

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 September 2010

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

The **SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

VISITORS

The **SPEAKER:** I acknowledge that we have in the gallery some students from the Booleroo Centre District School. There is only a small number of them but we welcome them and hope they enjoy their time here. They are guests of the member for Stuart.

GAMING MACHINES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 July 2010.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:04): It is my pleasure to confirm that I represent the shadow minister in the other place (Hon. Terry Stephens) in the debate on the Gaming Machines (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. However, I presume that quite a few members from our side will make a contribution. It is not my intention to go to the committee stage—I flag from the very start that the position held by the opposition is to support the bill—but some individual members have given a level of consideration to amendments that they may propose. I hope those amendments have been flagged with the minister, but maybe not. We will see what happens.

I indicate from the start that gambling is a very emotive issue in the community. For about 12 months after my election to this chamber in 2006, I held the shadow gambling portfolio, and, in that time, I tried to engage with the community, with the industry itself and with the community groups who were trying to support those people who were suffering as a result of gambling problems. In many ways, I found that 12-month period to be very enlightening.

I do recognise that, for some people, gambling is an issue that they barely tolerate while others find it to be a form of entertainment they can control quite comfortably, and they enjoy the experience that it provides for them. For other people it has become the devil in their lives, and it has affected them in so many ways. The industry, though, I think is very responsible in the way in which it controls, assists and invests; and I recognise that this bill is all about improving the systems that are in place and ensuring that we can manage to move forward the debate as it occurs with respect to gambling in South Australia to benefit all sections of society.

I commend the minister on bringing the bill before the house. I might make some comments later in relation to the Independent member from Tasmania, Andrew Wilkie, and the commitment he has obtained from the federal Labor Party in relation to gambling amendments and how they may impact on this bill, or, indeed, a series of legislative measures which the minister flagged in his second reading explanation, as well as a discussion paper to be released in the last quarter of this year to consider national amendments that may be required for gambling.

About halfway through the time I spent as the shadow minister for gambling, I was invited by the Australian Hotels Association to undertake a tour of some of its recently updated facilities—hotels in the community and metropolitan Adelaide. It was easy to recognise then—and, certainly, I have tried to be far more observant in my time since—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No.

Dr McFetridge: Research!

Mr GRIFFITHS: True. Lunch was arranged as part of the tour, but the drinking was kept very much to a minimum, minister. It was easy to recognise that gambling, as it is developing across South Australia, has created an opportunity for licensed premises—be they hotels or clubs—to invest serious dollars in upgrades of their facilities. That, in effect, creates some enormous benefits for people who use those facilities but who do not necessarily use the gambling

machines within them to enjoy a better quality of time, their meal and the environment, so I recognise that as a good thing.

The other side of the argument for me, though, was a couple of discussions I had with some gamblers' rehabilitation groups. Indeed, on one Saturday morning I went to a church hall in North Adelaide and met with a gamblers' rehabilitation group. About 16 people were there, and the discussion I had that day moved me. Each of the people recounted the story of their life and how gambling had affected them (predominantly with poker machines), how the devil still hangs over their head every day and that they have to resist the very serious temptation every day not to drive their car to a facility or walk into a facility that will provide them with an opportunity to gamble.

I respect enormously that it is an issue that affects a very small minority of the community, but, as a wider social responsibility which the parliament and our community have, we must provide every opportunity we can to support those people to ensure that their lives are returned to the way they would like to live (and we would all like to live) and to give them more productive opportunities to help them control that, and the industry has been very up-front about it.

I know from some of my discussions with the casino, when I have talked to them about gambling issues there, the number of people it has staffing it whose total responsibility rests around identifying people in the casino who might be having some level of difficulty and talking to them about it is very commendable. The Independent Gambling Authority, in the work it has done over a number of years now, has proactively worked in every area it can. The industry is maturing. Society is maturing in relation to its use of gambling machines, and now it is appropriate, as the minister indicated in his second reading speech, to bring in legislation that goes about improving things.

There are comments I will make and questions I will pose to the minister—I know he has people here making notes—that were discussed as part of the opposition formulating its position on it. There will also be other members from the opposition who will rise to speak in relation to the bill, but hopefully at the end of this and as it progresses through the parliament we will have a bill that actually improves gambling in South Australia, which is what everybody wants to see.

I note that the bill was introduced by the minister on 21 July, and its stated objectives were to create a better, responsible gambling environment in South Australia and to reduce the cost and risks associated with regulation and various administrative improvements. The second reading speech by the minister also referred to a consultation paper which the Department of Treasury and Finance will release in the last quarter of 2010 and which addresses 'the changes necessary to gambling legislation to allow a national response to be developed and implemented, therefore creating the need for a further bill to then be developed and introduced into the parliament'.

I note in some information provided by the minister's office late last week (which the opposition thanks him for) in relation to several questions that had been posed that there are some 12,900 entitlements currently held within South Australia (as on the 30 June 2010 figures), of which the live machines were actually 12,744. Any member who has been in this place for some number of years would respect the fact that in the parliament that sat from 2002 to 2006 there was a very lengthy debate about gambling and that, as part of those amendments, as I understand from the Hon. Mr Xenophon, there is a requirement for a reduction of 3,000 machines.

In the one year I held the shadow responsibility for gambling, in my questioning of the Hon. Paul Caica, the then minister for gambling, about how successful the government and the Independent Gambling Authority had been in reducing the number by 3,000 machines, the figure then outstanding was in the range of 850. The minister might like to update us as to exactly how many of the 3,000 to be removed have been removed and how many are still outstanding.

In all the consultations I had with people they all talked about the \$50,000 cap on transferable electric gaming machine entitlements and how that was a hindrance to it occurring. Even in my own electorate of Yorke Peninsula and the Adelaide Plains, I have had people who hold entitlements—not in my electorate, incidentally, but who operate other businesses in my electorate—and wanted to onsell those entitlements, but they were concerned that the \$50,000 cap was making it impossible. It was too low a figure relative to its real value, so the fact that this bill introduces a lifting of the cap is something that the opposition clearly supports.

The shadow minister put a very strong case for it; there were no objections, I understand, from within our party room. I know the minister has received many letters in his time as minister (and he indicates yes) from people within the community and within the industry—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: From you included.

Mr GRIFFITHS: From me included—who are posing the question on behalf of their constituents. The minister indicates that he has listened on this, so I commend him on that. They pose the question of whether it was the intention of the government to review this, and clearly it has been. The minister indicated in his second reading speech that the formation of this bill has been over some time also, so it is not just a reaction to issues that have occurred very recently or to media reports but a bill the government has been putting effort into, and I recognise that, with the studies that have been undertaken since 2008 by various groups, it has put some effort into that.

The proposed removal of the \$50,000 cap—and I presume therefore that it is to be supported by both chambers of parliament and come into law—would allow, I would hope, within a very short period of time, the removal of those excess machines down to the 3,000 total. I noted in the second reading contribution that it appears there will be several rounds of trading. I would ask the minister to clarify the intention of how many rounds will occur. Is it intended to try to put some limit on the number of machines for which trading will occur in each of those rounds, or is it an opportunity that, during a round, if all those machines are identified and there is a market for them and the transfer is able to occur, they actually proceed?

From the minister's contribution, I also believe that the stamp duty requirements that would normally be in place for this transaction have been removed as an encouragement for the transaction to occur, and I think that is a good move. No doubt, in the budget deliberations the Treasurer has been having over several months, it would have been an opportunity to put that back for a bit more revenue to come in; however, as I have read the bill, there is no stamp duty applicable.

I would like to go to some other areas. There is a school of thought that suggests that, because such a large number of establishments actually have gaming machine entitlements (I think currently, from the figures, some 476 hotels, 71 clubs and 40 other special circumstances), an increase in the number available to each of those facilities might be of some merit. When the shadow minister in the other place speaks on this he will elaborate further, but he does have some level of thought on this that was developed as a result of feedback received at his consultation on the bill.

It is a social effects test, and I might pose some issues here. I wonder if the minister, in his response, would be in a position to outline the social effect test, the practical implications of that, and where he sees the benefits to be. Again, just from my reading of the second reading contribution, I understand that it is about improvement and ensuring that the establishment actually understands and manages it appropriately and that the community around that establishment benefits from that; however, I would like to hear more detail provided by the minister if possible.

I understand (and correct me if I am wrong) that it is therefore intended to have some control of facilities that are operated on airport land controlled by the Australian government. I believe there are no state taxation revenue opportunities from those facilities—and the minister raises his eyebrows—but I wonder whether this is intended to cap the number of machines that can operate there. Indeed, I am interested to know how many machines are at the Roulettes Tavern at Parafield Airport, and what the implications would be for that group. I do not believe there is any other establishment that fits the bill for this; it is only the Roulettes Tavern.

There are various measures being introduced as a result of this bill—seven, as I understand it. The third and fourth measures formally recognise the solid work of the Independent Gaming Authority, Clubs SA and the Australian Hotels Association in creating Club Safe and Gaming Care responsible gambling approaches. It is obvious—and I have alluded to it already—that it is important to enforce that work.

I also recognise that one of the other changes is the incentives created for all facilities to be signed up to the gambling authority's new code of practice by imposing longer closing hours on gaming venues that do not have responsible gambling agreements with an industry-responsible gambling agency. As I understand it, these venues will be required to close from midnight to 10am on weekdays and between 2am and 10am on weekends.

It is possible that some members of the opposition will put to the minister that a level of consistent closing periods across all facilities would be a preferred option. I will be interested to hear the minister's response in terms of how he is taking the effect of only those groups that do not have an agreement in place having that level of restriction and what the impost will be on clubs and hotels that do have an agreement in place so that anyone reading the *Hansard* will be able to

understand the distinction between the groups that have an agreement and those that do not and what the impact will be on closing hours for those groups.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I know the minister is on top of his portfolio—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: True. The minister confirms that he suspects all groups will take it up, and that is quite likely if there is a reduction in hours of opening that they can do it for.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. I also note that compliance and enforcement is an area that occupied a significant part of the submissions that the minister received. It goes on to talk about the work the Commissioner for Liquor and Gambling will do in changing the approach to compliance and enforcement, but it does not give much detail on that. It is quite possible that, in the briefings the minister and his staff had with the shadow minister, he has talked about what the commissioner will do, but for the benefit of House of Assembly members I am wondering whether the minister can provide some background on that.

I note that the penalties have been increased. I have no concern with that. I also note that it makes it very clear that gambling machines must be located in enclosed areas where smoking is not allowed. I fully support that. I have raised a question regarding Roulettes Tavern. The last issue I focus on relating to the second reading explanation by the minister is the reduction in red tape. This has been a target area for governments and opposition, I think, for many years.

The Rann/Foley Labor government has had, I think, two goes now at red tape reduction, with quite high targets set. My recollection is that I read a report in the media last week that talked about the level of efficiency that had been created through changes to legislation to reduce costs to business. I would like to enforce that it is very necessary to do this in all industries, and gambling is no different. So, any change that makes it easier, in an administrative sense, for a business to operate and, therefore, improve its productivity, give it a greater chance to invest and give it a greater chance to employ more people, is one that must be supported.

I have another question for the minister. Again, I apologise, because it is not my intention to put forward any amendments and therefore go into committee, that there are a lot of questions being posed to him in this way. As I understand it, the forfeiture rules are that for a trading transaction to occur, for every four machines one is lost—pulled from the system. My question would be: what happens to that machine? Is it permanently lost? Does it go to Club One? I have some level of understanding about how Club One operates. What actually happens to the entitlement to that machine; that is, the one in every four that results from a transaction? I think that is an issue that I and some of my colleagues would have some interest in.

A question was also posed as part of the reply from the minister to the shadow minister (dated 9 September) which referred to the Spent Convictions Act 2009 (which we note is not yet in operation) and the fit and proper person test which is undertaken. As I understand it, that involves a review of any criminal conviction that an applicant may have. The question posed by the opposition in the discussion on this is: if it is a 30 or 40-year-old offence and, indeed, was a minor offence which the person has now fully recovered from—gone on with their lives, become an outstanding member of the community—and is now in a position to apply for a licence, does that preclude them, or, as part of the review that takes place for the fit and proper person test, do you only look at the recent history of the person or do you take the long-term objective; and does any long-term review involving even a minor indiscretion that resulted in some level of criminal conviction prevent a person from being deemed to be fit and proper? Can the minister provide feedback on that.

Overall, the opposition welcomes the bill. There will be various members who will raise issues relevant to their own electorates and constituents and concerns they may personally hold, but we look forward to the quick passage of the bill and recognise that this bill has been some time in its formulation. Further amendments will be proposed regarding gaming regulations in future times as a result of the work being done later this year, and further amendments may indeed be proposed as a result of the agreement with the federal government and Mr Wilkie from Tasmania. I know that various sections of the industry are somewhat concerned about that, so the minister may choose to make some comments on that. It is a bit hard to discuss an issue that is probably not personally across his brief yet, but he may have some observations on that. I look forward to the continued debate on the bill.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:24): It is a pleasure to be back here in the parliament. I will not be opposing the Gaming Machines (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2010. As I think the previous speaker indicated, this is a conscience vote for the opposition. Of course, we on our side of the house believe in the freedom of having a conscience vote on all bills. In respect of many bills we have agreed to take a party position, but that is just one of the fundamental differences between them and us.

Essentially, this is a bill to clean up the mess from a pretty much botched process undertaken during the debates in 2003. We are in that position because the government of the day (under premier Rann) announced that it was going to deal with all the problems surrounding gambling using gaming machines. This, of course, has a history. I remind the house that this legitimate form of gambling was introduced under the premiership of the Hon. Lynn Arnold and his then treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins) in the wake of the financial disaster which arose out of the government's hapless management (at best) and gross negligent supervision of the State Bank.

So, the state was in a perilous financial position. To deal with it, the government introduced poker machines as a panacea for tax revenue, and the subsequent financial impecunious circumstances of the taxpayers of this state have meant that that situation has remained. There have been reports on the dangers and perils associated with poker machines. There is no question that a great number of members of the community enjoy the use of this equipment as an activity, but some place themselves and their families in a very dangerous and perilous financial situation.

The Rann government's answer to dealing with that group was to say, 'We don't have a buyback scheme.' I think it was an insincere presentation to the people of South Australia that this was going to be some panacea or resolution to the gambling problems that afflict a few in the community. I made that position clear in those debates. It was a bit like putting a bandaid on a severed leg wound.

At the time, I indicated that the \$50,000 cap on the machines that could be bought back was a nonsense. I am pleased to see that the government has obviously realised that it is a nonsense and that it should be removed. I think I was a lone voice at that time, but I am pleased to see that the government has finally woken up and realised that the cap has to go.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: The minister indicates that there are others. I am pleased to see that, on the issue of that amendment, the \$50,000 cap is to go. There are some other things that the government has tidied up, and our lead speaker, the honourable member for Goyder, has covered those superbly.

I draw to the attention of members of the house, and to the minister in particular, the proposal in the bill to reduce red tape, which the minister says is important for all industry sectors. Included in that is a measure to strengthen the social effect test, and to ensure that, before extraordinary expenditure is undertaken by those who might wish to apply and to avoid unnecessary costs being incurred, a measure will be introduced to enable the ultimate failure of a venue in that social effect test to be circumvented. I think that is a good initiative, and there are a few others in that category which I think are meritorious. The industry has obviously spoken, and I am pleased to see that the minister has listened.

In his second reading explanation, the minister describes one of the measures as follows:

The sixth measure removes the requirement that a government inspector be present at the installation of a gaming machine to seal the machine. This allows the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner to better allocate the office's resources as part of its compliance and enforcement function based on the Commissioner's assessment of risk.

The bill, as I read it, changes the requirement of this obligation, in particular clause 44, which is to substitute section 64, to provide a new penalty regime for the sealing of gaming equipment and gaming machines. I think that is what he is referring to. There may be other aspects of his bill which cover this as well.

Can I remind the house, firstly, that we have a whole division in the Gaming Machines Act 1992 which provides for offences relating to cheating. Division 5 covers sections 62 to 67. That establishes a regime to ensure that there are severe penalties for anyone in that broad spectrum who interferes with machines, interferes with devices, or seals a gaming machine, unless they are an authorised officer or inspector, for the removal of gaming tokens, and sets out certain

circumstances, particularly in section 66, where machines are not to operate and that principally relates to their connections and the like.

Previous parliaments have been very clear in ensuring that we have a mechanism by which the machines themselves are unable to be tampered with, as best as can be dealt with, and that for any person who is not authorised to interfere with machines there are severe penalties if they attempt to or do so. As members may be aware, it is the potential rigging of machines to change the statistical capacity for a player to win or, on the flip side, for an operator to have the benefit of income from the machines and increase their own revenue stream that is very important. So the integrity of the game, in this case the piece of equipment, is very important.

It is no different from having integrity processes that secure that bets on racehorses cannot be placed after the horses have jumped, or that roulette tables are not skewed so that certain numbers come up. These are all important for the issue of integrity. If you are going to have a game of chance and an opportunity to have fair chance of winning if you play the game, whether you are playing against an operator or the government, which wants to secure an income stream from it, it has to be secure.

During the course of consideration of this matter, on our side of the house, I was ably advised by the member for Stuart, who has had personal experience with the installation and operation of a poker machine (I do not know how many, but I will just say one for the moment). He is an eminently decent person whose wise advice I have taken. He tells me that the technology of the day is that when a machine arrives for installation on premises it is already sealed and that when it is installed there are certain parts of the machine that are untouchable by the operator or the person who might be attempting to play the game—any unauthorised person—and that they are protected from tampering.

The mechanism to ensure that does not happen is an alarm system that goes off somewhere in Adelaide that alerts the commissioner's office that someone or something has interfered with the seal. The commissioner's office can then action some response, presumably to attend or to make a telephone call, depending on how far away these premises are, to identify whether there has been an unwelcome invasion, whether the owner has tampered with it by rigging the thing so he gets a better percentage, whether there has been an earthquake, or whatever the explanation might be as to what has happened, and as a result of that scrutiny is very strict. It presumably relies on the technical equipment that provides the alert and its electricity supply etc. all working. Nevertheless, there is an alert system that is there and actionable when there has been any attempt to tamper.

On the flip side, it is important to consider whether it is necessary for us to continue to send inspectors out to look at these machines at the time that they are being installed to observe and certify, or report back or whatever, that that seal has not been tampered with. According to what the minister has told us, it does impose an unreasonable obligation on the time and resources of the office; therefore, should we continue to impose it? He says not. He says the officers have better things to do.

I say that the number one responsibility of the office is, frankly, to do whatever this parliament, in its legislation, tells it to do. If it, in fact, is a necessary part of that process to secure the integrity of the machines—the very bit of equipment that can change the dice as far as the balance goes between government revenue, operator and player—then it needs to be under some considerable scrutiny if it is going to be removed.

I have received some comfort from the member for Stuart that these bits of equipment now come with the sections that are necessary to secure the integrity of these machines with an alarm system. I am very pleased to hear that. Apparently you can still undo a part of the back of the machine to get your money out, as the proprietor of the premises that operates it. Obviously, that is to clear out the coins every day from some poor hapless players who have lost their money.

However, I remain concerned, minister, that the machine should be inspected by an authorised person at the time of installation or transfer to another premises. The reason I say that is principally this: firstly, to simply have penalties for persons who are not authorised officers to be punished if they do tamper is a bit like shutting the gate after the sheep are out. Secondly, it is important for the operator themselves—that is, the proprietor of the premises who is operating the poker machine—to ensure that there is some independent certification at the time of installation that the equipment is intact and secure (the seal has not been broken) and that there is an independent record of that occurring. That would actually provide a protection for the proprietor

themselves to ensure that they are less vulnerable to an allegation at a later date that they had tampered with this machine, even causing an agent to tamper with it before it is installed.

I am not completely convinced that this idea that authorised officers of the commission have better things to do and that it is a waste of resources is a good enough excuse not to deal with the scrutiny of these machines, because in this instance poker machines need to be secure, proprietors need to have the proper protection themselves and the players need to be assured that when they go in to play these machines the identified legal odds are secure.

As I am sure the Speaker would be aware from poker machines in her own electorate, the odds are a little bit against the poor old player in the first place because there has to be a margin upon which there is a return to both the proprietor and, of course, the taxpayer in the sense that Mr Foley has to get his cut. So, these things are gauged to ensure that you do not have an even chance when you play a poker machine; the odds are a bit stacked against you anyway but, of course, you are entitled to go in and play and hope that you get the jackpot.

I will have a further look at it if an amendment is required in relation to that. I note that there is an increased penalty under clause 44 for persons, other than an authorised officer, in respect of the sealing of gaming equipment and also, separately, for the sealing in any way of any gaming machine (as distinct from equipment) or break or in any way interfere with those. I remind the house that that is now to have a \$5,000 penalty or imprisonment for three months, so it is quite a severe penalty.

As I say, I think that it is important that we ensure that the sheep do not get out and that we do not just shut the gate after they have got out. I may have more to say later, during the course of the committee, because I understand some members have other amendments to put forward. I will give the minister as early notice as possible.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from St Jakobi's school in Lyndoch. It is nice to see such a big group. Welcome, and we hope you enjoy your time here. They are with the Hon. Michelle Lensink, but they are guests of the member for Schubert. Welcome, it is nice to see you here.

GAMING MACHINES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:41): The first thing for me to do is to declare an interest: I own a third share in a hotel with gaming licences, but it is not in Stuart; it is in the outback. It is not in Adelaide and, in fact, it is not even in a small regional town—it is well in the outback. Through that business, I am also a member of the Australian Hotels Association. I would like to get that on the record before I start.

As the member for Bragg quite rightly pointed out, this is a conscience vote for the Liberal Party. One of the very positive things about participating in the Liberal Party is that we get that opportunity quite regularly, so it is important that that is on the record as well.

I would also like to say that, while I am a business owner and a shareholder in a venue that has poker machines and benefits from poker machines, I can quite honestly say that I have no interest in them as a player. I really do not understand what people find enjoyable about playing pokies. Sitting in front of a machine, putting coins in and hoping that the machine decides whether you are going to win or lose—whether you put in \$2, \$200 or \$2,000—has no interest for me.

Consequently, because it does not interest me as a player at a personal level, and because I have a business interest in the industry (albeit relatively small, I am sure, compared with most other people who have an interest in this industry), I have thought about this a lot. I have lived in and run hotels that have poker machines, so I have thought about this issue quite a lot. I do not claim to be an expert at all, but I would like to share a few personal views.

I certainly support anything at all that is going to reduce problem gambling. Problem gambling will always be with us. Addiction to gambling and problem gambling is not just confined to pokies, and there is nothing we can do within the gaming industry to remove it from society. It is my experience that, generally speaking, gamblers are gamblers and that if one avenue is closed off they will find another avenue.

People gamble because it is in their nature, and most people control it, of course, and manage very well. However, gambling has been with us for thousands of years; we will not remove it and we will not remove some of the problems. It is no different from eating—some people eat too much—and a whole range of different things in the human race and human nature. However, I do wholeheartedly support trying to reduce problem gambling.

With regard to issues of addiction, largely we are also talking about saving people from themselves, and we as responsible community leaders need to take some lead there. Of course, the primary responsibility is with the people who gamble and who have the problem to actually try to help themselves. Certainly, as community leaders and people contributing to legislation, it is very important that we play our part as well.

I pick up on something the member for Bragg said about the pokie industry specifically. It is a few years since I have had hands-on involvement in the operation of pokie machines, but I did do it for seven years. At that point in time (and I suspect still) the industry in South Australia was governed such that, on average, the return to players was a minimum of 85 per cent. Again, why would you play a machine; why would you participate in a form of gambling and/or a form of entertainment or amusement when you know that statistics tell you that, the more you play, the more you are going to come back to the industry average? You might just come in, put in your \$2 or \$10 and you might hit the jackpot, or you might just give it away. If you play day in and day out, you will come back closer to that average.

As an average player on an average machine in an average gaming establishment, you will lose 15 per cent of your money. It is just the way it is set up. That is true of gambling across the board. Gambling by definition means that, on average, you lose; otherwise, there would not be bookmakers, the TAB, or people wanting to do it. People must understand that this industry is quite openly and quite publicly predicated on the fact that, if you play, the average player will lose their money. There is no secret about that.

With regard to the management of the pokie industry, I think that, in general, the pokie industry is managed very well. I would like to say that publicans across our state and the responsible people who work within those businesses work within very strong guidelines and do so willingly. They have to comply with not only laws and regulations but also a voluntary code of practice. There are all sorts of things that require participants from the hotel industry to act responsibly. I think it is worth putting on the record that, by and large—and I am not aware of personal instances—the industry does fulfil its obligations very well and also goes over and above them with further codes of conduct.

I think it is important to compliment the industry in that regard. It is legal to have pokie machines and to operate them and, so long as a business proprietor does that within the constraints of the law and operates in the way that they should, it is their legal entitlement to do that. That is fair trade and fair enterprise. People should not feel ashamed about the fact that they participate in that industry. Getting back to the main point here, though, problem gambling is an issue and I do support any measures that will help reduce problem gambling.

There are many benefits from the gaming industry and I would like to focus on the benefits in a regional context. Everybody here knows that is my main focus, namely, the people of Stuart and then, more broadly, regional South Australia. We need to have successful businesses. We must have successful businesses in regional towns and small places. If we do not have successful businesses, we will not have successful communities, employment and people providing apprenticeships. If we do not have strong businesses, they will not have the opportunity to stay in their small, regional town and develop lives, careers, homes and families.

Although not every hotel has gaming machines, certainly within the hotel industry they are very important. It should not be underestimated how much this industry contributes to regional South Australia both through the money it returns through the gaming tax and the good work of many successful businesses. It is very important to highlight that fact, as well as the tourism benefit. Whether or not we like it (and keep in mind I cannot understand what the attraction is), a lot of people enjoy playing the pokies when on holidays. A lot of those people travel through regional South Australia, and they will stay and spend more money in regional towns if they have the opportunity to enjoy gaming machines.

With regard to compliance—and the member for Bragg touched on a couple of things—there is already extremely strong compliance within the industry. I have no hesitation at all in supporting greater compliance and greater obligations. I do not want extra red tape. As a person

who has done meter reads at 4 o'clock in the morning for years and years when machines have gone off, I am certainly not keen on extra red tape and bureaucracy.

However, with regard to extra compliance and strengthening laws that prevent any sort of tampering whatsoever, I certainly support that entirely, and I would have no hesitation in supporting, as with these in front of us, greater penalties for anybody who breaches those conditions. As far as I am concerned you should lose your licence, lose your entire hotel, if you knowingly, willingly, actively breach your responsibilities as a hotelier and as the owner of the gaming licence. I have no concerns about that whatsoever.

There has been discussion—again the member for Bragg touched on this—with regard to the concept of reduced hours. I understand the issue about complying with code of conduct practices, but there is a suggestion floating around the place that perhaps there should be uniform hours throughout our industry. I do not know whether that is an amendment that will be formally put forward, but I would actually support that—it would not hurt regional South Australia at all.

I support the idea that there would be hours across the state when it was not possible to gamble on gaming machines, because I think it is not necessary to have an opportunity to use poker machines 24 hours a day, and it certainly would not hurt regional South Australia or any of the hotels, businesses or communities that I represent.

With regard to the \$50,000 fixed rate for the transfer of poker machines and poker machine licence entitlements, this bill actually suggests removing that. As a person who is fully supportive of free enterprise, I have no hesitation in removing that \$50,000 numerate level and letting the market take effect. I think that is 100 per cent appropriate, as a person who believes in free enterprise and believes in letting the market control a lot of things—not everything, but a lot of things.

I would like, though, to highlight and foreshadow a very real genuine problem that I believe will follow through from reducing that, or potentially, and I think probably, reducing that \$50,000 by opening it up. There will be a shift of gaming entitlements from smaller venues to bigger venues. I am sure that is the case, and that concerns me enormously. It concerns me because the smaller venues will often be in country and rural regional areas and it will shift them to metro areas. I do not like that for the reason I have mentioned before: it will make businesses less profitable in those areas. However, if those people want to sell their machines for a price that they want to negotiate, I support that fully, but I want to flag a real concern about that.

The other issue that I think is very important is that I do not actually believe that it will reduce gambling, because there will be a shift—I understand that one in four machines will be taken out of the system—of machines and entitlements from lower volume, lower turnover, lower profit establishments to higher volume, higher turnover, higher profit establishments. It will be the bigger gaming venues that can afford to buy the machines from the smaller gaming venues, and the smaller gaming venues will be inclined to take that capital opportunity, to make the sale and let the licence go.

All that will mean is that each one of those machines that is left in the industry is going to have a higher turnover. Each one of those machines will have more people playing it and more dollars put through it. We all know that for every dollar that goes through a gaming machine, a small percentage belongs to problem gamblers. So, clearly, if you increase the gaming and the dollar turnover that goes through some of these establishments, you will increase the event of problem gambling.

I think it is very likely that removing this cap—while I certainly support it for free enterprise reasons—will move problem gambling in the opposite direction to the way it is intended. It will create more gambling, and consequently the small share of the industry that has a problem will also grow as well.

I will support the bill, as I said at the beginning. It is a conscience vote for us. I will support it, but I would like to have it very clearly on record that I support the bill because it endeavours to address problem gambling and I would like to do everything that I can to contribute to addressing problem gambling. I cannot understand why people want to play pokie machines. I support their right to do it, but I would like to support this because it addresses problem gambling.

I would like to support it because it removes that \$50,000 legislated figure and I believe that the free market should be allowed to operate and people should be allowed to sell their machines for whatever they think they are worth. However, I would like to say very, very clearly that I worry about the impact that that is likely to have on regional communities by making some of the

businesses in those regional areas less successful and, consequently, able to provide less sponsorship for the local sporting team, less employment, fewer apprenticeships and all the things I have mentioned before. I also suspect, although I cannot provide any statistics, that the reduction, or the removal, which I believe will turn into a reduction, in the \$50,000 will shift those machines from smaller turnovers to larger turnovers, and I think that is likely not to help problem gamblers.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (11:56): I wish to speak briefly on this to indicate how much I welcome this legislation, which has been a long time in the making. Indeed, the minister for the environment and I had many conversations on this matter when he was the minister for gambling, and also when the member in the other place, the Hon. Carmel Zollo, was minister, she and I also had a number of conversations on various aspects of the issue of regulation of gaming machines. Some of those conversations are reflected in the bill that we are considering today.

I particularly welcome the lifting of the \$50,000 bar. The minister for the environment announced that about three years ago, as I recall, but matters were deferred because of the need to take account of what the Productivity Commission had to say, and that has now been done. I hear what the member for Stuart opposite said about the likely impact of that on small facilities, and indeed it is a relatively small facility in my area that has been desperately waiting for this measure. It is going to cut both ways.

It may work differently in regional South Australia, but some small clubs are finding that it costs them more to run gaming because of the requirements and restrictions that are involved and the number of staff they need to have. Whereas some other tasks in a small licensed club can be undertaken by volunteers, the regulations that we have in an attempt to control the issue of problem gambling mean that trained staff have to be used and it is therefore not an asset for some clubs.

That might apply in Stuart, in regional South Australia, as well. Some of the smaller establishments might make efficiencies in that way. So we have had an artificial constraint on trade and the removal of that will enable clubs and pubs to make their own personal decisions and their own business decisions and follow the wishes of their members in the case of clubs. I certainly welcome that.

The other important measure relates to the experience I had, when I was representing groups and residents within our community who were opposed to a new gaming centre being established in a particularly prominent place, which was in close proximity to a number of important community places, such as the war memorial across the road and, within a couple of hundred metres, three childcare centres and two schools. They did not like that. It also abutted residents in a way that good town planning would never have allowed for.

The fact that we had to go through the development approvals first, where the issue of the impact of that activity was not taken into account, was unfair for everyone, really. The proponents of the development spent I do not know how much, but they ended up in court dealing with that, and the residents certainly went through much heartache. It was not an easy decision for some of the members of council at the time, because everybody was conscious that this fitted in with all the definitions in the current planning arrangements for the City of Onkaparinga.

The fact that I had thousands and thousands of names on petitions, that Neighbourhood Watch people had gone out on a day that was 42 degrees to deliver questionnaires to neighbours and that well over a third of neighbours actually responded indicated that there was a fair bit of community feeling. So, because we could not do that social effects test before we did the development approvals, everybody was put to considerable inconvenience.

Another issue is the fact that there will now be some definitions about what will be considered in the social effects test. Many community organisations, when they heard that they could not do much in relation to the development application, wanted to start putting together their submissions to the social effects test, but it really was not clear whether it was worth doing, and it looked very much like it was currently based on a purely mathematical formula. So, I am one who will be wanting to provide submissions to the commissioner about the types of matters that should be considered in the social effects test.

Like the member for Stuart, I am not, in principle, opposed to poker machines. I also see that there are many paths to perdition. The problem is excess. Just as there is a problem with excess intake of food and excess gambling on the stock exchange and on the horses, the issue is excess. I believe that we need to focus on issues relating to people who have addictions and habitual behaviour problems rather than the machines.

Not everybody agrees with that, but it is my view that we need to talk about gambling and addictions of all sorts and do far more work as a community to try to unpick some of the issues of addiction. In that regard, I commend the work that is done by Flinders University and the Flinders Medical Centre, which seems to have a very effective program in relation to overcoming some of the issues to do with addiction. Of course, that research is largely funded from the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund, and I encourage that to continue.

Another important measure, I think, is the fact that there will not be any permission for machines to be placed in smoking areas. At one stage, I was on the hospitality smoke-free task force, and that was a matter we considered extensively. I think members of the task force in general knew that the abolition of smoking in gambling areas was likely to have the biggest impact of any of the measures that had previously been proposed in relation to problem gambling.

We have been through the idea of having to have clocks in the room and all sorts of strange things that really did not seem to make any impact on the amount of gaming revenue. How much they made on problem gambling we do not know. My view is that people with addictive behaviours often have more than one addiction. They may have a nicotine addiction and they may have a gambling addiction, and they may have other addictions as well which, again, is why it is my focus on the behaviour.

Overall, I think these are some very sensible measures that will help the community to deal with the problem of problem gambling and enable people who welcome gaming machines as a form of entertainment to continue. Like the member for Stuart, I do not actually know what you do with them; I have tried a couple of times. I remember one time having the Hon. Anne Levy out doorknocking with me on a hot day and we needed somewhere cool, so we went to the pub. We thought we would get rid of the change in our pockets while we had a glass of soda water and between us we could not work out what you actually did.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: I didn't want to have anything else while I was out doorknocking. I am one of these people who go to Oakbank regularly with my prospective losses in one pocket and my real money in the other pocket, and never the twain do meet. If I come home with anything in the prospective losses pocket, I have won for the day—that is a very good day.

I do not think there is any magic bullet in relation to poker machines. It will be interesting to see what happens at the federal level. I think that a predetermined spending level is probably very sensible. It is somewhat like me going to Oakbank with my losses in one pocket. That may be a useful measure, but in the meantime I think the measures proposed in this bill enable the industry, which is generally conducted in a very responsible way in this state—and it is an industry that has been prepared to cooperate with the concerned sector, as we call it, to try to work through some of the issues of problem gambling—to provide efficient and enjoyable entertainment to the community. I commend the bill to the house and I congratulate the minister on finalising many years of negotiations undertaken by many people and predecessors.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:07): I rise to comment on the Gaming Machines (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2010. This is a conscience matter for the Liberal Party, so nothing I say should be interpreted as Liberal Party policy.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister interjects saying that it will be, so clearly the government is going to run a scare campaign based on misinformation, but it is good of the minister to put that on the record through interjection.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No worries, shadow treasurer.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister interjects, 'No worries, shadow treasurer,' so clearly he is going to run a campaign with the Hotels Association about my views on poker machines. The Hotels Association is well aware of my views about poker machines, so I do not fear that in any shape or form.

I want to touch on a few of the issues, and I am probably going to be the odd one out in this debate largely in relation to some of these issues. I want to go back because, when the Labor Party first proposed through a private member's bill of treasurer Frank Blevins to introduce poker machines, we all remember the great drama of Mario Feleppa being chased down a corridor by premier Bannon and others to get that last vote to get it through the upper house. One of the

arguments given was that the hotel industry was struggling and this would be a boon to the industry.

As luck would have it I was not in the place at that time, but that was essentially one part of what was a long and complicated argument. I suspect that if you lift the \$50,000 cap, for a lot of regional hotels they will be back in that position within the next five to 10 years. The reason I think they will be back in that position within the next five or 10 years is simply—and the member for Stuart touched on this in his contribution—that the government seeks to lift the \$50,000 price cap and make it an open market on gaming machines in an attempt to reduce the number of gaming machines down to a target set by the Premier some years ago.

If the market works as markets normally do, the highest price will be paid for the machine by those trading entities that can get the greatest rate of return from them, the highest profit, and where you get the highest profit generally from gaming machines is in metropolitan Adelaide, particularly the lower socioeconomic areas of metropolitan Adelaide.

In my view, what will happen over time is that, once you lift the cap, the low profit, low turnover machines (which I would classify as being generally in regional hotels and clubs) will be purchased by the bigger trading entities in Adelaide, and there will be a transfer of machines from regional South Australia that are low profit, low turnover and generally by definition therefore low problem gambling machines—and I know that that is a general statement. They will transfer into the city, and they will be placed where they can get a higher rate of return.

The higher rate of return is where there is more gambling and by definition, if you believe the problem gambling argument, more problem gambling. So, I think the lifting of the cap will actually transfer machines from low profit, low turnover, low problem gambling areas to higher populated, higher turnover, higher profit and therefore a higher level of problem gambling. That is what I think will happen, so I am not convinced that lifting the \$50,000 cap will actually address problem gambling at all. I think it will probably lead to more gambling and more problem gambling.

Where is the evidence presented by anyone that the reduction in the machines has reduced the level of gambling and therefore problem gambling in South Australia? We have reduced the number of machines, but the revenue to the government has basically sustained itself or in fact increased, as I understand it, over a period of time. I am not necessarily convinced that lifting the \$50,000 cap is actually going to be a good thing for regional and country hotels. In 10 years there will be those small regional hotels outside the big regional centres and, if the cap is lifted, they will have the democratic, free-market choice, to sell their goods.

There will be profit takers who do that, who have bought in at the low end of the market. The market then opened up, and they will then sell their machine as a profit taker in the high end of the market because their machines may well be worth as much or more than the trading value of the hotel, depending on the number of machines they have. I think that is a concern for those small regional communities, but I accept the fact that the parliament, in this chamber at least, will vote to lift the cap; I think that the parliament in the other chamber will as well, so I suspect that that is where we are heading.

It is unclear to me through the briefings whether we are going to have trading rounds to bring it down only to the previously announced reduction level that the government announced (I think they need to reduce it by roughly another 800 machines to get it to the government's desired level) or whether there will continue after that to be open rounds so that, if people want to sell and there is a further reduction, that is available to the market. If it is a real open market, you would assume they would have regular rounds so that people could sell on a regular basis. If that occurs, of course, the logic is that Coles and Woolworths will end up owning a lot more of our machines than they do currently, and I know that the community will have some interesting views about that.

The other issue is that I am glad that the government has recognised in part my campaign to have a uniform closure of machines. It has put in this bill a provision that if clubs and hotels with gaming entitlements are not signed up to a responsible gambling agreement with an industry-responsible gambling agency, then they have to close between midnight and 10am.

For over two years I had a bill before this house in the last parliament seeking to close all gaming venues (except the casino because of its licensing requirements) between 3am and 9am and, of course, the government flatly refused to vote on it a number of times, always adjourning it because somehow it was such an outrageous idea that we could not possibly even vote on it. Lo and behold, the government in its own bill seeks to close some venues at least for a longer period, so it recognises the principle in my bill was fundamentally right.

However, as the minister might have indicated (but it might have been the shadow minister, so I am not sure who), if you read carefully the second reading speech it says they are closed only if they do not have a responsible gambling agreement with an industry responsible gambling agency. The industry-responsible gambling agency, by pure coincidence, happens to be Club Safe (run by the clubs association) and Gaming Care (run by the Hotels Association). So the two industry groups get to run the responsible gambling programs so, as long as people sign up with them, they can open when they want. I suspect they will all be opening when they want—or, at least, those who wish to trade other hours will all sign up.

I am still of the view, and I have held this view ever since I have been debating poker machines, that the way the government is reducing machines will not reduce problem gambling and will not reduce the volume of gambling. All it is doing through its mechanism, in my view, is taking low-profit, low-turnover machines and putting them in high-profit, high-turnover venues because they will be able to pay the highest price for them. If the government wishes to address problem gambling, I think part of the package (not all) is to close all the venues for a uniform 3am to 9am break and then the problem gambler really has nowhere to go. I have an amendment on the table ready to debate when we get to the committee stage that does that for all venues (except the casino, due to its licensing provisions).

At any time, how will someone who has been trained under the responsible gambling agreement know whether Joe Citizen has been gambling three hours at a venue around the corner when he walks into that venue and gambles for another two hours? How would they actually know that? If someone asked me that, I would suggest they go and get another interest in life. The reality is that people can change venues on a regular basis.

I am not sure how the responsible gambling agency and its groups will monitor that. Are they really going to have a system that says, 'You have gambled three hours here and two hours there and, therefore, you might have a problem: let's sit down and talk about it'? I can understand how they can do it in one venue but I am not sure how they will do it in multi-venues at this point. I know Mr Wilkie has a very expensive solution to that problem, and that is a matter for prime minister Gillard to address as part of her agreement.

The other issue I raise is that I have always found it odd that the hotels that have handed back entitlements as part of the reduction program the government has had in place have been able to then host machines on behalf of Club One into exactly the same venue where the entitlements have been taken out. I am sure that has occurred. I guess the argument is that there is a reduction across the board and therefore that is a gain, but it seems a bit bizarre that a hotel has lost an entitlement and can ultimately host one back through Club One. That is as I understand it.

The other issue I raise is a broader principle in relation to expiation notices. It might be an unusual stance to take, but I do not support the concept of an independent authority setting its own level of expiation notice. The way I understand it, the bill allows the IGA to set penalties at a maximum level of one of three lower levels. I do not know why the parliament is not setting the penalties. We do not allow the Police Commissioner to say, 'Look, this is the range, I'll set the penalty.' We do not allow that; we set the penalties and fines that we want, we set the offences and fines and then it is administered.

I have a letter from the minister to the shadow minister for gambling, Hon. Terry Stephens. The last dot point on the first page states:

The bill will reduce the maximum penalty to \$10,000 and include the ability to set expiation fees up to a maximum of \$1,200 for provisions of a code of practice. It will allow the IGA to set the penalties at the maximum level of one of three lower levels.

It then goes on to say:

This is appropriate. It allows the IGA to tailor the penalties to specific requirements of the code of practice.

Why is the parliament not setting the penalties as it does with other offences? We do not say to the Police Commissioner, 'Look, you have the right to issue expiation notices, but you decide the level of penalty for the various traffic offences.' We do not do that. The parliament has a say on the level of penalty. We are taking away, and I think we are setting a dangerous precedent by giving an independent authority the power to set its own expiation notice level within a range. The Independent Gambling Authority by its very nature is independent. I assume it is not directable by the minister, so the expiation notices will be set and the parliament will have absolutely no say over it. If any person out there gets a fine, essentially we are powerless to a large degree, and I do not support that principle.

They are the issues that I see with the bill. The bill will get through; I accept that. I advise the house that I do not intend to divide on my particular amendment. The government has made clear its position on trading hours over a number of years, so for those on the non-government benches who might want to express a view about the amendment, feel free, but I will not put the house to the pain of a division on that given that the government has the numbers on that issue. They are my views on this matter and I look forward to the committee.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (12:24): I thank all members for their contributions and for the manner in which they made those contributions. It was a helpful and respectful debate. The interesting thing about being gambling minister is that I can be in a room of five people and all five people will have a different view on not only how to help problem gamblers but even on gambling itself. It is a very controversial and emotional issue and it is something that divides our community.

When something is as emotive as gambling, it is very hard to come through the middle and come up with good effective policy. We rely on a lot of bipartisanship in this house when it comes to gambling policy. Quite frankly, gambling policy can be taken hostage. This bill is an example of the parliament coming together in a way that gives some measured, responsible responses to some very pressing issues.

Without wanting specifically to attack him, the member for Davenport has held his views on gambling consistently for a long period of time, and those views on operating hours are consistent. I find it hard to reconcile those views with his views on trading hours for retail workers.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: I can explain that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am sure you could, and I am sure that the honourable member will do that in committee. My reasoning is: how could the shadow treasurer argue at the last election that there should be complete 24-hour deregulated trading hours for South Australians, yet wish to legislate compulsory closing for other venues? The argument that the government is making is that, if you have responsible identifiers of problem gamblers who can intervene, the hours of operation do not really matter.

I will just quote the member for Davenport. He said that, if his bill had been passed, problem gamblers would have nowhere to go other than the casino. I think that, while I understand what he is trying to do (and I am not necessarily criticising it), the member for Davenport's hypothetical argument to the parliament is: if someone is walking from one pub to another pub, how could you possibly recognise how long they have been gambling?

Well, how could you possibly recognise how long someone has been gambling if they stopped gambling at 3am (under the member for Davenport's private member's bill), and then they drive into the city and go to the casino? You can't. I think that the member for Davenport recognises that, but I understand his intention. I find it an interesting argument that he has in his own head where he can totally deregulate trading hours for retail workers—he is happy to have retail workers working through the night—but not for people who work in the gambling industry.

The shadow minister, who was the lead speaker for the opposition, asked a number of questions. One question was: how many of the 3,000-machine reduction will be required to go? I am advised that 782 machines are required to reach that 3,000 target. I think that both shadow ministers asked about the trading system. Once the 3,000-machine target is reached, I envisage that there will be continued trading rounds after that in the interests of being a free market economy, as I am sure members opposite would champion.

With respect to the social effects test, I think that, when dealing with the community, a lot of people become frustrated (and when I say 'a lot of people', I am talking about our constituents) with systems of planning and the way in which they work. I think that having the social effects test at the end, after you have received an approval, gives people the idea that there is a sense of inevitability about these approvals. Bringing it forward, I believe, really enfranchises people who wish to make objections.

The good thing about it is that it gives people a chance to get in early to know what work has to be done if they are trying to open a venue somewhere where it might be controversial, and people have a real chance to try to stop it. I think that bringing that forward, rather than going ahead and getting the planning and council approvals and having those stamped off and then

going to a social effects test, in some way disenfranchises people, because they feel as if, 'Well, the approvals have already been gained, this is just really a rubber stamp.'

Bringing the social effects test forward, and having the IGA set the parameters for that, makes it a lot more interesting for people who have genuine objections to gambling venues. Obviously, we would like to have the rules and regulations of the land apply everywhere and for there not to be exemptions, such as currently exist at the airport, and I think that is something with which every member of this chamber would agree, as indeed does the commonwealth.

The member for Davenport raised another matter about the Independent Gambling Authority setting its own expiation fees. That pathway was established with the 1999 Productivity Commission. October 2001 was the first occasion, I am advised (but I will double-check this), when we started having codes of practice without ministerial approval. Once we have started down that path it is pretty hard for us to then come back and say, 'But we'll set the fines.' The member for Davenport might disagree—and that is his right—but I think that, once you set down the path of allowing an independent authority to set codes of practice without ministerial input, to then have the parliament set the fines for breaches of those codes would not exactly measure up.

The member for Bragg made some very important points about having technicians seal machines. Machines are monitored daily; if there are any inconsistencies they are picked up almost immediately. I would much prefer to have the commissioner take a risk-based approach to inspections. The idea of having a technician out there watching it being sealed does not really match up with the latest technology; I am advised that we would know if something was going on through our centralised monitoring system, so I do not think that having someone there would make a real difference.

Of course, what we can do is have the risk-based approach, which means that the commissioner can then inspect venues and, if there has been tampering, it would be picked up. I do not see that as being a major issue, but I do understand the member's concerns. I commend the bill to the house. We will go into committee, because the government has an amendment, and there is an amendment from the opposition.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 18 passed.

Clause 19.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move:

Page 12, lines 34 to 38 [clause 19, inserted subparagraph (ii)(A)]—

Delete 'there are at least 6 hours in each 24 hour period (which may be a continuous period of 6 hours, or 2 separate periods of 3 hours or 3 separate periods of 2 hours) during which gaming operations cannot be conducted on the premises' and substitute:

gaming operations cannot be conducted on the premises between 3 am and 9 am

This amendment seeks to bring in a uniform closing time between 3am and 9am for venues with gaming entitlements, except the casino, due to its licensing provisions. This will affect all venues but, because the government's provision covers the issue of having a 'responsible gambling agreement with industry responsible gambling agency', this closure would essentially apply to those groups that do have that agreement. I accept the fact that I will not win this particular amendment, but this will be my chance to actually have it voted on after two and a bit years of waiting.

The minister mentioned that he was confused about my position and how I could possibly argue that shops could be open for longer but that gaming venues be closed sooner. Let me walk the minister through it. The reason the government licenses hotels and gaming venues is that there are concerns about social harm, so they license them—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Same as shop trading hours.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: They don't license, not to the same extent.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: So it's like that, is it?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Come on. The reality is this: the government's position is that gaming venues can open 24/7, but it is concerned about liquor licensing. The government has just

put out a liquor licensing discussion paper suggesting that some of those venues close at 3 o'clock but that shops should close a lot earlier. So, the product that does the least social harm is closed earliest, and the product that does some of the biggest amounts of social harm is fully deregulated. That is the government's position.

If a gaming venue can open 24 hours seven days a week and the staff be able to work there and earn their income, but if a shopkeeper wants to open longer hours and their staff want to work the extra hours and get the dough, or indeed employ more people, the government needs to explain why hotels and gaming venues get to make that choice but shoe shops and butchers shops do not. That is the government's position.

The reason I have a slightly different position on poker machine venues is that I accept that there is an issue with problem gambling, and the government is coming at problem gambling from one angle and I am coming at it from a slightly different angle. I think there is merit in a uniform closure. The government itself has conceded that point by saying that if you do not have one of these industry agreements you are going to have uniform closure.

We could have had a uniform closure for the last two years for a lot of venues, but the government chose not to vote on it—such is politics. One assumes that there are lots of problem gamblers out there who have lost more money than they had to over that two-year period because this government did not have the courage to put it to the vote or, indeed, amend it to a better system, as the offer was made. The government chose not to do that.

A lot of venues already do not trade between 3am and 9am. It tends to be the bigger venues that trade those hours. In fairness to the house, I consulted on the original bill with the Hotels Association, which, surprisingly, opposed it but now supports a longer uniform break. I asked the minister earlier, when I came into the chamber, whether the hotel industry supports all of this bill. The hotel industry does now support all of this bill.

The hotel industry now supports a longer uniform break than I proposed. I welcome the hotel industry association's coming to that conclusion, because it certainly did not support a six-hour closure 18 months to two years ago, but it now supports a 10-hour closure for all those venues that have not signed up to their responsible gaming program or the clubs associations' responsible gaming program. The issue for me is simply that I think there is merit in having a uniform closure. It gives the system a rest.

The minister talks about the casino. I have always acknowledged that that is the one hole in the argument; I accept that. I come from the view that I do not think that the problem gambler is going to get into their car at Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier or, indeed, Elizabeth, Stirling (where I live) or Noarlunga at 3 o'clock and drive to the casino; some will, but I think very few will. I think that the uniform closure, outside of the casino, will have more of a positive effect than a negative effect.

I accept that there is an argument about the casino and that some people will go there. I understand that, but I think there will be far fewer people who will do that rather than simply walk around the corner to the other venue that is open because, by pure coincidence, the venue that is closing between 2am and 4am, its neighbouring venue, is open at that time and they can walk around the corner and make it far easier to keep gambling. So, I think my model makes it harder for them to keep gambling. It is not a perfect model, but I think it is a model that is worth consideration. I am pleased that the Hotels Association has come on board, even if it is conditional on having an agreement.

I wrote to various church bodies. The Salvation Army supported a uniform closure, preferably between midnight and 6am; the Anglican Church supported a uniform closure between 3am and 9am; and the Catholic Church referred it to one of their committees. That committee is yet to respond, so I think it must have been lost in the process, as my records seem to indicate. As I said, I am not going to divide, but I think the clause has merit.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Obviously, the government opposes this amendment. I will mention to the honourable member that gambling venues must close for six hours during a 24-hour period. So, there is not 24-hour trading, and I apologise if I misled the member. So, they are not open for 24 hours, but his policy remains 24 hours for—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: They can trade for that long.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Shops shut.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, they can't trade when they want; they must be closed for six hours. A licensed gambling venue must be closed for six hours. They can choose—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Of their choosing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Of their choosing. The opposition policy is that retail trading outlets can be open for 24 hours, seven days a week, and we all know what the answer to that would be if that were passed. So, the government opposes this amendment. The idea that problem gambling occurs only between certain hours of the day—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not saying that that is your point. I think we need to look at problem gambling in terms of addiction, and addiction has many faces. I think we really need to understand problem gamblers. We cannot lump them all into one basket and say that they come from a certain socioeconomic area, a certain postcode, a certain type of family or a certain demographic. Addiction has no borders. I think the best way to deal with problem gambling is that, whenever gambling is on offer, we have the appropriate people in place to identify problem gambling.

No system is going to be perfect. Anyone who stands up and says 'I have the perfect solution to problem gambling' is probably lying to you. The truth is that there are a number of responses to problem gambling. There are things that we can do to minimise harm: intervene, make sure that there is supervision, make sure that there is human contact and make sure that access to funds can be regulated in a certain way. We can do all these things as much and as often as we can to try to minimise the problem, but I do not think that common hours of closing is the silver bullet that we are all looking for.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 passed.

Clause 22.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My question relates to the trading that will occur, and I thank the minister for providing the answer that there are some 782 machines still from the—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, that are being sought. During my second reading contribution, I mentioned that the minister talked about rounds. How often will these rounds of trading occur, and is there a limit on the number of machines that will be traded for each of those rounds?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The details are still subject to consultation. However, the advice I am receiving is that there will be as many rounds as are needed and that there will be as many machines in a round as people wish. So, if people want to trade as many machines as they can, they can put them all into one round and we will trade them, and we will continue trading. As minister, I expect I will direct the commissioner to start off the first trading round. We generally want this to be a free market exercise with the reduction of one machine per four machines traded until we reach 3,000. So, we have a bit of socialism mixed up with a bit of free capitalism there. Once we reach the reduction, the trading rounds will be available as needed.

Mr GRIFFITHS: That was, I suppose, the basis of my question. If you achieve 500 from the 782 machines in the first round, would you wait six months and let the industry consolidate itself to some degree? I was contemplating what periods would be in between rounds. It might be difficult to answer that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think you're right: it is difficult to answer that. I would like to see how the first round goes, but my gut instinct is that there will be a lot of machines traded very quickly, and there will be a lot of demand, especially from smaller clubs of constituents that you and a lot of country members here represent, who are holding onto two or three machines, who want to get rid of those machines, trade them, so that they can spend money on capital infrastructure in their local communities and their clubs. They have been hanging onto them and they will want to trade them as quickly as possible. So I think that once the cap is lifted you will see a lot of trading going on very quickly. I cannot see into the future and give you a concise answer about how it is going to work. It is a free market.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I have another question that stems from this but it relates to the successful removal of one machine for every four that are traded. What happens to that machine? Is it physically removed from the system forevermore, or does it go to Club One, and then is it parked and able to be used in other venues?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you are from a hotel the gaming machine entitlement is removed forever; if you are from a club the gaming machine entitlement goes to Club One.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: On that issue, just picking up on the member for Goyder's question about the rounds, I am not trying to labour this, but I have a view that it is very important because it will have an impact on the price. If there was a round every single day for a year the prices would actually go down because after a while nobody is that interested. If it only happened once every year that this was an opportunity to sell your machines, prices would be quite high because the opportunity is there until enough venues that are prospective purchasers get their 40 machines. I think it is very important how the rounds might be established because it will have a very direct impact on the value of these entitlements. So, I am not really sure, again, whether you can answer, because I understand it is a difficult question, but I would just like to highlight that it will be critical to the market.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is still subject to consultation however. There are a couple of points. The first one is that the market will establish what the base price of a machine will be. The market will decide the price, taking into account what someone is prepared to sell it for and what someone is prepared to pay for it. Once we establish a price, people will know when to trade and when not to trade. I think that my setting out a structure—there will be trading periods from this period to this period to this period—may stifle that market. My approach will be to open it up for an initial round of trading, see what happens, and we will make considered decisions after that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a question about the Australian government land at Parafield and the 40 machines that operate in an outlet there. I am happy to have an answer on this clause or in some other place, but my understanding of the second reading explanation is that the minister indicated that he will bring them into the regulatory regime, although he cannot capture them for taxation purposes because this is an enterprise which is operating on federal territory—I may be wrong on that, but that is my understanding—and that they are now going to be within the regulatory regime. Do I understand then that they have not yet been subject to this buyback process, that they do not have any obligation to diminish their number of poker machines? That is my first question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Currently, the Roulettes Tavern has 40 machines. They have not been part of the reduction. We are in constant negotiation with the commonwealth. I suspect that since the federal election the commonwealth is more amenable to negotiations about poker machines and regulation. What I am most concerned about at those two sites is not necessarily the number of machines, although that is important, but regulations and responsible gambling intervention matters. I am very keen to negotiate with the commonwealth to give me the power to go in and say, 'Actually, this is what is required for you to operate in South Australia.' I am advised the commonwealth is very keen to work with us on that. That is what we are trying to do. I am more interested in them providing responsible gambling, the same way as is provided everywhere else in the state.

Ms CHAPMAN: During the last three years, minister, are you aware of any activity, program or procedure that has operated in respect of those 40 poker machines which is inconsistent with the current standards that are imposed? If so, what are they?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Our standards do not apply because it is federal land. That is what we are trying to do here today.

Ms CHAPMAN: Are you aware of any?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised now that we are not aware of anything, but our standards do not apply, so it is a bit hard for us to find out if there has been a breach.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have you received any submission in the last three years from the Hon. Nick Xenophon, a senator for this state, who is part of the federal parliament, in respect of the operation of these machines?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Nick is not someone who is going to die of shyness; he makes his views very well known through the federal parliament and he has spoken to me on many occasions about the issues of problem gambling.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am talking about these 40 machines.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have a recollection of a conversation with Nick about it. I do not have all the details here with me and I do not want to mislead you or the committee on it, so I would have to refer to my notes back at the office. I would imagine that Senator Xenophon, without trying to put words into his mouth, would be just as concerned as you and I would be about these machines.

Clause passed.

Clauses 23 to 35 passed.

Clause 36.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to new section 47A(2), which talks about an offence of selling or supplying gaming machines, components or equipment without an approved contract or, indeed, with inducement. In proposed subsection (2) the bill refers to a maximum penalty of \$35,000 or imprisonment for two years if a gaming machine dealer provides some form of inducement other than a discount. Why have you decided to introduce that? I find that rather interesting. If a gaming machine producer decides to offer a special a trip to New York as part of buying a certain number of machines, which was the example provided to me, that, in effect, is not a discount, but it would be an offence and a penalty of \$35,000 would apply.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we do not want one gaming machine manufacturer to dominate the South Australian market with one type of machine. We would like there to be as few inducements as possible so that people can buy on the merits of the business case rather than a free trip to New York which, quite frankly, I think would be in breach of our procurement policies as well.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Minister, I was providing that as an example off the top of my head, but it could be any form of inducement and that is just it. I can understand the fact that you want to ensure that there is a level of openness so that everybody truly understands the value attached to that machine.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No monopolies.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. However, it seems to me that through history enterprise has provided an opportunity for some level of support in other ways to exist for people who are in business, too. In this case it appears as though you have decided to target one particular industry and to take away that opportunity where, in the interest of an efficient business, that may indeed produce the most value for money machine, but still decide to offer some level of inducement not to just a person (as you have identified here) but perhaps a club where it is a prize that could be raffled, for instance, again, that is an inducement which provides a wider benefit to that club or association and you have taken away that opportunity with this bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that, when gaming machines were first introduced, the role of the procurement board was to stop these forms of inducements. I would like to see inducements in this industry eliminated. It might be an ideological argument that we could have about whether or not it is appropriate for me to say, 'If you buy my five machines I'll throw in two first-class tickets for you and your wife to wherever.'

Mr Griffiths: I'd say no.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Of course you would say no and I would say no, but I am not sure about others. I think that type of inducement in this industry can be dangerous. I think it is best that we ensure that that type of inducement is stamped out completely.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Para Hills High School.

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

MENTAL HEALTH (REPEAL OF HARBOURING OFFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RAILWAYS (OPERATIONS AND ACCESS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS—PRICE DETERMINATION PERIODS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

TRUSTEE COMPANIES (COMMONWEALTH REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Appropriation Bill 2010.

PORT WAKEFIELD COMMUNITY WASTE MANAGEMENT SCHEME

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Presented a petition signed by 84 landowners and ratepayers of the Wakefield Regional Council area requesting the house to urge the government to implement independent investigations into the approval, monitoring and construction of the community waste management scheme currently under construction in the township of Port Wakefield.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY RURAL PROPERTIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Presented a petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to facilitate the proposed sale by Adelaide University of rural properties bequeathed to it.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MOBILE PHONES

- 5 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). For each government department—
- (a) how many public servants have the use of a Departmental issued mobile phone for personal use;
 - (b) what is the average cost of calls per month charged to the Department; and
 - (c) what has been the cost for the use of these mobile phones in each year since 2004?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries): Responses are provided in relation to mobile phone usage and call costs for public servants within the Department of Treasury and Finance.

(a) In relation to Department of Treasury and Finance, no public servants are issued with mobile phones for the primary purpose of personal use. Where personnel incur incidental personal call costs, the costs are reimbursed to the department in accordance with departmental policy.

(b) The average per month cost of mobile phone calls to the department for the 2009-10 financial year is \$6,317.

- (c) The cost of calls to the department on a per month basis since 2004 is as follows:
- \$1,729 for 2004-05;
 - \$1,528 for 2005-06;
 - \$1,499 for 2006-07;

- \$2,073 for 2007-08;
- \$5,905 for 2008-09; and
- \$6,317 for 2009-10, as reported in part 2.

The increase in costs from year 2007-08 to year 2008-09 is attributable to inclusion of mobile phone calls for Shared Services SA operations which commenced in that year.

DESALINATION PLANT

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition)** (22 July 2010).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries): I refer to the Question Without Notice asked by the Leader of the Opposition Mrs. Redmond in the House of Assembly on 22 July 2010. Mrs Redmond has asked:

'Can the Treasurer confirm to the house that the total cost of the Adelaide Desalination Plant has now blown out by \$400 million to at least \$2.2 billion?'

The \$2.2 billion figure relates to the costing for two separate projects, namely:

- the 100 gegalitre Adelaide Desalination Plant and transfer pipeline, costing \$1.8 billion; and
- the North-South Interconnection System Project, costing \$0.4 billion.

As outlined in the 2009-10 Budget Papers, the capital cost estimate for the Adelaide Desalination Plant is \$1.8 billion. This capital costing includes the cost to build a 100 gegalitre desalination plant at Port Stanvac (\$1.4 billion) and the cost to build a transfer pipeline between Port Stanvac and the Happy Valley water treatment plant (\$0.4 billion).

The North-South Interconnection System Project is a separate project to connect Adelaide's northern and southern water supply networks. The capital cost estimate for this project is \$0.4 billion.

SINGAPORE AND INDIA MISSION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Six years ago, following advice from the Economic Development Board, the government began making a concerted effort to establish a strong trading partnership with the emerging global economic giant of India.

While China is well established as one of our nation's and this state's greatest trading partners, India is still a largely untapped market that has huge potential. That is why, for the past six years, I have led five business, trade and education missions into India. In that time, because of the concerted effort of universities and TAFE, and also because of businesses, particularly in the mining industry, the rate of growth of South Australia's exports to India has outstripped that of all of our other trading partners. Indeed, I was told while was in India that the rate of growth of exports in the past year had increased by 120 per cent.

On Sunday, I returned from my fifth trade commission to India, which this time focused strongly, but not entirely, on the benefits of educational opportunities for Indian students to study in South Australia. Given the Indian media's level of attention devoted to certain violent incidents against Indian students, predominately in other parts of Australia, I believed it was important that I delivered the message that South Australia not only has outstanding world-class educational institutions offering the very best courses with the highest standards but that we are safe, affordable and student friendly.

Indeed, I was told that a recent survey of international students voted Adelaide as the number one city in Australia as a student destination (I think it was 6,000 students surveyed)—number one for friendliness, number one for safety, and number one for being affordable. That is a critical message that we had to get across to differentiate ourselves from other parts of Australia. It was a message I believe we managed to deliver effectively to the media in Chennai, Mumbai and

Delhi, and in an area where many of the Indian students in this state come from, the Punjab, next to the border with Pakistan.

To put the importance of this message into context, the house should be aware that there has been a 55 per cent average growth per year from 2002 to 2009 in Indian students coming to South Australia to study. That is 55 per cent average per year. Last year, about 7,000 Indian students called Adelaide home, the second largest contingent in our total international student population of 34,000. This is why South Australia cannot afford to have our reputation in India diminished by events elsewhere in Australia.

Our education industry has become our third largest export sector, and I would imagine that very few South Australians realise that it is now our third largest export sector. I am advised that it now earns this state \$990 million a year compared with \$294 million a year back in 2002 and today supports 6,500 jobs. I was accompanied by representatives of Education Adelaide, which represents local universities, TAFEs and other education providers, and also Professor Michael Worton of University College London. Incidentally, while we were in India, UCL was confirmed as number four in the world rankings of universities behind Cambridge, Yale and Harvard. Of course, it has its only campus outside the United Kingdom here in Adelaide. UCL obviously has a very important link with India because Mahatma Gandhi was one of its students.

Last year I wrote to about 4,500 Indian students in Adelaide to highlight my personal commitment to them and to provide information about support networks available during their stay. This government also established a task force last year to look at how to provide the best education and lifestyle experience for international students while here. While on this topic I want to inform the house that South Australia has led work at a national level to improve the experience of international students, overseeing the development of the International Student Strategy for Australia 2010-14 initiated through COAG.

On the way to India I made my first official visit to Singapore where I met with the Singapore Economic Development Board to engage in very positive discussions about our two-way trade with Singapore which, according to the latest figures in 2008-09, was worth more than \$1.2 billion. I met with a number of senior members of the government, including the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Defence who showed a keen interest in the capabilities of the common user facility at Techport Australia where Australia's largest ever defence project, our air warfare destroyers project, is being built.

In my meetings with representatives of Singapore's business community I was delighted to find strong interest in what South Australia has to offer in education, tourism, food and wine, defence technologies, resources, engineering and advanced manufacturing and, increasingly, clean technologies and opportunities from development of Tonsley Park as a sustainable industries precinct.

The South Australian government has its India representative office in Chennai. Indeed, we are the only Australian state with a trade office in the state of Tamil Nadu which has a population of more than 66 million and is the fifth largest contributor to India's GDP. In Chennai I met with the MARG Construction group and other significant corporations operating on the Indian subcontinent. The MARG group has interests in ports, ship repairs and airports, and I was able to reinforce business opportunities, showcase our own industry capabilities and explain what is happening in this state in mining and resources.

As a result of previous meetings with the Confederation of Indian Industry in Chennai, I was pleased to see that its Water Institute has selected South Australia as its International Partner of Choice and witnessed the signing of an MOU with the South Australian Water Industry Alliance, which I am told includes around 250 South Australian companies. This will encourage cooperation in water consulting, technology transfer and education research. India's rapidly increasing water industry has created an opportunity to grow our exports into this market in terms of irrigation, environment and water technology.

I also hosted a South Australian wine reception and state dinner that showcased not only our wines but our economic achievements, investment potential and education of our foreign students to businesspeople, government officials and media. This further reinforced the strong bilateral relationship between South Australia and Tamil Nadu. Meetings in Mumbai included Deepak Fertilisers and Petrochemicals Corporation, who are visiting South Australia this week, the Australia and New Zealand Business Association in India, a CEO lunch with top industrialists and

government officials, and a networking dinner co-hosted by the World Trade Centre and all India Association of Industries.

In Delhi we were involved in helping a group of South Australian high-technology companies promote their business interests, particularly pitched at India's transport and defence industries. Those seeking to establish themselves in the Indian market include Prism Defence, which produces helicopter landing guidance systems here in South Australia; Daronmont Technologies, developers of coastal radar systems; and Lockheed Martin Australia, which is promoting its over the horizon radar systems to the Indian Air Force.

One very well-known South Australian company who joined us was Codan, which has sold their high-frequency radio systems to border patrols and police forces in India. While in the Punjab, I met with senior representatives of the Chamber of Commerce to introduce our state and its numerous investment opportunities and cultural ties with India.

In the year to July 2010, South Australian businesses increased their exports to India by 120 per cent to nearly \$600 million. Our growth in exports to India is growing faster than anyone had predicted and has the potential to keep growing at this rate for many years to come, but it will not happen by chance.

It is very important that governments of all persuasions—as the former Liberal government did in China following John Bannon's opening up of relations with Shandong—be involved in trade missions to India each year to keep the momentum going and to ensure that as many businesses and industries in South Australia as possible realise the potential of this surging economy and the great partnerships that we can forge over the coming decades. I am told that members opposite have been in China recently on a delegation with members on this side of the house.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I want to acknowledge the presence in the house today of members of Para Hills High School years 11 and 12, guests of the Hon. Jack Snelling, welcome. I also welcome St Spyridon Greek Orthodox years 4 to 7, who are guests of the member for Unley I hope you enjoy your time here today.

I also want to acknowledge some neighbours of mine, the Port Pirie Probus Club across the gulf from Whyalla. It is a pleasure to see you here today, and they are guests of the member for Frome. We hope you enjoy your time here and we are always pleased to see you come in here and see how we work in this place.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

No. 5 of 2010—Alternative Vehicle Request for Magistrate McInnes

No. 6 of 2010—Members of Local Government Councils

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Distribution Lessor Corporation—Charter

Generation Lessor Corporation—Charter

Transmission Lessor Corporation—Charter

Regulations made under the following Act—

Land Tax—General

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

Commissioner of Highways—Leases of Properties Annual Report 2009-10

Non-Metropolitan Railways Transfer Act 1997—Approvals to Remove Track Infrastructure Report for Period 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Development—Private Bushfire Shelters

Motor Vehicles—Schedule 1—Fees

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)—General
Public and Environmental Health—Waste Control

By the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
History Trust of South Australia—General

By the Minister for Police (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

State Lotteries Act—Review of Special Appeal Lotteries Report July 2010

By the Minister for Families and Communities (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Annual Report 2008-09

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Children's Protection—General
City of Adelaide—Elections and Polls
Conveyancers—General
Land Agents—General
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—General
Land Valuers—General
Liquor Licensing—
 Dry Areas Long Term—
 Barmera and Berri
 Coober Pedy
 Hahndorf
 Port Elliot
Local Government—Cemetery
Local Government (Elections)—General
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—General
Residential Tenancies—General
Retail and Commercial Leases—
 Exclusions
 General
Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—General
Local Council By-Laws—
 District Council of Barunga West—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
 No. 5—Dogs
 No. 6—Cats
 District Council of Franklin Harbour—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land
 No. 3—Dogs
 District Council of Loxton Waikerie—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
 No. 5—Dogs
 No. 6—Cats
 District Council of Renmark Paringa—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
 No. 5—Dogs
 No. 6—Cats

- No. 7—Nuisance Caused by Building Sites
- Kangaroo Island Council—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 - No. 2—Moveable Signs
 - No. 3—Local Government Land
 - No. 4—Roads
 - No. 5—Dogs
 - No. 6—Cats
 - No. 7—Bird Scaring Devices
 - No. 8—Boat Facilities
 - No. 9—Foreshores
- Naracoorte Lucindale Council—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 - No. 2—Local Government Land
 - No. 3—Roads
 - No. 4—Moveable Signs
 - No. 5—Dogs
- The Rural City of Murray Bridge—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 - No. 2—Local Government Land
 - No. 3—Roads
 - No. 4—Moveable Signs
 - No. 5—Dogs
 - No. 6—Nuisance Caused by Building Sites

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

- Regulations made under the following Acts—
- South Australian Housing Trust—General

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. P. Caica)—

- Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Employment Agents Registration—General
- Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare—General

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

- Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Prisoners (Interstate Transfer)—General

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

- Independent Gambling Authority—Inquiry into the Suitability of Certain Close Associates of the South Australian Jockey Club

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

- South Australian Citrus Board—Annual Report 2008-09
- Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Aquaculture—Schedule 1—Fees
- Plant Health—Fees

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

- Professional Standards Council—
- Annual Report 2007-08
- Annual Report 2008-09
- Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005—Annual Report 2009-10
- Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Criminal Investigation (Extraterritorial Offences)—General
- Guardianship and Administration—General
- Public Trustee—General
- Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth)—Unexplained Wealth

Subordinate Legislation—Postponement of Expiry
Rules made under the following Acts—
Legal Practitioners—Legal Practitioners Education and Admission Council Rules—
Amendment 4
Supreme Court—Civil Rules—Amendment 12

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. P. Caica) on behalf of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. G. Portolesi)—

By-Laws—
Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands Act 1981—Permits

KEMPPAINEN, MS PIRJO

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:19): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: First, I offer my condolences to the family and friends of Pirjo Kemppainen. I can only begin to imagine the devastating impact these tragic circumstances are having on her family, friends and members of the Callington community. I know nothing can lessen the pain and grief of their loss. However, I wish to extend my sincere sympathies to her family and friends.

On Monday 13 September the death of Ms Pirjo Kemppainen was declared a major crime and is currently the subject of a comprehensive and ongoing investigation. A major crime investigation team has been dedicated to the case and is being assisted by a range of SAPOL specialist teams, including the STAR Group, forensic officers, dog operations and police divers. SAPOL has assured me that the increased police presence in Callington will be maintained for as long as necessary.

Today I received a briefing from the Commissioner of Police in relation to the events leading up to the discovery of Ms Kemppainen at her home by her brother at approximately 5pm on Saturday 11 September 2010. The commissioner has advised me that on Saturday 11 September at 12.35am Ms Kemppainen telephoned the 131444 police assistance line to report that stones had been thrown at her house. Ms Kemppainen apparently did not see who threw the stones but was of the opinion that two 14-year-old boys may have been responsible. I am further advised that the call centre operator established from the complainant that the rock-throwing incident occurred approximately five minutes before Ms Kemppainen telephoned the call centre and that the alleged offenders had run off.

The commissioner has informed me that the call was one that should have been attended by police and the correct procedure would have been to enter a computer-aided dispatch tasking for patrol attendance in accordance with call centre standard operating procedures. A comprehensive review will be conducted into the manner in which the call was handled. It will also look into training, policy, operating procedures and supervision to see if any improvements can be made.

I am advised by the commissioner that there was an error of judgment on behalf of the operator who took a police incident report but did not refer the call to the communications centre for follow-up by a police patrol. South Australia Police receive hundreds of thousands of calls every year to the 131444 and 000 numbers which are dealt with correctly. The processes that have been in place for many years have served the community and SAPOL well.

Unfortunately, on this occasion, it appears that an error of judgment by the call taker resulted in the matter not being referred to Police Communications Branch for a patrol to be dispatched. With investigations at an early stage, now is not the time to be jumping to conclusions. It is important we allow the investigation to run its course and wait and see what the evidence tells police. However, I can rule out resourcing as a factor in this incident.

This is a tragic incident. However, it must be remembered that day in, day out the dedicated men and women of the South Australian police force work hard to keep the people of South Australia safe. They carry out their work with integrity and great professionalism. I am proud

of our police force and I believe we have the best police force in the nation. It has always had, and will continue to have, my full support.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:27): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I wish to inform the house about some of the likely impacts arising from the expected increased inflows into South Australia due to the recent rainfall across the southern Murray-Darling Basin. Areas in northern Victoria recently experienced extremely high rainfall over a short period resulting in flooding. After years of drought, this inflow has added significance for the River Murray in South Australia, with the anticipated additional water having significant benefits for the river's health and the health of the Lower Lakes region, for irrigators, communities, wildlife and tourism.

The Murray-Darling Basin Authority has indicated that South Australia will receive around 900 gigalitres of water from this flood event. I am advised that this figure cannot be confirmed at this point in time, but I expect to be able to provide a more accurate assessment over the coming weeks. The authority has confirmed that at least 190 gigalitres of unregulated flow will be received by South Australia, with the volume expected to increase in the coming weeks as more information emerges about the flood situation in Victoria.

It is important to note that large sections of the environment in this part of Victoria have received limited watering over the past decade and, with this event resulting in the inundation of large areas of floodplain, including Barmah Forest, much of this water will not return to the River Murray system. I am advised that unregulated flows cannot be captured in South Australia so they cannot be allocated for purposes such as irrigation.

This water will flow through the River Murray to the Lower Lakes and will provide the environment with a much-needed boost. In addition to unregulated flow, the authority has indicated that South Australia will receive a further 459 gigalitres of additional dilution flow to mitigate salinity in the River Murray and the Lower Lakes.

The state government and the federal Labor government have been prepared to take tough decisions, including investing in massive engineering works, the lowering of pumps along the river to depths not previously contemplated, and some wetlands have been disconnected and new pipelines have been constructed to ensure Lower Lakes communities continue to have access to water.

In this regard, the Narrung bund and Clayton and Currency Creek regulators were built to manage local acidification risks, and preparations for the Wellington weir had to be considered in contingency, despite vocal opposition and the state government maintaining its preference for a freshwater solution for the Lower Lakes.

We now have a very different landscape before us. The River Murray and the Lower Lakes, and the Coorong and Murray Mouth will see the first significant flows for about a decade, and effective management of natural and man-made infrastructure is pivotal to the successful recovery from the unprecedented drought. The current water level in Lake Alexandrina is about 50 centimetres above sea level, and it is expected to increase to 75 centimetres above sea level by early October, while the level in Lake Albert is about 30 centimetres below sea level. These are the highest water levels since 2005.

The improved water levels and access to additional water have provided the opportunity to reconnect Lake Albert with Lake Alexandrina. They will also allow us to open the barrages to discharge water into the Coorong, thereby reducing salinity in Lake Alexandrina, providing fish passage to the Coorong and slowly transitioning the Coorong from a marine to a more estuarine condition. Currently, small flows are being released through the barrages and fishways to assist fish passage and slowly re-establish an estuary beyond the barrages.

Yesterday I was advised by the authority that from today all fishways along the barrages will be open and that from 20 September additional bays adjacent to the fishways at Tauwichterie barrage and Goolwa barrage will be opened. This pre-release of water now will enable more salt to be discharged from Lake Alexandrina. It is envisaged that considerably larger releases will be able

to occur in coming months, allowing good flows of water into the Coorong and potentially out of the Murray Mouth.

While the refreshing of the Coorong is extremely welcome, it is still likely that we will need to pump sea water into the southern part of the Coorong this summer because of the hypersaline condition of that water body. The rising water level also provides an opportunity for many irrigators to access water for the first time in a number of years. For other irrigators, the rising water level places some modified or relocated infrastructure at risk of being inundated, and advice is being provided about relocating high-risk infrastructure as soon as possible.

An embankment was constructed between Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina at Narrung in March 2008 as a short-term emergency measure to assist in the management of potentially devastating acidification in Lake Albert. On 10 September, I announced that because of the extra water in the River Murray system it is now possible to remove part of this structure and allow water to flow into Lake Albert. Preparatory work to remove 100 metres of the 280-metre structure began over this past weekend, and the first water is set to flow into Lake Albert early next week. It is expected that water levels in Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert will equalise within two months.

Full removal of the bund will occur when the authority can confirm that water levels in the Lower Lakes will not fall below sea level before the end of 2011-12 under a worst case scenario. Just over a year ago, temporary environmental flow regulators were constructed at Clayton and Currency Creek as part of the Goolwa Channel water level management project to mitigate the very real threat of acidification in the Goolwa Channel and its tributaries. Partial removal of the Clayton regulator may soon be possible, restoring a connection between Lake Alexandrina and the Goolwa Channel, enabling releases of water through the Goolwa barrage. The use of all barrages during a large release is necessary to ensure the Murray Mouth is maintained in a stable state.

Discharges from the Goolwa barrage fishway will enable the unrestricted movement of fish species between the Lakes and the Coorong. Discharges from the Goolwa barrage will result in reduced salinity in the Goolwa Channel, which will have a positive benefit on the freshwater ecosystem. If this unregulated flow event can restore the water level in the Lower Lakes so that it does not fall below sea level before the end of 2011-12, then acidification in the Lower Lakes can be managed without the Clayton regulator in place.

At this stage, there is no requirement to remove the Currency Creek regulator as it has a spillway that maintains the connection of Currency Creek to the Goolwa Channel at water levels above sea level. Another benefit of the increased flows to South Australia is that there will be significant delay in the need to make a decision on constructing a weir near Wellington or the opening of the barrages to allow sea water into the Lower Lakes to manage acidification. The extra water means that the triggers for those actions are unlikely to be reached for several years, and hopefully never.

Further up the River Murray, the Lake Bonney regulator is open and the lake is refilling. Lake Bonney will receive 25 gegalitres of inflow, which will fill the lake. The unregulated flow event provides an opportunity to top up Lake Bonney to pool level and reconnect it to the River Murray channel. I am advised that at this stage the estimated unregulated flows will not be sufficient to allow a full flushing of Lake Bonney, but it might provide the opportunity to open the structure indefinitely and help maintain a lower salinity level within the lake.

Higher river levels will also lead to the inundation of lower-lying areas of the flood plain and the watering of vegetation lining the river channel and wetlands, such as the river red gums. This environmental watering could potentially lead to breeding opportunities for fauna such as frogs and waterbirds. Water quality within connected wetlands will also improve. The unregulated flows will also allow the opportunity to open wetlands that were closed over the drought period to achieve evaporative savings.

This unregulated flow event is great news for South Australia and will provide significant environmental benefits for the River Murray environment in this state. It is important, however, that this good news event does not deflect attention from the need to address the long-term problems created by the overallocation of water in upstream states and the need for a whole-of-basin management plan to ensure we have a sustainable and healthy river system for the benefit of all South Australians in the future. In this context, I think we all eagerly await the release of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan Guide by the authority on 8 October.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE ATTENDANCE PROCEDURE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. If a rock being thrown at night through the window of a house belonging to a woman living alone is not enough to warrant police attendance, then what is?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:38): I am happy to answer the question. Look, I made a serious ministerial statement. I have put to the house all of the information that has been provided to me by the commissioner. That has now been shared with the house.

Obviously, we treat this as a very serious incident. The commissioner has defined it as an error in judgment. The call that was made to—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, I don't know what you are laughing about. I wouldn't have thought it's a laughing matter. The call was made to 11444. The person who took the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Sorry. My apology, the call was made to 131444.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a serious issue and I would like to be able to hear the minister's response. I cannot hear a word.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The call was made to 131444 and, as the commissioner said yesterday, as a result of the information that was provided to the operator, the operator should have passed that information on to the communications centre, which would have then triggered a police car going off to this particular incident.

Now, the commissioner has defined it as a mistake in judgment. Obviously, I am very sorry that a police car did not attend this incident. Clearly, it should have.

STATE STRATEGIC PLAN

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:40): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the house on the community engagement process being undertaken to update South Australia's Strategic Plan?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:40): I am very pleased to answer this question from the member for Torrens. When I launched the plan in March 2004, I wanted it to be a goad for action for all South Australians. I wanted it to be a plan for everyone—business, the community and government—not a plan for government alone.

After nearly six years, our Strategic Plan has taken root in communities across South Australia and people from all over our state, from all walks of life, have taken part. The plan has helped to change the way South Australians see their future and to think about what we need to do to make our great state even better.

In 2004, I also promised that the state's progress against the plan's targets would be reported publicly and objectively by an independent group of experts. We have done this and last month I released the most recent progress reports showing that we are making significant progress in meeting many of the plan's targets.

When I launched the plan back in 2004, I said that it must be a dynamic, living document, because a plan that is about achieving change must itself be open to change when circumstances alter. That is why in 2006 we launched one of the most comprehensive community engagement programs ever conducted in South Australia to update the plan.

Four years down the track, it is time to do it all over again. Last month, I launched the 2010 update process. This time we are aiming to reach even more people and give even more South Australians the opportunity to have their say.

The Community Engagement Board, headed by former Conservative member of parliament, National MP Peter Blacker, is six weeks into the consultation process and reaction has been fantastic, not only in the sheer numbers of people engaged but also through the diversity of South Australian views expressed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I find it amazing to hear members opposite yelling out things against Peter Blacker. It seems that Tony Abbott appreciates the support of the Nationals.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: More than 2,200 people have been engaged in the update to date—600 more people than were engaged in the entire update process in 2006. The Community Engagement Board has already visited the Riverland, Yorke Peninsula and the Mid North, Eyre Peninsula, Ceduna, Roxby Downs, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Kangaroo Island and Fleurieu Peninsula, holding numerous public consultation sessions.

The board is not just relying on people to come to community meetings; it has been going to the people to make sure that a diversity of views is heard and reflected in the plan. This has included talking in the streets to people going about their daily business in such diverse locations as Rundle Mall, Roxby Downs and Kingscote, as well as going to workplaces and community organisations across regional communities.

Through this process we are also engaging with South Australians online and in new and innovative ways. Through the plan's website and through social media like Facebook, Twitter and YouTube, we have seen many South Australians posting their own visions for our state.

People have also been responding via widely distributed reply-paid postcards so that those who are not able to attend a meeting and cannot get online can send in their thoughts. These have been hugely popular and used by community organisations to assist their clients in having their say. This is about listening to the people.

Topic-based stakeholder conversations started last week, focusing on areas of safety and justice, health and the environment. Over 200 people have attended these sessions so far. There are many more opportunities for the community to have their say and to shape the future of the plan in coming weeks, with consultations on education, community, creativity and innovation and economic development.

This is a community plan, not just a plan for government. This is recognised in the increasing number of Alliance members. The Alliance member program demonstrates how the plan is a community plan and is implemented by the community as well as by government. As an Alliance member, organisations indicate what targets in the plan they are committed to helping to achieve.

The Alliance members reflect all elements of the community: businesses such as KPMG and Fuji Xerox, or not-for-profit organisations such as Anglicare or United Care Wesley, local government, and peak bodies such as Business SA—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Why don't you attack them as well—Volunteering SA—why don't you attack them—Housing Industry Association, which are all Alliance partners? These organisations are pursuing initiatives which contribute towards achieving the plan. All of these organisations, through the Alliance program, support the plan. It is not just South Australian businesses and individuals that have recognised the importance of the plan, South Australia's Strategic Plan has now been recognised internationally by the US-based Community Indicators Consortium as the world's best example of integrating community indicators to drive sustainable change—but, no doubt, you'll attack them as well.

The plan was a first for both South Australia and for the nation, and I am pleased that other states have now followed our lead and that our plan is getting the international recognition it deserves. I encourage all South Australians to get involved in the update process for our Strategic Plan.

It must be so horrible for you. When you get the latest figures on mining when we open the 12th mine, or the latest figures on \$2 billion worth of investment in renewable energy, or

120,000 more people in jobs than when you were in office, you despair, you chew your paws. So, we will just keep going, and we won't take notice of you, but we will listen to the people instead.

POLICE ATTENDANCE PROCEDURE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): My question is again to the Premier. Following the tragic events of the weekend at Callington, will the Premier order an independent review—that is, not a Police Commissioner or police review but an independent review—of the government's management of the emergency police phone system? I just think it needs to be independent to be properly assessed.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: I didn't say that at all.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: I didn't say that at all. I said that it needs to be independent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: —so that we can be satisfied that people will be safe in their homes.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, you have asked your question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:48): Unlike the opposition, this government has complete confidence in the Police Commissioner and also in the South Australian police force. What the commissioner did yesterday, at the very first opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —was to acknowledge that there was an error of judgment, as I have previously explained, as a result of the call to 131444. The caller put in a police incident report but did not pass that information on to the communications centre, which would have triggered a police patrol going out. The Police Commissioner yesterday came forward with that information at the very first opportunity.

In addition, he also announced yesterday that a comprehensive review would be undertaken of this particular incident and that that review would look at things such as training, policy, operating procedures and supervision to make sure that the system in place is doing exactly what it is expected to do.

A full review will be undertaken by the commissioner, and he will ensure that we have the very best systems in place. He is confident that that is the case already, but he is going to make sure that there is a comprehensive review that at least looks at things such as training, policy, operating procedures and supervision as a part of his review.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. How is the government's mental health reform agenda helping to improve services available to South Australians suffering from mental illness?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:49): I thank the member for Taylor for her question, and I acknowledge her keen interest in matters of health, particularly mental health. I would also like to congratulate the member for Taylor for joining me, the opposition health spokesman and many state and federal colleagues as ambassadors for the Exercise Your Mood Week at the current moment. This campaign is an

initiative of the Black Dog Institute, which is a not-for-profit educational research, clinical and community facility that specialises in depression and bipolar disorder.

The campaign is aimed at highlighting the benefits that exercise can play in reducing the severity of depression through interrupting the inactivity cycle of depression, providing distraction from worrying, and improving sleep, fitness and energy and an increased sense of control while promoting social interaction—complex stuff. Exercise can also effect physical change as it promotes the release of endorphins, often described as the body's natural feel-good chemicals, and reduces the level of stress hormones. I would encourage all South Australians this week to get active and exercise, particularly those who suffer from depression and mood disorders.

As you would know, Madam Speaker, the government works closely with many non-government organisations in the mental health sphere and these partnerships help to supplement what is a good mental health system in our state. There were a number of positive results of South Australia in the latest Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report into mental health services in August 2007-08, which was released earlier last month.

Members will be pleased to know that, per capita, South Australia has the highest number of specialised mental health hospital beds of any state or territory at 37.7 beds per 100,000 of our population; the highest number of public mental health staff at 154.4 per 100,000 of our population; the highest number of mental health salaried medical officers at 14.5 per 100,000 of our population; and the highest number of mental health public nurses at 78 per 100,000 of our population.

The recurrent expenditure in South Australia on specialised mental health services was \$173.23 per capita, which is well above the national average of about \$156. While we can be pleased with these figures, we understand that there is a lot more that needs to be done. As members of this house would know, the government is implementing a significant reform of our mental health system in this state with over \$300 million being spent to improve mental health, including the new 129-bed Glenside Hospital and the 10 limited treatment centre beds in country South Australia.

With the reforms identified in the 'Stepping up' report, we are moving towards more services in the areas of intermediate care and supported accommodation to assist people with mental illness to step between levels of care. So we have done very well in the past in acute services but we need to do more in the sub-acute area. This includes 60 beds in four new intermediate care centres and 30 intermediate care places in country South Australia. There are also 73 supported accommodation places which will now be increased by a further 80 places as a result of the successful COAG funding bid, bringing the total to over 150.

We are also building six community mental health centres that will enable people to directly access assistance in a timely manner. The first of these community mental health centres will be part of the Marion GP Plus which will open early next year. By having intermediate care options available in South Australia for the first time it will assist people with mental illness to step between levels of care. This should result in an overall reduction in the amount of acute hospital care required. The first of the government's intermediate care centres will open at Glenside in October this year.

The positive results in the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report places South Australia in a very good position for the continuing reform of our mental health system. Finally, I congratulate Mark Butler on his promotion to federal Minister for Mental Health and Ageing. I have worked closely with Mark in his role as Parliamentary Secretary for Health and I am absolutely certain he will bring the same level of vigour and spirit of cooperation to his new role.

POLICE ATTENDANCE PROCEDURE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is again to the Premier. Do members of the public need to phone 000 for police attendance or the publicly advertised number for police attendance: 131444?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:54): I am not too sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am not too sure what point the leader is making. We, of course, are treating this matter very seriously. The Police Commissioner and I have acknowledged the

human error that has occurred. Obviously I am very sorry that that has occurred, but I remind the opposition, particularly the leader, that we are in the middle of a murder investigation. This is a very serious incident and, if they want to play political games with it, they do so at their own peril.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ashford.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader! The member for Ashford.

ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES, VOLUNTEER AWARDS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. How is the role of volunteers in the areas of environment and conservation acknowledged?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:55): I thank the member for Ashford for her very important question. Approximately 6,000 people currently volunteer in activities coordinated by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, and each year DENR facilitates a volunteer awards program to recognise the valuable work that volunteers do in conjunction with the department.

The government greatly values the role of volunteers and DENR rightly identifies their key role in the volunteer engagement strategy 'Success through partnerships', which is the overarching strategy for supporting volunteer engagement with the department.

Each year, a dedicated group of volunteers donates around 20,000 days of work caring for our parks, gardens and reserves. There are over 140 friends of parks groups aligned with various parks throughout the state. The 2010 DENR annual volunteer awards were presented at the Friends of Parks Forum in August which was held in Woomera, formally recognising individuals and groups for their outstanding contribution to the environment through volunteering.

This year's Outstanding Individual Volunteer Achievement Award was presented to Mr Frank Gordon for his involvement in the Friends of Telowie Gorge Conservation Park in the Southern Flinders Ranges. Mr Gordon has been an active member of the friends group for 11 years and recently took on the role of monitoring the park's flora and fauna, identifying and reporting on population numbers of the yellow-footed rock wallaby, weed infestations and feral animal threats.

Outstanding Group Volunteer Project Achievement Awards were presented to three groups: Campground Hosts, Friends of Belair National Park and Friends of Shorebirds SE. The Campground Hosts program involves volunteers residing at designated campgrounds during peak holiday periods to welcome visitors and to assist visitors to help them find and settle into a campsite including helping them with permits.

The Friends of Belair National Park, one of the largest and oldest friends of parks groups in the state, has been instrumental in working with a range of community groups in the park including the Blackwood scouts, local schools, private companies and park visitors.

The Friends of Shorebirds SE group works together to protect beach-nesting shorebirds from introduced predators. The friends have used innovative techniques for monitoring the impact of introduced predators on shorebirds including monitoring artificial nests to give an indication of predation and monitoring of fledgling numbers to indicate breeding success.

A High Commendation was also awarded to the Hunting and Conservation SA Branch of the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia for its contribution to the Flinders feral predator program. Other volunteer awards recognising outstanding efforts included the Best Biodiversity Project, awarded to the Hunting and Conservation SA Branch; the Most Supportive Staff Member, awarded to Senior Ranger Jennifer Pitman from the Southern Lofty District; and the Friends Group Achievement of the Year (incorporating the McLaren Shield), awarded to the Friends of Sturt Gorge Recreation Park.

I congratulate not only the winners of these awards but all volunteers for their outstanding work in helping to protect and conserve our extensive network of parks, gardens and reserves to ensure that they can be shared and enjoyed by the entire community now and into the future.

POLICE ATTENDANCE PROCEDURE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): Since I have not had any luck with asking the Premier, I will try the Minister for Police. Given that the minister is always saying that South Australia has record numbers of police on the beat, why was a woman, living alone and calling for help because of an attack at her house at night, ignored?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59): For the very reason that I have already outlined to the house. I have gone through this in a comprehensive ministerial statement and already answered three questions. I am happy to keep answering the opposition's questions, but I really can't—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Why don't you just listen? Your leader has asked a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy leader, listen!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Why don't you show some manners for a change? I really cannot reinvent the answer because I have already provided the answer to the leader. I know the leader wants to play games with this, and that is why they are in opposition.

The fact is that we do have record numbers of police. It is well known that we have record numbers of police, and it is well known, of course, that we have pledged and will deliver another 300 on top of the previous record numbers—which, by the year 2014, will see an additional 1,000 police from when we first came to office.

I have acknowledged that in regard to this particular incident the commissioner put on the public record yesterday that there was an error of judgment and for that, of course, we are very sorry. I have admitted and acknowledged that a police car should have been dispatched. That is not in argument. The very question asked by the Leader of the Opposition was answered in my ministerial statement, and I have answered it in response to the first three questions. You know what the answer is.

INTERNATIONAL TOURISTS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Will the minister inform the house how South Australia is performing when it comes to attracting international visitors?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his question. All members probably know what a great booster he is for tourism in South Australia and, in particular, the beautiful McLaren Vale region, where he invites people to go all the time. I am pleased to say that I have been there at his request, and it is very nice to go there and he is doing a great job—as are many members, including members opposite, who I know are enthusiasts in relation to tourism.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Even the member for Finniss is a great enthusiast for tourism and likes to invite people to his electorate.

However, I would like to get onto some of the detail about this because it is great news for tourism in South Australia. South Australia welcomed 363,600 international visitors for the 12 months to the end of June this year. That is a 5 per cent increase on the previous 12 months and is ahead of the national increase of 3 per cent. So South Australia is doing better than the national average.

These results show that visitors are also staying longer in South Australia. International visitors spent 8.2 million nights in the state for the 12 months ending June this year, and that is an all-time high. This represents an increase in international visitor nights of 16 per cent on the previous 12-month period. This is well above the national average of a 5 per cent growth for the same period.

Why are these people staying longer? There are a number of reasons but, to touch on a few of them, some of these extra stays are related to educational services (and I know the Premier in his statement today mentioned the effort that is going into increasing and improving that effort,

particularly in India) and also business stays. There have also been increases in people staying for holiday purposes, and this has improved over the previous 12 months. In all, \$685 million of international visitor expenditure in South Australia in the previous 12 months is a pretty good achievement. That is a 14 per cent increase on the previous year and ahead of the 3 per cent national increase. Again, South Australia is doing substantially better than the national average.

So, the state is doing well in relation to tourism, and I thank the honourable member for his question and continued support, in particular for McLaren Vale.

ARKAROOA WILDERNESS SANCTUARY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. What is the government's position on mining in Arkaroola?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:04): I guess what we have heard today is that the Liberal Party is totally split on this issue. They have been fighting amongst themselves once again. I went to—

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order. The question was about the Premier's position.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, he has hardly even started. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know for members opposite, too, that the issue of mining—and, indeed, uranium mining—is very contentious. For instance, I know that there was a golden silence—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker!

Members interjecting:

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

Mr PISONI: The question was about the Premier's position on mining at Arkaroola, not about any other members in the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: What number is that?

Mr PISONI: Relevance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley, I will not uphold that point of order until I have heard a little bit more from the Premier; he has only just started. I know that he will stick to the subject.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will tell members my position, first, on mining, that is, that we have just opened the 12th mine. There were five mines—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Point of order: just for the Premier's benefit, it is mining at Arkaroola. That is the position we want—mining at Arkaroola, Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down, member for Unley. Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay. In the next few months, it will be the 16th mine, and 30 more to come.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Go on, stand up, stand up! So, the key thing is that for members on that side mining is some kind of 'mirage in the desert', but not for us. I went to Arkaroola—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't want to hear the bit about Arkaroola.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, point of order.

Mrs REDMOND: Madam Speaker, you already said that you would listen to the Premier to see where he was going with the answer. Clearly, he is not providing an answer which is relevant to the question asked, which was: what is the government's position on mining in Arkaroola?

The SPEAKER: I am sure, leader, that the Premier is leading to that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We had a member opposite laughing about a tragedy before, and now, when I get onto the issue of Arkaroola, they try to shut me down. I went to Arkaroola. I went to Arkaroola with the minister for the environment. I went to Arkaroola with the minister for mineral resources. In fact, the three of us went together, because we are a united front—not like you lot; you would have gone in separate buses.

The key thing is that what we did there was listen to the Spriggs and those naturalists and environmentalists—good and decent people—who are opposed to mining. We also listened to the proponents of the mine. We gave them equal amounts of time, and we gave them separate time as well as collective time. And, I can announce today, that the minister for mineral resources will soon be making a determination.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Little Para.

RIVERLAND

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:07): Will the Minister for Regional Development inform the house what the government is doing to help communities in the Riverland deal with structural changes required by irrigated industries due to lesser water availability and lower commodity prices?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the minister.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:07): I thank the member for Little Para for the opportunity to outline the range of measures that the state government has put in place to assist the Riverland community.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes. That community, as the member for Chaffey can well indicate, is under significant stress. I think that at least the member for Chaffey would like to hear the answer. In October 2008, as a result of the Riverland experiencing drought and decreasing water allocations and low commodity prices for its core industries (that is, wine and grape), we have a 20 per cent over-production in the nation at this point, and it is particularly impacting in areas such as the Riverland in irrigation-based communities.

In the face of drought and decreasing water allocation and a difficulty selling their core products, the state government established the Riverland Futures Task Force. This task force was tasked with the role of creating a future for that community and to avoid what was staring that community in the face, which was a decline in population and a collapse in underlying asset values.

Some six weeks ago, the Hon. Mr Robert Brokenshire, through a freedom of information request, was able to ascertain that there had been a significant fall in underlying asset values in real estate in the Riverland that had actually commenced occurring. So we were trying to prevent population loss, a collapse in underlying asset values and maintain the level of economic activity within that community. Over the last three years the federal government and the state government have injected \$200 million into that community, largely through drought relief. Once that is withdrawn—and that is imminent—we are concerned that there will be a collapse in retail sales and the like.

This task force was established to deal with those fundamental issues. I was the inaugural chair. It was made up of the three councils in the area, the Economic Development Board and the NRM board. Over the last 18 months it has put considerable work into establishing a future for that community. The state government has injected \$400,000 to underwrite a very rigorous examination of the economy of the Riverland as it currently stands and the possibilities that exist for that particular community.

The prospectus was launched on Friday. The member for Chaffey was there, the previous member for Chaffey was there, and it was well received by the South Australian Riverland community. I spent a week in the previous fortnight travelling along the Murray Valley from Mildura to Albury, meeting with irrigation-based communities along the river. This state is the only state that has undertaken the necessary work to protect our irrigation-based communities. No other community in either New South Wales or Victoria has undertaken this work, so we are in front of the game. We are in a position to secure significant finance from the federal government. The state government has—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Vickie, could you just let me finish?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, silly man.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The state government has underwritten this exercise with \$20 million over four years. We expect to attract an additional 7,000 people over the next 20 years, which will ensure the population integrity of the Riverland. We expect, over that period, to attract, I think, nearly \$400 million in additional investment. The objectives are to maintain population and population growth in the Riverland with that which is occurring elsewhere in the state, and similarly with the level of economic activity. I believe that the state government has put in place a proposition which will retain the viability—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, it's all very funny. You may have seen the Cotton CRC report that indicates that if we take 50 per cent of water out of irrigation communities in the Murray-Darling Basin there will be a 25 per cent slump in population in the Murray-Darling Basin. These are serious issues, and I would expect the opposition, being rurally-based, to take it a little more seriously.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ARKAROOA WILDERNESS SANCTUARY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): My question is again to the Premier. Given the Premier will not tell us what the government's position is on mining in Arkaroola, will he at least tell us what his position is on mining in Arkaroola?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:13): And that is the difference, because when our cabinet comes down with a determination we are ad idem.

STEPPING UP THE PACE PROGRAM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What is the government doing to halve the gap in employment outcomes between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:13): I thank the member for Florey for her interest in these issues. The state government is dedicated to increasing Aboriginal employment within the state, and to this end has developed Stepping Up the Pace, South Australia's Accelerated Aboriginal Employment Strategy.

The plan was endorsed by the former Aboriginal Workforce Development Inter-ministerial Council in September 2009 to accelerate progress against our national promise to halve the employment gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. For South Australia to halve the gap in employment outcomes an extra 470 Aboriginal people need to gain and sustain employment every year, with a further 250 to undertake training.

I am very pleased to advise the house that as at June 2010 the strategy has already generated 429 new employment opportunities and delivered 460 training outcomes. Since 30 June 2010 the strategy has generated an extra 229 employment outcomes and delivered 166 training outcomes. This means the Stepping Up the Pace strategy has generated 658 employment outcomes and 626 training outcomes, exceeding both targets, which is a great achievement.

Some of the employment outcomes achieved since 30 June include employment within BHP Billiton of 10 apprentices from the Indigenous Apprenticeship Employment Initiative, with the help of the commonwealth government and Santos, and five participants from the iTrain project. I would also like to acknowledge the funding provided by industry, which has seen 74 Aboriginal people undertake training in the national infrastructure project.

On Thursday I will be presenting certificates to the 20 graduating participants of the Woolworths national Indigenous Employment Program, which is part of the Stepping Up the Pace strategy. The program is a joint initiative of the commonwealth and state governments, the Mining, Energy, Engineering Academy Ltd and Woolworths Ltd. It is a \$1½ million project that aims to provide paths to traineeships and apprenticeships for 100 Aboriginal people within Woolworths Ltd.

Participants in the program come from Adelaide's northern and southern suburbs, the Upper Spencer Gulf and the Far North. The participants for this round of graduates are all from the southern areas. I am pleased to hear that they have shown great enthusiasm and dedication to the program and are eager to work in the retail industry after they graduate.

We are also supporting the South Australian private sector to employ and train Aboriginal people through the 2010 Industry Action Plan. This plan established the Aboriginal Employment Industry Champions Network, a network of 27 senior business leaders, and seven industry clusters. The work is pivotal in closing the gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in employment and training.

I am pleased to recognise the great work of industry, commonwealth and state governments in working together to help Aboriginal people into our workforce and also to help ensure their economic futures. The examples I have mentioned today reflect the state government's dedication to meeting South Australia's Strategic Plan objectives in Aboriginal unemployment and Aboriginal wellbeing and are central to ensuring the future wellbeing of our state.

LOWER LAKES

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Water. If the government has been monitoring the Lower Lakes and the bund at Narrung and you have a plan, as claimed by the minister on radio last week, why is it that the government is now having to build the bund higher before it can be removed? At what additional cost to the taxpayer will this occur, and how will siltation of the narrows be prevented during removal of the bund?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:17): What we have had over a significant period of time is a plan to manage the river system that South Australia is responsible for in the best way we possibly can to mitigate against what has been the most unprecedented drought in anyone's living memory and, in addition, in a cautious approach, to make sure through risk management that we made what were sometimes difficult decisions that needed to be made so that the river system was able to live to fight another day. In regard to the specific or multipronged questions provided by the deputy leader, yes, we have had a plan. We have had a plan for a significant period of time. For some people—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: The only thing that is not working, Mitch, is you. What we have attempted to do—and I know it is terminology that some people might say is a bit cute—through what is in essence a real-time management, is work through different scenarios about what might be and then, when situations occur, that we can react accordingly with the situation as it exists at that point in time.

There was no doubt, and everyone knows that the bund is a temporary structure. It was always meant to be a temporary structure. We always knew that as water rose—and that is

something I think that we all welcome here, not only in this house but throughout South Australia—that that would then have an impact on the structural integrity. We were aware of that.

Of course, one of the things that we certainly did not want to do was remove a structure until such time as we had a fair indication of what the circumstances and the future circumstances would be. We have received information—and I made a fairly detailed ministerial statement earlier—from the Murray-Darling Basin Authority.

That information is still, to a very great extent, speculative at this time. What the real circumstances might be is not confirmed, but what is confirmed is that we will have a significant amount of water down there. That will obviously have a positive impact on the water levels below Lock 1 and through to Lake Alexandrina. By partially removing that bund we would look at the equalisation of the two lakes by the end of October.

However, in regard to the specifics of the deputy leader's question, we hold safety foremost and paramount. What we needed to do was ensure that, when working on the top of that bund, there was enough structural integrity there so that equipment did not fall over. We know that and, quite simply, that was the right and appropriate thing to do.

That work commenced over the weekend. It will continue and we expect that by later this week, or by the weekend, that 100 metre removal of the bund will ensure that, for the first time in four years, water will flow from Lake Alexandrina through to Lake Albert.

We also know that for too many years the Murray-Darling Basin system has been treated as a compartmentalised system, depending on where you sit within that particular system. What we do know is that it is a connected system, and this is part of the first processes of reconnecting that area that we are responsible for. We are certainly very hopeful that with the water coming down, we will see for the first time significant water flowing over the barrages and finding its way to the Murray Mouth.

I hope this is not construed as being a tautology, but there are going to be significant unregulated flows, as we know, but we are hopeful that we are going to be able to regulate those unregulated flows in such a way that we are able to use that—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Oxymoron.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Oxymoron is it, Patrick, thank you. We are hopeful that we will actually be able to regulate that water in such a way that we can use it most effectively to the best benefit of the section of the system over which we are responsible and, in doing so, make sure that, through the regulation of that flow, we are able to ensure that further damage is not caused to those other areas that are suffering structural integrity, and the deputy leader is aware of those, whether they be the banks or our levee banks. So, it is about managing it as best we can and managing it under real-time circumstances, and that is what we will continue to do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, what we will be able to do in regard to the siltation is to remove the significant proportion of that. We know that some of that material will find its way into the lake and we will need to, again, manage that as best we can to minimise that amount of siltation, but also do it in such a way that, as best as we can, we can recover it. That is the commitment we have made to the local community down there as well.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr KENYON (Newland) (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Will the minister update the house on the progress of child protection initiatives?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:23): Madam Speaker, as you and members of this house know, the Rann government has had a very strong focus on child protection and keeping our children safe here in South Australia. Last week was National Child Protection Week—a time when this important issue becomes a focus for the wider community.

I think it is fair to say that good news is not something we usually associate with child protection, but there is much good work being done when it comes to child protection here in this state, such as the Stronger Families Safer Children program. This program has been running for just over 12 months and I am pleased to report that almost 1,000 children across the state and more than 300 families have been supported through this program.

Evaluation of the program is under way and will include a report prepared by the University of Adelaide and an analysis of family circumstances before and after their involvement with the program. Empowering seven of the state's most respected non-government organisations to deliver this program in their local areas has been a key to connecting with so many people in such a short period of time. The success is underpinned by the significant funding the state government has provided—\$28.2 million over four years for the Stronger Families Safer Children program.

With the support of Families SA, non-government organisations work with families who are in contact with the child protection system. Caseworkers provide a range of support from parenting and household advice to linking them to counselling, financial assistance and a range of other services.

Involvement in this program is often the difference between keeping a family together and children being placed in alternative care. This was certainly the case for a family of five in Adelaide's north. Here we had a mum and a dad, three children aged from three to seven and another child on the way. Dad has a disability and mum has mental health issues. The children's behaviour was very challenging, and they were being put at risk.

It has now been eight months since the family connected with Stronger Families Safer Children, and I am pleased to report that, while there are still ups and downs, much has improved. This family is now receiving support from the Central Adelaide Mental Health Service and getting counselling. The case worker has equipped the parents with techniques so that they can better look after themselves and the children long after their involvement with the program is finished.

Unfortunately, not all families can stay together. To support families where children have been removed, Stronger Families Safer Children also comprises a reunification service, which supports these families to get back together.

National Child Protection Week brings the safety of our children to the forefront of public awareness and discussion. However, all year round, we as a government maintain our commitment and collaborative approach to this cause, and we will continue to give all the help and guidance we can to mums and dads so that they can successfully raise their children and keep them safe.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:27): I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I just ask the minister—

An honourable member: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: I can ask a supplementary; she has given me permission. How much—

The SPEAKER: Member for Bragg, I just warn you that I normally would not allow someone else to ask a supplementary from a question asked by someone but—

Ms CHAPMAN: I can assure you that it is very relevant. Minister, how much of the fund, if any, has been applied to children on the APY lands?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:28): I am happy to take it on notice and to get that detail, but there is a program specifically for Aboriginal families.

CLAYTON WEIR

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:28): My question is again to the Minister for Water. Given the minister's statement earlier today that it may soon be possible to partially remove the Clayton weir, what plans does the government have, what trigger points need to be met before it is removed, and what will be the cost to the taxpayer of its removal?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:28): I thank the deputy leader for his question. Had he been listening to the ministerial statement, he would have realised that the trigger is information from the Murray-Darling Basin Authority that says that, over a two-year period, the level within the lakes could be maintained at sea level, and that was detailed.

The other point I would make in relation to the floodwaters that are coming down is that it was not so long ago that we had our northern floods and we secured our 400 gigalitres from that.

There were people who believed that we were going to have massive amounts of water that would open up the mouth. What we are doing is monitoring the amount of water we are getting, making decisions based on the information that is provided and then confirmed and making those decisions based on real information, and we will continue to do that. In regard to the costs involved, I do not have those details with me at the moment.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes. I will get back to the house on the costs, which, of course, will be dependent upon whether it is a partial or full removal. Our preference is to remove it fully, but we need to do that dependent upon the circumstances.

The deputy leader would also know that the EIS needs to be put in place or provided as to whether or not we keep the regulator there. We have to justify its staying there, and I think Mitch is fully aware of that.

The other point I will make—and this is my final point—is that we know that there are members of the opposition who support not only the work that is being done by this government but also the work done by the commonwealth government prior to the election. I thank the member for Chaffey for his support of our plan and I am very pleased that his body parts remain intact.

TAFE SA

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:30): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Given that before the election the previous minister misled the public on the closure of Panorama TAFE—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: For the benefit of the interjecting Leader of the Opposition, he is not allowed to make comments of any kind or debate in asking the question. That is the point I make. If he seeks leave to explain the question, he can do that later, but he still will not be able to couch it in comment or debate.

Mr PISONI: Can the minister then guarantee that no other TAFE in metropolitan or regional South Australia will be closed as part of the government's centralisation plan for TAFE?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:31): The government has no plans to close any other TAFEs. What I will make a guarantee of is that TAFE will be able to train more students than ever before in its history. In the next few years TAFE will be training more students than it ever has before on the back of a \$194 million investment by the state government into skills and training over the next six years to create 100,000 extra training places.

This announcement was made yesterday by the Premier and me about this new TAFE facility at Tonsley which will be the centrepiece that will help us deliver that training. It is a \$125 million investment—the largest ever single investment in TAFE infrastructure in South Australia's history. I am incredibly proud of it. I would like to thank the member for Unley for giving me the opportunity to rise this afternoon and talk about it because it is an absolutely fabulous announcement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Listen to them. It has been met with universal acclamation. Except for a couple of members on the other side of the house, it has been met with universal acclamation. For example—and this is quite remarkable; I do not think we will ever see this again—the union movement and the Housing Industry Association are in complete agreement that this is a good thing. David Smith, Vice President of the Australian Education Union, said:

...building a new college is a marvellous thing to happen, in the sense that everything will be up to date, it will be state of the art and the training will clearly be better than if you were using outdated equipment...

Mr Robert Harding, Regional Director of SA and NT Housing Industry Association, said:

We think that there needs to be a close liaison between teaching institutions and the industry to make sure that everything that's being taught is relevant.

I say to members of the opposition: get with the program, support this fabulous investment into skills for South Australian workers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TAFE SA

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:34): A supplementary to the minister: are you saying that there will be no more TAFE closures in South Australia?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. That is not a supplementary: that is the same question again.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Hammond.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader be quiet!

MYRTLE RUST DISEASE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:34): My question is to the Minister for Forests. What steps is the government taking to identify and combat the possible spread of myrtle rust into South Australia? Myrtle rust is a non-indigenous fungal disease that can cause serious damage to eucalypts and flowering native plants and threatens both farmed and native forests. It was identified in New South Wales earlier this year and has recently been found to be spreading in that state. Control measures are dramatic, involving destruction of affected trees and plants and quarantine of affected areas.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, I didn't quite understand who that question was to. Myrtle rust—I am fascinated to find out. I assume it is the Minister for Forests, is it?

Mr PEDERICK: The Minister for Forests, yes. It is a fungal disease of trees.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:35): All possible steps.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Very good answer, minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure we all know a lot more about myrtle rust now than we did before. Do we have any further questions?

Mr PEDERICK: I'll go again.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:35): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Mrs Redmond: The world's greatest agriculture minister!

Mr PEDERICK: That's the one. Before he made his decision to close the month of October to southern zone lobster fishers, was the minister aware of studies by the University of Tasmania that indicate no apparent harm to spawning female lobsters when caught and returned immediately to the sea?

Information published in 2009 by the University of Tasmania's Aquatic and Fisheries Institute indicates strongly that there is little egg loss from handling spawning females. Indications

from specific trials currently underway by the same university are that eggs are very robust and handling loss is trivial.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:36): This is quite a serious issue and I have just had a discussion with the member for Mount Gambier in some detail. If I could just commence with a brief examination of the state of the Western Australian fishery. Over the past three years, boat numbers in Western Australia have declined by about 40 per cent from 491 to 300. That is nearly 200 boats that have been taken out of a fleet of around 500—a dramatic drop in the productivity of the Western Australian lobster fishery. Just recently, within the month, the Western Australian government has further reduced the catch by 50 per cent.

So, we have a fishery under significant stress and in crisis and, according to ABC News, the Western Australian fisheries minister (Hon. Norman Moore) said he regretted the social and economic impact of the measures imposed this year but he had no other choice. Minister Moore said he was very much aware that, when you go below a certain threshold, the fishery does not recover.

Moving to South Australia, I believe that we are in a better position than Western Australia but we are heading down that particular road to a position where we may not be able to reverse the decline in the fishery. In making that decision to close off October, I was guided by the fundamental principle in the Fisheries Act which is the precautionary principle.

This is a United Nations auspice principle that has to be incorporated in all South Australian legislation relating to fisheries. It flows out of the United Nations Rio Declaration of 1992. It compels me as the fisheries minister, when a fishery is in decline and even though the scientific evidence is not substantial, to act on the principle of precaution. Now, I have done that.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: No; in the absence of scientific data, I am compelled by the Fisheries Act and, in making that decision, I look to every other state in Australia. I look to Victoria, I look to Tasmania and I also look to Western Australia. They close off their fishery in October.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I will come to that. October is a month in which lobsters carry eggs. Last season, 87 per cent of females brought to the surface were carrying eggs. Common sense would indicate that in a fishery in significant decline you do not interfere with spawning females.

I have looked at some research. I am not sure if it is the scientific research that the member for Hammond refers to, but I have looked at Tasmanian research where they are trying to develop an aquaculture industry. The research I have found tends to indicate that there is around a 10 per cent to 15 per cent loss of fertility when tampering with—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: No. The Tasmanian and Western Australian material that I have indicates that it is not a smart thing to do.

Mr Williams: Why won't you release it?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I will release it. I will table it when I have access to all the scientific information. I have acted in accordance with the Fisheries Act and the precautionary principle. We have a fishery in decline. Is the opposition suggesting that we ought to go in boots and all and not take—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Do you want us to find ourselves in the situation in two years' time that Western Australia is in at this very point in time where it is highly likely that that fishery will never recover?

What I have done is intervene to halt a downward spiral. There is an influx of young lobsters—a recruitment pulse—coming into that fishery. It is an ideal opportunity to rebuild the fishery rather than plunder it. I stand by the decision, and I believe that industry in the South-East is now coming round to the view that for short—

Mr Pederick: I don't think so.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, that for short—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You can have a discussion afterwards.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I think I have pretty well canvassed all of the issues.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

MURRAY RIVER WEEDS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:42): My grievance is directed to the Minister for the River Murray. Many of the problems facing the River Murray and the impact that these problems have had on the communities which rely on the river have been well documented and well publicised. There are quite a lot of these problems, and one such problem is aquatic weeds.

For a decade now, and perhaps much longer, invasive weeds have been building up in the river and now present a real threat to regional tourism, navigation, water quality and, quite possibly, human lives. There are two species of aquatic weed involved—the *Elodia canadensis* (an exotic species commonly called Canadian pond weed) and *Hydrilla verticillata* (a species native to Asia, North America and Australia).

The invasion of these weeds has been insidious because, like the European carp, the problem is mostly happening out of sight. However, the extent of these weeds is now becoming quite clear. They are everywhere. They have spread along the river from Lock 6 at Murtho to Lock 1 at Blanchetown. It is understood that this may well have been a result of low river inflows, allowing higher concentrations of nutrients to build up in the weir pools. The weeds appear to have thrived in these conditions, and two weeks ago I saw for myself the extent of the problem at the invitation of some constituents who live along the river.

The location of these weeds can often be found by looking for patches of floating duckweed, which sometimes anchors itself to the Canadian pondweed and the *Hydrilla*. Today, there are patches of this anchored duckweed covering most of the breadth of the main river channel, although it does not reveal the true extent of the other weeds. Reach below the duckweed with a hook and you will drag up large clumps of this invasive weed.

At one point during our short trip to the river, we were forced to stop and clear away the weeds which fouled the propeller and stopped our travel. The major concern I have is that, in the warmer weather, someone will go for a swim or come off their water ski, become trapped in these weeds and drown. There have already been some close calls reported, and I understand that in New Zealand there have already been some drowning deaths associated with that same weed.

On my trip we saw a dead kangaroo, which obviously had become caught in the weed trying to cross the river. Another important concern is the impact that the weed will have on river traffic, particularly houseboats and tourism. Not all patches of weeds will be readily visible, so there is a real risk of inexperienced boating tourists getting into difficulty; this, of course, has the potential to diminish the tourism experience in the region, as does the prospect of unsightly patches of weeds spreading across the river.

More than ever, the Riverland is relying on tourism for the local economy, and any possible impediment to regional tourism, such as these weeds, must be addressed. The weeds also present a potential threat to water quality. They appear to inhibit natural water flow, which could possibly lead to the build-up of toxic blue-green algae. It is my understanding that the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resource Management Board has investigated the problem, as well as having the weeds positively identified and establishing the extent of the infestation. What remains is for the state government to acknowledge the problem, to develop a solution and to act.

In New South Wales and on Lake Burley Griffin in Canberra, these weeds are controlled by mechanical harvesting. This method also involves collecting the clippings to ensure that they are not scattered across the water body and thereby spread the infestation.

I strongly urge the government to investigate this and other methods of effective control before these weeds become more than a problem than they already are today.

REYNELLA KIWANIS CLUB

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:47): I rise today to highlight the work of one of the many important community groups operating within my electorate of Mitchell. I cannot help but admire and be inspired by the Reynella Kiwanis group, especially after attending their meeting last month. With just 15 members, this group has helped many thousands of people within our community and beyond. The Reynella club was formed in 1973, expanding out of the Glenelg chapter six years after the community service organisation came into Australia.

The club helps with anything in which children are involved, as well as doing a lot of work for the elderly. I especially want to acknowledge the Reynella club leadership, including the retiring president, Dawn Eastwood; the incoming President and long-term bus driver, John Coats; the Treasurer and founding member, Brian Joliffe; the Secretary, Jeff Kaye; and the immediate past treasurer, Ray Wakeling, as well as the general membership for the good work that it does.

Across Australia, there are more than 60 Kiwanis clubs and around 1,000 members. However, the goal here is the same as the worldwide organisation's mantra of changing the world one child and one community at a time. I firmly believe that we should have children at the forefront of our minds when we plan for our future, including thorough policy and legislation, which we politicians develop and enact. Giving our children the best possible start in life and the best possible opportunities for the future is absolutely paramount. That is why the quality of education and health systems is crucial, as is the provision of appropriate family and community services.

One of the ways in which the Kiwanis, including the Reynella chapter, are supporting Australian children is by raising funds for HeartKids and heart research. This is so important, because 2,000 children are born each year in the country with a heart defect and six babies each day in Australia are diagnosed with heart disease. Little is known about childhood heart disease, its causes and any possible cures, facts which put further strain on the families involved.

Kiwanis, including the Reynella club, also use their fundraising efforts to support the Flinders Medical Centre children's trauma ward. I was so impressed with the dedication and passion within the Reynella Kiwanis and the projects they championed, that I would just like to talk about a recent project that I played a small role in—helping to cook a few snags.

The project was a fun day for disadvantaged children and their families. Over 300 attended the fun day at the Noarlunga cinema for a barbecue lunch and a screening of the latest 3D movie. On the completion of the movie, all the children were provided with a show bag full of goodies to take home and enjoy. The 15 Kiwanis members raised the funds, collected donations, coordinated the catering, and facilitated all the fun that everyone enjoyed on the day.

What a wonderful contribution to our society. Where would our society be without volunteers? They provide services in health and welfare, arts and culture, sport and recreation, conservation, community-based media and a wide range of other areas free of charge. An Australian Bureau of Statistics voluntary workforce survey in 2006 found that more than five million adult Australians volunteered, while just over 30 per cent South Australians were giving their time and talents freely in a variety of ways.

Staggeringly, the national voluntary contribution was valued at the time at more than \$40 billion. Voluntary activities provide opportunities for personal growth, social interaction and the sharing, broadening and development of skills. Volunteering can be of great value in preparing people for the workplace, helping them change careers or making the transition to retirement. It also empowers people who take part, giving them a chance to influence or affect their communities and groups within.

COUNTRY VOLUNTEER ORGANISATIONS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:52): I would like to talk for a few moments about the difficulty for small volunteer organisations in regional South Australia and also, no doubt, other places, brought about by the recent change in clarification to section 61 of the Occupational Health, Safety Welfare Act that requires that all corporate bodies, even if they are not-for-profit organisations, must appoint a trained responsible officer on their behalf. I can certainly see the merit in that, of course, with regard to larger organisations.

It is very important, and I am not trying to pretend anything other than occupational health and safety is very important, but the problem is the really unfair burden that this places on small regional organisations if they are an incorporated body, even if they are a not-for-profit organisation

and fully run by volunteers like the local bowls club, the local footy club, the local netball club, youth clubs or any of these organisations that run all that sort of thing.

They have to nominate and train one person in their organisation who will be solely responsible for any problems that come up on behalf of that organisation; so number one for that style of organisation. I think that it is really unfair; it is way too much pressure for a volunteer. I am sure that it is the same in the city, but in the country most people are on lots of organisations and most people are relatively senior in age. A lot of them are retired and they have the time and they want to help and contribute, but they do not necessarily want to take on a binding legal liability.

Another difficulty is the cost. It is in the order of hundreds of dollars for the training to get the qualification. So, again, for a volunteer organisation that might just have a few hundred or a few thousand dollars in the bank, that is a significant amount of money for them to try and come up with.

The next issue, of course, is that some of the roles might turn over every few years. Right now the president, for example, could be a 65 or 70-year-old man or woman contributing of their own time to this organisation. They have to go and get trained in their own time. They or the organisation have to come up with the money to pay for that, and maybe next year they will not be the president or the person taking on that role any longer.

It is a huge problem for these organisations, and without these organisations in regional South Australia we will really suffer; particularly sporting clubs, but all sorts of other organisations, whether they happen to be car clubs or youth clubs or, as I said, the many sporting clubs that are around the place. Without them, regional South Australia would be in all sorts of dreadful situations, but this is a really unfair obligation or burden to put on those people.

In case anybody is curious, the Volunteers Protection Act 2001, which would normally exempt people from personal liability, in this case actually is overridden by the health and safety act. The provision does not extend the immunity from criminal liability that attaches to a person who breaches a responsible officer obligation, even if the responsible officer is a volunteer. That is an extraordinary amount of pressure to put on a volunteer in a small volunteer organisation purely working on behalf of the community.

Another really important thing to point out is that, if these clubs cannot actually find somebody, if these clubs actually cannot get one of their volunteer committee people, whoever it happens to be, to put up their hand, then every other leader or position holder within that body corporate essentially becomes the responsible officer and takes on that legal responsibility on behalf of the club.

While I am sure we would agree that all over South Australia the people in these situations and positions will do their very best and try very hard. This is not about trying to get out of the law or trying to have unsafe organisations. I think we would all agree that putting this sort of pressure on volunteers, who really are just putting up their hand for the good of their organisation and their local community, is unfair. We are not talking about the SANFL clubs or anything like that, but if their organisation is a body corporate—we might be talking about the local under 16s netball club or whatever it happens to be—that obligation is really unfair, and I ask that the government consider that.

COLES SUPERMARKETS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:57): I am concerned that the decision made by Coles supermarkets recently to cease purchasing pork from farmers who utilise gestation stalls may destroy the industry with no net benefit to animal welfare. Clearly we should support action that promotes improved animal welfare in farming and there is no dispute that gestation stalls need to be phased out over time and as soon as practicable—that is not in question. However, the Coles supermarket decision could result in local industry being wiped out and we could end up exporting critically needed jobs in rural and regional Australia to countries where animal welfare laws are weaker than our own.

It is not just jobs in farming that would be lost but also those involved in processing pork. The Coles decision could have a severe adverse impact on rural towns and communities. Equally, the decision could mean that more pigs and animals generally live in poorer conditions than they do now. There is no point in imposing conditions on local farmers and ignoring the plight of animals in the countries of our trading partners. The local pork industry could become collateral damage because of the corporate strategy between two supermarket giants, Woolworths and Coles.

I understand that Woolworths has agreed to participate in new research initiatives being proposed and coordinated by the independent Pork Cooperative Research Centre based at Roseworthy, while Coles, on the other hand, appears to have made a unilateral decision to improve its market share and profits without any thought for the overall general welfare of animals or farmers in the long term. Clearly, Coles has put its grab for bigger profits ahead of the long-term needs of animal welfare, consumers, farmers and the nation. As a result, we could end up importing all our pork and pork products from countries whose animal welfare standards are lower than those in effect in Australia. Sadly, in the end we could destroy an industry in Australia, without any benefits for animal welfare.

We need to take a thoughtful and balanced approach to ensure that we achieve actual benefits in animal welfare and minimise the losses to the industry. Losses to the industry could contribute significantly to the decline of our rural areas and regions. Research—and, I might add, research that Woolworths is supporting financially—would help farmers adopt better practices without a massive reduction in productivity. On this issue, Woolworths is demonstrating its capacity to be a good corporate citizen.

It is not a good idea to adopt policies that would make us more reliant on importing an increasing amount of our food. Our farm animals, consumers and our hardworking farmers need genuine reform, not marketing gimmicks and corporate spin. What is good for Coles is not necessarily good for the consumer or the country in the long term. At present, 70 per cent of manufactured pork products consumed in Australia are imported. If we are not sensible about animal management changes, we will be importing all our fresh pork as well.

This new policy has been described as a con job by the Australian pork industry, as it only applies to and impacts on fresh pork that is supplied by Aussie farmers. Over 70 per cent of ham and bacon consumed in Australia is processed from imported, frozen, boneless pork, produced from agricultural systems that will continue to use gestation stores. This policy will drive a big price differential between locally produced pork and cheaper imports. Australian consumers are also being conned, as they have no way of differentiating between imported pork used in bacon and ham products with the labels used in supermarket delis. Since price is the only guide, it takes away the consumer's ability to make a considered decision on purchasing Australian-grown pork.

The industry is calling on Coles to apply the gestation stall-free policy to all pork, whether it is fresh or processed, produced locally or imported. This policy by Coles has the potential to decimate the Australian pig industry because it favours overseas producers at the expense of our Aussie pork farmers. If it were really about animal welfare, Coles would demand that the same supply standards apply to all its pork suppliers, whether they are sourced from the grain belts in South Australia or from Des Moines in Iowa. A pig is a pig, and the same rules must apply to all. It appears that Coles Supermarkets are telling some porkies.

Time expired.

FOOD SECURITY

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:02): I rise on quite a serious matter. Today, I want to raise the importance of research and development in agriculture in order for humans to keep on top of the new threats to our crops. Food security is being raised as a major concern around the world, and I spoke about my concerns relating to food security in Australia prior to the winter break in this house.

In its submission to the Productivity Commission Inquiry into Rural Research and Development Corporations this year, the South Australian Grain Industry Trust (SAGIT) deplored the reductions in commonwealth and state government investments in agricultural research, development and extension—extension being that process whereby the results of research and development are communicated to farmers in a way that they see the advantages and therefore adopt them.

SAGIT outlined the importance of state and commonwealth investment, stating that, while neither state nor federal governments make a direct cash contribution to SAGIT, their continued investment in core capacity is nevertheless essential. SAGIT relies on the state government, especially to fund the core capacity of such things as research stations, laboratories and expert staff. The member for Hammond has highlighted this many times in this house.

It is of considerable concern to SAGIT that state governments are cutting their budget allocations to agricultural activities, especially RD&E. With the state budget on Thursday, we

certainly hope that we do not see further cuts to this vital work. SAGIT's submission to the Productivity Commission also states:

In fact at national and state level one could be excused for thinking that governments regard agriculture as a sunset industry which is no longer worthy of investment.

I find this comment very disturbing in light of the current threats to agriculture across the world and, indeed, here in South Australia. For instance, as just one example, last year I attended a private conference in Kenya, where the pandemic of wheat stem rust was discussed. Wheat stem rust is amongst the most serious diseases of wheat worldwide and represents a major, immediate threat to wheat and barley production in the East Africa and near east regions.

In the 1950s, 40 per cent of America's wheat crop was wiped out by stem rust, and this prompted a new form of international cooperation among wheat scientists worldwide. This cooperation, spearheaded by Nobel Laureate wheat scientist Norman Borlaug, developed wheat varieties that resisted stem rust for more than four decades.

According to an article in *Science Daily* of 28 May 2010, ironically the very success of the wheat scientists' work eventually led to complacency. In the 1990s, for instance, the United States had only one scientist with expertise in stem rust, just before the discovery in 1999 of a very, very virulent new race of stem rust in Uganda (hence, now named Ug99)—and you are going to hear about that a lot more.

Before his death last year, Borlaug drew the world's attention to the threat that this emerging pathogen poses to world food security, and he warned of its newfound ability to overcome the resistance that had kept stem rust at bay for more than 40 years. Four new mutations of Ug99 have overcome existing sources of genetic resistance developed to safeguard the world's wheat crop. The variant of Ug99 identified in Kenya, for example, went from first detection in trace amounts in one year to epidemic proportions the next year.

Ug99 threatens to spread into other wheat-producing regions of Africa and Asia, and potentially the entire world. Most at risk is South Asia, which produces 20 per cent of the world's wheat for a population of 1.4 billion people. While we can afford to use chemical tools to deal with stem rust here in Australia, in poorer countries the cost of chemical control is prohibitive for most farmers, whereas the direct costs of growing resistant varieties in the developing world are zero.

It is also better for us to grow disease resistant crops rather than relying too much on chemicals. In the case of these stem rust variants, once they take on epidemic proportions, even chemicals are of limited use. Wheat scientists and farmers alike are now mobilising to identify and fight the virulent new forms of Ug99, and it is encouraging to know that researchers are collaborating around the globe on this.

Getting back to a more grassroots level here in South Australia, I refer back to the South Australian Grain Industry Trust's statement to the Productivity Commission, as follows:

At national and state level, one could be excused for thinking that governments regard agriculture as a sunset industry which is no longer worthy of investment.

Research and development in agriculture must not be relegated to a sunset industry; there is too much at risk. On Thursday, when the budget is presented, I very much hope that the money for research in this area is increased, not decreased.

ELECTORAL HISTORY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (16:07): I would just like to acknowledge the member for Schubert's contribution on the issue of food security, and I congratulate him on his ongoing campaign; it is very much appreciated.

First of all, I congratulate Mark Butler and Don Farrell on their joining the federal government's cabinet and outer cabinet, along with Penny Wong and Kate Ellis. It is great to see that South Australia is represented by such fine people.

As a student of women's history and also women's studies, I have been even more inspired recently by my participation in the Muriel Matters Society. Members in this chamber have heard about our very own Muriel Matters. However, in pursuing her history and her contribution, particularly to the suffrage movement, I have been concerned by the lack of knowledge that many of our journalists in South Australia seem to have about our history and also our electoral legislation history.

So, I asked the Parliamentary Research Library whether it could check some facts for me because I thought it was quite concerning that we quite often get it wrong, and I think a number of us have been acting on information that has not been entirely correct.

Apparently South Australia can claim to have the first Australian jurisdiction to give women the vote for parliament. We are also the first jurisdiction worldwide to give women the right to stand for election in parliament and we are the first Australian jurisdiction where a woman was elected to a local council. So I think we can be very proud of that. It is sometimes said that Catherine Helen Spence was the first female political candidate and that Susan Grace Benny was Australia's first elected politician. Both of these women were South Australian and both achieved these milestones in South Australia but not in the parliamentary sphere. I am told it is not correct to claim that South Australia was the first place to give women the right to vote nor is it correct to claim that South Australia was the first to introduce secret ballot, which is another thing that I had been told and I am sad to hear that that is not the case.

Mr Bignell: We would've if we could've.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I agree with the member for Mawson; we certainly would have if we could have. From 1861 South Australian women who owned or rented property in their own name were entitled to vote at local government elections. This right was not extended to voting for the Australian parliament until 1894 when that parliament passed the Constitution Act Amendment Act 'Adult Suffrage Act' 1894. That legislation allowed women to vote for both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on the same basis as men. I think the interesting thing to note about that is that adult Aboriginal women were also able to vote at that stage as well.

Because the legislation amended the Constitution Act, it was reserved for royal assent, which was received in March 1895. Once the act received royal assent, women could enrol as electors and then needed, like men, to be on the roll for six months before they could vote. So even for the very first women to enrol in South Australia, they would only have been entitled to vote in September 1895. The first election after the act received royal assent was a North Adelaide by-election held in June 1895 but that was too early in the year for women to vote generally. The first election at which South Australian women would have been entitled to vote was held on 25 April 1896. This was a general election for 54 House of Assembly seats in 27 districts. So South Australian women were first given the right to vote in parliament in March 1895 and were the first to exercise that right in April 1896.

There is a lot of other information that I would like to discuss in this area but it is also interesting to note that, if you want to know where women could first vote, there is some evidence to say that women had voting rights in 1871 in the Paris Commune, in 1881 on the Isle of Man, although they could not stand as candidates and, closer to home, Norfolk Island was in 1856.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:13): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The government is strongly committed to implementing measures to curb behaviour on our roads that is inherently dangerous. This bill's principal focus is a reduction of the incidence of offences involving unregistrable miniature motorcycles colloquially known as 'monkey bikes' or 'pocket rockets'. These vehicles have been implicated in a number of tragic deaths in South Australia and are the source of great frustration and concern within the broader community.

Through reforms to the Summary Offences Act, this bill makes it an offence to drive or cause to stand a prescribed motor vehicle on a road. Significant penalties will apply to act as a strong deterrent to the behaviour exhibited by a small number of irresponsible members of the community who, through their use of such vehicles, place themselves and others at risk. This government is determined to pursue the initiatives in this bill to reflect the community's intolerance of such behaviour. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill inserts a new section 55 into the *Summary Offences Act 1953* to create a new offence prohibiting a person from driving a prescribed vehicle on a road, or causing a prescribed vehicle to stand on a road. The offence will attract a maximum penalty of \$5,000 or an expiation fee of \$315.

Further, where a prescribed motor vehicle is driven or found standing on a road, the owner of the vehicle will be guilty of an offence attracting the same penalty. This ensures that, if a child is found driving a prescribed motor vehicle on a road, it is open for the owner (frequently the child's parent or guardian), to be charged with an offence. This places additional responsibility on a third party owner to ensure that their prescribed motor vehicle is not used on a road or a road related area.

Although the Bill is principally directed at 'monkey bikes', the offence extends to the unlawful use of a 'prescribed motor vehicle'. That expression is defined to mean a motor vehicle that is not able to be registered under the *Motor Vehicle Act 1959* and that is of a class declared by the Minister, by notice published in the Gazette, to be a prescribed motor vehicle for the purposes of the section.

Registrable miniature motor bikes will not be subject to the Bill. Road Traffic offences committed on those motor vehicles will nonetheless remain punishable under the existing criminal law.

The Bill provides a defence to a driver, or owner, if they can prove that the motor vehicle was driven or left standing on the road in circumstances which the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* permits an unregistered motor vehicle to be driven or left standing on a road. These include where the conduct constituting the offence was authorised or excused by or under a law, was done in compliance with a direction given by an authorised officer or police officer, or was done in response to circumstances of an emergency.

A further defence is also afforded to an owner of a prescribed motor vehicle who is charged with an offence under the new section, where they can prove that, in consequence of some unlawful act, the vehicle was not in their possession or control at the time it was driven or left standing on the road. The inclusion of this specific defence ensures that the owner of a prescribed motor vehicle which is stolen, will not be held criminally liable for offences under this section, which are committed by another unlawfully using that vehicle.

A key feature of the Bill is that it grants police a discretionary power to seize and retain a prescribed motor vehicle in a broad range of circumstances—including where a person is reported for an offence against this section. This ensures that police can, in appropriate circumstances, immediately address and remove the source of dangerous or disruptive conduct. A vehicle, once seized, may be retained by police until proceedings are finalised.

Where a person is subsequently found guilty of an offence, expiates the offence or—in the case of a young offender dealt with under Part 2 of the *Young Offenders Act 1993*—admits the commission of an offence, then the motor vehicle the subject of the offence is forfeited to the Crown and may be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the disposal provisions of the *Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007*. It is anticipated that given their unregistrable nature, forfeited vehicles will be destroyed.

Finally, the Bill makes a minor amendment to section 4 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953* to clarify that a reference in that Act to 'drivers' or 'driving of vehicles', has always included a reference to 'riders' or 'riding of vehicles' (unless otherwise stated).

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Summary Offences Act 1953

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends the interpretation section to make it clear that a reference to a 'driver' of a vehicle includes a reference to a rider.

5—Insertion of section 55

This clause inserts new section 55 into the principal Act. The section establishes offences in relation to driving a prescribed motor vehicle, or causing one to be standing, on a road. Under the proposed provisions both the driver and the owner of the vehicle would be guilty of an offence punishable by a fine of \$5,000 or an expiation fee of \$315 (unless a defence is available under subsection (3) or (4)).

The proposed section defines a prescribed motor vehicle as a motor vehicle that is not able to be registered under the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* and that is of a class declared by the Minister, by notice in the Gazette, to be a prescribed motor vehicle for the purposes of the section.

Proposed subsection (5) also allows police to seize prescribed motor vehicles involved in offences under the proposed section, and subsection (6) provides for the forfeiture of the prescribed motor vehicle in the circumstances specified. The proposed section sets out procedural matters in relation to such seizure and forfeiture.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

GAMING MACHINES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 36.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you for the chance to ask one more question about clause 36. Minister, just before we broke before lunch, we were talking about inducements, and the member for Goyder asked why inducements associated with purchasing gaming machines are not allowed, and we were all talking about certainly aboveboard legitimate-type inducements in many other industries.

I want to ask a couple of questions and delve a bit deeper. The last thing you said, minister, if I got it right, is that inducements are not good for this industry. The first question is: why is this industry different from other licensed industries, such as building or car dealerships, liquor licensees, GPs, surgeons, all that sort of thing, where these types of inducements, all aboveboard, are very often in place with regard to purchasing? Why is this industry different from those?

Secondly, I share a view and ask your thoughts on it: if the act is right, if the operators are right, if the purchasers of gaming machines are all aboveboard and doing what they are meant to do, and if the sellers of the gaming machines are all aboveboard and doing what they are meant to do, what is the problem with inducements? If inducements are not allowed, does that mean that there is room for error, that there is a problem with this industry?

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I wonder if it is, but I accept the sincerity of the member for Stuart. I will just give him a bit of history and take a step back. When gaming machines were introduced in South Australia, I think in 1991 or 1989, I cannot remember the exact dates—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: It was 1992-93 the federal legislation was passed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: '92, '93

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If we want to have a 'deputy leader off', I am happy to have one, no problem. I can count seven of yours straightaway, and you struggle with three. When they were first introduced, there were strict government controls in place. The parliament decided there would be strict government controls, that is, to make the State Procurement Board the middleman between manufacturers and purchasers of gaming machines. Parliament believed back then that preventing direct communication between manufacturers and purchasers would lessen the opportunity for kickbacks and corruption.

We believe that the industry is now mature and that the State Procurement Board is no longer considered necessary as a middleman for the sale of gaming machines, and measures that would lessen the opportunity for kickbacks and corruption have been included in this bill. They are aimed at balancing the negotiations between gaming machine venues and gaming machine suppliers, and I will give an example.

One of the concerns I have is profit sharing. Let us say, for example, you have 10 machines in a small rural community and you want to upgrade your machines, and a supplier says to you, 'You can have my machines free of charge. In return, I wish to have 25 per cent of all profits.'

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: That is illegal.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is why we are trying to make sure these types of inducements are not in place.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: It's got nothing to do with the purchase price. That is clearly illegal. You are not allowed to share the money.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, exactly, so we do not want those types of inducements being able to be offered at all. So, profit sharing and inducements are something we

do not want to see in this industry. If the member for Stuart and the opposition have different views on this, by all means do not support this amendment. You are well within your rights. The government does not believe that there should be any inducements available between the sellers of poker machines and the people who buy them. If the opposition has a different view, that is fine.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: For clarification, the minister's example is 100 per cent right. That is illegal inducement. I am just talking about legal inducements. If someone goes and buys 10 poker machines from whoever they choose to buy them from—Aristocrat, or whoever else—and if they are given an overseas trip to go along with it, they can make up their mind about what that net price means to them, just as all those other industries that I mentioned do. I am only talking about 100 per cent aboveboard purchasing inducements that have an impact on the net price. I have been offered those things and chosen not to do it. You just want the best price. At the end of the day, in this issue, it is just a piece of machinery that you are buying. On the other side is all the operational things that go with it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do not confuse being able to negotiate a cheaper price with an inducement. They are two separate issues. If you wish to buy your machines from a hypothetical seller, as opposed to seller A and seller B, and you choose B because they are cheaper, the government has no concerns about that. The concern I have is if seller B is offering you two first-class airfares to Los Angeles plus accommodation. I think that is a very different scenario. I am not quite sure why the member for Stuart, or anyone, may consider this to be the same as discounts. If you wish to negotiate with someone to sell you the machines and you want to buy 10 machines and there are four sellers and you are at a convention, obviously, you will buy the machines that suit your business plan. You will make a decision based on the best service they can offer you, price, etc. What we do not want these decisions based on is inducements.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I do not want to labour the point. The example is very good. The issue is if it was a surgeon purchasing prostheses for his patients and choosing which brand to use, they could accept the overseas trip, and I suggest that is very important as well. They can actually choose, as I understand it, all the things that wrap up in their buying decision, and that is no reflection at all on the quality of their surgery or what happens in the hospital, the same as this would not be anything to do with the quality of the gaming venue or their operation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not sure if the member wants to start comparing drug companies offering overseas trips.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is not a drug company.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay—medical companies that sell prostheses, or whatever the member was talking about, offering inducements to use their products rather than the medically best products. In fact, I believe that the AMA has also spoken out against that type of practice. I do not have all the facts and information in front of me about that, so I do not want to make any authoritative remarks about it, but I do not think, as the member for Stuart says, that because that practice is okay with medical practitioners it should be okay with the gambling industry. I do not accept that link and nor does the government.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I can provide a practical example. I do have some knowledge which I just think highlights the philosophical differences between what the minister is saying and what a few members on this side are saying. I know that when farmers purchase chemicals they negotiate the absolute best price for themselves, but they do recognise that, say, at Christmas time, and depending on the value of their purchases, some chemical dealers provide some level of other products—if a certain number of points are achieved, you get products.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. Those people take the fullness of that issue into account in determining who they will write out their cheque to. We see those sorts of examples occurring in our community, and we question the specific nature of the need to include something completely opposite to what is in this legislation. As the minister says, at the end of the day, if we do not like it, we can vote against it. I think that we have probably questioned this area enough, but it is just a philosophical point of view.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I accept that. I am not trying to labour the point either, but I just say this: the government's intention here is not to stifle free enterprise. The government's intention here is to make sure that there is not inappropriate artificial stacking of machines of a

certain brand and type within our marketplace in South Australia. I would like there to be a diverse range of machines.

I think the more we can do that, the better off a lot of the carriers who use different machines—maybe smaller facilities, such as clubs or other venues—will be. They may have a better choice, variety and range available to them. That is all I am trying to do. I am trying to stop monopolies; I am not trying to end any sort of free enterprise agreements.

Clause passed.

Clauses 37 to 43 passed.

Clause 44.

Ms CHAPMAN: I speak in opposition to this clause. I am advised by a parliamentary draftsman that, as I have no objection to the continuation of the same maximum penalty provisions which exist in the current section 64, simply opposing this bill rather than introducing an amendment will have the effect of continuing the requirement of authorised officers to be the only people permitted to seal or break a seal on any part of a gaming machine.

As would be noted from the previous debates on the principal bill, I have indicated my concern that this was being removed when it is one of the important precautions to assist with, amongst other things, preventing cheating and, in particular, changing the percentage returns by, essentially, the fiddling of machines.

I raised these concerns in the general debate. The minister has responded by indicating that the commissioner takes the view that he prefers a risk-based approach and that—again to quote the minister—if there has been any tampering then the commissioner would intervene. That is all well and good, but in light of the previous contributions, in particular the most recent, if the government says that it wants to maintain a high level of intervention and supervision, which is evidenced by no procurement benefits being allowed with the transaction, I find quite inconsistent that it would say, 'We will just listen to what the commissioner says in respect of this.'

As I said in the principal debates, the commissioner is to do what this parliament directs him to do and, in some circumstances, what the minister directs or asks him to do. That is what his job is—to carry that out. He may from time to time come forward with valuable and useful advice to the minister, which could be brought to the house and which may result in some legislative change. However, at this stage he is simply saying to the parliament, via you, minister, that he just prefers a risk averse process. That is, I suggest, totally inconsistent with what is being maintained here as a very high level of scrutiny over an industry which has some history.

The minister tells us, from events in history, that there had been a need to have a procurement board as an intermediary in this process, in this high level structure and secure licensing system, in the 1990s under premier Arnold and treasurer Blevins. This course of action, simply leaving this as a risk averse process, I suggest, is inconsistent with that.

Incidentally, I have since met with former premier Arnold in his new role, where he serves South Australians as the Chief Executive Officer of Anglicare and does an admirable job. In fact, I recall one occasion when he said, not long after he had undertaken his new role, that South Australians were facing a high level of need for public and affordable housing and that they were facing levels of poverty which he could now at a first-hand level appreciate and understand. I think I said words to the effect, 'That's good coming from a former premier who introduced poker machines to this state', to which his response was, 'Touché.'

Nevertheless, I recount that on the basis that it has been introduced, it is with us, and even the people who were responsible for introducing it recognise that there are some aspects of it that are unsavoury, unsatisfactory and unacceptable. Therefore, there needs to be intervention by this legislature to protect and support them and guide them out of the abyss of financial poverty which results from, on their part, an unacceptable and unaffordable level of participating in gaming.

There has been a history of a high level of supervision on its introduction for good reason. I also point out for the record that, when this legislation was first introduced, it came after an earlier commitment made by the former premier Bannon to this parliament that he would never introduce poker machine licensing in this state; perhaps we had to wait until his demise and another premier and a new treasurer took possession of the reins.

Nevertheless, everything that the minister has indicated is necessary to continue to supervise an industry in which there is some financial fragility for some South Australians is contra

to this exclusion. I thank the minister for his response at least in indicating honestly what the commissioner has said he would rather set his priorities to, but I hope that this contribution reminds the commissioner that his role is to undertake the objectives and priorities of this parliament. Consistent with the rest of the precautions that the minister has outlined in this bill, I indicate that I will be opposing this section.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would agree with what the member for Bragg is saying if there were not a central monitoring system. The analogy I can make here is your water meter at home.

Ms Chapman: That has already been tampered with. That has been exposed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let us say an individual attempts to tamper with their water meter at home to show no water use, but they are actually using water, so they do not pay any money. That can only be detected at the end. You would have to attend the resident's house, have a look at the bill, have a look at the meter, realise that it has not turned over over a period of time, that something is going on and an investigation be launched.

With this system there is a central monitoring system that monitors every machine daily. So, quite frankly, whether the machine is sealed at one end by a technician with the commissioner standing by, or not, is irrelevant, because at the other end, electronically, people can see exactly turnovers in machines and what they are doing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is the problem, because if someone tampered with one of those machines or someone opened one of those machines we would know, whether the commissioner is there or not. It is a very old-fashioned way of thinking about the monitoring of a system. I understand why some people would think this. People like my father want to see things stamped, and when they are stamped it must be official so everything is okay. He likes his receipts on his power bills, because when he goes home he can see it. 'See, I've paid it. I've got the stamp from Australia Post. It's all done.' Whereas my wife and I pay it online and we do not care about the receipt because it is all stored electronically. It is a difference in thinking, I imagine.

Venues will still be inspected. There will still be a risk-based approach. The fines are relatively harsh, so I am not sure why anyone would even attempt to do this, because we would find out about it instantly, I am advised. People would be dispatched if someone attempted to alter a machine and what it was paying or how it was operating, regardless of whether the seal at the front was broken or not, because we would know electronically back at base.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have misunderstood you, have I? I am sorry if I have. The government stands by this amendment, and the advice that I have been given is that it will not in any way lower the safety standards and the regulation of poker machines in South Australia. At commissioning, there is a signature check and if that is not accurate the machine will not work. So a technician putting a seal on one end and the signature check, I know which one I think is more important. It is the signature check at the other end, not the seal.

Ms CHAPMAN: In response, I think the minister and I are at cross-purposes.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Probably.

Ms CHAPMAN: There is no question that it would be absurd to have an authorised officer or inspector standing next to every machine for the entire time that it was operating when there is a signal process that can alert in the event that there has been a seal broken. The only thing that is required under this section as it currently stands is that the authorised officer needs to be there at the time of installation. That is my understanding. In fact, you specifically said it in your second reading explanation.

I think that there is an important aspect here to protect the poker machine owner as well, that that is identified, because it is true that when the machine is built and leaves with its certificate from the manufacturer, and it is sealed, then the only thing that is missing is an observation and recording—certification, if you like; recording, I think, is what is done—at the time it is received at the place of installation and operated. Once it is done it is online to set off alarm bells if someone tampers with it. What I am asking is that the government—and particularly the minister—consider continuing that obligation. Otherwise, there is a potential interruption to that chain of events.

The operator may be sufficiently knowledgeable at the time that the machine arrives to actually be able to identify if the seal has been interrupted, or if there has been some change to the mechanism—that is what is necessary at that point. I suggest that should be continued and, if the minister were consistent, he would insist that it continue and not just accede to what appears to be the request of the commissioner not to have his or her officers go out to do this job.

May I say that I think there is an important element of having these authorised officers not just to sit in their office, provide reports to the minister and watch the machines to see whether anything has lit up on the wall, but to actually observe these premises and make some assessment when they go out to install these machines, because, apart from being a licence to print money for the person who owns them—there is nothing wrong with that—they need to be secure, even at the time of installation, to ensure that the people who use that facility are not ripped off. There is a whole section of this act on cheating, and I suggest to the minister that, as has been clearly identified by previous ministers, he leave open the opportunity to close a loophole.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not sure how to explain this. At installation, when the technician is doing his work and the authorised officer is there for the sealing of the machine, a signature check is done electronically of that machine at a remote place where all machines are checked at installation. If those signatures do not match, the machine will not operate. If anyone attempts at any stage to tamper with that machine and if those signatures do not match, the machine will cease to operate. We would know if someone had tampered with it.

Now, you say that having an OLGC officer present at the commissioning would add a level of security to the owner of the premises. I do not see that link. I would much rather those authorised officers were out there doing their jobs, inspecting venues for not having the appropriate signage or harm minimisation measures in place.

Something that can be done remotely and electronically does not need to have someone standing there watching it being done, because, ultimately, the commissioned officer who is standing there watching a new machine being installed cannot tell if the signatures match. It is done remotely at another end where we monitor it. So, it does not really matter. It is an improvement in technology and I do not know how else to explain it to the member for Bragg. We will move on.

Clause passed.

Clauses 45 to 50 passed.

Clause 51.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

Page 21, line 16 [inserted section 76A(1)(a)]—

Section 76A(1)(a)—after 'gaming machine licence' insert ', the special club licence'.

This is more of an oversight, and I apologise to the committee for this oversight. It has always been the policy and intention that Club One have access to this provision to use gaming machine entitlements as collateral. This is an important amendment for Club One.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Without having spoken to the shadow minister, this is an obvious correction for which the opposition indicates its support.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 52 to 55 passed.

Clause 56.

Mr GRIFFITHS: In relation to the amendment to be moved by the member for Davenport, I presume that, as his amendment No. 1 at clause 19 was unsuccessful, this is a consequential amendment and therefore he will not be proceeding with it.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (MUTUAL RECOGNITION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 July 2010.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:48): I rise to speak on the Professional Standards (Mutual Recognition) Amendment Bill 2010. As members would be aware, I am sure, having read carefully the Attorney-General's contribution on this matter when he introduced it on 21 July this year, this bill essentially comes before us as a result of a Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (commonly known as a SCAG committee), when attorneys-general from the federal, state and territory parliaments meet and decide in their wisdom when it is important for there to be some level of agreement on usually introducing some model legislation for which there can be mutual recognition and/or an easier scheme to either facilitate problems or advance issues.

In this instance, the history of the bill emanates from the HIH-induced insurance crisis in Australia, subsequent to which South Australia implemented the Professional Standards Act 2004 in 2006. State and territory parliaments around the country met, having received the report of a major inquiry undertaken by the former justice Ipp. Our act, along with other similar jurisdictions, provided for the approval of schemes under which the occupational liability of the members of a particular occupational association would be limited; that is, they would be able to cap the liability. The tenor of this legislation was that, in consideration for being allowed to do that, the members of that occupational association had to do a couple of things: one was that they had to hold compulsory insurance or a minimum business asset up to a prescribed level and, secondly, they had to adopt some kind of approved risk management and dispute resolution procedures in exchange for this entitlement to be able to participate in such a scheme.

To facilitate the national scheme of professional standards legislation and schemes, uniform regulations had been promulgated and a national Professional Standards Council and a common secretariat for the state councils were then established. Everything was going well until it emerged that mutual recognition became a problem. At present the professional liability is capped only for acts and omissions occurring in the jurisdictions where the professional has the benefit of the scheme. Although a professional can obtain a benefit of a cap of liability in a jurisdiction other than in their home jurisdiction, it is claimed that—and it is probably correct—that would be a cumbersome, expensive and time-consuming process. Essentially they would need to make that application in each of the jurisdictions. There is merit that, if you are going to have a national scheme and you are going to enable it to be a registration in each of the jurisdictions, there needs to be some way of remedying that.

So to address that issue, SCAG put it on its agenda and agreed to a model of mutual recognition in all the jurisdictions of schemes approved in one jurisdiction and that meant that the professionals, as a consequence, could enjoy the capped provisions—a cap on their liability outside of their home jurisdiction. We are informed by the Attorney-General that this bill reflects the nationally agreed model to enable the South Australian-based associations, including any national associations, to have their head office in South Australia. I am not quite sure whether there are any, sadly, these days. Nevertheless, that is to apply to the South Australian council for approval of a scheme.

In applying, if they indicate that they want the scheme to operate beyond South Australia, the scheme will be advertised in newspapers in all relevant jurisdictions and is to be gazetted in each. We are further informed that the scheme may be challenged in any state or territory. An approved scheme and that scheme's cap will apply to a member of the occupational association covered by the scheme in every jurisdiction in which the scheme has been gazetted. On the other hand, the national occupational associations would be able to register a scheme in one state or territory that covers its members in all jurisdictions.

Members of a state or territory-based association—for example, the Law Society of South Australia—will be able to have the benefit of their association's scheme for occupational liability arising in another state or territory, unlike the poor Law Society of South Australia or in particular its members, the legal profession, who do not enjoy some of the other national benefits. However, that was a matter on which we had discussions with the previous attorney-general, left unremedied I am sad to see, but nevertheless he decided he was not going to introduce it, so hopefully we will have some more encouraging news from the new Attorney-General.

The opposition spokesperson on legal and justice matters in another place, the Hon. Stephen Wade, specifically sought advice from the Law Society of South Australia and a

number of other stakeholders. The Law Society responded by indicating that it considered that it may also be appropriate to repeal section 5(2)(b) of the act.

This is a clause that excludes the act from providing cover on 'anything done or omitted to be done by a legal practitioner in acting for a client in a personal injury claim.' I am informed by the Hon. Stephen Wade that similar clauses have been repealed in New South Wales and Western Australia and that, consistent with the SCAG approach, all states and territories act consistently on this matter. I would ask the Attorney-General to at least consider between the houses the repeal of that section, which would, as I say, keep some consistency. It appears that it is no longer required.

If the Attorney-General indicates in response that he will give favourable consideration to that between the houses, I will not ask that the house be delayed any further and I will not be seeking that the matter go into committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:56): I thank the honourable member for Bragg for her contribution on the matter. As the honourable member has indicated, I think this is a sensible step to be taking given the history of the matter going back to the lpp report, and I note her remarks in relation to section 5(2)(b).

As I understand that particular issue, which has been raised by the Law Society, the situation in which that would occur is fairly unlikely or at least uncommon. That would be where a lawyer acting for a party acts in a negligent way. The party then sues the lawyer in relation to their professional negligence, is successful in suing them in relation to their professional negligence and is awarded a sum in excess of the cap.

Obviously, that is going to be rare, one would think or one would hope, depending on the level of the cap. However, one situation that does strike me as a matter of concern is circumstances in which, for example, the negligence of the practitioner is not as to the detailed conduct of a matter but rather something as elementary as failure to issue proceedings.

The only matter I would ask the honourable member for Bragg to consider and perhaps discuss with the Hon. Mr Wade in the other place is a catastrophically injured plaintiff whose matter was placed in the hands of a solicitor who then failed to lodge proceedings in time and therefore those proceedings were barred. The injustice to that individual of being unable to recover above, for example, even half a million dollars would be terrible.

I am happy to take on board the remarks the honourable member has made. I do think it is important we have a think about it and, indeed, I would be happy to speak to the honourable member for Bragg and/or the Hon. Mr Wade about these matters at greater length if that would be of any assistance to anybody. However, I appreciate the member raising that matter explicitly at this point in the progress of the bill, and for that reason I put on the record, too, my concern. If it turns out that the only people who would be disadvantaged by such a change are catastrophically injured individuals, I think that would be a matter of some concern. I think that is something we need to talk about, and I very much appreciate the honourable member's remarks.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

GREEK LANGUAGE CURRICULUM

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:01): In speaking to the adjournment debate, I use this opportunity, as the shadow education minister, to fully support the inclusion of the Greek language in the Australian curriculum for schools. While the selection of LOTE languages to be included as part of the national curriculum has yet to be finalised, the state Liberals are keen to see Greek included and promoted at the national level. Further to that, we have always supported, and will continue to support and promote, the benefits of Greek language tuition in the South Australian school system. As the shadow education minister, and in my role as a local MP with a significant Greek community, I have had several meetings with representatives keen to see the continued promotion of the Greek language and have offered my active support.

The South Australian Greek community is a large and important contributor to the multicultural fabric of our state, and there is no doubt that many educational avenues for our children, from many cultural backgrounds, have been made possible by our Greek community and through our ethnic community schools—for example, the Sturt Street Community School, St George College and St Spyridon College. Of course, Greek is also taught in many other schools

in South Australia—36 in total—and it would be my hope that school communities were able to continue their second language programs as part of the national curriculum.

Greek is a primary world language and, of course, forms the basis of many other languages. It may surprise many members in the house that 30 per cent of the English language, for example, is derived from Greek. Historically, Greek is fundamental to the western linguistic tradition, with many significant texts, including those from Christian scripture, being written in this language. As a key European language, it is one of five official languages of the European Union.

In Australia, it is the fourth most spoken language, serving as a means of communication for 600,000 people, not only for social and educational purposes but also for business and economic activity of financial benefit to the nation. In this regard, Greek is much more than simply an ethnic language. It is a language of national importance.

South Australia has played an important role in being the first state to implement Greek in public education and in its state secondary school curriculum through language schools as early as the 1970s. Currently, over 2,500 students in state primary and secondary schools, over 660 in non-government schools and 1,300 students in ethnic schools have participated in Greek studies. The establishment of the Ethnic Schools Board has provided the mechanism for quality assurance in the teaching of the Greek language, and successive governments have ensured adequate resourcing for Greek education.

At a tertiary level, the Modern Greek Department at Flinders University has produced 2,000 graduates over 21 years. In fact, South Australia has the highest number of students studying Greek per capita in the nation—in both the government and non-government education sectors.

The Greek language is an essential and valued characteristic of our state and nation's multicultural identity, contributing to our society's fabric, cohesion, intellectual experience and financial prosperity. Inclusion of the Greek language in the national curriculum—which I support—by the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority will also be consistent with valuing the significant contributions and achievements of our Greek community and its historic language as an integral and ongoing part of our education system here in South Australia.

'SWIM WITH THE TUNA'

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:05): First, let me wish the member for Taylor a very happy birthday. Some months ago I was approached by a Port Lincoln based company, run by the Forster family, who wanted to speak to me about putting in a cage, with a platform attached to it, to allow people to swim with fish and to watch fish being fed, similar to the one that is operating in Port Lincoln. It is called 'Swim with the Tuna' in Port Lincoln, and it will be called the same thing on Kangaroo Island.

This particular cage was used at Victor Harbor. The Forster family procured it and have spent considerable amounts of money on it; in fact, as I understand it, it is a \$1 million project. Let me place well and truly on the record that I have absolutely no objection in our democracy with people expressing concerns, raising issues and making sure that the environmental matters and general worries they have about things can be expressed in the media and in letters to their local members. They can do what they wish in a free and open society.

However, what I do object to most strongly is nonsense being perpetrated by some people regarding this matter—which I think is over and above their democratic right—in not telling the truth as it should be told. This proposal is a tourism experience. It is for people, visitors, overseas visitors, South Australian families and families from interstate to get on a boat, go out to sea a short distance and get on the platform. They can buy a cup of coffee. They can feed the tuna. There are only 60 tuna, which, incidentally, the company had to buy. It does not have a tuna licence: it had to buy them.

People can generally enjoy themselves, have a bit of fun, have a swim (if it is not too cold) and get out there and see how it works. Those who oppose this—quite correctly, as I said, if they wish to—want to stick to the facts. About 10 years ago we had what was called the 'tuna wars' on Kangaroo Island, when a company—I think from memory run by Mr Grant Birrell, the manager—wanted to put in tuna pens off the island, similar to Port Lincoln. Well, it was World War III a few months early, quite frankly, because all hell broke loose and, in the end, the people walked away and nothing happened.

Some of these people who were involved in that at the time are trying to put forward a bit of mischief now to say that this is a smoke and mirrors campaign for tuna farming. It is not. Nothing could be further from the truth. As I said the other day, in Australia we used to have a thing called a 'fair go', and the proponents of this business are not getting a fair go. It really concerns me. I pick up what the Treasurer said a few months ago—words to the effect that it is very difficult to get anything to happen in South Australia.

I actually agree with him on that, because, in this particular case, this business and the proponents have done the right thing. They have gone to the local Kangaroo Island council, which I have urged to support it, and it will make a decision, I guess, one way or the other, even though it is a state issue and not a local government issue. They have gone to environment groups, to tourism bodies and to all sorts of people. They have told them what they are doing, but we still have this nonsense being perpetrated by those who do not want anything to happen anywhere that this is a front for tuna farming. It annoys me intensely.

The reality is that the 'Swim with the Tuna' company must apply to PIRSA for an aquaculture licence because they are keeping the fish in a cage. It is pretty hard to go out and not see them in a cage. You will not see a lot of tuna swimming past at any given time. Tuna actually swim past the north and south coast of Kangaroo Island; it is their natural migratory path.

They then say it is against what Kangaroo Island is all about. Well, Mr Acting Speaker, if you visit the wildlife parks on the island (there are a couple of them) you will see animals and birds in cages. If you go to the aquarium at Kingscote Wharf you will see fish in an aquarium, a terrible state of affairs. If you go to the Raptor Domain, which is a very high-class tourism raptor display on the south coast near Vivonne Bay, guess what they do with them at night? They put them in a cage; it is a bit hard not to. For that matter, about 700,000 sheep on Kangaroo Island and about 20,000 or 30,000 head of cattle are in cages too; they are called paddocks. What is being perpetrated is absolute arrant nonsense.

I would like to see the government actively support this company in what it wants to do. I am sure that it does, but I would like to see the Minister for Tourism come out and support it and the minister for agriculture come out and say, 'Well, these poor beggars have got no choice but to go for this aquaculture licence' and put the record straight. I want to put the record straight. The Hon. Mr Parnell in another place was a bit keen to fire up and make some noise, but when he actually learnt what it really is my understanding is that he backed off considerably. However, I am afraid that we still have a minority pressure group making a lot of noise and trying to stop this.

This leads me to wonder where we are going to end up. If you went to Queensland or the Northern Territory the thing would be up and running in about two minutes flat. There are no environmental safeguards that cannot be put in place with this particular issue. Heavens to Betsy! They have done kilometres and kilometres looking for the appropriate bottom. I told them that they have to be very careful about where they put this, not only for environmental reasons but, more to the point, so that it has some degree of shelter, so that if you want to go out in the member for Hammond's 50-footer, for example, you can do so and have a look at it, but you do not want to get out there when you have a swell of about four metres or waves chopping around at about 15 feet or so on top of a swell. It will be educational, it will teach people about what goes on. It is an investment of about \$1 million off the coast of Kangaroo Island, it will create jobs and it will have a flow-on effect, and it is yet another tourism attraction.

The other thing that irritates me is that we have this seemingly endless argument that we live in such a fragile place on Kangaroo Island that you cannot touch anything, you cannot do anything, it is all going to fall apart and we will all be doomed. Well, it is not quite like that. No-one knows what can be done there better than the long-term residents, the generations of families who have lived and worked in coastal areas where there is soft sand and light vegetation. Of course, you do not disrupt that, but there is a fair bit of sea off the land.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, there's a lot of it. It is a surprising fact of life that a great part of the world is covered by the sea, and there is a lot of it. I agree with the Treasurer that it is difficult to get things done. I reiterate what I said at the start of these few words that I have absolutely no problem with people objecting, demonstrating, or exercising their democratic right to have a crack at something; however, they need to stick to the truth and not invent stories that suit their particular argument. They will get caught out.

I think some have been quite reasonable about this, and others who are a little bit more extreme have already taken the other side of the argument. I want this to proceed. It is looking for no public money. It is all their own private investment, and it deserves the opportunity to be adjudicated on properly and for the project to go ahead. I sincerely hope that it is successful.

PARLIAMENTARY WEB STREAMING

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:14): It is a pleasure to speak again on the adjournment. I note this is the third or fourth time that I have had the opportunity to speak on an adjournment debate in the brief time I have been in the parliament. We do, of course, get this opportunity whenever the parliament is done with the government's business a significant amount of time before the sitting is due to rise. In a year when we only have 32 sitting days, it has been a great surprise to me, along with a number of other things that have been of surprise to me upon arriving here, that we apparently have so little to do in this chamber. It is disappointing.

Another thing that has surprised me is the standard of behaviour in this place. I had an opportunity last week to speak to a seminar of university and year 12 students, organised by Clem Macintyre and this house. I congratulate Dr Macintyre for his work. I know that he organises this seminar every year, and it is well attended by his parliamentary internship students, as well as year 12 students from the University Senior College. The issue was parliamentary reform. The member for Light and the Hon. Tammy Franks from the Greens gave very good presentations, and I spoke about a few of the things I had observed on my less than six months in this chamber.

One of the things that really struck a chord with that group was the question of why on earth this place not televised, or at least made available through web streaming of its proceedings. In 2010, it strikes me as extraordinary that this is the case, and it goes to parliamentary behaviour.

We saw in question time today, as we see every question time, extraordinary displays by ministers, going to the most senior positions in this state, and there is no opportunity for anyone in the state to actually see that sort of behaviour, unless it is the 10 seconds that might be displayed on the TV news that night or they are among the 100 or so people who can fit in these public galleries. Given that it is impossible for most people to make it here for question time, for example, because they might have jobs, I think the very minimum we could do is to allow public scrutiny and accountability of our behaviour and the government's behaviour in this place, through web streaming, even if it were just audio, but preferably video.

I have gone back and looked at some of the *Hansard* of estimates committee hearings when this has been discussed, and I read the evidence given that apparently it would cost \$2 million for such a policy to be implemented. When I read that and passed that onto the students last week, I saw the shock in the eyes of a group of 20-year-olds who, I am sure, with four video cameras and a \$10,000 grant could probably get the whole place rigged up in a weekend. I think it is a perfect example of how sometimes, when government comes along, contractors can add a zero to the end of a quote.

It is hard to fathom in this day and age that we do not have this sort of accountability measure available. I know that it is in the wings—it has been in the wings or in the pipelines for some time now. It is something I would like to draw to the attention of members of this house in the hope that we can actually get it done more quickly in the interests of public accountability so that if people are concerned about what is going to happen regarding Arkaroola mining or a bill, or if they are interested to know how the government is responding to the questions of the day in question time, they can do so with a little window on their computer at home or work at no inconvenience to them.

This is a privilege accorded to people in every state and territory in Australia, but not in South Australia. The legislatures in the Northern Territory and the ACT have managed to overcome the incredible technical hurdles to get their parliaments web streamed. The parliaments in every other state have managed to overcome the technological hurdles. I did a little bit more digging and found that the parliaments in Trinidad and Tobago have managed to get over the technological hurdles so that they can have web streaming in their parliament.

Portugal, Turkey, Malaysia, Lithuania, Estonia. New Zealand, for goodness sake, have the technology to web stream their parliaments. The parliamentarians in Chile can say 'buenos dias' to their constituents through the web streaming of their parliament. Even the Majlis Al-Nawab in Yemen has web streaming of its parliament, yet here in South Australia in the year 2010 we do not have that facility.

It would be wonderful to have web streaming of parliament, if only to give the public of South Australia a greater opportunity to see their members at work or otherwise. It would be a wonderful opportunity for better accountability of this house to increase the opportunity for the people of South Australia to see the hard work that so many ministers and members are doing. I urge the government and the officers of the house to pursue this as a matter of great urgency.

At 17:20 the house adjourned until Wednesday 15 September 2010 at 11:00.