlled substances, and it is also currently an offence to possess a precursor with the intent to sell it for the production of drugs.

It is fair to say that, even with the provision changes proposed in this bill, it would still be legal to supply proscribed equipment to a person who intends to manufacture drugs. A person who sells proscribed precursors or equipment would be guilty of an offence, but, if a person provides them without charge, no offence is committed. It is possible they could be charged as a principal offender under the aiding and abetting provisions under section 267 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Nonetheless, it creates an inconsistency in the legislation.

If the key concern is the provision of materials used for the production of drugs, then it would make no difference whether the person sells or supplies such materials. If the evil in all of this is the capacity for one or more to manufacture and create illicit drugs—and I think we all agree that is not a good thing—and that is something that we should in our criminal law clearly proscribe as offensive and therefore should have penalties associated with it, we need to make sure that it is comprehensive.

We started in a situation in 2010 where the Premier and then attorney-general wanted to tell the public of South Australia that they were keen to close down a loophole and make sure that we were going to be tough on these areas and to confirm their position to restrict the availability of materials. In fact, there was already existing legislation. There remains existing legislation, and the addition of this bill will create some extra offences but will clearly not close all the avenues that would be open in those circumstances.

Why did the government do it? I suggest that the government was keen to make announcements, to present to the public that in some way it was going to be giving them greater protection, and that this was a way in which it was going to reduce the capacity to develop these illicit drugs. From the document that was published at that time, there did not appear to be any data that suggested that the provision of these instructions, which is designed to be remedied by this bill, was in any way operating or that the law as it previously existed, which concerned being in possession of the instructions, was in some way defective in not being able to capture people; that is, people were getting away with it because there had been no supply and sale offences.

In the absence of any evidence to support that there was actually a problem, it is concerning that the government would try to make such announcements under the gamut of providing community safety when they had not even outlined any justification for it.

The other concerning issue is that, 10 months down the track, having announced that they were going to fulfil this election commitment, the new Attorney-General introduced the bill on 10 March 2011 and then promptly offered a briefing to members of the house. Matthew Goode, who I think is still employed in the Attorney-General's office, has provided briefings to this house on a number of legal matters over a very long period of time. In fact, Mr Goode, I think, is pre-eminent in his field in the preparation of legislation for this parliament, and indeed has had a history with the University of Adelaide law school where I first became acquainted with him, and I have absolutely no reason to doubt that he is very competent in this area.

But it was interesting, in providing this briefing, that although there had not been any indication in the second reading contribution as to how the operation of the offences against the possession of instructions were going, it seemed that he did not even know how many charges or prosecutions there had been under the current section 33 for the past five years, or at all, in respect of possession of instructions. That did strike me as rather unusual, particularly as he had been sent along to provide us with a briefing in respect of this legislation.

The simple answer was that that information had not been sought by him or provided to him and that the only reason that he was being asked to present this to us was that it was an election promise. That in itself did raise some concern for me because the former attorney-general has had some weird and wonderful ideas in this house and presented them in the short time that I have been here and surprised us with the uniqueness of some of them.

As novel as some of them have been, one can sometimes expect that the peculiarity of these ideas would be a bit more prolific during election campaigns and that, after the heat of an election campaign, in the clear light of day when you sit down and look at the actual implementation of some of these ideas or promises or election commitments, sometimes the implementation is not warranted, is not cost-effective, is not sensible, is not even a good idea. When you look clearly at the matter, it can become at least apparent that what appeared to be a great idea at first blush actually is not worthy of pursuit.

In those circumstances, it is reasonable for the person in charge of that idea to come back to the parliament, if it has been a published election promise, and explain to the parliament that the

basis of the apparent merit of a particular idea has now evaporated and, for x, y or z reasons, it is not going to be progressed.

I would have expected that, with the discontinuance of service as attorney-general by the member for Croydon and the appointment of the new Attorney-General, a fresh look at this legislation would have at least alerted the new Attorney-General to some of the defects of introducing this legislation without even making that inquiry himself apparently, as to whether there was a problem in the community, whether or not the current possession of instructions offence legislation was working and, if not, where the deficiency was. It seems that we have ended up with the realisation that they had made a promise to deal with an ill that was already covered, so they then went to another level to create the sale and supply without any foundation or basis upon which it would be necessary.

The opposition says that progressing with an idea, even if it does not have merit in the full examination of it, if you are going to do it at all—even on the basis that it might catch or deter somebody somewhere from getting involved in the acquisition of instructions and disposal of them to someone else—you do it comprehensively. In the first instance, the disappointment is that we are even here at all for an ill which has not been identified or of which there is no evidence of its existence and, in the second instance, if there is a possibility of it, we should do it properly, and clearly the government has not.

Another matter I mention is that on the day of the briefing by Mr Goode we were told that this bill was going out for consultation because, on inquiring about whether anyone else had been consulted, other than whatever advisers the Attorney and the Premier might have had during the course of the election campaign when they made this announcement and published this new policy, it seemed as though there had not been any consultation. In those circumstances, it was not surprising to hear from Mr Goode that the government, having introduced the bill in the parliament through the Attorney some days before and provided us with the briefing on it, had not gone to any consultation in that preceding 10 months but were going to do so.

So we come to 21 March, and I mention that because the joint party of the opposition met to consider this (it had clearly been tabled in the parliament), to consider whether this was necessary to support and, if it was not adequate, what amendments we might make. In principle, we were concerned across the board that there had not been any consultation, although our representative, the Hon. Stephen Wade in another place, having received the bill, sent it out for advice to stakeholders—at least those we could rapidly get advice to. Obviously, there was no opportunity to do that before the briefing on the 16th, but we were satisfied at that time of the advice that the government would be going out for consultation.

It is fair to say that we have not heard anything further from the government as to what consultation they have undertaken, what response they have received or whether, having consulted, they will undertake any further action or amendment. I understand that the Law Society (and I am looking for the copy of a letter from the Law Society, but I do not appear to have it here) has responded. They have indicated that an offence of supply would be sufficient to cover both instances of provision—that is, sale and supply.

The Law Society also suggests that the penalty for supply should be higher than that of possession since it involves a greater culpability, so I indicate that the opposition will be proceeding with amendments to make it an offence to supply or possess to supply precursor chemicals, to make it an offence for the sale and supply offence types (that is, sale and supply, possession with intent to sell and supply in regard to equipment) be modelled on the precursor provisions in section 33A and that possession with intent to supply instructions offence in section 33LAB consistent with the possession with intent to sell provisions in the proposed 33DA and 33GB.

I will refer to this at the time of introduction of the amendments, but they will provide for penalties on graduated amounts depending on whether there is a commercial quantity that is to be used for unlawful manufacture. There are several graduations, and I will refer to those at the time of the committee.

Disappointed as we are that the government had not come back with some particulars as to whom they ultimately did consult after introducing this bill and whether in fact there was any reaction to people in the community, this is in the category this time (unlike the previous bill that we were discussing) where there is a long gestation period, effectively 10 months from the announcement of the election. I am not sure before the election when this gem of an idea germinated in the mind of the former attorney-general and/or the Premier, but 10 months down the

track, there has been no consultation. Obviously there was an indication that there would be consultation and then an expectation by the government, in the absence of both of those things, that the parliament should proceed to debate this matter.

The opposition has done the best it can, in the absence of any information, to work at least with the Law Society in respect of some amendments to try to fill the gaps that the government has obviously failed to deal with because essentially in going down this path, if it is justified at all, then it should be done properly.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau]

SUMMARY OFFENCES (TATTOOING, BODY PIERCING AND BODY MODIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (16:50): As I was saying earlier, this stuff is about artefacts of popular culture which are here today and gone tomorrow, like ripple-soled desert boots, the *Bobbsey Twins*, bootscooting—I am delving into the past here. There is—

Mrs Vlahos: Wang Chung.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Wang Chung—the Bay City Rollers, for goodness sake.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The honourable member for Bragg might recall that on *Countdown* on one occasion they had the Bay City Rollers, and there was a chap there called Woody, I believe. This chap Woody had apparently given an undertaking that if he were ever to turn 21 he would kill himself, because he just could not imagine being that old. It was then revealed to a shattered audience of 14-year-old girls that he was, in fact, a 26 year old masquerading as a 19 year old. His credibility, of course, was in tatters after that, but not before fans dressed up in tartan skirts had climbed up the drainpipes of hotels all around Australia trying to catch a glimpse of Woody and his friends.

If you asked any one of those women today, 'Would you climb a drainpipe dressed in a tartan skirt so that you could catch a glimpse of Woody?', I am sure most of them would say, 'No way; I'm not that interested in Woody—seen it all before.' They would not be that interested. I am just trying to emphasise the point, because the ephemeral nature of popular culture does not appear to be quite as squarely in the frame in our discussion about this matter as it should be. Anyway, having reinforced the ephemeral nature, I am going to move on at some point later to the future as envisioned by Stanley Kubrick and talk a bit about *A Clockwork Orange*, but that is for later.

Tattooing a minor, as the honourable member has said, is illegal and continues to be illegal. We are just toughening up the penalty for a breach and making it a bit more onerous so that people cannot just say, 'Oh, I didn't know.' They have to actually go through some process whereby they have made a reasonable effort and demonstrate in the case of a complaint being made against them that they have made a reasonable effort.

The subject of intimate body piercings was perhaps—if you will excuse the terminology—the most stimulating aspect of yesterday's debate, because we got to the business about speaking with a forked tongue, and all that sort of stuff. I am indebted to the honourable member for his contribution on that topic. This is an example of the ecumenical approach that the government has to the making of law. We are impressed with the honourable member's contribution and the passion with which he addressed that matter. One of the reasons that I wish to take this into—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Member for Chaffey. One of the reasons I will ask that we move the matter into committee and then adjourn at the end of this process is that some matters were raised by the member for Bragg, the member for Chaffey in particular, and, of course, the member for Adelaide. Everyone said very good things that we may address over the course of the week or two

that we are up, and we will consider and discuss with the honourable member for Bragg about exactly how we do this. The first issue I want to mention is tongue splitting. Why somebody would want to do that, I do not know.

The honourable member said it was something to do with a pop artist, which again underlines my point about the artefacts of popular culture etc. Apparently, this is to show that this person is somehow related to the serpent king or something. Before he explained that, I thought he was going to take us down a Harry Potter track. I thought he might have been talking about the Dark Lord but no, it was something else.

Anyway, his point was well made, but I must say to him, as I indicated to the honourable member for Bragg yesterday, that we envisaged that the minds of those who wish to defile their own temples are very fertile places and that over time they will discover new ways of mutilating themselves. We as legislators cannot be expected, every time someone conceives of a peculiar way to mutilate their body in the name of art, to have the whole parliament sit down, consider this new form of mutilation and then pass an act to include the latest thing, which might be chopping off ones toes, or some other thing, because there is a popular rap artist whose name is Nine Toe or something.

That is why we put in here the idea of a regulation-making power, so that as each bizarre cult manifests itself—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am here today, in the spirit of compromise that always accompanies these matters, to say to the honourable member for Bragg and the honourable member for Chaffey, indebted as we are to your contribution yesterday, that the regulations will include tongue splitting.

Ms Chapman: Tongue forking.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Tongue forking, I beg your pardon. That will be in the regulations but, just to show what decent folks we are, if it would make you happier to include tongue forking in the bill as another form—and, by the way, over the break if anyone else can think of anything else particularly weird that we can add in as a statutorily prohibited thing, I am up for it, but let me know so we can tell parliamentary counsel—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I won't necessarily accept everything, obviously, but the purpose of our having the regulation-making power there is so that we can relatively simply catch up with these bizarre circumstances as they evolve. I am in the hands of the opposition about that one. I can give you an undertaking: I will do it by reg, which will be just as effective. I do not know how many matters the honourable member has been able to get enshrined in the law in his period here in the parliament, and if I can assist him by having one in there it would be my pleasure.

Mr Gardner: That's what you came here to do.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You will be able to go back to your constituents and say, 'See that piece of legislation? I got that in there.' That is not an insignificant matter. That is what this parliament is all about. That is what we are all about here. The next one was an interesting issue.

Mr Gardner: What about the educational documents?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We will come to that. We are not up to that yet. We have dealt with the intimate body piercings, and we have talked about the things that might be included in that.

An honourable member: Yes, we've done that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We have done that well enough. It is just that that was the point in which the honourable member for Bragg—

An honourable member: Excelled herself.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: She did excel herself in that particular milieu. We have moved off the other topic and onto non-intimate piercings, parental consent and so forth. An important question was raised about what amounts to cosmetic surgery or elective surgery. I can indicate to honourable members opposite that it was never the intention of the government in any way to interfere with the legitimate practice of a legally qualified medical practitioner acting in the course of their practice as a doctor, dentist, or whatever it is.

We may have a personal view one way or the other about breast augmentation, having artificial teeth embedded in our heads, or whatever else, but clearly we do not wish to stop that when performed by legally qualified medical practitioners. Therefore, if it is necessary to include some reference in that definition that appears in the legislation to say that we exclude elective surgery, or whatever, from the potential scope of this legislation, then, again, because that was always our intention, we are happy to do that, and we will have something looked at in that regard over the break.

The honourable member raised some issues about section 144F of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, in particular offences relating to identity theft. I am advised that section 144F(a) provides that part 5A does not apply to misrepresentation by a person under the age of 18 for the purpose of obtaining alcohol, tobacco or any other product not lawfully available to persons under 18; or gaining entry to premises to which access is not ordinarily allowed to persons under the age of 18, and so on. That was intended to make it clear that these serious offences did not apply to the conduct of the under-aged person attempting to be admitted or gain access to those things, but I agree that similar issues are thrown up in this instance.

That is something that, again, I would like to look at between now and the time that we return and, again, I would like to, either directly or in conjunction with officers of the Attorney-General's Department, have discussions with the member for Bragg to see if we can adequately address that matter. However, it does enable us to imagine the hypothetical family the member painted a picture of for us yesterday whose parents had given them consent to marry at the age of 16, they had a child and could drive a car with L plates, but they could not yet smoke, drink at a hotel, vote or, if we pass this, be scarified. I would have thought not being able to drink, smoke or vote is enough for a person to work their way through. Perhaps they do not need the burden of these other things to worry about during those two years as they prepare for adulthood.

I turn to police powers. This is an area in which there is a genuine difference of opinion between the government—and I say this completely openly—many of the people who made representations to us in the course of this consultation and, indeed, the member for Bragg. I have gone to some lengths to explain the fact that in my opinion and in the government's opinion these restrictions that we are trying to impose are not being imposed for a trivial or capricious reason. They are being imposed because of the Circulon lady. They are being imposed because this is not simply an ephemeral artefact of popular culture: it is an irreversible artefact of popular culture and, therefore, it deserves to be taken seriously. That is point 1.

Point 2 is that we are concerned here not only with the tattoo parlour, the hairdressing salon or the beauty place that might offer one or other of these services, but we are actually (member for Bragg and others) also very concerned about the backyarders. We are concerned about the backyarders. I am not one of these people who generally gets too caught up in this debate of the perennial philosophical political tension between harm minimisation and law enforcement. It is a perennial argument.

Depending on what particular issue you are talking about, people tend to drop on one or other side of that ledger. Generally—not always—I find that the apologists for everything that people might do tend to fall in the harm minimisation category, and the people who actually think that there are some norms which deserve to have some substance placed behind them usually fit on the other side. You can guess which side I am on.

Anyway, for that reason, I am not persuaded that this bogeyman of backyarders, which I accept exist—I accept that they exist, but they always have and they always will, and there is not going to be a mushrooming of backyarders just because we pass the bill as it is. That is just a nonsense, a complete nonsense; and, if you were going to follow that argument through, what you would be doing is actually saying to anyone who wants heroin, 'Go to your doctor and he'll prescribe it for you, because then you'll be under a managed treatment regime and there will be a harm minimisation thing going on because you'll be having your heroin and you won't be breaking into people's houses,' etc., etc.

These are legitimate arguments in favour of that. I understand the arguments, but, in that particular instance, society has said, 'No, no, we don't want to do that.' We all know that has had limited success. We have not stamped out heroin completely, but nor do we give any encouragement to people who wish to get involved in it.

It is a matter for others, but my view about the thing is simply this: the backyarders, to the extent that they exist, have existed, will exist and will always exist. Doing this will not make their

position worse, but the police powers that we are putting in here will apply to the backyarders every bit as much as they apply to the people who have got the recognised shop somewhere.

Let me give members a hypothetical, and this one is not quite so bizarre as it might sound originally. I went to present some Premier's reading awards at one of the primary schools in my electorate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An excellent program.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is an excellent program, actually; a fantastic program and one of which we should all be very proud. I went to present some of these awards in one of the schools in my electorate; and these children were between eight and 11, maybe, something like that.

One of these girls who was there, who would have been, obviously, no more than 11, was sitting there in a summer frock. It was not a school uniform. It was one of the schools where uniforms appear to be sort of optional. I am not identifying anyone or any place, I am just trying to set the scene a little bit. Okay?

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Are you getting it, yes? This girl who was actually—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —yes—a lovely looking young girl, had a beautiful smile and was proud as punch to get her award, when she came up to get it, I noticed that on her left shoulder, left arm, she had a fairly crude heart with an arrow through it, tattooed, and on the right-hand side she had a lightning bolt. Now, to me these did not look like they had been done by Gauguin, Monet, or whatever these people call themselves.

Ms Bedford: Cézanne.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Cézanne, yes; or 50 Cent, or whatever you call yourself when you are an artist in this genre. It was transparently obvious to anyone looking at this person that, No. 1, a minor had been tattooed, clearly; and, No. 2, that the tattooing had occurred in circumstances of probably a backyard.

Ms Chapman: They could have been transfers.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, these were the real thing. I have seen a tattoo or two, and these were the real thing. You forget; I was on the committee with one of the table officers here I cannot name because he is a table officer. Like a dentist, you cannot name them.

We explored this thoroughly. In fact, I remember the table officer concerned getting us very, very important research material which the committee would have to look at. I remember the member for Stuart holding the material up sometimes, rotating the book, trying to understand exactly what it was that he was looking at. Once he had worked out what he was looking at he made remarks to the effect, 'My God, look at that,' and, 'This is disgusting,' or, 'This is outrageous.'

Mr Pederick: As he would.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As he would. The place is not the same really, is it? No disrespect to his successor, who is a fine young man.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Right. If this legislation were in place, a teacher, the parents—although, obviously, the parents—well, not obviously, but presumably—had noticed the tattoos and had done nothing about it. Somebody could make a complaint to the police and they could have investigated that. They did not, but the point is that this would give them the power, for example, to go into the house where they believed that this might have occurred, or make inquiries.

This is not limited just to the parlour in Hindley Street or some other place. Those people who are on this harm minimisation trip, particularly some of the people in the industry, need to realise that this is actually not so much a worry for them, it is a worry for the people who are the illegals operating out there. That is who it is a big worry for. So, we do have a difference of opinion about that matter.

As to the business about the provision of health information, I actually agree with that. I agree that there needs to be health information provided, and of course the bill does provide for the

prescribed material to be made available. It would be my intention that, in conjunction with the people from the health department, appropriate material would be mandated and provided. That is the case.

In fact, another aspect that came up through the consultation process in this matter was the question about using guns instead of a needle for the piercing of ears. The majority of submissions made to us indicated that the needle was a much better option than the gun, but unfortunately the gun appears to have almost total dominance of the marketplace at the present time.

I guess a judgement was made that, given the magnitude of the harm caused by the gun versus the needle, and the interference with what appears to be the otherwise legitimate business of these people now by banning guns, it would be a little bit heavy-handed and prescriptive; however, I recognise, and the submission has advised me, that really the gun is not the way to go, and I accept that. In a perfect world you would get rid of them, but how much perfect world stuff do we want to impose on people? That is the sort of John Stuart Mill stuff that you were on about yesterday. I accept that.

I think I have probably covered the question about contraception and people who keep losing their keys and need to have a microchip put in their hand. As long as it is done by a doctor, that is intended to be okay, and if we need to make amendments to fix that up so be it. There is more good news, though. For those of you who are worried that after this legislation comes in you will not be able to have your hair removed by laser, relax.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, that is the good news—lasers, or wax for that matter, and, I suspect, by means of the passage of electronic current. The honourable member did ask whether problems would be caused by this, and there is no intention to in any way interfere with a person's desire (perhaps at considerable discomfort to themselves) to go through one of these procedures. Again, I am pretty confident that the legislation does not permit of that interpretation, but if in the interval the honourable member can assure me that it does permit of it, then I will undertake to do whatever is necessary to make clear it does not mean that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. Then we have circumcision, which was painful—I mean that the honourable member dealt with it as delicately as one can, but it was still obviously a moment of reflection. In relation to that, I think our first port of call is the doctor because, if this is done by a doctor, having regard to what we have already said about medical procedures, then we do not have a problem. As to the particular matter that was raised, I think it gets back down to the definition of scarification.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I realise we all have an idea, and I will tread as delicately around this terrain as possible. Scarification means the cutting of a person's skin to encourage the production of scar tissue. If the court pleases, in my submission, that connotes a purpose, namely, the purpose of the creation of scar tissue as opposed to an incident or to remove skin. In this particular case, I am reliably informed that the sole purpose of the exercise is the removal of skin and that it is therefore not contemplated to be within the scope of scarification.

That said, I do understand the honourable member's concerns about this whole process and particularly the circumstances that the honourable member described, but I do not really think this bill is the place where we are going to deal with that fairly interesting and hot potato because this bill does not need to traverse that problem.

I suspect that, if we try to use this bill as a mechanism to make some prescription about those particular practices, we will not only start to find difficulties with all of the particular variations of initiation that might apply in various Aboriginal communities, but there are also other communities, as the honourable member knows, such as the Jewish community and the Muslim community who may be engaging in similar things and they may not be using what we would call doctors, although the people doing it apparently have a pretty good idea of what they are doing.

I think we would be best to leave that alone for those reasons. However, as I said, I do not think it is covered anyway, and, if that is a problem for the honourable member, I think she will be

opening up a fairly big topic and will make this much more complicated than it presently is or needs to be.

I think in general terms I have probably covered most of the points that the honourable member was raising. As I said, we will undertake to deal with those matters during the break, and it would be my intention, if we can resolve them by discussion over the break, that I would at the committee stage be moving some amendments to give effect to those matters so that the points of doubt that have been raised by members opposite can be resolved.

As I said before to the honourable member about tongue splitting, it is entirely in his hands whether he prefers to have a regulation or he would like to have his own bit in the act. If he wants it in the act, then that is fine by me. It is a matter for him. If he lets me know whether he wants to be in a regulation or in the act, we will do our best to accommodate his wishes in that regard.

Everyone will be relieved to know that that really concludes my remarks on this topic, and I would indicate that it is our intention to go into committee but then immediately adjourn so that the matters that we have discussed can be worked through. I am happy for the honourable member for Bragg to put on record any other questions that she might wish to give us notice of. She can do that either on the record or off the record, it does not matter; whatever suits.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Thompson): Procedurally, it would be appropriate, if there is a generous chair of committees acting, to allow that to happen in conjunction with the first clause. The member for Bragg cannot speak now.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We can go to the stage of the first clause if that would help.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that on a number of the matters that we propose to raise in committee, the Attorney has attempted to answer a number of the questions we have raised, already foreshadowed in the second reading of this matter, but I will identify a couple of other matters.

One is the question of the submissions themselves. The question I ask the Attorney to consider is whether he will agree to make those submissions available, irrespective of the fact that there is an FOI process proceeding. I think I have made it clear but, if I haven't, it seems that it remains an issue that we ought not be expected to progress a matter such as this in the absence of that information or, in the alternative, that the matter be adjourned until the completion of the FOI process. I don't mind which way, but I think it is a matter that needs to be resolved.

The other aspect relates to the traditional customary body modification procedures for Aboriginal South Australians and, as the Attorney said, there are some other cultural practices of others in our community who undertake processes which are clearly a permanent modification, usually of a male child. Whilst some reassurance is given as to the applicability under the definition relating to scarification, it is of concern that in the absence of having any clarity on this we may expose people to the risk of prosecution.

As I outlined in some detail in the second reading, this is an area that needs to be looked at to the extent of ensuring that we have practices that respect cultural norms, but also that that is balanced against safe practices that are administered on children, the very basis which underpins the legislation that we are discussing. The reason I raise this is that I have to hand a letter from Mr Neil Gillespie of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement who—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Look, I understood that this wasn't an opportunity to continue, in effect, the second reading debate. So if we could just have the questions, please—because we will have a chance to debate these.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think I made it clear in the second reading that there had been material sent to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, but there had not been a response. The question that was asked in the response that I have is:

It is submitted that the Attorney-General should enter into specific consultations with Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara and Maralinga Tjarutja in order to make it clear that ceremonial conduct by traditional Aboriginal people does not contravene the proposed legislation.

I simply ask the question whether anyone in your office has actually consulted these people about this aspect, or has there just been silence on that? It seems to me that we were given the impression, in the consultation, that Aboriginal Legal Rights had not indicated any problem themselves. If that information is correct then we would like to know whether these people have been consulted or not and, if so, whether they are seeking any clarity on this issue.

Regarding hair removal, cosmetic collagen, Botox, and so on, I think we can probably work something out in the interim. There were one or two areas left unattended to. One is the question of implants for contraception. I don't know what they call them these days, but it used to be an IUD device, for the purpose of contraception, which is the implanting of a particular mechanism inside the female body. The second one I am advised on—and I have not heard of it before this debate—is where a slow hormonal release is actually implanted in the skin by a doctor. As long as that is not caught, then we will not have an issue with that. The other one was earlobe stretching.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is caught.

Ms CHAPMAN: Right. So, if there is a circular disc placed in the earlobe, which is pretty much *carte blanche* under this legislation, and it stretches it out to a larger hole, even though that is not permanent to the extent that it may cause some damage if you remove the ring or whatever, then that is covered.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is a prohibited behaviour under this.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is prohibited; right. I think we have dealt with the provision of health effects and I think that you are going to ensure that is in the prescribed material that has to be made available to the recipient. I will discuss tongue forking with the member for Chaffey and we will have an amendment drawn up to cover that.

The final matter will be in relation to the deletion of section 21I. I will say to the Attorney that, while we got onto the topic of backyarding not being able to be avoided under this legislation—and I accept that—that the explanation for why we have a different regime of police search powers here without reasonable cause I do not think was validated by that.

Of course, it is reasonable that, if the 11-year-old girl in the transparent dress who has the two tattoos, has clearly had that committed on her under age, then of course the police would investigate but they would use the same search powers that they have under the act and they would use the same investigation that they would have under the act, irrespective of whether it is a backyarder or some professional tattooing establishment. I am still at a loss to understand why that is justified but I am happy during the course of the adjournment to be convinced if there is some other justifiable reason for it. Otherwise, I indicate that I will be progressing with the moving of that amendment in due course.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:30 the house adjourned until Tuesday 17 May 2011 at 11:00.