LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 18 September 2003

The PRESIDENT (Hon. R.R. Roberts) took the chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The PRESIDENT: Before we start proceedings today, I draw the attention of honourable members to the presence in the gallery of some very important young South Australians from the year 5 class of Scotch College, together with their teacher, Mrs Gail Scaverelli. I understand that they are being sponsored today by the Hon. David Ridgway. We hope that you enjoy your visit to our parliament, and that it is educational and enjoyable.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. P. Holloway)—

Regulation under the following Act—
Education Act 1972—School Community Care.

SCHOOLS, SAFETY

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a ministerial statement relating to new regulations to enhance school safety made by the Minister for Education in another place.

QUESTION TIME

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation a question on the subject of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Section 9 of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act constitutes the executive board of Anangu Pitjantjatjara. The act provides that the executive board shall comprise a chairman and 10 other members elected at an annual general meeting. It provides that the members shall hold office from the date of election until the next annual general meeting and that that board has important functions to perform in relation to Anangu Pitjantjatjara.

Last year an executive committee was elected at the annual general meeting of Anangu Pitjantjatjara, which the minister will well recall, as he was there indicating support for some candidates who were elected. It has been suggested that those who were elected to hold office at the last annual general meeting should continue to hold office, and that no election be held at the annual general meeting, which is required to be held later this year. My question is: will the minister rule out government support for an undemocratic process like that proposed by some which would prevent members of Anangu Pitjantjatjara from this year again electing an executive body?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thank the honourable member for his important question. The situation in relation to the past election of the AP council, and probably the history associated with previous elections, is that the AP follows the act and its own constitution. There has been a lot of activity by the state government and the commonwealth government with the COAG trials concerning the restructuring that the APY have indicated to me as minister that they would like to engage in, and some of that involves dealing with disputation within the groups in the north-west where there have been traditional differences.

That restructuring involved the role, function and structure of the Pitjantjatjara council, the role, function and structure of the APY council and what roles they play in the governance of the lands within the north-west communities. We were able to get agreement amongst the different groups and we hope that will lead to better governance within the lands, that is, an easier way for the APY executive to deal with the various government agencies such as health, education, housing, justice and other things. The aim is to get a more streamlined approach to governance so that both commonwealth and state government agencies can be engaged to improve services within that area.

I think the honourable member would probably agree that much of the restructuring that was required by the governance and the moves that were made have been positive in order to simplify and also to broaden the engagement base for the various groups within what is called the APY lands.

It has been suggested that, because of all the restructuring that has taken place in the subcommittees that have been formed from the APY Council in assisting that engagement (in addition to the COAG trial consideration), it would be of some service and assistance to the outcomes and the streamlining of those forms of governance, with the experience that they have gathered, for them to continue in those roles for an extended period, and the historic dislocation or differences that occur around election time would be minimised.

There would be a continuous process, if you like, for the incumbents to remain for more than one year. We expect local government to solidify its circumstances by half the council going and half remaining; the Legislative Council has a process whereby half the council go and half is elected. Yet, under the act, which was framed in the early 1980s, we expect all the council to be up for election and still have stability. It was felt by some (and I agree) that it would be better to change the circumstances in which those elections were held by either extending the period or changing that process.

A request has been made by the current executive for the government to look at its legislation, and an approach has been made by the AP executive to look at changing its constitution. No change can take place without consultation and consensus. Government cannot force the situation on the AP executive. It can discuss the issues and take advice on whether changes to the constitution will allow them to occur without legislation, and that is occurring at the moment.

However, if there is not general agreement in relation to the legislation being applied, that is, the current circumstances, I cannot see that there will be much hope of any change being brought into the circumstances in which the APY find themselves now. I understand that they can extend their election time frames to February but, as we get closer to November, the circumstances of getting legislative and/or constitutional change become more remote; however, I am not saying that they could not happen.

If it were the wish of the APY executive, which I say now includes, through negotiations over time, agreements that are

now being forged between the Pitjantjatjara Council and the APY Council, and there is a consensus for a move for such a change that needs government assistance, we would certainly make it a consideration. However, if there is widespread opposition to a proposition for any change, I suspect that interfering in those democratic processes would be a negative.

Consultation has begun in the north-west where consideration has been given to changing the electoral process. The APY executive have indicated (through a resolution) that they have a preference for maintaining stability through rolling over their executive for, I think, two years. That has been endorsed by the executive and is being discussed as we speak in the communities, basically to determine how their executive is to be elected.

So, it appears that, in the current circumstances, even if the APY does indicate that it wants to have the legislation changed, time is of the essence. The APY have written to the shadow minister indicating that they would like the opposition to consider changes to either their constitution or the act. We on this side of the house are sympathetic, but I think time will make it difficult. It is not impossible, but unless we get that cooperation it will be difficult.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I ask a supplementary question. Why should the people on the lands be denied their democratic and statutory right to support or oppose the current executive board through the ballot box as envisaged by the legislation?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It is not the first time that there has been a proposal for extending the time frames for the elections within the APY. What we expect of the APY executive is unfair. That is, it appears that what would be regarded as an area of local government has to be administered by what gradually grew out of what was expected of a landholding body. We now have human services delivery programs being run by APY. We have a whole range of other service connections for organisations that are non-profit to be run by an executive of 11 people.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Well, it is quite possible, but at the same time the government is asking the APY executive to look at a form of local government. We are approaching the LGA to draw up a model that can be discussed. This will not be the first time. Members of the opposition will remember 'rolling thunder' very well. It actually canvassed changes to the constitution.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Well, I think there were messages, either subliminal or real, in what was going to happen in that election. The question that the honourable member asks is why would we stand in the way of democratic elections being held. We are not doing that. We are living in a time of change—I know that is hard for conservatives to understand—and there needs to be change within the AP lands because of the dire circumstances in which the people on the lands find themselves. These circumstances are unlike any other local government area. We are trying to get a consensus formed in a very difficult climate so that we can move forward in the way in which those human services and infrastructure supports can be supplied.

I understand what the honourable member is saying. It would be preferred that there be no dislocation in the transfer of the power and responsibility that has been developed in the last 12 months in dealing with a myriad of government departments at the commonwealth and state levels. Progress has been made by the traditional owners (the tjilpis) who have now been empowered through the electoral processes that have been put in place.

I think everyone should be proud of the way in which they have grasped the opportunity to broaden their democratic processes and to be more inclusive and prepared to engage the state and federal governments. I congratulate the current executive for doing that. As I said earlier, I suspect that the time frames in which we are moving in order to get some sort of consensus to move forward mean that you would need only a section of the community to object to the election processes that have been mooted for the election to go ahead, either in November or at a time determined within the time frames the legislation allows.

TAMAR WALLABIES

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the reintroduction of Tamar wallabies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Tamar wallabies are native to South Australia but are virtually extinct, as I understand it, on the mainland—although they are in almost plague conditions on Kangaroo Island—due to the introduction of foxes and feral cats to the environment on the mainland. At present, a number of Tamar wallabies are being quarantined at Monarto Zoo pending their reintroduction to mainland South Australia. They are being relocated from an island off New Zealand due to the environmental damage they have caused there. It appears that the favoured site for their reintroduction is the Innes National Park on Yorke Peninsula. As I understand it, there has been little or no public consultation on this process. Several farmers have expressed concern that there are already huge kangaroo and emu problems on the farms abutting the Innes National Park. They are concerned that any release of the Tamar wallabies will only add to these problems. My questions are:

1. Can the minister assure the council and the farmers of South Australia that any release of Tamar wallabies will not add to the pest burden that South Australian farmers are already experiencing?

2. Was the minister informed or consulted about the imminent release of these wallabies, and did his department or the pest plant control board for the region have any input into this decision?

3. Since there has been a huge fox baiting program within that region, does the minister agree that there will probably be insufficient foxes to keep these Tamar wallabies in environmental balance?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I think that question is targeted at the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation. I will take that important question on notice and bring back a reply.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: So, the farmers do not count?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yes.

EX GRATIA PAYMENTS

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about ex gratia payments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I often surf the South Australian government web sites on a regular basis to see what is happening. Recently, on the Treasurer's web site I came across a site containing the Treasurer's instructions and a section entitled 'Ex gratia payments' which caught my eye. The instructions state:

> Where an ex gratia payment is $10 000 or less the responsible minister must approve the payment of the same.

Consequently, in order to find out who was getting some of these ex gratia payments, I issued a series of FOI applications. Some of the responses were very interesting, to say the least. One of the more interesting pieces of information came from the minister's department (the Department of Primary Industries and Resources).

Interestingly, some 23 payments of $3 300 were made pursuant to the river fishery structural adjustment program, a total of $75 900; another payment for $295 240; another for $195 411; another for $60 000; another for $101 009; another for $66 000; another for $62 700; another for $77 289; another for $139 898; and another for $165 707—a total of $1 239 155. However, the payment that really caught my attention was a payment of $2 315.55 made on 22 April last year in relation to a dead cat.

Without seeking to give an opinion, it would appear to be an awful lot of money for a dead cat. I know that the RSPCA will sell a cat for $90, which includes sterilisation, vaccination, worming and microchipping. The dearest cat advertised in last Saturday's *Advertiser* is a Bengal Snow kitten or a Somali kitten for $300—some $2 000 less than that paid for this cat. There is one advertisement in the same paper for free cats. Indeed, for $2 315 I would expect the cat to take out the rubbish and bring me my slippers.

An honourable member: And the paper!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: And the paper, yes. In light of this, my questions are:

1. What were the circumstances that led to the death of the $2 315 cat?
2. What features did this cat possess that made it worth $2 315?
3. Is the government interested in purchasing any more $2 315 cats?—because I can source them.
4. Are any more ex gratia payments contemplated in relation to the river fishery?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): In relation to the latter question, ex gratia payments are to be paid in relation to the river fishery.

The Hon. IAN Gilfillan: Catfish!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: As for the cat, I wish I could remember its name but, unfortunately, it escapes me.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Tabby.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No, it was not Tabby. Whatever it was, this particular cat, as I understand it, had died following the fruit fly eradication program that happened at the end of 2001-02 when the Hon. Caroline Schaefer was the minister for agriculture. Nevertheless, I take responsibility for acting on advice from crown law that suggested that we should settle this particular case. Apparently, it was claimed that this animal had been poisoned as a result of ingesting in some way fruit fly poison, which was spread in conjunction with the program. As I said, crown law investigated it, and it was on its advice that I approved settlement of the claim.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I have a supplementary question. How did they arrive at the value of $2 315?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I imagine it would not have been just the value of the cat. I assume it was a matter of suffering and other elements for assessment—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The sort of thing that the Hon. Angus Redford and his colleagues in the legal profession claim in relation to these sorts of things.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I have a supplementary question. Was it the deft way in which the minister settled the claim that resulted in his prominent rise to being the stand-in Attorney-General? Was this the start of it all?

The PRESIDENT: Some other catastrophe, I expect.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It did give me the habit—as I had to do as Attorney-General—to deal with a great number of claims, mainly from humans as victims of crime—rather than animals; and I always took crown law advice.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about fruit fly research.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH: South Australia currently uses the sterile insect technique against Mediterranean fruit fly, or medfly, outbreaks. When an outbreak occurs, millions of sterile male Mediterranean fruit flies are released into the environment resulting in wild males having to compete for access to females.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. SNEATH: They might be related. Matings by sterile fruit fly results in the laying of infertile eggs which do not hatch. My question to the minister is: can he advise whether any further research has been undertaken to improve this technique?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): Those early interjections were really right to the point. It was actually as a result of the issues that were raised during the fruit fly outbreak when the Hon. Caroline Schaefer was minister, or it might have been the year before. In any event, it was a couple of summers ago. It was as a result of that that a study by PPK recommended a number of changes. As a result, the department has moved more to using the sterile fruit fly technique, which is a much more benign way of dealing with fruit flies than the use of poisons. Whether saving the cat population is good on balance for wildlife is another matter—I will not answer that question.

I thank the Hon. Bob Sneath for his question, and I hope the council will listen to the answer with some interest. There has been further research into the current technique arising from the fact that sterile males are generally not as efficient in obtaining mates as wild males. This is due to the process of sterilisation by radiation and the genetic changes that occur in the strain as the flies are mass reared in artificial conditions. For example, high density housing requires less of a need to attract mates. In addition, food and water are always

close and readily available, possibly selecting for less efficient field foraging capabilities. When I was in Western Australia earlier this year, I visited the facilities at the Department of Agriculture in South Perth, where sterile fruit flies are reared for our programs. If anyone is travelling to Western Australia I would be happy to arrange for them to visit the facility.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is the pain and suffering. Recent work done by US researchers has indicated that exposing the flies to ginger root oil (GRO) has a beneficial effect on their ability to attract mates. It literally gingers up their sex lives. It is thought that volatiles from the oil contribute to the male's ability to successfully attract females, perhaps due to some improvement in the pheromone quality. For those members who would be ignorant in these things and do not understand what a pheromone is, I did look it up in the dictionary, because I thought it would be helpful if I understood it myself.

Pheromone is a chemical secreted by an animal, especially an insect, that influences the behaviour or development of others of the same species, often functioning as an attractant of the opposite sex. It is believed that the ginger root oil may lead to some improvement in the pheromone quality. In the fruit fly world males form leks, which are small groups of about 10 flies within the tree canopy. Females visit these leks and choose the male with which they will mate. The males perform courtship displays involving the eversion of the pheromone sac and various wing flutters.

The US trials are being conducted on a particular strain of sterile medfly. However, the strain South Australia uses is different. Scientists from the South Australian Research and Development Institute and their counterparts in Western Australia have joined forces to trial the same technique with our sterile medfly strain. This began in March 2003 with field-cage experiments conducted in Western Australia.

These experiments involved testing the ginger root oil treated sterile males against ordinary sterile males in their ability to out-compete wild males for mating with a set number of females in a field tent situation. A number of trials were conducted and the results were promising, but they need further confirmation in additional trials to be carried out in the future.

South Australia is limited in the kinds of experiments that can be conducted here. Females cannot be imported or used here, obviously, due to concerns of causing a fruit fly outbreak. The calling ability of the sterile males can be measured and experiments are being conducted to investigate this, that is, the ability of the males to evert the pheromone sac. However, the success of their calling cannot be directly measured. The field performance of the GRO exposed sterile males can also be looked at, and it is something that is planned for future work when the weather is warm enough for field activity of the flies (that is, spring or summer).

The eventual outcome of this work could be the ability to reduce the number of sterile flies that we obtain from Western Australia for outbreak eradication. Currently, the flies are produced in Western Australia and brought in as pupae. If the flies are found to be more effective at competing with wild flies for mates, we should be able to release fewer of them and still have a successful eradication. This has the potential to save costs—the cost of flies and, potentially, the cost of materials used for their distribution.

GLENSHERA SWAMP CONSERVATION PARK

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development a question about mining or exploration in Glenshera Swamp Conservation Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: On Sunday 7 September (which was National Threatened Species Day), the environment minister, John Hill, released South Australia's 2003 Threatened Species Schedule at Glenshera conservation park. The event was reported the following day in *The Advertiser* by its journalist, Catherine Hockley. The environment minister described the decline of South Australia's native species as 'depressing' and claimed:

> We're trying to hold on to what we've got, the remaining vegetation that's intact, and keep the feral animals and plants out of it.

Glenshera is home to the endangered southern emu wren, the vulnerable flame sedge-skipper butterfly and the southern brown bandicoot, and is a refuge for wetland plants such as the coral fern, the fishbone water fern and the veined sun orchid. Catherine Hockley's report also revealed that Glenshera could be open to mining and that the Department of Primary Industries and Resources would block any move to singularly proclaim the park to exclude mining.

Mining is seen by the environment movement as a trojan horse that carries exotic plants and animals into our parks, which echoes the views that the environment minister expressed, which causes one to wonder whether the two ministers concerned are singing from the same hymn sheet. My questions are:

1. Can the minister confirm whether or not the Department of Primary Industries and Resources is opposing the single proclamation of this very small conservation park?

2. If so, and given that the 67 hectare park was purchased specifically to protect the nationally threatened southern emu wren, and forms part of the swamps of the Fleurieu Peninsula, which are listed as a critically endangered ecological community under the commonwealth EPBC Act, can the minister tell us whether there is anywhere within those 67 hectares that his department would deem to be worthy of full protection?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development): Unfortunately, *The Advertiser* did not print a response to a letter that was put in there (or, at least, it had not when I last saw it), from the Director of the Minerals Petroleum Energy Branch of the department which explained the situation at Glenshera Swamp. The particular article that was published in *The Advertiser*, as I understand it, had suggested that the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (and a subsequent letter writer to *The Advertiser*) had accused the department of choosing the day on which my colleague had made a statement to bring up this issue. In fact, that was not the case. As I understand it, Glenshera Swamp has been declared a dual proclaimed park. As such, that means that no mining can take place in that park unless it has the permission of the Minister for Environment and Conservation as well as the Minister for Mineral Resources Development. Because it is a dually proclaimed park, it requires permission from both ministers.

As far as the Department of Primary Industries and Resources is concerned, the swamp is near Mount Compass where a significant amount of sand mining has taken place. I understand that the sand in that area has particular value in

relation to glass production, and, given the prominence in this state of the wine industry and the significant new bottle plant that has been established in the Barossa Valley, the department's view in the longer term was that the value of that resource should be recognised and taken into consideration.

That does not mean that I as Minister for Mineral Resources Development, or even less likely my colleague the Minister for Environment and Conservation, would ever approve mining in that region. The key point that my colleague was making in relation to the particular species is the preservation of the habitat, which is absolutely imperative for the preservation of the species. Where shallow sand mining occurs—and I understand that there are some mining leases which, if not adjacent to that site, are very close to it—the surface sand is removed, so the vegetation can be restored, and the total area that provides habitat protection, which is the key issue for the preservation of species, can be maintained.

In relation to Glenshera Swamp, this government recognises the importance of that area to maintain habitat. The position taken by Primary Industries and Resources is that the worth of this particularly valuable sand should be recognised, but before any mining takes place, if it ever does, and that would be well into the future, given existing resources. There is adequate protection under the current park protection system.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I have a supplementary question. Can I read into that answer that the minister will guarantee that there will not be any joint proclamation that would result in any downgrading of the status of this particular park?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: My understanding is that the park has been dually proclaimed and the definition of a dual proclamation park is that no mining activity can take place unless it has the permission of both the Minister for Mineral Resources Development and the Minister for Environment and Conservation. The last thing that I would want to do as minister is disturb a park that is necessary for the protection of a species unless there were some alternative. Whether one would wish to sterilise for all time access to that park is another matter. The status of the park should be completely adequate to ensure that there is no threat to the species that require that habitat.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I have a further supplementary question. In light of the minister's commitment to valuable species retention, if I reintroduce my bill that seeks to restore to Yumbarra Conservation Park that same dual protection status to protect the various threatened and endangered species in that park, could I anticipate government support?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member is somewhat confused. Yumbarra was a singly proclaimed park, not a dual proclamation park. The status of parks varies. Regional reserves are different again, and they have a different level of access as far as mining is concerned. Singly proclaimed parks exclude all mining under all conditions, and that was the case at Yumbarra.

Dual proclamations would require the permission of both ministers, an appropriate plan and so forth. In relation to the Glenshera Swamp, it was my understanding that in fact extensive exploration of that area had been conducted in the past by the then department of mines and energy, which drilled in the area to establish the existence of this valuable resource, so the resources in that area were well known to the department. Yumbarra is a different issue entirely. However, I have set out the views of the government on previous occasions in this council. There has been an application, and the government's policy was that, unless it proved fruitless, it would allow that current exploration to continue.

MEMBERS, SECONDARY EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Premier, questions regarding members of parliament and secondary employment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Under tough new rules recommended by the New South Wales Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), state politicians would be banned from moonlighting as advocates, consultants, strategists, or lobbyists, and would be forced to disclose other secondary jobs. ICAC has also proposed changing the state MPs' code of conduct to ensure that politicians clearly pledge that their primary obligation is to their constituents and to the people of New South Wales, not secondary employers. The report is a response to a request last year by the New South Wales parliament that ICAC review MPs' moonlighting in the field of public affairs—and an interesting report it was, too.

ICAC recommended banning paid advocacy similar to lobbying. It is also considering banning secondary employment as a parliamentary strategist, adviser, consultant, or lobbyist, as well as mechanisms to deal with alleged breaches of any new rules. MPs involved in other forms of secondary employment, such as medicine or the law, would face tougher disclosure requirements, including public disclosure of contracts and payments.

However, under the New South Wales ICAC recommendations, the tough new rules would cover all secondary employment not just public affairs jobs, such as consultants, advocates, or strategists. MPs would also have to declare conflicts of interest relating to past and present second jobs at the start of any related proceedings in parliament. My questions to the Premier are:

1. In view of the Randall Ashbourne affair, will the government consider establishing an independent commission against corruption in South Australia similar to that in New South Wales to investigate and to deal with these cases? If not, why not?

2. Will the government also consider introducing measures, such as those proposed by the New South Wales ICAC, to ensure that South Australian MPs' primary obligation is to their constituents and to the people of South Australia?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): The honourable member is probably aware that a select committee was established prior to the parliamentary break to investigate a code of conduct for members of parliament. That code of conduct would obviously look at such issues. There are already matters in relation to the ministerial code of conduct that certainly would exclude any sort of moonlighting, as the honourable member described it. The Hons J. Gazzola, R. Lawson and N. Xenophon are members of the Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament, which was appointed on 16 to 17 July. That is an appropriate forum for matters

such as those raised by the honourable member to be discussed.

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CENTRES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development a question about business enterprise centres.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: South Australia has seven business enterprise centres operating in the metropolitan area. I will quote briefly from a submission from Business Enterprise Centres South Australia (BECSA) in September 2002 to a Senate inquiry into employment. The business enterprise centres' governing body summarises their operations as follows:

> Around 25 000 metro, micro and small businesses access BEC services in South Australia each year. Of these 500 are successful start-ups developed and counselled by BECs and existing businesses also receive intensive development assistance. The remaining businesses use the BECs for networking and general information.
>
> The start-ups have been audited regularly and we consistently find that 96% are still in business at the end of the first year, they achieve an average turnover of $167 000 and created 2.2 staff positions each. Overall, BEC intensive assistance directly affects the creation of over 10 000 new jobs each year.

This submission goes on to explain some of the programs and services provided by business enterprise centres to small businesses in the metropolitan area.

In recent weeks, concern has been expressed to me by people associated with the operations of the business enterprise centres that the Rann government is contemplating major changes to the operations of BECs in South Australia. I am told that the three-year funding agreement entered into by the former government expired around the middle of this year and that since that time the new government has refused to extend another three-year agreement to the business enterprise centres in terms of their funding and operation.

I am also told that all of these centres have been put on a monthly funding proposal whereby they are guaranteed funds only for one month at a time. I note that BECs are funded by a combination of grants from the state government through the Department for Business, Manufacturing and Trade, local government and corporate sponsorship through local community businesses.

The people associated with these BECs who have spoken to me have said that the provision of monthly funding makes it impossible for BECs to plan for the future. It makes it impossible for them to appoint staff to contracts (particularly when they have to replace staff) if they are only able to commit in terms of monthly funding arrangements. They have also expressed concerns to me that the new Rann government is considering the future operations of the BECs through either their abolition or major funding cuts to their operations. My questions to the minister are:

1. Was a review conducted of the operations of BECs in the financial year 2002-03; and, if so, will the minister provide the results or recommendations of the review; and, in particular, can he confirm that the review confirmed the importance of business enterprise centres and the need to continue their operations in South Australia?

2. Why has the government (and, in particular, the minister) reduced funding continuity to BECs to monthly commitments, and is the government considering the future operations of BECs and/or major funding cuts to their programs?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will take those important questions to the Minister for Regional Affairs and Industry Development in another place and bring back a reply.

BARTON ROAD

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Attorney-General a question regarding the opening of Barton Road.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: The Attorney-General (the member for Croydon) the Hon. Michael Atkinson has been an outspoken advocate and campaigner for the opening of Barton Road over the years. The Attorney-General has made no secret of his plans to ensure that his cabinet colleague the Minister for Local Government would be required to repeal section 359 of the Local Government Act in order for him to fulfil his promise to the many people of his electorate of Croydon that on attaining government he would ensure the opening of Barton Road. On the many occasions when the Hon. Michael Atkinson spoke publicly about the closure of Barton Road, he indicated that such a decision had been taken by the Adelaide City Council without the approval of the residents in the western suburbs or the concurrence of the adjoining councils of Prospect and Hindmarsh.

In a letter to the editor published in *The Advertiser* of 17 September 2003, the former Labor attorney-general, Hon. Chris Sumner, who is a resident of North Adelaide, indicated that closure of Barton Road occurred after lengthy consultation and was part of the original traffic management plans for the upgrading of the Park Terrace ring route and Railway Bridge. According to Mr Sumner's letter, the plan was agreed to by the Adelaide, Prospect and Hindmarsh councils and the state government over 16 years ago through the Road Traffic Board. In his letter, Mr Sumner said:

> Citizens wherever they live are entitled to have agreements honoured and existing rights acknowledged by the government.

He went on to say that the residents would fight any move to undermine these principles by the opening of Barton Road. My questions are:

1. Has the Attorney-General discussed his plans to open Barton Road with his cabinet colleague the Minister for Local Government? If so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Attorney-General give an unequivocal undertaking that he will honour the promises he has made to many people to open Barton Road?

3. Will the Attorney-General consult with the former Labor attorney-general, the Hon. Chris Sumner, to address his concerns about the existing rights and agreements and to explain to him why he needs to honour the promises he has made to the voters in his electorate?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those important questions to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have a supplementary question. When will the unanswered questions asked by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw on 18 February 2003 and the supplementary question asked by the Hon. Julian Stefani on 1 May this year be provided to this council?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Were those questions in relation to the same subject?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: No, I got the picture after I got the interjection. I will refer those questions to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TRAINING AWARDS

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, a question about the South Australian Training Awards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The South Australian Training Awards, which were recently held at the Adelaide Convention Centre, is the premier event for vocational education and training. What is the significance to the state of the 2003 South Australian Training Awards?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thank the honourable member for her important question. I do have a certain amount of knowledge on this matter. The South Australian Training Awards recognises the most outstanding students and enterprises in our community and celebrates the efforts of students, businesses, training providers and schools.

These awards also reflect the importance we place on building a high performance work force, which is a critical factor in the success of the state's business and industry and on which our economic success depends in a very competitive global market place. Among the awards are those which acknowledge individuals, including outstanding apprentices, trainee, vocational student and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander student of the year. In the enterprise section there are the employer, small business, small training provider and large training provider awards, the VET in schools excellence award and a South Australian and Australian training initiative award.

Our training award winners reflect the passion and high level of skills South Australia needs for a better future. State winners will represent South Australia at the National Training Awards ceremony in Queensland in November, and the government wishes them every success in their endeavours.

PORTER BAY

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Urban Development and Planning, a question about the Porter Bay boat slip.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I have been asked, rather surprisingly, but certainly it is welcomed, by the Port Lincoln Mayor Peter Davis to support the community's concern about the potential sale of the land identified as the Porter Bay boat slip. An article in *Port Lincoln Times* of 4 September states:

> . . . currently operating as Norris Marine Boat Repairers, was advertised on the weekend for sale as 'premier waterfront' with 'tremendous potential as an ongoing concern or future residential development' incorporating up to 19 allotments subject to council approval.

Incidentally, the council advises that under the current circumstances it would be very hard for council to deny that application for residential development. The article continues:

> The land being offered for sale is 1.6 hectares in size and also incorporates a 99-year seabed lease with 97 years remaining. Mr Davis says the slipway is a public asset for the town built by Sir Thomas Playford in the 1960s. . . Mr Davis said the council recently sold the Slipway Road, which is now part of the sale, to Norris Marine for $180 000. 'I was the driving force to negotiate the sale of the road to enable them to have additional car parking and eliminate public liability concerns. . .

The concern of the locals is that this sale is potentially the measure to shut down the slipway, which is still used extensively by local shipping. The article quotes the Mayor as follows:

> Without a doubt that bushland area is one of the jewels of Port Lincoln's lifestyle and hundreds of people walk along the trail and enjoy the flora and fauna of Kirton Point.

It is quite clear that the sale of the road was done on the condition set by the council, that is, that it would enhance the continued use of the land as a slipway. Although there is, and has been, other inadvertent zoning of the area, it was not the original intention, and certainly is not the wish of the council or the community, that this should be turned into housing. My questions are:

1. As it appears the sale of the road was conditional on its use as enhancing the continued use of the area as a slipway, and given the facility in the past had been provided to the community by the state government under Sir Thomas Playford, will the government ensure the slip is not demolished and continues to be accessible by the community?

2. Failing that, will the minister cooperate with the Port Lincoln council to retain the area as open space for the continued use of the community?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): Upon hearing the question, I can understand the connection between the Mayor of Port Lincoln and the honourable member. I can see that they are kindred spirits in protecting the environment within this state. I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer those questions to the minister in another place.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Social Justice, a question about the Children's Protection Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: Division 4 of the Children's Protection Act 1993 provides grounds for the minister to make arrangements for a family care meeting if the minister believes that through such a meeting a child's safety and care may be facilitated. The act specifies a number of people who must be invited to attend, including a care and protection coordinator, an advocate for the children, the child's parents and other relevant parties. My questions are:

1. Will the minister advise how many family care meetings have been arranged by the department over the past five years?

2. Can the minister advise how many of those meetings failed to occur, despite reasonable endeavours to do so?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those important questions to the Minister for Social Justice in another place and bring back a reply.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Premier, a question about the proposed Adelaide Airport redevelopment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: Last year, on 26 August, I questioned the grand announcement that the Premier made with regard to the Adelaide Airport redevelopment, and I questioned how much relevance there was in that announcement. I will read, in part, my explanation, as follows:

> This announcement was made with great fanfare, which at the time, I believe, was warranted, because obviously the problem of modernising Adelaide Airport has now been solved. However, less than two days later, the Premier's announcement was watered down with Virgin's commercial head saying on Thursday that the airline was reviewing all of the design factors and he could not say whether it would opt for air bridges. Some deal! Adelaide and interstate travellers are no closer to arriving and departing in comfort, and the problem of antiquated services at Adelaide Airport remains.

My questions at the time were:

> Does the Premier acknowledge that a new airport without all the major airline tenants having access to air bridges is unacceptable? What is the Premier doing to alert Virgin Airlines to that fact, and when does he expect to be able to report that he really has clinched an acceptable deal?

The leader of the government at the time assured me that the Premier is doing a fantastic job for all South Australians and was on course to sorting out this airport. I stress that this was an announcement that we were getting a new airport, and that was 12 months ago. I refer to some of the Premier's announcements that I obtained from Media Monitoring only yesterday.

> 891 ABC. This is so important for us. This is our front door and this airport is going to be as long as King William Street, from Parliament House to Victoria Square. It's going to have three times the floor area of Adelaide Oval. It's going to be able to handle 27 aircraft at a time, 3 000 passengers per hour. This has been so close so many times and now it's finally happened. The new airport has finally landed after years and years of stops and starts and disappointment. Qantas today signed along the dotted line and we're going to see construction start in November or December.

All great news—except later in the day, he said:

> We have to get Virgin's signature. We have to sign the design and construct contract, which is only days away. We have to go through something called 'financial close', which is dealing with a lot of bankers and the ratings agency and they can pull you all over the place. But we're very confident. We got there before.

Some 12 months ago, I questioned the authenticity of the deal. Again, today, I am faced with the same grandiose announcement and yet, later in the day, we acknowledge that we still do not have a deal. Can the leader ask the Premier: is it time to chill the champagne or in fact will I be back here in 12 months again celebrating yet another deal that supposedly this Premier has for us?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will obtain an answer from the Premier. However, I think all South Australians would be grateful for the actions that the Premier has taken in getting—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: That's the same answer you gave last year.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The thing is that Qantas, which is clearly the major player in this arrangement, is now across the line, and I think that is something for which we should all be grateful. But I will obtain the details.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, that was the problem: Ansett fell over, and that is what delayed it.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT MAPPING SERVICE

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (15 July).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised:

1. The Department of Environment and Heritage will manage the aerial photography component of its mapping services with a budget reduced by $800 000 as previously indicated.

The government has not abandoned its mapping program but rather has stopped its cyclic aerial photography program. Government agencies will still access aerial photography on a project basis. Satellite imagery will also be used where appropriate.

2. Monitoring of the Murray mouth will continue. Options for the use of either aerial photography and/or satellite imagery are being investigated.

3. No contracts have been let by the Department for aircraft from Queensland.

The Department's contract for flying services expired on 30 June. The Department will seek flying services as required through the normal government procurement processes.

NORTH HAVEN MARINA

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (28 April).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. What year was the North Haven Marina maintenance fund originally established, and what was the intent and purpose of the fund?

The North Haven Maintenance Fund was established in 1985. Its intent and purpose was to cover the costs of the maintenance of the North Haven inner harbour and entrance channel depths, the breakwaters and all revetment walls around the perimeter of the marina.

2. What amounts have been deposited into it?

The initial balance of $620 000 was provided from contributions by the North Haven Trust, Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd and the Cruising Yacht Club of SA.

3. Has any interest been accrued and, if so, where has the interest gone?

Interest was accrued during the early years. The initial balance and accrued interest was used in 2000 on dredging and other related works at the North Haven marina.

4. Are amounts in the fund sufficient to carry out the government's obligations regarding the completion of the revetment repair works?

The North Haven Maintenance Fund was insufficient to carry out all maintenance requirements and was exhausted in 2000.

5. If not, will the government make additional funds available so the revetment repair work can be completed?

The government will fulfil its obligations. Work has commenced on repairing the remaining section of revetment adjacent One and All Drive and will be completed this financial year (subject to weather and tides) at a cost of $70 000.

PRISON FACILITIES

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (27 May).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised:

As the members of the House would understand, it is vital that while people are in prison, they be offered rehabilitation programs to learn new or additional skills and as a means of addressing the rates of recidivism.

The following programs are offered to all young people in Secure Care, taking into account, the various developmental, cultural or age specific needs of the individuals.

- All young people in Secure Care attend school daily; their education needs are assessed and programs are developed to meet individual needs.

- A Victim Awareness Program is offered to young people in order to develop their understanding of the impact that crime has upon victims, their families and the community.
- An Anger Management program is offered to young people who have difficulty in managing their behaviour in the community.
- A Rock and Water Program is aimed at developing young people's decision making skills. It also aims at increasing their self-confidence, particularly when they are under pressure from negative peers.
- Boys Talk and Girls Talk is a program offered to young people who are in the process of redefining themselves as adults and responsible members of the community.

There are also parenting programs to assist young people who are parents to develop their parenting skills, as well as various recreational programs such as team games and personal fitness programs. In addition a psychiatric nurse and psychiatrists are available for all young people for both diagnostic and treatment services. Services provided may include counselling around such issues as grief and loss, anger management and childhood abuse.

I am advised the issue of location of the two facilities in proximity is being further considered through an analysis of site options.

However it was never intended that rehabilitation would be provided for a 'mixed population', but that within the Youth Detention Centre rehabilitation services would be designed to best match the age, gender and particular needs of young people. Services will be provided to young people in their specific age groups and not mixed as suggested.

WESTERN CONNECTOR ROAD

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (29 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. What steps will the government take to protect these tenants from unnecessary disturbance and disruption to their business?

Tenants of properties acquired by the Commissioner of Highways were aware from the outset that their tenure was dependent on the timing of the road project.

The Hon. Member may be assured that the rights conferred on the tenants under their lease agreements will be observed.

2. Will the minister agree to consult with all adjoining businesses about the plan for the connector and also the government's plans for their businesses?

Consultation has been undertaken with individually affected businesses and representatives from business precincts close to the project site as follows:

- 20 November 2002, held at Capt'n Snooze, 240-256 South Road, Richmond, meeting with businesses from the Bell Centre and Deacon Avenue precinct.
- 12 December 2002, held at the City of West Torrens Civic Centre, meeting with London and Scotland Road precinct business representatives.

In addition, businesses from the London Road/Scotland Road precinct and Deacon Avenue/South Road precinct were represented on the Community Reference Group established to facilitate decisions for the Bypass project. This group has met five times since November 2002. The latest meeting was held 17 March 2003. There will be no further meetings with this group until the government considers the project for approval, and before construction commences.

Individual meetings have been held with business owners that have indicated specific concerns or issues.

A report is being prepared to provide community feedback on the outcome of the communication process. This report will be forwarded as a letterbox drop to residents and businesses of Hilton, Mile End, Mile End South, Richmond and Thebarton.

3. Will the minister ensure that only such land as is necessary for the road widening is taken for this purpose?

Every effort will be made to confine any required acquisition to the minimum reasonably required for the completion of the works.

EATING DISORDERS

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (14 July).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health has provided the following information:

1. Women's Health Statewide (WHS) employs a 0.6FTE project officer who specialises in eating disorders and a 0.2FTE general counsellor who also works at the Flinders Medical Centre's Weight Disorder Unit. As a result of the review into Women's Health Statewide, the roles of these staff are being re-focussed to specifically address disorders for clients who are from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, from rural and remote regions, clients who are Aboriginal and those who have experienced child sexual abuse.

WHS has had links with the Eating Disorders Association (EDA) for some time with the EDA referring the more difficult cases to this agency. WHS has also proposed alternative ways of extending their collaboration with EDA as outlined under the response to question 4.

2. Women's Health Statewide is not the only statewide service for people with eating disorders. Counselling services for people with eating disorders are provided by General Practitioners and specialist mental health services. In addition, the statewide specialist service available through the Weight Disorders Unit of the Flinders Medical Centre (FMC) provides for highly complex cases, including inpatient and outpatient management of eating disorders.

The EDA also provides information, offers support groups and refers consumers to WHS, FMC and to other community health services as deemed appropriate.

WHS is looking to build capacity in other services in the near future targeting community health services in particular.

3. Males experiencing an eating disorder are able to access a range of health services, as with females experiencing eating disorders. These options include: General Practitioners, self help organisations and specialist mental health providers such as psychiatrists and the statewide specialist mental heath services provided by Flinders Medical Centre.

The EDA (formerly ABNA—the South Australian Anorexia Bulimia Nervosa Association) also provides services for male sufferers of eating disorders, and the acute sector also treats men who are referred to them. It is acknowledged however, that identifying men with such disorders is a problem and men themselves don't necessarily identify eating disorders as a problem.

According to studies being undertaken by Murray Drummond, Senior Lecturer, School of Health Sciences, University of South Australia[1], men who might present with eating disorders tend to shy away from mainstream i.e. 'traditional' practitioners such as GP's, psychologists or psychiatrists, because of the stigma associated with mental illness, and the feminisation of mental illness and eating disorders. Men are more open to working with social workers and counsellors. These practitioners by and large do require more training and updated knowledge on eating disorders.

Young men are more likely to attend a youth service, eg Second Story, Cope, Anglicare or SideStreet (Adelaide Central Mission), to seek counselling and support. Eating disorders can be an issue for a small number of men presenting at such services, although higher on the list are issues relating to masculinity, body image and sexuality. It would appear that eating disorders are not as big an issue to deal with for young men as they are for young women.

4. WHS plans to develop programs aimed at increasing the skills base of workers who provide counselling in other services. With better understanding of the topic and focussed training, counselling services are also likely to be more willing to work in this specialist area.

WHS is also developing models for more generic application with eg GP's, and NGO's including church-based agencies, for better responses to this issue as evidence suggests that primary health care providers, such as family General Practitioners, are much more likely to be the initial point of contact for people with eating disorders. General Practitioners are also increasingly involved in the delivery of an individual and family focused treatment plan.

Greater public and health professional awareness of the prevalence and impact of eating disorders has also resulted in an increase in counselling services for individuals with eating disorders and their families.

5. Hospitals allocate inpatient beds to various clinical specialists. Individual hospitals are able to elect to allocate more beds to eating disorders, but this must take into account the many competing priorities for health care. Patients in need of urgent treatment are admitted immediately, whether at Flinders Medical Centre or other hospitals.

It should also be noted that research in South Australia, led by Professor David Ben-Tovim,[2] over a five-year period comparing treatment options for patients with eating disorders, indicate no

significant difference in outcomes between inpatient and non-inpatient treatment options.

[1]M.J.N. Drummond, Men, Body Image and Eating Disorders, International Journal of Men's Health, Vol 1, No. 1, January 2002, pp 79-93.

[2]Ben-Tovim D., Walker K., Gilchrist, P., Freeman R., Kalucy, R., and Esterman, A., Outcome in patients with eating disorders: a 5 year study, The Lancet, Volume 357, Number 9264, 21 April 2001.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the release of a WorkCover report made today by the Treasurer.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yesterday during question time, in answer to a supplementary question asked by the Hon. Angus Redford about a nuclear waste storage facility, I stated:

> I understand that there are about 270 sites, that is, sites within South Australia that contain nuclear waste.

I have been advised that there are 50 sites in South Australia where radioactive waste is stored, with a total of 185 sealed radioactive sources at those sites. The 50 sites are located in approximately 26 suburbs and towns.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 111.)

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: First, in responding to His Excellency's speech, made on behalf of the government, let me thank His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor for the delivery of his speech. Secondly, I take this opportunity to thank and congratulate His Excellency for the work that he undertakes for and on behalf of the people of South Australia. Indeed, it is normal for the Governor to deliver the Address in Reply and we do not often get the opportunity during the course of the Address in Reply to acknowledge the hard and diligent work that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor does for and on behalf of the people of South Australia. I know that, whilst his office is important, it is a low profile office and not many within our community know of the hard work that he puts in on behalf of us all.

The sad thing is that this government asked His Excellency to deliver a speech that shows a government that lacks vision, a government that lacks any plan outside a narrow populist agenda and a government that lacks the capacity, the willingness and the courage to deliver on many of the promises that it made prior to the last election. The speech, on the face of it, covered all the relevant topics. In the case of social justice, economic development, urban planning and education, we were reminded of past initiatives. In the case of financial accountability and industrial relations, we were told that old bills would be reintroduced. In the case of transport, procurement and primary industries, we were told of more reviews. In infrastructure, we have been promised a new office. Only in health, community safety and environment was anything new or tangible mentioned. In that respect, we were told of three pieces of legislation in health, seven pieces of legislation in community safety and a sanctuary and a national park in environment.

The agenda outlined last Monday is neither challenging nor exciting. It is hard to see how anything on the government's agenda will lead to a continuation of the momentum of economic growth or initiatives that will lead to the establishment of infrastructure so sorely needed if the state is to achieve the targets for economic activity and export announced by this government over the past year.

There are signs that this economy is slowing. Disturbingly, there are also signs that we are falling behind other states—a far cry from two years ago, when we were leading the country in economic growth. We have what is increasingly being described as a McDonald's, or a franchise, government, conceived in the early 1990s by President Clinton, perfected by Prime Minister Tony Blair in the mid 1990s, and picked up holus bolus by the various state governments in Australia, which are pretty much the same. The policies—and, more particularly, the rhetoric—are almost identical. The book written by John Rentoul, entitled *Tony Blair, Prime Minister,* is almost a government manual for this and the other Australian state and regional governments. Indeed, one only needs to turn the page in that book to determine what this government will do next. I will give an example.

In 1997, the then leader of the opposition in the United Kingdom said, 'Education will be the number one priority'. He also said, 'I want to be known as the education prime minister.' In 2001, Rann said, 'Education is our highest priority.' He also said, 'I want to be known as the education premier.' There are many other examples where, if the Hon. Mike Rann's premiership were an exam, he would be accused and convicted of plagiarism.

The 'McDonald's' left governments in the western world basically are the same as the old left governments with one exception: their rhetoric on law and order and their rhetoric on financial management. In the case of the former, it is all talk and no action. In the case of the latter, I need only mention one word: WorkCover—$500 million of financial mismanagement. Some people have suggested that, despite attempting to redefine socialism and jettisoning the more extreme aspects of it, Labor is still socialist and still does not understand that the way to a better society is a belief in the individual and his or her enterprise and rights. As one US Republican in 1998 observed:

> These guys are classic one-play quarterbacks—they fake to the right and then move to the left.

On this side, we know that, and increasingly the business community is now coming to that conclusion. We are now starting so see significant cracks in this government. I know that many in the community are not seeing this government close up, and it will take some time before they come to some of the same conclusions that we, who have the task and job of observing them closely, have come to. Let me make some general observations concerning this government.

I begin with the so-called Atkinson affair. With the opening of the new session, the opposition notes that the member for Croydon's return to parliament was as Attorney-

General. At the same time, however, the Premier resumed the sitting one staff member short, after having to stand down his own senior adviser, Randall Ashbourne, due to his involvement in the Atkinson affair, an involvement that the Premier would have us believe he knew nothing about.

In response to a united call from the Australian Democrats, the Independents and the Liberals, the Premier finally relented in the face of political pressure and announced the establishment of an independent inquiry into the affair. We are committed to ensuring that nothing is done to prejudice the criminal proceedings that are now in place and will be working hard to ensure the government maintains a similar commitment, but we do not accept the integrity of the government's first internal investigation, the McCann report. Questions regarding the issues of probity, propriety and process, the ministerial code of conduct and whether this government is committed to being open and accountable remain unanswered. In that respect, other players need to be brought to account.

We have dragged the government across the line on this and exposed the cover-up but still the absurdity continues. In the interests of transparency and open and accountable government, a mantra the Premier has repeated both before and since gaining office but has rarely put into practice, we expect answers. We expect them to be delivered as a result of an independent inquiry with far-reaching powers and we expect the public to feel secure in the knowledge that they are being told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

There are also questions regarding the government's accountability that remain unanswered from the winter break. Throughout June and July, Senator Bolkus's accounts of Labor-run raffles in Hindmarsh changed on a daily basis. First there was a major raffle, then it was only a minor raffle, then after July things did not add up so we had two raffles. Our questions to the Minister for Gambling seeking to clarify the constantly changing position have not been answered. The Minister for Gambling has stonewalled the parliament and refused to undertake an investigation. It seems that we may have to rely on other people within the Labor government to ensure honesty and transparency in relation to this issue.

Openness and accountability was a key plank of the election campaign. Every day we are told of the government's ongoing commitment to transparency, but we see little action. At present, there are some 131 unanswered questions on notice in the upper house. There were 63 unanswered questions asked by Liberal MPs in the lower house during 2002 and another 50 that have been asked in 2003 for which we are awaiting answers. There were 115 questions asked by the opposition in estimates in 2002 which remain unanswered and an additional 90 questions asked in estimates in 2003. In total, some 449 questions have not been answered by this so-called open and accountable government.

Excluding the Speaker's Constitutional Convention, the Rann government has undertaken more than 135 government-funded reviews and six taxpayer-funded summits, and that does not include those new reviews that were announced in His Excellency's speech on Monday. Despite our best efforts and endless requests, we have been advised of the release of only 14 of these 135 reports. It seems that reviews are a good way to put off making hard decisions and summits are a great way to get media headlines but achieve little in the way of delivering any real outcomes for the South Australian people.

I turn now to health. A lack of resources and funding is fast becoming a catchcry of public sector health providers. As recently as the end of August, CEOs of the state's major public hospitals met to consider cancelling all elective surgery in major hospitals for up to two weeks. Public hospitals were being forced to meet winter demand approximately 100 beds short. Consequently, elective patients are having their surgery cancelled, some up to three times in a row, while waiting lists to see some specialists have blown out to 18 months.

Similarly, psychiatric services at the secure psychiatric centre for prisoners, James Nash House, are stretched to the limit. Crucial funds for the treatment and rehabilitation of prisoners with major health problems have been slashed, and patients do not get the treatment they need. Others have been transferred to Glenside, a facility that is simply not designed to meet the needs of these patients, and in the last two months alone we have seen four potentially dangerous criminals escape from Glenside. No doubt, Mr President, you would recall the daily press conferences attended by the Hon. Paul Holloway at which he announced the latest daily escape. Each time that escape was investigated and each time a serious lack of resources was reported as a major contributory factor. In August, people could not get a hot meal at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Industrial action saw already stretched nursing staff having to deliver and collect meal trays. Conciliation meetings were cancelled and the government took two weeks to resolve the disputes. Nurses and patients suffered as a result.

There have been some winners. Thanks to the overwhelming public support and the tenacity of the workers and board of the Cora Barclay Centre for Deaf Children, the government has been forced to do a backflip over funding for the centre, and in that respect I congratulate the government on its decision, albeit a decision that was far too slow and tortuous in the making. Centre staff and their supporters have stood up to the government, and everyone could see the bullying side of this government in the face of the public, the sort of bullying that some of us on this side see in a private capacity.

I do not need to remind members of the problems of the Mount Gambier Hospital, which I spent some time talking about last evening. Industrial relations is also a difficult area for this government. South Australian FAYS workers celebrated National Child Protection Week with a protest to remind the government they are still understaffed and underresourced, despite promises to the contrary. A protest reminded us that every day South Australian children are left in care where FAYS staff know they will be abused.

In July, strikes at component manufacturers Henderson Automotive shut down Mitsubishi for 24 hours. In this economy, we cannot afford that. In August, lockouts of Bridgestone workers threatened to close car manufacturing. In September, we only narrowly escaped being forced to miss the Royal Adelaide Show with a bus dispute, a dispute minister Wright said was not happening and certainly had nothing to do with him. In July, I well recall the Secretary of the Transport Workers Union expressing his frustration at the fact that he had not been able to speak with the minister. Mr Gallagher joins a fairly extensive array of people who have difficulty accessing the minister.

I will go into that in more detail later. He was certainly not available because he was spending a lot of time reading reports, and he has certainly not read anything that WorkCover has given him. It took three weeks of strong pressure before the minister would intervene. Indeed, at one stage he had planned another very expensive overseas trip, and it was only the intervention of the Premier (and that, I suspect, only

as a consequence of a series of headlines) that prevented him from going overseas, ensuring that he attended to a job for which he is so well paid.

WorkCover is in serious crisis. It has had no chief executive officer at all for eight months, and the unfunded liability continues to rise—there are rumours that it is now $400 million, which is a rise of about $16 million since March this year. Despite repeated questioning from the opposition, it is unbelievable that the minister has not been able to advise the parliament of the level of unfunded liability. During this administration, the liability has increased by approximately $320 million.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The health system index has gone from 116 per cent to 60 per cent. The Hon. Paul Holloway interjects and says, 'Tell the parliament about the reduction in rates prior to the last election.' That is history, and I acknowledge that. However, the minister chose to ignore a series of recommendations that was made to him following the election. We have seen him play string and sealing wax games with figures in order to justify his failure to act after taking office.

We also have the fiasco of the low level radioactive waste repository. I will not go into much detail on that issue, as we have spent a considerable amount of time on that matter in this place already. As to law and order, the principal theme in this state and in the government program is that of press release and press announcement. This government has not appointed one additional police officer. In fact, the police will have 70 fewer officers to fight crime over the coming Christmas and New Year period.

We are also familiar with the cuts to the crime prevention program and, as a result, we are seeing evidence of increasing rates of graffiti and vandalism. We are also seeing orders from the Industrial Relations Commission to increase staffing levels in the police prosecution branch and the statement that officers are currently working under unreasonable workloads.

The government does not seem to understand remotely the sorts of pressures police prosecutors are put under. I know many of these people. They work extremely hard in an extremely complex and difficult environment, with very few resources. The difficulty is that, once a police officer takes up the task of police prosecution, they seem to get stuck in a rut and can never get out. Is it any wonder that SAPOL cannot get volunteers for that job?

We also have issues regarding finance. We have seen savage tax hikes in the recent budget. We have seen the government make huge grabs in terms of the property boom that this state is currently experiencing. We have also heard much rhetoric on economic development. The Rann government was quick to publicise the appointment of Mr de Crespigny as Chairman of the Economic Development Board. Indeed, it has provided us with a report setting out 72 key recommendations. However, in my view the report is a discussion paper and a series of motherhood statements. What it does say, however, is that this state needs a clear strategic plan; indeed, I agree with the statement of the Economic Development Board to that effect, but we have not had one single announcement as to when this state strategic plan will be prepared and/or delivered to the people of South Australia.

The Department of Industry and Trade is totally lacking in direction and resources. One has only to poke one's head out of the window and see the lack of cranes to know that there are signs that economic development in this state is stalling. We are also extremely concerned about exports. The Economic Development Board identifies, quite rightly, the need for South Australia to develop infrastructure to assist our important car manufacturing, defence, farming and wine industries. But it was of concern when the Premier announced a target of near tripling our exports to $25 billion by 2013 but no statement about how the government was going to support growth and, in particular, regional infrastructure.

When we took office in 1993, we did so with some mixed blessings. Certainly, the state was an economic basket case, having suffered a decade of Labor government. However, we did have the advantage of a significant amount of unused infrastructure in our regional communities. With the growth of the economy over the past decade, that infrastructure is now at stretching point. Indeed, the time has come for governments to seriously consider putting more effort into that area.

Another issue that I will touch on at another time is that of population. The Economic Development Board recommends that the government should develop a state population policy that encourages migrants to relocate to areas experiencing worker shortages. In my view, there are also other benefits of having other categories of migrants come to this state.

The federal government has a very clear policy which, putting aside any political issues, is one on which it is very difficult to deliver. It is quite clear that the Premier of New South Wales is expressing the viewpoint of the people of that state when he says that Sydney is at breaking point in terms of infrastructure and that it is not particularly interested in population growth through additional migrants.

In a bipartisan fashion, I suggest that in states such as Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, premiers and opposition leaders are saying, 'We want a greater population, and we want population growth.' Many people working within the economic development arena in this state have the view that we should be increasing our population. However, I can see signs (and I will not go into any detail) that we are not tackling this problem in anywhere near the same fashion as our interstate colleagues. I will give two examples, the first of which is the list of desired occupations for overseas immigrants.

If one looks at the Victorian list, it goes for page after page; if one looks at the South Australian list, it goes for about two-thirds of a page. In other words, the Victorians are more open for overseas migrants than South Australia. If I can give a practical example, the Victorian list states that there is a shortage of cooks, and it is described as such: the South Australian list states that there is a shortage of Indian cooks. Apparently, there is no shortage of Thai cooks, Italian cooks, or any other cooks. I am told that there is now a rumour going around that we do not even have a shortage of Indian cooks any more and that that entry will be removed. This sends a message to overseas communities and overseas families that Adelaide is not welcoming of overseas migrants, but nothing could be further from the truth.

The other observation I make—and this is, I concede, anecdotal—relates to the way in which we market to overseas students. Overseas students can, if managed properly, be significant contributors to our population growth in this state. What we have in this state is a dysfunctional marketing process. I acknowledge that both the former government and this government have endeavoured to overcome that in partnership with the Adelaide City Council through Education Adelaide. However, when one goes overseas and sees what Western Australia is doing to market its student services

to overseas people, it is marketing the state and every single institution, whereas in this state we see institution versus institution. We are not marketing our education services on a whole-of-government basis. That must be attacked—and attacked vigorously.

I call upon the Premier to bring together all the education leaders in this state and bang their heads together—because the situation is now getting to that point—so that, when we do go overseas, we market ourselves to overseas students correctly. Far too many overseas students come into my office and, on inquiry, discover that the courses they are undertaking will not lead them to permanent residency in this city or in this country. That is despite what these people were told by various institutions prior to their entering these institutions. If I bought a used car or any other good or service and I was misled to that extent, I would go to the Office of Consumer Affairs, my local member of parliament, or the legal profession and seek redress.

Generally speaking, our system works well, but when we are talking about overseas students, people who could be fantastic citizens of this state in the future, we are talking about a very disadvantaged group, a group of people who do not understand and who do not feel that they have good and proper access to the community and the legal rights that we all take for granted and enjoy.

Over the years we have heard from previous premiers and the current Premier a lot of rhetoric about this population issue. My challenge to the government is to seriously look at this issue in a serious bipartisan fashion and work out how we can get more than our fair share of overseas students. We have demonstrated that we have the capacity to get more of our fair share of overseas conferences to the Adelaide Convention Centre, so there is no reason why we cannot do the same with our students. Our cost base is lower, our fees and our cost of living are less than that experienced in other states, but we have one major disadvantage, and that is that most people who come to Adelaide have to come through another domestic port. Successive governments have endeavoured to address that difficulty, but I can only urge in the most constructive and positive way that this government deal in a bipartisan way with that issue. Many of us on this side would be willing to help the government in that respect.

The final issue that I want to deal with is one that I have raised in parliament on a couple of occasions previously. I refer to the issue of honesty and accountability in government, to which His Excellency referred and which the Premier has repeated like a mantra over and over again. It goes to the very standards that we expect from senior people within government. On 1 April this year, the current Attorney-General made a ministerial statement about the *Today Tonight* program on Henry Keogh. There has been ongoing media and other comment about the validity of the Keogh conviction, and the Attorney-General has responded by engaging in that comment and debate.

I suggest that the Attorney-General has every right and every duty to comment and intervene in this area. Indeed, he would be failing in his responsibility if he did not do so. A number of petitions have been presented to him. Under parliamentary privilege—and that is something that *Today Tonight* on Channel 7 does not have—he made a number of statements. In particular, he referred to an individual by the name of Professor Thomas. Professor Thomas is a forensic pathologist. His responsibilities are not only as a forensic pathologist—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: For how long? On Tuesday, I was promised an answer this week. That is what I was promised.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Yes. In the interests of absolute accuracy I will quote in full what the Attorney-General said in his statement on 1 April this year. He said:

> Professor Thomas was not a forensic pathologist when he had appeared on *Four Corners* and, I am told, he did not carry out a post mortem investigation on a homicide case in South Australia.

So, there are two statements of fact in this statement made by the Attorney-General in another place: first, that Professor Thomas is not a forensic pathologist; and, secondly, that he has never done a post mortem investigation in South Australia. That is despite earlier in his contribution referring to statements made by Professor Thomas in which he claimed to be a forensic pathologist and in which he claims that he had carried out post mortem investigations in South Australia.

The only conclusion that one can draw from that is that the first law officer of the state, the Attorney-General, was suggesting that Professor Thomas was not telling the truth when he was being interviewed on television programs such as *Four Corners* and *Today Tonight*. The Attorney-General, the first law officer of this state, went on to say:

> I am not sure of his current expertise in forensic pathology. I can tell members that in 1998 Professor Thomas was called as an expert witness for a defendant charged with having made a false representation to the police.

He then goes on to refer the parliament to some comments made by a judicial officer. Generally speaking, there is nothing wrong with that; in fact, the whole of the law and the law of precedent requires lawyers from time to time to refer to other judicial decisions. In his statement in another place, the Attorney-General said:

> Magistrate Baldino's sentencing remarks are pertinent given Professor Thomas's preparedness to question the veracity of the forensic evidence in the Cheney case. Magistrate Baldino says, 'I formed the distinct impression that the Professor's views, opinions and hypotheses were not entirely impartial and independent. In this regard I am compelled to agree with the prosecution submission that Professor Thomas was 'obviously not an unbiased witness'. As a general principle it should never be overlooked that an expert's role is to assist the court rather than to go into battle for the party which hires his forensic skills. The absence of independence in an expert's evidence renders it unreliable and unsatisfactory.

Mr President, I am probably telling you things that you already know, but you would be well aware that, first, the Attorney-General is the first law officer of the state and, secondly, we have heard on many occasions the Speaker in another place say that the House of Assembly or the parliament is the highest court in the state. I do not necessarily agree with that, but if he wants to use that characterisation for the purposes of this debate I will not part company with him.

Thirdly, as the first law officer of this state, the Attorney-General is the leader of the bar. He has professional obligations as the leader of the bar and he has standards to set as the leader of the bar. I have absolutely no doubt that, as the leader of the bar and the leader of the legal profession, he would agree that he is bound by the ethical standards that all lawyers would be bound by in making statements to courts. Sometimes, even the first law officer can make mistakes and assertions of fact that are not true—and that can be done innocently. Indeed, I am a reasonable man, and I am prepared, on occasions, to give people the benefit of the doubt.

On 16 July—the Wednesday before we got up in the last session—I asked some questions of the leader in this place

concerning the statement made by the Attorney-General (Hon. Michael Atkinson) on 1 April. On 16 July (or leading up to that point), as far as everyone in this parliament and the readers of *Hansard* knew, the Attorney-General, in an unchallenged fashion, had said about Professor Thomas that he had claimed expertise he did not deserve; that he had claimed experience he did not have; and that he was a man who was inclined, when he gave evidence in court, to be biased and would colour his evidence. As a professional witness, they are all extremely serious allegations and, when made by the first law officer of this state, are entitled to the untrained person and, indeed, from all of us as members of parliament to be taken on face value.

On 16 July, I asked a series of questions. In that series of questions, I drew the parliament's attention to a decision made by His Honour Justice Mullighan on 29 January 1999—more than 4¼ years before the Attorney-General rose in his place in another place and talked about Professor Thomas. Professor Thomas's evidence was examined in some detail by His Honour Justice Mullighan, who is a very experienced and highly regarded judge in the highest court in this state. What His Honour Justice Mullighan did was quote the exact same passage that the Attorney-General—the first law officer in this state—quoted in his statement to the House of Assembly.

At paragraph 46 of his judgment, His Honour Justice Mullighan said:

> The learned magistrate said that the fourth reason that he formed the impression that Professor Thomas's views, opinions and hypotheses were not entirely impartial and independent. . .

He went on to say:

> In this regard, I am compelled to agree with the prosecution's submissions that Professor Thomas was obviously not an unbiased witness. As a general principle, it should never be overlooked that an expert's role is to assist the court rather than go into battle for the party which hires his forensic skills. The absence of independence in an expert's evidence renders it unreliable and unsatisfactory.

What His Honour Justice Mullighan is doing there is identifying a very serious criticism of Professor Thomas made by Magistrate Baldino, which is the same criticism repeated by the Attorney-General in another place in his capacity as the first law officer in this state.

What His Honour Justice Mullighan said is this—and I could not agree more with what he said, and he puts it very well:

> There are very serious findings so far as Professor Thomas is concerned. He is a specialist in his profession and holds senior and important positions at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Forensic Science Centre where he is an honorary senior consultant. He has a long history of working in forensic pathology overseas and in this state.

What His Honour is saying there, quite correctly, is that the criticisms made by Magistrate Baldino are very serious ones and, indeed, is alluding to the fact that they have the capacity to damage a man's standing—a man who has extensive qualifications and who has worked very hard to secure those qualifications and, one would assume, a good reputation for which he has worked very hard. Indeed, qualifications and reputation, if one is to be a forensic (which means 'court') pathologist are very important aspects to that man's professional career. What His Honour Justice Mullighan said is this:

> The finding of the learned magistrate reflects poorly upon him.

So, in other words, Justice Mullighan is saying that this is a pretty serious criticism of Professor Thomas. What His Honour said in response is as follows:

> He gave no reasons for his conclusions. It may be seen that his adverse finding was not based upon a matter of credit or his demeanour in the witness box. It may have been based upon a matter of attitude, but that is speculation. Certainly, no suggestion of lack of impartiality or independence or bias was put to Professor Thomas during his evidence by the prosecutor or the learned magistrate.

In other words, His Honour is saying that Professor Thomas, in the primary court, was ambushed. It was not even put to him, and that is a fundamental rule. If you are going to accuse someone of something in a courtroom, there is a rule (we call it the Brown and Dunn rule) that it has to be put to the witness. His Honour Justice Mullighan said in this judgment:

> There is no hint of any of these matters in his evidence. His observations and opinions appear to have been recounted in an entirely appropriate manner.

He then goes on and makes this formal finding:

> In my view, the learned magistrate erred in his dismissal of Professor Thomas's evidence from his consideration. Dr Gilbert agreed that the manner of incurring the injuries to the arm and the neck, as advanced by the defence, was possible.

So, what we have is a statement by a senior judicial officer that what Magistrate Baldino said about this well respected forensic pathologist was incorrect and unfair. One might think that the Attorney-General—the first law officer in the state—would have advised the parliament of that fact.

Now, let me tell you about an ethical obligation on the part of legal practitioners: it is a requirement on a legal practitioner, in making a submission to a court, to be fully frank and open about any authority which that lawyer is seeking to cite to advance his client's case. In other words, if I refer or cite a case in a court, knowing that it has been subsequently overruled on appeal, that is unprofessional conduct and can lead to an application to have me struck off as a legal practitioner. In other words, the standard is that you must be open and full in terms of your explanation to the court and, in particular, citing authorities, and it is an ongoing obligation.

I have been involved in court cases where, if the case I have cited has been overturned on appeal, I am obliged to advise the court that that case has been overturned on appeal. In one case I was involved in before the High Court where that had happened we immediately wrote to advise the High Court of that decision overturning the court case to which we had referred during the course of argument. I suspect the High Court already knew about that, because the court is quicker with these things than the average practitioner. So, that is the standard and the duty required of a legal practitioner appearing before the court.

My question is: has the Attorney-General—the first law officer of this state—engaged in a standard of behaviour that is consistent with what he, as the first law officer in this state, should and must expect of the legal profession over which he has responsibility and charge. What I would suggest is that he has failed. Indeed, if the House of Assembly was a court of law, having been told on 16 July of the error of his ways and having failed to immediately correct the record, would be sufficient for an application to have him struck off the roll of practitioners. Fortunately for the Attorney-General, he has not signed the roll, so he is not a practising lawyer. He can get away with that, but as the first law officer of the state—a man who is ready, willing and able to criticise the legal profession on a regular, persistent and consistent basis for all sorts of different reasons, including imagined conspiracy theories—he has failed by the very standards by which those he criticises have to live.

People can make their own judgment about the Attorney-General, but I have lost an enormous amount of respect for him because he has failed to do what his responsibility would require him to do as the first law officer of this state. I have absolutely no doubt that the former attorney-general (Hon. Robert Lawson), or the previous attorney-general (Hon. Trevor Griffin), or the attorney-general before him (Hon. Chris Sumner) would not have played this sort of game. The Attorney-General stands—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I hear the honourable member's interjection, and I have probably pitched this argument as a lawyer, but I will come back to being a politician. I draw the honourable member's attention to page 2 of the South Australian *Ministerial Code of Conduct*, which states:

> 2.3 Reputation.
> In the discharge of his or her public duties, a minister shall not dishonestly or wantonly and recklessly attack the reputation of any other person.

People will make their own judgment. I have done a fair bit of criminal law in my time, and I am sure the explanation will be, 'Well, I didn't do it dishonestly—because he has been caught with his pants down—or wantonly or recklessly. Therefore 2.3 does not apply.' And it did not apply, if you use that argument, when he made the statement on 1 July. It may be that, despite having 100-odd lawyers at his fingertips, no-one bothered to tell him until I rose to my feet on 16 July. On 16 July it was made public. It was put fairly and squarely to the Leader of the Government, who was then Attorney-General—I do not think he was acting; I think he was the Attorney-General.

This statement given by the Attorney-General as the first law officer was not only given by the Attorney-General for the Attorney-General on behalf of the Attorney-General: it was given by the government for the government on behalf of the government. The leader in this place had a responsibility to deal with it, just as much as the Attorney-General.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: And he acknowledges that. This is what I love about this *Ministerial Code of Conduct*: it is fast running into a joke—and in some respects I should spell it because some members do not seem to understand it. It states:

> 2.4: Ministers are expected to act honestly, diligently and with propriety in the performance of their public duties and functions. Ministers must ensure they do not deliberately mislead the public or the parliament on any matter of significance arising from their functions. . . It is a minister's personal responsibility to ensure that any inadvertent error or misconception in relation to a matter is corrected or clarified, as soon as possible and in a manner appropriate to the issues and interests involved.

What does 'as soon as possible' mean? Is it 17 July? Perhaps not, as parliament was not sitting. Perhaps it should have been corrected on Monday. No, not according to this government. Perhaps it should have been corrected on Tuesday. No, not according to this government. What is meant by the term 'as soon as possible'? Indeed, the Attorney-General in another place today was asked the question directly and, instead of acknowledging or giving a statement saying, 'I will expand on it in more detail, but this is the state of affairs: I am sorry Professor Thomas, I defamed you under parliamentary privilege. I misled the parliament, and I'm sorry,' he did not do that. So, this minister has failed when it comes to the application of the ministerial code of conduct.

I say that my respect for this Attorney-General has been shattered as a consequence of his failure to uphold the ministerial code of conduct. When people say things about various other matters that are before the parliament and before the courts in relation to this Attorney-General, I take it with a grain of salt. These issues were brought before this parliament, and were again directed to the leader of this place on Monday, yet all we get at the end of the first week of parliament is a ministerial statement. This comes from a minister who thinks that statements to the parliament and making sure the record is correct and people's reputations are properly protected take less priority than playing with a yo-yo or other stunts we saw in another place.

The Hon. P. Holloway: And dummies!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: And dummies that we saw earlier in the week. I ask members to draw their own conclusions, but this conduct can be characterised in only one way. It will be very interesting, when it comes to the leader of this place, to see how he could characterise it in any other fashion. All I say is that the credibility of the first law officer of this state has a very big question over it.

The PRESIDENT: That is close to imputation.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIREARMS (COAG AGREEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 67.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I indicate that the Liberal opposition will support the second reading of this bill. At the committee stage we will support a number of amendments, which I will address briefly during this second reading contribution. The opposition has been pleased to accommodate the government in the accelerated passage of this bill. Within the opposition, the Hon. Rob Brokenshire (as shadow police minister) has carriage of it. It was envisaged that the bill would be introduced in another place by the Treasurer (who is the responsible minister), and it is there that the shadow minister would have had conduct of it.

Accordingly, consultation in relation to this measure has been undertaken by Mr Brokenshire. He and the opposition have been actively engaged in discussions and negotiations with the Combined Shooters and Firearms Council and Treasury and other officers who have been responsible from the government's side in the development of this legislative package. The Hon. Rob Brokenshire personally is extremely familiar with the issues and in due course will be able to provide the other place with expertise which I cannot profess.

It is important at the outset to indicate that the Liberal opposition does support the COAG agreement. We believe that the COAG agreement ought to be implemented in legislation. One of the defects of the bill currently before this council is that it goes beyond the requirements of the COAG agreement. I will come to that in due course. I should indicate that it is quite complex legislation and it did require consultation with those interest groups in the community who are most familiar with matters pertaining to firearms.

Regrettably, that consultation has not occurred. The police ministers' council reached an agreement on 6 December 2002. Despite the fact that the combined shooters had several

meetings with minister Conlon when he was police minister, and his advisers, they were given assurance on that occasion that consultation would occur in ample time to ensure a considered response. This ample time was not provided. After the change of police minister and the Deputy Premier, the Hon Kevin Foley, became police minister, the combined shooters, once again, sought to have input, but I am advised that nothing occurred until the release of a bill on 25 July. At that time, submissions on concerns had to be back to the minister by 5 September. That time for consultation was ridiculously and unfairly short. I am told it put undue pressure on the combined shooters and their constituent members.

I think it is worth saying that the Combined Shooters and Firearms Council represents a large number of community organisations and a large number of individuals in our community—law abiding citizens who are interested in firearms. It is appropriate that I list the constituent members so that honourable members can be aware of the widespread interest and support which this subject has in the community. They are as follows: Adelaide Pistol & Shooting Club Inc.; Adelaide Pistol Collectors Club; Antique & Historical Arms Association (SA) Inc.; Arms & General Collectors Association Inc.; Australian Cartridge Collectors Association SA Branch; Balaklava Pistol Club; El Alamein Collectors Club; Firearms Traders Council; Hellenic Games Shooters Association Inc.; Heritage Arms Society Inc.; Heritage Arms Society Inc.; International Handgun Metallic Silhouette Association; International Practical Shooting Confederation (SA) Inc.; Military Arms Collection Society; Military Arms Preservation Society; Military Sporting & Historical Arms Association SA; Penfield Historic Arms Collectors Club; Police Firearms Collectors Club; Port Lincoln Firearms Collectors Club; SAFE Collectors Club; Security Shooters (SA) Inc.; Single Action Shooting Society; Spencer Gulf Centrefire Pistol & Shooting Club; Sporting Shooters Association of Australia (SA) Inc.; South Australia Canine Association Inc.; South Australian Field & Game Association Inc.; South Australian Revolver & Pistol Association Inc.; and the South Australian Target Pistol League.

I enumerate those clubs and associations to emphasise that this is a significant community activity in this state. It represents not only people who shoot but also collectors who have bona fide interests. These people deserve consideration. This measure has been too rushed. These are clubs which are manned by unpaid volunteers. They have had to put in many hours, in a rushed situation, in an endeavour to consult—so called—with the government. These are not organisations which receive government funding or support from any outside organisations.

As I said at the outset, this is a complex bill, and many of the provisions are, or certainly appear to be, contradictory and also implement measures which are quite outside the purview of the COAG agreement. It is easy, and too easy for some members of our community who are not interested in shooting and firearms, to dismiss those who are. As I said, this is a legitimate activity, this is a sporting activity of the very highest level. Australians participate in shooting competitions with great and increasing success around the globe. These are not fringe dwellers, they are not people who are engaged in illegal activity and they are not people who are in any sense at the fringes of the law. They are people who have a legitimate interest in pursuing an important recreational pastime. They deserve consideration—and they certainly deserve more consideration than they have received to this date.

It is gratifying that the government agreed to split the bill into matters pertaining to the implementation of the COAG agreement and some other measures that the government proposes to implement in relation to amendments to the Firearms Act. Regrettably, the government has not been sufficiently diligent in this bill in excluding all the material that is not strictly implementation of the COAG agreement, and the people who are interested in these matters are convinced that the government has gone outside the scope of COAG for the purpose of imposing unnecessary regulation on their activities.

We believe that the COAG agreement can be fairly and appropriately implemented, and that some of the measures that are included in this bill ought not be supported. One of the difficulties in this area of the law—more so than in many others—is that the regulations are an integral part of the legislative scheme that regulates and controls firearms. Of course, what we are considering in this bill is the legislative measure. Some regulations have been tabled in respect of firearms, but the full scope of the government's proposal in relation to this is not before the parliament.

We will produce the amendments that we believe should be incorporated in the bill at the committee stage early next week (and I am assured that we are taking all steps necessary to have those available on Monday, and we will certainly make them available to the minister as soon as we have them to hand). The first area concerns parts of firearms. Firearms parts are not referred to in the COAG agreement, except in relation to what items qualify as a major hand gun part for the buyback purposes of the act. This creates an anomalous situation.

The amendment which is now proposed in the bill is similar to a proposal which arose at the time of the 1996 amendments to the firearms legislation. At that time, those amendments were rejected and, as I am advised, the South Australia Police acknowledged that the proposals then were unworkable. The combined shooters believe that these current proposals (which, as I said, are outside the COAG agreement), once again, introduce measures concerning firearms parts which are inappropriate. The amendments that we will introduce will seek to refer to only those parts of hand guns or clay class H firearms that are being included for buyback purposes.

There is a considerable issue in this bill in regard to antique firearms. Many of the antique firearms that are now to be the subject of this legislation have been in the community for over a century and, as the opposition has advised, have not been a cause of any serious concern. Many family heirlooms are involved, and the proposals contained in this bill will affect those people who have held these family heirlooms, even though there has never been any suggestion of criminal or other activity. Many of these items are entirely unsuitable for use as modern day weapons or for any purpose other than collecting, yet under the measures contained in this bill their owners will have a levy put on them and will have imposed on them the requirement of joining a collectors' club and having to attend meetings, and the like. This is an imposition for which there is no public policy justification. We will therefore move an amendment to endeavour to accommodate this difficulty.

There is also a problem in relation to ammunition. I am advised that there is no provision in the legislation for the ammunition of firearms which are to be the subject of the buyback. This will mean that the owners of handguns to which the buyback applies will be left with ammunition on

hand, and it would be entirely appropriate, and no public interest would be jeopardised, to allow persons in that situation—certainly during the first three months of the buyback period—to use such ammunition as they may have, because this will become useless after the buyback period.

There are also some anomalies in relation to the students-of-arms criteria, and it is proposed that those anomalies ought to be addressed in this legislation so as to make it less onerous than would otherwise be the case for legitimate collectors and students to be able to continue their lawful hobby.

Once again, we regret that the government has been slow to produce this measure. We thank the government for splitting the bill, which is appropriate, but the rush that is now upon the parliament is something of the government's own making and is something that we regret. However, we will accommodate—both here and in the other place—the rapid passage of this measure. I will be seeking support from all members of the council, including the government, for the amendments which will be circulated next Monday.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I indicate Democrat support for the second reading of the bill. In my understanding of it, there is nothing in the bill to which we would object. As honourable members would know, I have been personally involved in, and the party has been strongly supportive of, gun control in general terms right across the board. I was one of the founding members of the Gun Control Coalition in South Australia and continue to have that interest. Obviously we tend, from our policy, to be supportive of the move.

It is important to realise that the days of our still being attracted to a gun culture are far from over. Let me share with the council what was distributed on a Woolworths purchase docket, as follows:

> Do I fire real bullets? Is it safe? Yes. No licence required—fully supervised by safety officers. Present this Shop-A-Docket offer for 20 free shots with every purchase of 50 rounds .22 cal ammo for $39. Save over $15. Marksman Indoor Firing Range. Corporate and group bookings available. Normal hiring conditions apply.

I share this with the council because we tend to become very complacent that the use of firearms is just a relatively benign activity, and in the vast majority of cases it is. However, where it is misused and where it is the cause of death and serious injury, it is often because there has been a proliferation, a lack of supervision and a lack of storage and control of firearms in the community.

I have no problem with this legislation going beyond the COAG agreement. South Australia has led the debate, and that has been partly because of pressure from the Democrats (I am not so arrogant as to say entirely) and the Coalition for Gun Control, which had significant support from leaders in the community after the massacre at Port Arthur.

We are prepared to look at amendments but if they tend in any way to water down what should be tight controls and onerous conditions on people who hold operative firearms in our community they will not have our support. If there are glaring inconsistencies or glaringly unnecessary impositions, we are prepared to look at them with an open mind, but I indicate to the chamber and to the opposition that, having heard the shadow attorney-general speaking to this bill, the opposition should not be encouraged to look to us for support for any measure that would water down the effectiveness of this legislation.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I thank members who have spoken in this debate for their indication of support. The shadow attorney-general indicated that, although this piece of legislation has been limited essentially to the recommendation of the Australian police ministers' conference and the COAG agreement of last year, it is nevertheless a complex area. I would agree with him on that. As he indicated, this legislation has been separated from other legislation that the government has foreshadowed, including that which would remove the statute of limitation in relation to certain firearms offences. I expect that that legislation will be introduced into the parliament later this year, and I believe that it will be welcomed by responsible shooters.

I am pleased that members have indicated their support, and I thank them for facilitating debate on this measure at fairly short notice, given that the bill has to be passed through the next week of sitting so it can meet the starting date for the buyback scheme of 1 October. I agree with the shadow attorney that the vast majority of sporting shooters and club members are responsible people. I have a number of friends who are sporting shooters and I know that they are responsible people.

In this legislation, we need to meet the requirements of the COAG agreement, and at the same time we need legislation that is as practicable as possible and will not involve unnecessary complexity for responsible shooters. At the same time, they must of course be consistent with the COAG agreement and achieve those ends. The government has already foreshadowed several amendments—in fact, they have been more than foreshadowed: they have been tabled. Next week we will look at those amendments which the opposition has indicated.

I thank members for their speedy consideration of the bill and I look forward to this council being able to complete the committee stage early next week so that this bill can go back to the House of Assembly and be passed in time for the buyback to begin on 1 October.

Bill read a second time.

DRIED FRUITS REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 59.)

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: The opposition will be supporting this bill. It is largely as a result of a national competition policy inquiry into the Dried Fruits Act, which controlled the central organisation for production and marketing of dried fruit in South Australia for more than 70 years. I thank the minister and his department for their briefing. On inquiry, it appears that much of this act has been superseded by self-management and national standard processes. The national competition policy review was conducted in 1998 and completed by August 1999. It found that, subject to a number of key functions taking place, the act and its regulations should be repealed. Those key processes were:

- food safety legislation for packers and their premises;
- an approved supplier program for delivery by growers of quality assured product for packing sheds;
- a code of practice documented and agreed;
- training delivered to the industry;
- a funding mechanism for the South Australian Dried Tree Fruits Association;

· dried fruits research and development to be secured through links with Horticulture Australia; and

Other industry development information support functions were to be developed and delivered by the South Australian Dried Tree Fruits Association.

I had the opportunity to ask a number of questions of the person who briefed me. It is interesting to note that 2 146 tonnes of dried fruits are produced in South Australia each year, and the vast majority of those are apricots, followed by dried vine fruits. One of the questions I asked was: why is this administered by the Dried Tree Fruits Association? Apparently, sultanas, raisins, currants and all dried vine fruits are administered out of Victoria, but the Vine Dried Fruits Association works in close cooperation with the Dried Tree Fruits Association in this state.

The standards necessary as part of this review are now delivered on the food safety side by HACCP based management systems and on the standards of fruit by market demand. Many producers over the years have chosen to not necessarily comply with the old standards in the act, because they have wished to differentiate their product from others. As part of the previous premier's Food for the Future program, they have encouraged individual branding and the finding of niche markets.

Those standards are now met by a code of practice which applies for growers supplying the packers, and a training program has been delivered to growers on this code of practice. Quality assurance systems are demanded by their supermarket customers which, again, covers the requirements in the previous act.

Further to that, there are some $70 000 to $75 000 of unexpended levies which are currently under the control of the minister but which will be transferred to the new Dried Fruits Association. The industry development, information and support functions will also be handed over to that association. This is an uncontentious bill and, as I have said, most of the practices that were covered under the old act have long been superseded by more modern methods of marketing and control. The opposition supports the bill.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I indicate the Democrats' support for the second reading. Whilst we recognise both Liberal and Labor support and there is little that would stop the move (and it is not our intention to try), I express some disquiet. Once again, this parliament is supporting the deregulation of an industry in response to the National Competition Council review. The NCC is threatening the sovereignty of South Australia with these directions, and I note that the government benches are starting to realise this, too.

On Monday this week, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries stated, in answer to a question relating to genetically engineered crops:

> National competition policy issues are becoming increasingly difficult for the states.

In his second reading speech, the minister may well take the opportunity to elaborate on whether the government would have taken this measure had it not been for the general tide and climate of pressure from the National Competition Council.

I believe that it is time to reconsider the value of the competition payments and ask whether it is worth the cost to the free will of this state, as has happened in several other areas recently; in my judgment, the shop trading hours is a classic case. The Dried Fruits Act was designed to assist the dried fruits industry. It has achieved this through a statutory corporation that oversees the dried fruits industry, registration producers and packers, and that requires certain standards to be met in the production, packing, storage and handling of dried fruits.

I believe these are noble aims, and we would rather see these achieved by legislation, rather than leaving them to the market. I note, however, that some provision has been made to ensure that the benefits of the legislation are not entirely lost with its repeal. The minister indicated in his second reading contribution that there is now in place:

· food safety legislation for packers and their premises;
· an approved supplier program for delivery of quality assured product to packing sheds by growers;
· a code of practice documented and agreed to by packers and growers and training on this code of practice delivered to industry;
· a funding mechanism for the SA Dried Tree Fruits Association secured;
· dried fruits research and development secured through links with Horticulture Australia;
· other industry development, information and support functions developed and delivered by the SA Dried Tree Fruits Association.

I am not clear how many of those dot points have already been achieved; some of them may be promised as a consequence of the repeal this legislation. However, I repeat that we believe (and I certainly have a strong belief) that, where there is to be regulation of this nature of an industry, it is far better that it be by legislation of the parliament. For that reason, I regret this move being forced upon us but, as I indicated earlier, we do not oppose the second reading.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I thank honourable members for their indication of support. The Hon. Caroline Schaefer, as she indicated, has had extensive briefing from officers of my department, but she may wish to raise any further issues at the committee stage.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan asked whether we would have introduced this bill had it not been for competition policy. Certainly it was the competition policy review that led us to look at the issue, but in this case the answer is yes. I have some sympathy for the comments of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan in relation to national competition policy. The state is currently awaiting the public release of the response of the national competition policy to issues raised this year, so I am somewhat restrained in what I can say about matters related to the NCC, but I certainly look forward to joining the debate in the near future when that information is made available.

While I share many of the reservations of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan in relation to the operation of competition policy in recent times, I point out that the Dried Fruits Act relates to an industry where those structures that have been in place for 70 or so years have not achieved their objective. The fact that the industry has got to the stage it has means that this is one case where the repeal of the bill, and hopefully the new arrangements and ownerships within what remains of the industry, will cause some regeneration of the industry, which obviously has suffered over the past decade or more from the importation of cheap apricots, particularly Turkish apricots. However, there is a future for the industry in niche markets and, hopefully, as a result of the industry getting its act together, that will be where its future lies.

I do not think the existence or otherwise of the dried fruits legislation is significant, and I think we would have introduced this bill regardless of national competition policy. However, I share some of the honourable member's views on NCP where it has been applied in other areas. I thank members for their indications of support and, if there are any further questions, we will deal with them in committee.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I did ask whether the dot points I read out from my notes had been achieved or were aims to be achieved.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: They have been achieved.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: The answer has come from the opposition benches.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 5) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment; committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 61.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I rise to indicate Liberal opposition support for the passage of this bill. The bill was originally introduced in another place by the Attorney-General on 28 May but was not progressed by the end of the last session and is now reintroduced in the same form in this place. The first part of the bill makes minor amendments to 65 existing acts. None of these amendments are controversial. They derive from decisions of parliamentary counsel rather than policy decisions of government. Most of the amendments relate to the headings in legislation, and some convert existing numbering to the standard and style now used in all new acts. The opposition commends this continual process of making our acts of parliament easier to read.

The second part of the bill repeals a number of acts, four of which relate to financial agreements which no longer have any practical relevance. They are the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act 1945, the Commonwealth and State Housing Supplemental Agreement Act 1954, the Homes Act 1941, and the Loans for Water Conservation Act 1948. The Native Industries Encouragement Act 1872 is repealed. This is an interesting measure which was designed to facilitate the protection and encouragement of South Australian industry at a time when, as all students of Australian history would know, there was a great debate between the protection state of Victoria and the free trade state of New South Wales.

The material that I have been able to gather at fairly short notice does not indicate whether any—and if so what—financial support was granted under the Native Industries Encouragement Act 1872, but it is worth noting. Here I am relying on the excellent *Wakefield Companion to South Australian History* published by Wakefield Press in 2001 to say that, in this state until relatively recent times, the manufacturing industry played a minor part in our economy. Under the heading 'Industrialisation', it is stated that by World War I manufacturing was still on a relatively small scale and contributed proportionately less to state employment than was the case in Victoria and New South Wales or indeed to the Australian average. It was largely restricted to a few industrial categories: the processing of rural products and the like. It was not until the late 1930s (largely coinciding with the premiership of Thomas Playford) that rapid industrialisation transformed the state. Notwithstanding that interesting aside, it is clear that the Native Industries Encouragement Act served its purpose and ought be repealed.

Finally, the act repeals the White Phosphorous Matches Prohibition Act 1915. The repeal of that act is entirely appropriate, as its subject matter is now covered by other legislation, namely, the Trade Standards Act 1979 and the Dangerous Substances Act of that same year. We certainly support the second reading of this bill.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE (ADMINISTRATION GUARANTEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 63.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I indicate that the Liberal opposition will support the second reading of this bill. At present the Administration and Probate Act provides that when a natural person is the administrator of an estate which is deemed 'vulnerable', the administrator must enter into an administration bond with the Public Trustee. The purpose of this act is to alter that procedure and to introduce the notion of surety guarantees, and also to facilitate the appointment of joint administrators in certain circumstances. An administration bond—that is the instrument used under the current legislation—is an agreement with the Public Trustee under which the administrator and the sureties promise to pay to the Public Trustee the full value of the South Australian estate if the administrator fails in his or her duty.

If such a failure does occur, an interested party may sue on the bond to recover the value of the South Australian estate from the administrator and the sureties. The interested party then holds the money on trust for anyone entitled to a share in the estate. There has been a trend away from administration bonds in other jurisdictions. Victoria, for example, has abolished them entirely. In that state the court has a general power to require surety guarantees in any case where it deems appropriate, and in Western Australia a similar position pertains.

In New South Wales, on the other hand, a bond and sureties are generally required in all administrations. However, the court in that state does have power on application to dispense with this requirement or to reduce the amount of the bond or sureties. Queensland, on the other hand, has adopted an entirely different approach. There, administrators are treated in exactly the same way as the executors under a will, namely, they are not required to provide a bond nor to have sureties. South Australia has adopted a measure, as now proposed in this bill, which is supported by the Law Society and by the legal practitioners who practise in this particular field.

This bill will remove the requirement for a bond with the Public Trustee and require instead a surety guarantee from a third party who guarantees to meet the liability if the administrator fails to meet his or her obligations. Unlike the existing administration bonds, which include the Public

Trustee as a party, the new surety guarantee is only between the administrator and the person giving the surety. It was envisaged, I believe, when this scheme was first thought up, that insurance companies would provide surety bonds.

However, owing to changes in the insurance market, there is no insurer presently trading in this state that is willing to act as a surety. If this situation continues, sureties will be available only from private persons or from entities who are willing to risk their own funds. These may be difficult to find. Accordingly, the bill provides that the court can dispense with the requirement for a surety guarantee and, if needed, appoint joint administrators as an alternative safeguard against maladministration of the estate. This joint administration will provide a practical solution where an administrator is unable to find a third party willing to act as surety.

However, we believe that the government is correct in incorporating in the bill a requirement for a surety guarantee in the first instance because administrators should satisfy the court that a surety guarantee should be dispensed with before additional administrators are appointed. In practice, it is envisaged that persons with professional indemnity insurance, for example, solicitors and accountants, will be appointed as joint administrators with their lay client. By that means the interests of consumers will be protected. The natural administrator will be able to fulfil the responsibility aided by a professional person.

As I mentioned earlier, the origin of this bill was a request from solicitors who practise in the field, and it is supported by the Law Society. The bill strikes a balance. It provides practical solutions to problems whilst at the same time retaining protection for vulnerable estates. We support the second reading.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

COOPER BASIN (RATIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 September. Page 113.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: This bill is a consequence of competition policy review, and it largely puts into law what has been the practice. The bill itself was introduced on 7 July and reintroduced a few days ago on 16 September; so, it has been in the public domain now for more than two months. No-one has contacted the Democrats about this bill since it was introduced on 7 July and it appears therefore to be non-controversial; and, as a consequence, the Democrats will be supporting the second reading. However, I assure members that it is not because of any sympathy with competition policy. I make certain that it remains on the record that the Democrats continue to be cynical about competition policy and will continue to criticise it.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.08 p.m. the council adjourned until Monday 22 September at 2.15 p.m.