

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 November 2010

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 14:00 and read prayers.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

The SPEAKER (14:01): I would like to remind honourable members that today is Remembrance Day. It is a time to commemorate the sacrifices made by both military and civilian forces in times of war. I am sure many of you attended services this morning.

MOONTA HEALTH AND AGED CARE SERVICE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Presented a petition signed by 3,094 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to continue to fund the eight 'long-stay' beds at Moonta Health and Aged Care Service.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government—

City of Port Lincoln Annual Report 2009-10

City of West Torrens Annual Report 2009-10

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Auditor-General's Department—Annual Report 2009-10

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

TransAdelaide—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Surveyors Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Food Act 2001—Annual Report 2009-10

Health Performance Council—Annual Report 2009-10

Health Service—

Barossa and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

Berri Barmera District Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

Ceduna District Health Services Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

Kangaroo Island Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

Loxton and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

Port Augusta, Roxby Downs and Woomera Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2009-10

Port Lincoln Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

Renmark Paringa District Health Advisory Council Inc. Annual Report 2009-10

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

Adelaide Festival Centre—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Care of Children, Council for the—Annual Report 2009-10

Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee—Annual Report 2009-10

Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry—Second Annual Report by the Minister for Families and Communities November 2010

Families and Communities, Department for—Annual Report 2009-10

Housing Trust, South Australian—Annual Report 2009-10
Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2009-10

By the Minister for Water (Hon. P. Caica)—

Stormwater Management Authority—Annual Report 2009-10
Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, Department of—Annual Report 2009-10

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau) on behalf of the Minister for Gambling (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Club One (SA) Ltd Financial Report—Financial Report 2009-10
Gaming Machines Act 1992—
Annual Report 2009-10
Distribution of Funds Among Community, Sporting and Recreational Groups
Report 2009-10
Independent Gambling Authority—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Claims Against the Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund—Annual Report 2009-10

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Adelaide Entertainment Centre—Annual Report 2009-10

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In the latter half of 2008, the nation and the state were faced with meeting the challenges of the sharpest and deepest global recession since the Great Depression. As a result of rapidly decreasing revenue forecasts, the government was forced to consider a range of options to ensure the sustainability of the budget in such a climate and meet our ability to meet increasing demand in our core services. Critical to that strategy was debt reduction and, in the Mid-Year Budget Review of December 2008, I proposed several divestment measures, including the sale of up to three forward harvests of ForestrySA. At that time I said:

...over the next 18 months, the government will work with ForestrySA and key stakeholders to explore the range of options for the upfront sale of ForestrySA harvests.

I also said at the time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much background noise; it is hard to hear the Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I also said at the time that, 'This will be a considered and thorough process.' That is what we are doing. We have undertaken initial consultation and have met with ForestrySA's board, key customers and harvesting contractors to gain a better understanding of the forestry business. We have met with a range of industry analysts and commercial advisers, and we have monitored the global market for these financial assets carefully. We have not rushed into this investigation; we have taken our time and have taken a very measured approach. We are undertaking a comprehensive analysis of the commercial and policy options available to us.

As a result of this initial consultation, I believe the decision to investigate the sale of the forward harvests is now ready to progress to the next stage.

Today I can announce that the government will shortly engage a prominent external consultant with specific expertise in this area to undertake a detailed examination of the risks and benefits of the sale process and the options available to deliver the best outcome for taxpayers.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Bragg, you are shouting out and we can hear what you are saying from here. Can you keep your voices down, please.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The external consultants will undertake a comprehensive consultation process with key stakeholders which will in turn be used by them to help inform their development of a regional impact statement. The regional impact statement—which will be made public—will advise cabinet on:

- The issues and the views expressed in the consultation undertaken in relation to regional issues;
- The impact of proposals on regions and regional interests;
- The full range of cost and benefits of the proposal on the region and its community, in particular on employment;
- Strategies for managing the identified risks, impacts and issues, including the impact on downstream industries; and
- The impact of the proposals on social inclusion and economic development within the regions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will be quiet.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The consultation process will include discussions with stakeholders, including local members of parliament, local councils, timber industry representatives, key unions, chambers of commerce, and others.

I expect the consultants to deliver their report to us by the end of the first quarter next year and then shortly after I will take a recommendation to cabinet for a final decision about the sale and its process. No such decision will be made until the consultation process and the regional impact statement is completed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This government is committed to the forestry industry in this state now and into the future. That is why we will be retaining ForestrySA in state ownership. That is why we will continue to replant forests on a commercial basis. That is why we have established bodies like the Forest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop is being very noisy, and I have something to say soon, that you may go without any warnings today.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is why we have established bodies like the Forest Industry Development Board to look at ways to grow the industry more generally. Madam Speaker, the government is committed to getting this sale right and to ensure that we consult and grow this important industry sector into the future.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:10): I bring up the 388th report of the committee, entitled Port Bonython Jetty Refurbishment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

HIGH COURT DECISION, TOTANI

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Today, the High Court handed down a decision in the matter of Totani & Anor v the State of South Australia in relation to the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act. This case involved a challenge by Mr Totani to a section of the act which was introduced in 2008 in response to the public's well-founded concerns about, in particular, the activities of outlaw motorcycle gangs. The High Court's decision involves complex constitutional law arguments that may have broad implications beyond section 14(1) of the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act.

It is necessary for me and for those who advise me to carefully read the six separate judgements so as to fully understand exactly what the implications might be for this act and, possibly, other legislation. Obviously, I would have been a lot happier if the High Court had ruled in favour of the legislation as it now stands. That said, I am pleased that we will now have a secure platform on which to build our legislative response.

South Australia was the first to enact this type of legislation to specifically tackle organised crime. Other states have followed South Australia's lead to varying degrees and so this ruling has national implications. Once we have weighed up the 186 pages that make up the judgement and have a clear view of the common threads in the majority judgements, we will be able to respond with some certainty.

Let me be clear: most of the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act remains operational regardless of today's ruling. After due consideration and discussions with the Crown Solicitor, the Solicitor-General and the Commissioner of Police, I will advise cabinet and then the parliament as to what steps should be taken to effectively take up the government's battle against organised crime. I am confident that in the new year we will be able to bring to the parliament amendments that address those concerns.

In the meantime, my advice to criminal gangs is, 'Don't start popping the champagne corks or cracking the Jim Beam yet,' our commitment to dealing with this scourge is unshaken. Our policy direction will not change, our support for the police will not change, and our determination to fight organised crime will not change. What may change and what may even need to be extended are the tools that we give to the police and prosecutors to do their job on behalf of the people of South Australia.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of year 8 students from Valley View Secondary School, who are guests of the Hon. J.J. Snelling. We also have here today, Mr Robert Didier, the President of the Conseil Régional of Reunion Island. Welcome, and we hope you enjoy your time here today.

MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR

The SPEAKER (14:15): The Speaker or any other occupant of the chair is responsible for the maintenance of order in this house. Standing order 144 states:

The Speaker is responsible for the orderly conduct of proceedings of the House and for maintaining its decorum and dignity.

This responsibility and the application of other standing orders, and the practice and traditions of the house, is the way disorder is dealt with and orderly proceedings are restored. Ultimately, the chair is reliant on the willingness of members to obey the rules of the house.

In maintaining the decorum of the house, it has been the practice of successive Speakers to, when necessary, elevate calls to order, when disorder is persistent, to a higher level of warnings to members. The issuing of warnings to members is not in standing orders, but successive Speakers and members seem to have accepted that after a third warning the next resort of the Speaker in trying to restore order is the application of standing order 137, the naming of a member.

As *House of Representatives Practice* (4th edition, page 507) says, the naming of a member is not the ruling of the chair; it is, in effect, 'an appeal to the House to support the Chair in maintaining order'.

I am of the opinion that there has been a level of disorder so serious in this house that the practice of issuing warnings must be dispensed with so that the chair can seek the support of the house in maintaining order. Therefore, members cannot rely on my issuing any warnings prior to being named if, as standing order 137 provides:

If any Member:

1. persistently or wilfully obstructs the business of the House, or
2. persistently or wilfully refuses to conform to any Standing Order of the House, or
3. refuses to accept the authority of the Chair, or
4. having used unparliamentary language refuses either to explain its use to the satisfaction of the Speaker or to withdraw it and, if necessary in the opinion of the Speaker, apologise for its use.

Therefore, I may or may not issue warnings to you. You may be named without warnings.

QUESTION TIME

HIGH COURT DECISION, TOTANI

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My first question is to the Premier. Does the government now regret not taking the opposition's advice to bring the bikie legislation back to the parliament for amendment following the Supreme Court's rejection of it, rather than appealing the decision of the Supreme Court to the High Court?

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) (14:17): Let me say this: I just want to repeat and support the words of my learned colleague the Attorney-General, as someone, of course, whose family has had hundreds of years of interest in jurisprudence. Any bikie, whether they are at the Talbot Hotel now sinking a Jim Beam, popping a pill or going out the back to fire up a bong, need not celebrate too early—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —because the fact of the matter is that the vast bulk of our legislative framework—the suite of measures—remains in place. This is one small part of it. Can I say—

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

Mrs REDMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question was specifically whether the government now regrets not having brought the matter back for amendment, rather than taking an appeal to the High Court.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order. The Premier is answering that and has said no.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I just said no. My advice to the bikies is: if you celebrate now, wait and see what we are doing next, because we are already preparing for a new measure to deal with this issue through the law—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —hopefully, getting the support of the opposition, who always seem to want to defend the bikies. We will keep going. We are going to keep coming at them. But, let me read from Justice Heydon, the dissent, the mischief and its solution. The opening remarks of Heydon's dissenting judgement in the High Court today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'In 2007, at least according—'

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Transport!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Isn't it interesting—only the bikies and the Liberals are celebrating the High Court's decision today. You know—

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, there is a point of order.

Mr PISONI: I ask that the Premier refer to standing order 127, reflections on other members. There is no celebration by the Liberals, and I ask him to withdraw. It's outrageous. It's an outrageous suggestion.

The SPEAKER: It is a valid point of order. I would just ask you to be careful, Premier, with your comments.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay. Well let's go to another learned colleague—

Mr PISONI: Point of order: I asked him to withdraw, and you upheld the point of order.

The SPEAKER: You didn't ask him to withdraw; you just said—you mentioned it.

Mr PISONI: I did ask him to withdraw, Madam Chair.

The SPEAKER: Premier, will you withdraw your remark?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: How can I withdraw remarks when, on a suite of measures on law and order, the Liberals have opposed them?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will sit down. Point of order.

Mr PISONI: The Premier is defying your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Premier, I have asked you to withdraw the remark. Could you withdraw the remark.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What is the personal reflection that I have made, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, what were the exact words you were objecting to?

Mr PISONI: That the Liberals are celebrating today's judgement. That is what the Premier said and I have asked him to withdraw it. You have asked him to withdraw and so far he has refused to do so.

The SPEAKER: I don't think he did say that. He said 'it appears to be only'. At this point I will not uphold the point of order but I am going to read the *Hansard* and I will come back if necessary.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, ma'am. Okay, Heydon's dissent—'The mischief and its solution':

In 2007, at least according to the then Attorney-General for the State of South Australia:

'outlaw motorcycle gangs remain prominent within the criminal class of South Australia and continue to expand. [Police] intelligence indicates that outlaw motorcycle gang members are involved in many and continuing criminal activities including murder; drug manufacture, importation and distribution; fraud; vice; blackmail; intimidation of witnesses; serious assaults; the organised theft and re-identification of motor vehicles and motorcycles; public disorder offences; firearms offences; and money-laundering.'

But it was not just the seriousness of the crimes that troubled the Attorney-General. He went on:

'Although comprising a small proportion of the state's population, outlaw motorcycle gang members and associates commit a disproportionate—'

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, the question was about whether the parliament has to redress what has been overturned by the High Court. The Premier is just quoting what the former attorney-general put on the record some years ago and has nothing to do with the High Court's judgment.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold that point of order because he is reading the judgment and it does reflect back on the question, I believe.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It continues:

'Although comprising a small proportion of the state's population, outlaw motorcycle gang members and associates commit a disproportionate number of serious crimes. Outlaw motorcycle gang crime affects all levels of society. It is varied in scope, expertise, sophistication and influence. Incidents in which outlaw

motorcycle gang members and associates are suspected of involvement...pose a risk to public safety. Outlaw motorcycle gangs are increasingly infiltrating legitimate industries and using professionals to insulate their criminal activity from law enforcement.'

Then back to the judge:

On 14 May 2010 Attorney-General laid before the House of Assembly a document giving his reasons for making a section 10 declaration in relation to the motorcycle club of which the respondents allegedly are members. In it he stressed the club's capacity to instil fear into the public and to induce the withdrawal of criminal allegations against its members.

This is what the judge then says in the High Court:

South Australia aspires to government by the rule of law. A government seeking to foster the rule of law has a primary duty to preserve the safety of persons within the Queen's peace—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and to preserve the government itself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —from criminal violence and other criminal activities. It is a legitimate expectation of the governed that their government will fulfil that duty. The legislation under challenge in this case is the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008. The impugned Act was enacted on the initiative of an executive which believed that it was not enough merely to respond to crime after it occurred by seeking to attribute fault and dispense punishment or order reparation. That executive thought that measures were necessary to forestall what it saw as very serious and socially damaging crimes. It thought that failure to implement those measures would be an abdication from duty. Like Coke—

You would not even know who that was.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —it thought that 'preventing justice excelleth punishing justice.' It sought to combine established techniques to meet modern problems. The measures employed in the impugned Act had the object of protecting the public from violence at the hands of organisations involved in serious crime by disrupting and restricting the activities of those organisations.

We are keeping going on this. We have a raft of measures in place and they have not been able to knock out any of the others, so there is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —a massive legislative shield that is there in place and we are coming back into the parliament next year with new legislation to deal with this issue and we are coming at them with even more measures.

HIGH COURT DECISION, TOTANI

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): I have a supplementary question arising out of the answer.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to whether it is a supplementary question.

Mrs REDMOND: It is, Madam Speaker, because the Premier quoted extensively from the one dissenting judge in his response. Would he care to inform the house what the six other judges who found against the state had to say?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:26): Isn't it interesting where they line up? They line up with the others. They are showing their true colours.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PREMIER'S ANZAC SPIRIT SCHOOL PRIZE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier tell members about the 2011 ANZAC Spirit School Prize recipients?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:27): I would like to thank the honourable member for Reynell for her question. I would also like to commend those members of parliament who attended ceremonies today commemorating the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month in 1918, which, of course, was the time when—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland will be quiet.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting when I am talking about Remembrance Day to hear the inane interjections from members opposite.

I wanted to acknowledge that, at the start. We decided some years ago to set up the ANZAC School Prize, which was about having a competition and then sending our young people to the other side of the world so that they could experience the Western Front. They could see the sacrifice that was given on their behalf and for future generations.

The ANZAC Spirit School Prize aims to encourage young South Australians to recognise, connect with and maintain the ANZAC spirit. Now in its fifth year, the tour provides the students with a historical, cultural and social perspective of Australia's involvement in the World War I campaigns in Europe. It also provides the students with a personal insight into the impact of this war on the troops in Europe and the Australian families waiting for their return.

I am delighted to advise the house today, on Remembrance Day, that the students for 2011 have now been chosen. These students will travel to the site of the Western Front and other important sites as part of a two-week study tour to Europe to commemorate ANZAC Day next year. I am aware that last year they visited the Churchill Museum, the underground cabinet rooms in London, the Imperial War Museum, and other sites in Britain, as well as in Belgium and France.

The students this year are: Cassandra Roccisano, a year 9 student from Charles Campbell Secondary School, and year 10 students, Maggie Rutjens from St. Mark's College and Nick Falcinella and Edward James from Loxton High School, Joseph Chu from Glenunga International High School, Alison Wilson from Pembroke School, Monique Champion from Immanuel College, and Jade Pass and Clair Coat from Loreto College.

To enter the competition students had to tell the story of a South Australian who served on the Western Front and discuss what the experience means to them today, almost 100 years later. The reality is that some of the students are not that different in age from the brave men and women who fought and in some cases sacrificed their lives over successive conflicts.

On previous occasions, the student participants were required to research the personal story of a World War I fallen South Australian; however, for the first time, students were given the opportunity to research a digger who had returned safely home. Interviews will be held on 19 November to select two teachers to accompany the students to Europe. They will be joined by a representative from the RSL and a staff member from my protocol department.

I congratulate all students awarded the 2011 ANZAC Spirit School Prize and commend them for the respect they have shown to our brave men and women who risked their lives and in some cases paid the ultimate price to ensure that we can all remain free.

After each of these visits, and, of course, attending an ANZAC Day on the Western Front at places like Fromelles, they have come back to the parliament and made presentations to members and ministers. On a number of occasions I can say that they have been some of the most moving ceremonies that I have ever experienced in the almost 25 years that I have been in this parliament: young people who go away and find the grave of a young South Australian who died, conduct a service and ceremony there, research their story, and then come back and find, if possible, their relatives and tell the story back to people generations on. I think it absolutely changes the lives of these young people, as each of their letters have testified.

ANTI-BIKIE LEGISLATION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Attorney-General. What is the estimated total cost to the taxpayer for the failed Supreme Court and High Court challenges to the anti-bikie legislation, including costs awarded to the Finks Motorcycle Club, the costs of the government's legal representations, and internal costs, such as the work of the Crown Solicitor's Office?

It was reported in the media last October that the then attorney-general, Michael Atkinson, said, 'If the High Court upholds the Supreme Court's decision on control orders, it will mean a \$50,000 legal bill at worst.'

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (14:32): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. As she would be aware, the traditional rules in relation to the awarding of costs are that the winning party has their costs, as taxed or agreed, paid by the losing party, and I understand that that is the order that has been made by the court. Mr Caldicott, I believe, was representing the successful party in this appeal, and I am not sure whether even Mr Caldicott has added up his numbers yet, and if he has added his numbers up he has certainly not told me what they are, and might I add—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood! You are too noisy.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I know that the Leader of the Opposition knows all of this information from her own experience, but some of her colleagues don't, so they might like to listen. The member for Bragg knows about all of this too, of course.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Finniss!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If the member for Finniss would be quiet for just a moment he would be hearing the answer. The answer is this, that in respect of Mr Caldicott's costs, if he knows what they are yet, and I would be surprised if he did, but if he did know what they are he has not yet shared it with me, and when he does share it with me I dare say we will have to have a look at what he says his costs are and consider which, if any, of those costs are recoverable.

Inasmuch as your question is directed to the costs borne by the government, I have to say that I am not entirely clear as to how one would be calculating the cost borne by government because, as the Leader of the Opposition well knows, many, if not all, of the people who have been involved in this matter are employees of the government. As I understand it, and I could be wrong here and the honourable member might know better than me, government lawyers do not sit there with six minute units in front of them and work their way out in this way. I will try to find out what I can about the Crown's—

Mrs Redmond: Ring Michael Owen.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I will.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I might try—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —someone else next time. Anyway, back to the main point—

An honourable member: Try Greg Kelton!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's right; Mr Kelton can expect a call shortly, but back to the point. I will make inquiries of the Crown to see whether we can get some idea what their figures are. I guess that I will just have to wait for Mr Caldicott to let me know what his figures are.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN OF THE YEAR AWARDS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Volunteers. Can the minister update the house on the South Australian finalists for the Australian of the Year Awards?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his important question. Last night I was honoured to represent the government at the presentation of the South Australian of the Year Awards. It was a wonderful evening, and I offer my sincere congratulations to all those nominated for their invaluable contribution to our state. Four awards were presented last night. Peter Goers, a well-known and much-loved local radio presenter was crowned SA's Local Hero—

Mr Marshall: A Norwood resident.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —yes, a Norwood resident—in recognition of his dedicated voluntary work with a large number of community organisations and events. Internationally-recognised expert in the field of water management and water quality Professor Don Bursill was named South Australia's Senior Australian of the Year.

Vincent Jack Buckskin is truly a remarkable young South Australian. A Kurna and Narrunga man, he teaches the endangered Kurna language to more than 100 Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students between the ages of five and 62. Last night Jack was named Young South Australian of the Year.

Finally, the recipient of the South Australian of the Year Award was given to internationally-renowned physicist Professor Tanya Monro of Adelaide University, a fantastic young woman. I was honoured to meet, for the first time, the famous Professor Monro, last night and speak with her about her research, which, funnily enough, includes a collaboration with the region of Puglia.

Professor Monro very generously shared with me her views about the Puglia/South Australia research collaboration. She told me—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What did she say?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Well may you ask. She told me that she believed it to be completely unjustified to belittle a fantastic project, which will have very real and tangible benefits across many sectors—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —of the South Australian and international community. She advised me that the Italian academics who have been part of her research have been a great asset, and that Adelaide has world-class facilities in applied research programs funded through state and federal government initiatives.

Professor Monro told me that the relationship is so valuable because it allows us to take ideas from high-quality Italian researchers and translate them into reality, using our cutting-edge facilities, giving us the opportunity for world-class outcomes. In fact, Professor Monro went on to stress that she would like to see greater collaboration between South Australia and Italy because the results of such partnerships are incredibly beneficial to the research being undertaken here in South Australia.

The Hon. R.B. Such: She's on the payroll.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I ask you to withdraw that remark. Madam Speaker, the member for Fisher said that she was 'on the payroll'.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Fisher resume his seat.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I ask the member for Fisher to withdraw that comment.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: By way of personal explanation, the professor is on the payroll of Adelaide University. I met her last Friday. She is not a volunteer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Can I respond to that? Can I explain to the member for Fisher—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: In this particular case, I am speaking about Professor Monro's collaboration with Puglia and South Australia. She does not receive a cent for the work she does as part of that project; it comes from Puglia. So, in fact, she is not on the payroll when it comes to this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I shall continue nonetheless. They have besmirched an outstanding South Australian's reputation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will sit down.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Be careful member for Unley, or you will be out again—for three days this time. I accept the member for Fisher's explanation. There was no point of order anyway. Minister, would you get back to your answer.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker, she said that any initiative that enhances collaboration between universities in different countries is of great value. There is no doubt that public debates are important; however, in all of this we must be very careful not to trash our researchers, their outstanding work, and our fine institutions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Listen to the minister in silence, please.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: In my view, that is the risk that we now face as the member for Waite uses this debate to reposition himself against the Leader of the Opposition. Well, I'm backing you, Isobel!

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will sit down.

Mr PISONI: Point of order. This question is about the volunteer awards night last night, not about Puglia. It is outrageous.

The SPEAKER: I will uphold that point of order. The minister has strayed from the substance of the question. Have you finished your answer, minister?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I have, Madam Speaker.

ANTI-BIKIE LEGISLATION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. When the government uses taxpayer money to pay the Finks' legal costs, will the Premier guarantee that the Finks will not use this money to build another bikie fortress that the government will then have to knock over using taxpayer money?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:42): It is very interesting you should say this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —because you did not like the fact that one bikie fortress was told to remove its fortifications in the Adelaide Hills and another one was stopped. Here is another law that the opposition does not support. We gave the police commissioner of South Australia the rights to apply, if there were evidence of criminal malpractice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise on that side.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett will restrain himself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When you are quiet the Premier can finish his response.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This parliament passed legislation to give the police commissioner certain rights to have a court order to remove fortifications from bikie premises where there was evidence of crime being committed. I have great confidence in the police commissioner, even if members opposite do not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are almost halfway through question time and we have had three questions.

PANASONIC KID WITNESS NEWS NEW VISION AWARDS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier tell the house about the success of students from Kaurna Plains School and Hackham East Primary School at the recent 2010 Panasonic Kid Witness News New Vision Awards in Sydney?

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) (14:44): I would be very pleased to, and I also want to thank the honourable member for introducing me to some of these young people over the years and, in fact, to do an interview and also see some of their musical performances. They are kids of great talent led by teachers of great talent. So, I thank the member for Mawson for his question and for his great interest in his local schools. I am pleased to inform the house that two schools from South Australia did exceptionally well in the 2010 Panasonic Kid Witness News New Vision Awards held in Sydney on 20 October.

These awards were launched in 2004 and provide students with the opportunity to write, direct, film and star in their own short movie. More than 180 students from primary and secondary schools across Australia attended the awards at the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney. Judges at the awards included INXS lead guitarist, Tim Farriss; former Young Australian of the Year and three times AFI award nominee, Khoa Do; as well as highly regarded film editor and member of the Australian Screen Editors Guild, Jane St Vincent Welch.

Sixty-three primary and secondary schools from around Australia participated this year, giving students the opportunity to write multiple scripts, edit, interview and use storyboards. Amidst strong competition, I was delighted to hear that both Kaurna Plains and Hackham East Primary were successful at the award ceremony in Sydney. Kaurna Plains School, an Aboriginal school that caters predominantly for Aboriginal students, was awarded the National Secondary School Award and South Australian Secondary School Award for its film, *Warraburna Kaurna*, or translated, 'Let the language be spoken.'

About 30 year 8 and 9 students, under the leadership of teachers Kevin Duigan and Leayshia Gaston, took part in the making of the film, which tells the history of the Kaurna language and its disappearance after English settlement in Australia. It also celebrates the 30th anniversary and revival of the Kaurna Aboriginal language. Year 8 student, Amy Karpaly, did the translation from English to the Kaurna language. These highly acclaimed winners were also recognised for the movie's technical excellence, taking home the National Spotlight Award for videography.

Members of the house would be familiar with the outstanding talents of the students at Hackham East Primary School. Their school choir not only boasts wonderful singing voices but also performs in Maori—Maori music—including an outstanding Haka (which I am quite happy to replicate one day in the house) under the direction of teacher, Jarrod Lamshed.

Earlier this year, I was advised that seven students from Jarrod Lamshed's year 7 students were making a short film on the Adelaide desalination plant and that they wanted to interview me for the movie, *Beneath the Surface: Desalination is the Answer*. Two of the young filmmakers flew to Sydney with their teacher, Jarrod Lamshed, for the 2010 Panasonic Kid Witness News New Vision Awards. On the night, they won the SA Primary School Award for their movie, winning a trophy and \$2,000 worth of movie-making equipment for their school.

I am advised that, while unsuccessful on the night, Parafield Gardens Primary School also reached the finals and, having had a long association with that school, I congratulate them on their efforts. On behalf of all South Australians, I thank all the students and teachers from both Kurna Plains and Hackham East primary schools involved in this project and commend them for doing their schools, their communities and their state proud—great journalists of the future.

LA RÉUNION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:48): Is it the case that, in light of the scrutiny on the Premier's Puglia relationship, the Premier has at the last minute decided to pull out of announcing a new Nicola Sasanelli inspired trade agreement or special relationship with the French island of La Réunion?

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) (14:48): His Excellency the President of La Réunion—which is a part of metropolitan France, even though it is off the coast of southern Africa—is in the chamber here. We will be celebrating over the weekend, including right—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: At Carrick Hill

The Hon. M.D. RANN: At Carrick Hill. I hope members opposite will be here. We are looking forward to signing a friendship memorandum of understanding with La Réunion, and I understand that President Sarkozy has a very strong interest in that.

LA RÉUNION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:49): My question is again to the Premier. How much taxpayers' money has been spent and committed in preparing for and executing the special relationship? Does it include a trade agreement with La Réunion, and what are the expected benefits? The ABS indicates that South Australia is not exporting anything to La Réunion and has not for at least 11 years.

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) (14:49): I understand that the French government has paid for the visit here, not the South Australian government.

LA RÉUNION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:49): That was not the question: the question was whether or not the Premier or the government has spent any money at all on this proposal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:49): I am not aware of any money, although I understand that the French ambassador met with the Deputy Premier while I was in hospital last week. But we are very happy to offer hospitality on the weekend at Carrick Hill, and I hope that members opposite would support that.

PUBLIC SERVICE CUTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Education. Does the minister agree with the Treasurer's comments on radio today that the minister helped the Treasurer design the budget and put forward some of the initiatives that have been controversial since, including cuts to the Public Service? The Treasurer said today that the minister and the Treasurer were:

...team mates on this budget; that everything we did, including issues to do with workplace reform, both Jay and I did together. Jay was quite comfortable in every decision that we took; in fact, supported and put forward some of the initiatives that have been controversial since.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (14:51): I must say that my role is often exaggerated, both positively and negatively.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: However, I can say that I am very proud to serve in this cabinet and this government and I support every one of our government decisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MURRAY COD FISHERY

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Could the minister update the house on the status of the Murray Cod Fishery which was closed in 2009?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is an important question.

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) (14:52): I thank the member for Little Para for the question. Members may have seen the piece in today's *Advertiser* (the 'codpiece') that announced that the iconic Murray cod will now be available to recreational fishers as a catch-and-release fish in the coming season. I am pleased that this move has also been welcomed by the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council. As members may well have been aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much background noise and the minister is quietly spoken so it is hard to hear.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: It was a reasonably prominent article and brought to the attention of the state's fishers the change in regime as far as our new catch-and-release policy for the Murray cod is concerned. I think the member for Chaffey, in particular, would be interested in the import of this particular decision given the fact that an extensive process of consultation occurred throughout the Riverland to determine where we went with this particular issue.

As members may be aware, the Murray cod has been a threatened species and has been in significant decline since European settlement, for a whole range of environmental reasons, such as the introduction of pests and disease, and numbers have been plummeting. What we found during the drought was that there was a virtual cessation of breeding because the fish actually need heavy flow to breed. In December 2009 we prohibited the catching of the cod.

The drought has broken and the science informs us that we will see a resumption in breeding. Recreational fishers along the Murray, particularly in the Riverland, not only residents of the Riverland but also visitors and, as the member for Chaffey is well aware, shack owners, bring significant amounts of money into the Riverland, particularly over a weekend and on holidays.

So, we went through a process of consultation with the community and with fishers to determine where we went with the management of this particular species. The end result has been that, on the basis of science and public consultation, we are now opening up that fishery to the catching of cod, but it is very much on the basis that they must be returned.

What was not mentioned by *The Advertiser* is that PIRSA will now be embarking on a fairly comprehensive campaign of advice and education for anglers, because this is a vulnerable species and rough handling can impact on their breeding. This is a great outcome for the Riverland and for amateur fishers, and hopefully it will prove to be a good environmental outcome.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MURRAY COD FISHERY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Can I ask a supplementary to clarify the answer the minister has just given?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr WILLIAMS: Minister, am I right in that, up until now, it has been illegal to catch Murray cod, but that, if you inadvertently caught one, you had to put it back, and now it is legal to catch them but you still have to put them back?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:56): As the deputy leader is aware, life is made up of balance, so in this particular instance we have determined that we want to see anglers back in the Riverland enjoying what they do, which is pursuing the cod, but we are very much cognisant of the fact that the species is under threat.

The science has informed us—and it has been a very rigorous process—that we will be able to maintain the population and see it grow. If the deputy leader wants to get out there with a policy opposing this particular position and go up to the Riverland and argue it, well, so be it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: That's much clearer!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Transport!

PUGLIA, MINISTERIAL TRAVEL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Was the minister accompanied or joined by Mr Manlio Longinotti, a research intern who worked for the Premier's office, on her recent trip to Puglia? If so, what expenses were incurred for his costs and who paid for these costs?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:57): He did not accompany me, but he was a member of the mission for, I believe, one to two days. I certainly did not arrange for his presence there. I am happy to be corrected but, as I understand it—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —he is a resident of Italy. He spent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You asked a question; the minister can expect to be heard in silence.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: He is very familiar with South Australia because, under another agreement that this state has with Bocconi University, which is an outstanding university in Milan, he spent three months here in South Australia working for us—working on research projects identified by us, for us, prepared a report for us—at no cost to the South Australian taxpayer, and these internships occur on a rolling basis.

Anyway, I understand that the arrangements for Mr Longinotti were that his fare was paid, I think, from Sardinia to Puglia and two nights' accommodation were paid for him as well. He does not work for me, he does not work for the South Australian government, there is no contract, as I understand it. I am happy to check those facts and bring back an absolute answer, but I think that is pretty much the scenario.

NATIVE FISH AWARENESS WEEK

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:59): Can the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The fan club will keep quiet.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Can the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —for Environment and Conservation, given that it is Native Fish Awareness Week, starting tomorrow, outline how our government is supporting native fish projects?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:59): Yes, I can, Madam Speaker. I thank the member for Croydon very much for his question. He does, in fact, like fishing very much. It is just that he doesn't catch too much when he goes, but we are working on that. The fish I am going to talk about today are those species that are not targeted, unlike those many fine species that are targeted by anglers. I thank again the member for Croydon for his question.

As most people would be aware, it is Native Fish Awareness Week. It runs from 12 November through to 21 November this year. It is an initiative of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and the basin states aimed at drawing attention to the work underway throughout the basin to help restore native fish populations.

Events such as Native Fish Awareness Week play an important role in making the community aware of what is already being done to help restore native fish populations, what they can do and how they can get directly involved in native fish projects. Members might be aware—they might be more aware if they listen, but certainly members should be aware—that critical habitats and freshwater refuges for native fish in South Australia have been hit particularly hard in recent years as the drought in the Murray-Darling Basin system has continued and inflows of water into the River Murray have declined.

Five species of native freshwater fish—the Murray hardyhead, the southern pygmy perch, the Yarra pygmy perch, the river blackfish and the southern purple-spotted gudgeon—have been identified as under immediate threat and are a high priority for protection, along with other species. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources is working—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Very small fish, mate—very, very small fish. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources is working closely with the Department of Primary Industries, SARDI, the Department for Water, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, the SA Murray-Darling Basin NRM Board, Native Fish Australia SA and a range of private and community groups. I want to particularly highlight the work being undertaken by community groups on a variety of these projects to ensure that these species are not lost to the Murray-Darling Basin.

Specific projects to rescue native fish from rapidly drying habitat for captive breeding and transfer into suitable temporary freshwater refuges are currently underway. As an example, around 200 Murray hardyhead were last month released into the Causeway Lagoon in the Riverland as part of a captive breeding program managed by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the Murray-Darling Freshwater Research Centre in Mildura.

The native congolli is another great example of the collaborative work being undertaken to protect our native fish. A recent operation to prevent the congolli from extinction in the Lower Lakes and Coorong proved successful, with many thousands of the fish—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: That's right, exactly—swimming through the boat lock at the Goolwa Barrage to do their thing and ultimately breed. One of the major highlights for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —Native Fish Awareness Week in South Australia is a unique educational opportunity organised by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources—the Get to Know Your River event. It will be held next Tuesday, 16 November, at the department's Wyndgate property on Hindmarsh Island. School groups and the community have been invited to spend the day with native fish experts, including a chance to paddle kayaks to see first-hand some of the area's important fish habitats.

As was mentioned by my colleague, a native fish forum will also be hosted at SARDI Aquatic Sciences at West Beach on 17 November, bringing together leading native fish experts to discuss the latest research. There will be an opportunity for recreational fishers to meet and discuss native fish issues at an information night in Berri on 18 November. I want to acknowledge my colleague the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and his department for supporting Native Fish Awareness Week events.

In another highlight for Native Fish Awareness Week, students from the Alberton Primary School—that outstanding school—will travel to the Paiwalla Wetland near Murray Bridge to help release a number of purple-spotted gudgeon they have been raising. The students established their own breeding program as part of a major conservation effort being managed by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the SA Murray-Darling Basin NRM Board.

Our hope—and I am sure it is the hope also of the opposition—is that, through activities such as this, more South Australians will become involved and become aware of the plight of our native fish and the work that is being done to ensure threatened species are not lost to the Murray-Darling Basin system.

SASANELLI, MR N.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Does the minister hold, or has she held, any artwork by Mr Nicola Sasanelli and, if so, how many items and were they given as a gift?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:05): Madam Speaker, how is this relevant to my portfolio?

SASANELLI, MR N.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:05): Supplementary, Madam Speaker: given that answer, if she has been given artwork, does she feel it would be appropriate for her to have it valued and disclosed on her register of interest, for which she is responsible both as a minister and as a member of the house? And I ask her to answer the first question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I think you need to make some answer to the question.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:06): Very happy to. Yes, Mr Sasanelli is also a renowned artist. Last year, before I became minister, he very kindly gave to me and my family, as he gives to many other South Australians, like Don Totino for instance, a piece of artwork. Now, this is from one friend to another. Unlike you, I am not a fairweather friend.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: So that is my answer to you. You have presided over the wholesale destruction and damage of—

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

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, the minister is clearly debating the answer and reflecting on a member.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has finished her answer.

BURRA HOSPITAL

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise when on-call accident and emergency medical treatment will be provided at the Burra Hospital by a Burra-based doctor? It has been over six months since on-call accident and emergency medical treatment has been provided at the Burra Hospital by a Burra-based doctor. In that time, accident and emergency patients have been asked to travel to Clare for treatment, and on-call doctors from Clare have attended at Burra to treat patients.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:07): I thank the member for the question. It is an important issue that he has raised for the community of Burra. In fact, I met with some representatives of that community just last week. The issue is a simple issue. We, as a health system, enter into contracts with GPs in local communities to provide services, if those GPs are credentialed to provide that particular service. In order for any doctor to work in any one of our hospitals right across country South Australia—or, indeed, in the metropolitan area—they need to be credentialed. A GP does not automatically have the skill set or the credentials to go and work in an emergency department.

The local doctor in Burra was assessed and found not to have the skills that were necessary to work in the emergency department. After the health department went through that credentialing process, the doctor has appealed that process, which is her right and she is entitled to natural justice.

That assessment of her skills will be conducted now by an independent body and, until that has been resolved, there is not a lot that I as health minister can do, other than to make sure that the hospital has coverage from doctors outside of the town. That is why we are very grateful to doctors who are based in Clare for providing service, and, of course, there are senior nurses in the Burra community who are able to provide a triage service as well.

Obviously, it is not an ideal circumstance, but, as I said to the residents the other day, as a health minister I will not compromise the safety of the community by bending the rules just to make people feel better. It does not matter how many people sign a petition, it does not matter how many public comments, how many press releases, how many public meetings that they have; we will not allow a doctor who is not credentialed to work in the hospital. The GP service, I understand, as one of the residents told me the other day, is contemplating taking on another doctor who may well be able to be credentialed. That would be a good thing, I said, if that was the case, but it is really in their hands.

As the member would understand, GPs are private businesses. We do not organise those businesses, they organise themselves. If they choose to not have a doctor available who can provide a service in the hospital who is credentialed then there is not a lot that I can do about it, other than to attempt to recruit another doctor to the town through the Rural Doctor Workforce Agency. Until this particular doctor's appeals process has been settled I cannot really do anything. That is exactly what I told the residents and the public and I tell this house. We would like to see this matter resolved but to a large extent it is outside of the control of the government at this stage.

LONGINOTTI, SENOR MANLIO

Ms FOX (Bright) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Can she advise the house of when she first met Senor Manlio Longinotti?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:11): I am very pleased to answer this question. The member for Goyder asked me a question a minute ago about Mr Manlio Longinotti. I know there has been some talk about who he is, and who he is working for, etc. I first met Mr Longinotti in his capacity as an intern as part of this other relationship that we have going with Bocconi University. He is an outstanding young Italian man and is very keen to return to South Australia in some capacity, such was his experience when he was here.

Of course, I am not the only person in this chamber who knows him; the member for Norwood also knows him very well, he took him sailing for the day. The member for Norwood, who probably is the future of this party, undertook—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta will be quiet.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —to introduce him to local businesses, such was his belief in this young man's potential. You threw the first punch, sunshine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I am very pleased—

Mr PISONI: Point of order: members must be addressed by the electorates which they represent, not as 'sunshine'.

The SPEAKER: That is true, but I think that was a generic term, so we will not say that it particularly applied there. Minister, have you finished your response?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I have.

STORMWATER RE-USE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:12): My question is to the Premier. Does this government still stand by its position that drinking stormwater is reckless and dangerous, in light of its recent decision to provide over \$1 million towards the Salisbury council study into turning recycled stormwater into drinking water?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his question. To differentiate us from them I would make this point. The deputy leader has said, and he has been well quoted—not that the quote, or the statement, was very good: 'Look, stormwater, you run it through reeds for a couple of weeks and it's almost good enough to drink.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the last question, so please keep quiet.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Is it the last question?

The SPEAKER: It depends how long you go for, minister. If there is an opportunity, we will get another one.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There is a distinguishing difference between us. Members opposite have asserted on numerous occasions that the most appropriate use for stormwater is for drinking purposes.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister is clearly debating. It has nothing to do with what we said; he cannot get that right. The question is: does he still believe that drinking stormwater is reckless and dangerous?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order because I am sure that he will get to that response, and this is information which is certainly related to the question and which needs to be taken into account.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I believe that it certainly is, madam; but, Madam Speaker, you will decide that. It certainly seems to me that the deputy leader is somewhat confused from time to time because he will say whatever he thinks needs to be said at any time to make a point—quite often without any continuity.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: The question has nothing to do with me or my potential to be confused, which I am not: it is about the government—

The SPEAKER: All right. I will uphold that point of order. Can you get back to the question please, minister?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, I will Madam Speaker. I will make this point: we have provided money, which I believe is quite right to do. We do provide money in a variety of areas for all different types of research. This is a contribution to the CSIRO, and we will work very close with

that organisation through this scientific arrangement. It will continue to work on the science as to whether or not—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Which is what we've said all the time.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, which we have always said. In essence, more science is required to—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is answering the question, not you.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —determine whether or not stormwater could be used for drinking purposes. I make this point, too: to adopt the views that were expressed by the opposition in the lead-up to the election was completely reckless. They were irresponsible. In fact, it showed more than anything else their lack of understanding about how you deal with stormwater. Stormwater—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —that comes off our streets is very variable with respect to its quality. Certainly, you cannot polish it—and it be reliable to polish it—to even an appropriate fit-for-purpose standard on occasions given—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: That's right, and there is a major difference between—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —the water that falls and comes off someone's roof or comes through the Adelaide Hills catchment than that which falls on Port Road, for example. Quite clearly, we are going to continue to invest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will just sit here and wait until the end of question time if you keep talking.

The Hon. P. CAICA: We will continue to invest in science—science that, ultimately, perhaps, will determine that there are mechanisms and that there are ways by which we can polish stormwater to appropriate standards for potable purposes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: At the moment, what we say is that it can be polished to appropriate fit-for-purpose standards. The difference between us and them is that we are not reckless, as they are.

MEMBER FOR UNLEY, POINT OF ORDER

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:18): Madam Speaker, I raised a point of order with respect to standing order 127 regarding the Premier reflecting on other members. You said that you would wait for the *Hansard* before you made a decision. I have the *Hansard* here, and it clearly states:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Isn't it interesting—only the bikies and the Liberals are celebrating the High Court's decision today.

I then went on to say:

I ask that the Premier refer to standing order 127, reflections on other members. There is no celebration by the Liberals, and I ask him to withdraw.

Will you now ask the Premier to withdraw his reflections on members on this side of the house?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I said that I will consider it. I will go back to my office, and I will look at and read the *Hansard* and go through the standing orders.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

PUGLIA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:19): Madam Speaker, I have been adding up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will be quiet and take their seats.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I have been adding up the Rann Puglia bill. The Premier has spent anywhere between \$2 million and \$3 million of taxpayers' money in relation to the Puglia region of Italy since 2007, and may spend up to \$6 million by 2013-14 if the largesse continues. Clearly, they are endeavouring to conceal this truth. There is no justification for this spending. It is a pet project of the Premier, protected from cuts recommended by the Sustainable Budget Commission through the personal intervention of the Premier.

The Prince of Camelot has sailed off to Puglia. He has described Adelaide as 'Camelot on the Torrens'. He has seen Puglia before him, and he has decided to bestow the riches of South Australia upon it. The trouble is that it is the taxpayers' money. Back here in Camelot, schools are being closed, hospitals are facing closure, public servants are being sacked, rural South Australia is being sliced up and small business support has been cut, but he is over there spreading the joy. The whole thing stinks. In the interests of openness the Premier must reveal the following:

1. He must tell us the address of the house described in his register of interest as 'Puglia property, spouse'. If there is nothing to hide, tell South Australians and the media where the property is, and show South Australians that there have been no planning concessions or other benefits granted by local authorities that might be perceived as a conflict, given our activity levels in Puglia.

2. The Premier must explain the full financial or in-kind benefits described in the Premier's register of interests as—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You don't like it, do you?

The SPEAKER: Sit down. Member for Croydon, your point of order?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My point of order is that all members are required to address the chair, and the member for Waite is addressing the television cameras rather than the chair.

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

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Premier must explain the full financial and in-kind benefits described—

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite will address the chair rather than turn his back on me from across the floor.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Premier must explain the full financial or in-kind benefits described in the Premier's register of interests as 'Travel to Italy as a guest of the Pugliese government, spouse', including free travel, accommodation, gifts, and any payments made.

3. The Premier and ministers must provide a full list of any gifts or benefits received from any party in Puglia, advise where such gifts are, and if they exceed the allowable dollar value. Are they home on the mantelpiece or in ministerial offices?

4. The Premier must reveal the circumstances of the employment of Mr Sasanelli and dispel public perception—and you need only read *The Advertiser* letters to the editor to see it—that this is a case of jobs for the boys—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Croydon!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: We know that the position was not advertised. The Premier must come clean on whether or not the position was created especially for Mr Sasanelli as a personal friend and fully outline the relationship between Mr Sasanelli and his family.

5. The Premier must deal with questions about ministerial responsibility and code of conduct. We have heard today that a minister has received paintings from Mr Sasanelli which are kept at home as gifts. If these paintings—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That is a lie!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: We have just heard it.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: If these paintings have been gifted or purchased at a discount—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Croydon!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —an explanation must be given as to why they were not declared on the Members' Register of Interests. There needs to be full disclosure to ensure that there is no perceived link between Mr Sasanelli's appointment and any such gift.

6. I believe that the Premier is about to go on yet another trip to England. There have been so many. Is he attending job interviews? Is he seeking employment in Europe? And is a holiday house in Puglia part of the Rann retirement plan? If it is, it is being funded by the taxpayers of South Australia.

These questions need answers. All this delivers a simple message: the state needs an independent commission against corruption. Perhaps the Puglia farrago and the Premier's inability to deal with it partly explain why he steadfastly opposes an ICAC. Sunshine is the best disinfectant. State taxpayer-funded investments pushed forward by the Premier must be explained. This has created a perception of conflict. The exposure of the Puglia imbroglio and this waste of money itself could have all been avoided if the Premier had made different choices.

As leader of the government, the Premier must bear full responsibility for the waste and must justify himself to the hardworking taxpayers of South Australia, who are facing one of the worst budgets in recent memory. It is not at all surprising to hear reports in the media today of Labor backbenchers meeting in secret to question the Premier's leadership. South Australians have suffered long enough with scandal after scandal under this leader. Labor said once, 'It's time'; well, I say to Mr Rann, 'It's time.'

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. Sit down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: I move to extend; I was enjoying that.

The SPEAKER: There will be no extension of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Finniss, keep your voice down.

GAWLER RSL CLUB

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:24): Most members today would have attended some Remembrance Day service in their electorates, and I would like to briefly comment on the service I attended today. It is unfortunate that on this day I also have to bring to the attention of the house an ongoing dispute between my Gawler RSL Club and the Town of Gawler.

Before I do that, I would like to pay my respects to all those who have served this country, particularly those who have made the supreme sacrifice by giving their life. It is particularly sad for me to stand here today against the backdrop of Remembrance Day and talk about a decision made by the local Gawler council that has caused a great deal of distress for the Gawler RSL. In fact, so upset is the local RSL club that it has actually printed a flyer—which I have distributed amongst the community—to put its case and also to protest the council's decision. As an indication of its hurt and disgust about this council decision, the flyer is actually entitled, 'Gawler RSL offended'. So, that gives an indication of how upset the local RSL club is with the Town of Gawler.

Before I actually read onto the record some of the comments made in this leaflet, I would like to provide a brief outline of the dispute to date. On 5 July, the local RSL club sought my assistance and advice after a meeting they had had with the council regarding the proposal by the council to move the honour boards from their current prominent position in the civic buildings. I wrote to the council on behalf of the local RSL and was advised on 7 July as follows:

This matter...was 'floated' as an opportunity for the boards to have pride of place in the Institute and be incorporated back into the space as part of the new work.

In addition to that, the council also wrote to the president, or another officer of the Gawler RSL, on 17 July, and I quote from this email, which is very important:

No decisions have been made by council...As indicated a report is being prepared for council consideration on 27 July.

It goes onto the options. One of the options is 'to relocate the honour boards to the institute'—and this is very important—'if the RSL agrees'. The email continues, 'I would be pleased to discuss this matter in person with you.'

The council meeting duly took place on 27 July, but no meeting between the council and the RSL took place before that. The RSL was not afforded the opportunity to address the council, and the council went ahead and made the decision to relocate the boards. The council decided to relocate the honour boards despite giving the RSL a written assurance that it would only relocate them with the agreement of the RSL. I quote again, 'The other option is to relocate the honour boards to the Institute if the RSL agrees.' I understand why the Gawler RSL is outraged by this council decision and action. I will now quote briefly from the leaflet, because I think it says a lot:

The dismantling of Gawler's Walk of Honour and relocation to the foyer of the newly renovated Gawler Institute, where they are not readily accessible to members of the public, veterans' relatives or loved ones was done without proper consultation with the RSL Gawler sub-branch.

These honour boards and the Walk of Honour had a pride of place in major council civic buildings, but now they are proposed to be put elsewhere. On a day where we actually say, 'Lest we forget,' it is unfortunate that the Town of Gawler has, indeed, forgotten those who have served.

FRUIT FLY ROADBLOCKS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:29): My grievance is addressed to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, who is responsible for this state's biosecurity. The nightshifts at the Ceduna and Yamba roadblocks, which protect South Australia from many pests and diseases, have received some budget cuts which are going to impact on the state's biosecurity. Through this government's inattention, South Australia's fortunate position of being fruit fly free in the Riverland and phylloxera free throughout the state (those two jewels in our crown) is now in jeopardy.

The fruit fly roadblocks essentially protect the state from the fruit fly being introduced into the state from particularly Western Australia and Queensland. Having a fruit fly free status potentially puts us on top of the fruit fly free list. The phylloxera free status is highly recognised in South Australia. It is very important within the wine industry, the table grape industry, and it is also reflected within the vine improvement committees across South Australia. It is a vital industry because those businesses support and supply material to all of the vineyards across this country.

Also, there are weeds carried into this state on machinery and animals, and they need to be inspected. As to animal pests and diseases, particularly with Western Australia currently in drought, we are seeing WA destocking a lot of their farms and bringing that stock into South Australia, which is fortunate enough to be having a bumper year. The benefits of the roadblocks into South Australia mean that we have access to the lucrative international and domestic markets. We are particularly recognised as having the fruit fly free status with all of these fresh fruit markets right across the world. That is the advantage that South Australia and, more particularly, the Riverland have.

It is also the perception of the markets that the region of the Riverland has fought long and hard for so many years. The government has taken its eye off the ball. Keeping the roadblocks operational 24/7 is imperative, and the government should reverse its decision. The closure of the night shift has been opposed by all of the fruit industry, the vegetable industry, the grain and livestock industry, the Horticulture Plant Health Consultative Committee, and it has now been opposed by all of the agricultural and horticultural communities all around the state.

This decision has been made despite discussions between government and industry to find alternative savings, and it is a very shortsighted decision by this government. It would appear that

this government is simply bullying the industries and that has been very disappointing. Through a half-baked consultation process, the decision has been made without closure on the consultation. This closure will affect the industry at the height of the fruit fly free status coming up on 1 January. It is during the holiday season, it is during the height of increased tourism coming into the state, and it is also at the height of the fresh fruit season, so why, I ask the minister?

This government can blow hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars on special envoys and junkets to Italy but cannot find the money to safeguard the state's border protection. Again, this state government must reverse its decision to cut the night shift at Yamba and Ceduna, which would uphold South Australia's impeccable biosecurity record and support the region's agricultural and horticultural sectors.

SPIRITUAL CARE AUSTRALIA

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:34): I rise to speak about an event I attended last Friday, the SA launch of the Spiritual Care Australia group, previously known as the Health and Welfare Chaplains Association. In attendance at the function with me was His Grace Archbishop Philip Wilson, in his capacity as the current chair of the Heads of Christian Churches in South Australia; the Reverend Carl Aiken, the national president of Spiritual Care Australia; Chaplain Nora Kunzel; Chaplain Frances Bartolomeuz; and leaders of other faiths and beliefs from South Australia.

It was indeed an honour to be present at the birth of such an organisation that has been so thoughtfully planned and promises so much. Up-front, I want to commend everyone involved in Spiritual Care for getting the group off the ground. It was obviously the result of several years of worthwhile discussion by people who daily provide pastoral care within public institutions, such as hospitals, prisons, aged-care homes, universities and with the police.

The aims of the group are sensible and admirable. It is a good thing to foster high standards of pastoral care. For example, it will help practitioners fully develop their skills and, in turn, be supported themselves. Most important of all, they need to have the skills and personal qualities required to carry out their work and to treat those that they help with the respect that is needed for their faith. This is crucial, because matters of faith are inherently sensitive. It is also crucial because pastoral care is frequently provided at times of stress and emotion, such as when a loved one is in hospital through serious illness or injury and family members are looking for comfort.

I am particularly pleased to hear that Spiritual Care Australia is concerned with providing high-quality pastoral care for people of all religious faiths and beliefs in Australia. This is an implicit recognition that one's faith is a very important part of one's cultural identity and, in turn, of the fact that our country is increasingly becoming a multicultural place day by day. The vast majority of pastoral care providers are currently of the Christian faith, but I hope that Spiritual Care Australia will expand its membership such that we will eventually have representatives of all major belief systems. We in this state are well placed to encourage this trend. After all, South Australia was founded in the 1830s as a 'paradise for dissent', a place for religious pluralism.

We should also bear in mind that in the 2006 census South Australians identified themselves as being followers of almost 150 categories and subcategories of faith. I believe that religious diversity is one of our state's greatest social assets and I am passionate about finding ways to foster even greater freedom and understanding, with respect, when it comes to religion.

I am also passionate about the role of volunteers and the respect, value and wonderful contribution they bring to our community. I understand that about 50 per cent of the pastoral care providers carry out the work on a voluntary basis. I take this opportunity to congratulate and thank all the volunteers; they do generous, valuable and selfless work. Perhaps more than most people realise, they help make South Australia a fairer, more compassionate and richer society. We in the state government are determined to support these people, just as they are determined to support those in need in their daily lives when they come in contact with our public institutions.

I am also delighted that Reverend Carl Aiken is a South Australian heading the national body, and it is a great job that he is doing. It seems to me that Carl's work as a full-time chaplain at the Women's and Children's Hospital and his recent service with Australian soldiers in Afghanistan make him well qualified to lead. I know that Spiritual Care Australia will continue to grow and flourish, and provide support to both people in need and their own membership over the coming years, which is a very worthwhile task.

GRAIN HARVEST

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:38): I rise today to talk about the much-anticipated upcoming South Australian grain harvest. The Premier quite rightly indicated a couple of weeks ago that the upcoming harvest will be in excess of nine million tonnes this year. At the current grain prices, this will be an extraordinary boost into the state's economy. It will be a record crop harvested by the state's farmers. The value is expected to be around \$1.8 billion, which is a huge boost to the state's economy.

However, going along with this state's grain harvest are some logistical issues that need to be considered. The harvest is just beginning out west and in the upper north of South Australia at the moment. The headers are starting to roll and the harvest will continue through until about Christmas time, so in the next six, seven, eight weeks or so nine million tonnes will be delivered into the state's grain storage.

Part of this logistical exercise is the job of hauling the grain from the paddock to the grain storage or silos, as they are commonly referred to. We have an issue right around the state, but it seems to have been highlighted on the West Coast of late, with road train access to roads from farm to silo. Many roads have been gazetted already, or are declared major transport routes, and road trains are quite able to access these transport routes or roadways. However, there is an issue in many districts with getting the fully laden road trains from the paddock, from the farm, onto the gazetted roads.

Now, a system of permits has existed in the past. At some point in the last little while, it has been indicated to local government that the system of permits was no longer available. Well of course, this left heavy vehicle operators, haulage carriers and farmers themselves at a bit of a loose end, because they had no way of gaining approval to have their road trains access the roads that they needed to.

On discussions with DTEI, it seems they have had second thoughts about this and reinstated the permit system. However, that message has failed to get through to local government and, more particularly, the operators themselves. It has really left operators up in the air at a very critical time of the year.

The permit process itself is convoluted. There seems to be no consistency between local government areas as to how this permit system operates. Some local government areas do it very well and have many roads gazetted, some have a blanket gazettal right across their particular area. Other councils have been reluctant to go down this path, have stuck to gazetting major roadways and thoroughfares and relied on the permit system, which, as I said, is convoluted, inconsistent and difficult to understand. Also, the time frames involved are well in excess of what producers would expect.

This issue has been highlighted of late, as I said, with the upcoming grain harvest. I would also like to make the point that producers need to be able to run road trains. More and more individual farmers, sole operators, are now running road trains as they strive for efficiencies and competitiveness. We have to remember that we are, quite rightly, operating in a global market and need to be competitive in those world markets and on the world stage. Part of that competitiveness is gaining all the efficiencies we possibly can. So, I would actually urge DTEI to reconsider this convoluted process and make permits far more accessible and easier to access or overhaul the process entirely.

In my remaining few seconds, I would like to reinforce the calls of the member for Chaffey for the government to reconsider its position on the Yamba and Ceduna quarantine stations. I have to ask what price the government puts on protection of this state's agricultural and horticultural enterprises. The only answer I can really find is that the value of that protection is, in fact, 4.4 full-time equivalent jobs, which I think is a sad indictment on the state government.

HILLCREST COMMUNITY FAIR

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:43): The other Saturday, I had the pleasure of again attending the Hillcrest Community Fair, which is always a very exciting and well attended event. In particular, the children really enjoy the day, especially the 'paws trail'. There are many things to see at the fair and, as usual, to do and buy.

Gary Johanson, Mayor of the City of Port Adelaide Enfield, opened the event. He always spends time talking to members of the local community, and I have to say that I enjoy catching up with Gary, because he really makes a genuine effort to make the time to attend community events

and keep in touch with people. I was also very pleased to see so many families come along this year and enjoy themselves without the usual heavy expense of taking a family out for a day. It was a wonderful opportunity to catch up with so many folk and just have some nice relaxed time to chat.

The children were entertained this year by Lindi Jane and Snap's Kakadu Club. One little girl said that she had fallen in love with Snap the crocodile but was sadly a bit taken aback when she found she could not take him home with her. Other activities included demonstrations by the South Pacific Star Cultural Community Group brass band, which I must say was very good; Empty Hands Martial Arts; Kenpo Karate; Zumba with Gaby, which was a bit energetic for me; Legends Rock and Roll Community Club; and, of course, Funky Feet Dance.

Many local community groups use the fair as an opportunity to fundraise, and some of those groups are: the Gilles Plains Lions Club, of which I am a member, doing their usual fantastic barbecue; the North East Community House; and volunteers also from Hampstead Centre, who run a bric-a-brac stall. The Hillcrest Scouts and Hillcrest Guides were there, and NECAP had a clothing and bric-a-brac stall, from memory.

There were 200 show bags distributed, which had vouchers in them, and the children pick up the show bags and wander around the various stalls, get a stamp, and they are given fruit, vegetables and some little knick-knacks—again, that is at no cost to the parents.

I also need to mention one of our local Port Adelaide Enfield councillors, Anne Marie Hubyz. She comes along and provides a stall and sets up the brochures to give people information about what the council is doing. We also had staff from SA Water providing nice cool water for those people who were at the fair.

I also need to mention Liz Haar, the Hillcrest Community Centre coordinator, and the organising committee for the fantastic work they do in making the day a great success. The committee goes out of its way to make sure that the children, in particular, are entertained throughout the day, with things like the 'Little Aussie' bouncing castle and Animal Lovers, which I have to say is a fantastic activity for the children.

I also want to thank all the people who participated with the various businesses that donated items for the fair's prizes. All in all, it is a fantastic day, it does not cost families very much at all and it is a great opportunity for everyone to mingle. I particularly enjoy it because I get to chat with my community.

I have a little time left, so I am just going to briefly respond to some comments by the member for Fisher on Tuesday regarding some female members, including myself. He made some comments about the sad event that transpired after he raised the issue of wearing a head covering. The member for Fisher, sadly, has a tendency to jump on populist bandwagons and then fails to take responsibility for his actions, even when he has it wrong, as he did again today. It is most disappointing.

He soured what was an important event for women in this chamber and the state. We were celebrating Muriel Matters and her achievements, for which we women are grateful. I am also going to take the opportunity to congratulate the member for Florey on her wonderful efforts in bringing Muriel's achievements to our notice. Congratulations, Frances; I think she has done a fantastic job and we are all now being well educated about Muriel.

PRINCE ALFRED COLLEGE INCORPORATION (VARIATION OF CONSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2010.)

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:49): I am the lead speaker for the opposition on the Prince Alfred College Incorporation (Variation of Constitution) Amendment Bill, but I can assure the house I will not need very much time. The amendments being made are at the request of Prince Alfred College, in consultation with the Uniting Church of Australia and the Synod of South Australia, and will bring the voting requirements more in line with other similar legislation and with the synod itself.

The original Prince Alfred College Incorporated Act dates from 1878, and the school itself from 1869. Prince Alfred College was named after Alfred, one of four sons of Queen Victoria and her husband Prince Albert. The founders of Prince Alfred College were determined that the religious traditions of John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, should be indoctrinated in the

school. Young Methodist men of the colony and Prince Alfred College were encouraged to lead disciplined, hardworking and predominantly Christian lives.

The college today represents the finest traditions of independent school education in South Australia, offering the highest standard of academic instruction and school community life. It has been an International Baccalaureate program since 1995, so it has been offering that since that period, and the college counts many leading academics, medical professionals, sportsmen and those who have succeeded in the world of business amongst its old scholars. Some that come to mind are people such as Rob Gerard, Sir Robert Helpmann, and even Bob Francis is an old scholar of Prince Alfred College.

Mr Marshall: That notable academic.

Mr PISONI: That notable academic, the member for Norwood reminds me. Artist Sir John Ashton and, of course, the Independent senator, Nick Xenophon, not to mention the member for Flinders, the member for Schubert and the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place are also scholars of Prince Alfred College. I think it is fair to speak of—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr PISONI: The member for Kavel is also an old scholar of Prince Alfred College—the values instilled in those members in accepting me, an old Salisbury High School boy, as one of their colleagues and being accepted so welcomingly into the Liberal Party all those years ago when I used to attend those meetings in my overalls. I must say that I was much more welcome at the Young Liberal meeting than I was at the Young Labor meeting that I attended first, and decided against it. I felt very uncomfortable about everybody sitting around calling themselves 'Comrade'. It was not a comfortable feeling, I can tell you.

The Chappell brothers are other notable old scholars. The 2010 MasterChef winner Adam Liaw was also a student of the college. So, we can see a broad range of skills. The opposition supports the amendments requested by the college.

This amendment relates to the number of members of the council of the college who must agree to a variation of the constitution of the council. Currently, a variation must be passed by 12 members of the council, or three-quarters of the members present and voting, whichever is the greater. The amendment will provide that a variation will require the support of three-quarters of the members of the council (and thus remove the reference to at least 12 members). A variation will still require the approval of the synod under section 19(3) of the act.

So, we support the bill.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:52): I rise to also speak on the bill before the house. As the member for Norwood, I have the fortunate situation that Prince Alfred College is located within my boundaries. This is one of the few organisations in South Australia which has been established under an act of this parliament. I take this opportunity today to place some history and some facts about this very fine school onto the public record.

Prince Alfred College was established in 1869 and was named after Alfred, one of four sons of Queen Victoria and her husband Prince Albert. The school currently has an enrolment of 1,000 boys, including some 100 borders, who are there from year 7 to year 12. It offers a range of courses, including the South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE) and the International Baccalaureate (IB). It is a great school. It has had 10 headmasters, dating back to the first headmaster, Sir Samuel Fiddian (1869-1870), right up to the present headmaster, Mr Kevin Tutt, who has been a headmaster at this fine school since 2004.

It is a great school and it has many notable achievements. In fact, the school has had no fewer than 18 separate Rhodes scholars. The first, of course, was in 1937 when William Douglas Allen attended New College, Oxford, right up to the most recent, Ryan Paul Manuel, who attended Merton College, Oxford in 2006. What a great and proud history that is.

There have been many notable members of the business community, including, of course, Sir Edward Holden, the founder of the Holden manufacturing company based here in South Australia; Rob Gerard, a great South Australian businessman and philanthropist; and the Coopers family. There have been other very notable old scholars, including Sir Robert Helpmann, a great dancer, actor, director and choreographer, and last year's South Australian of the Year, Dr Bill Griggs, is an old scholar of this school.

The school has made many fine achievements on the sporting field. The intercols for this school are played with St Peter's College, which is also based in the electorate of Norwood. The

first intercol was played in 1878, and it was recently reflected in *The Weekend Australian* that this is the oldest unbroken annual contest in the history of cricket. What great competition between these two fine schools.

I would just like to say that many fine footballers have attended the school, including Wayne Jackson and Craig Kelly, to name a couple, but it is on the cricket field where this school has really performed, providing Australia with no fewer than four test captains. The first was Clem Hill, followed by Joe Darling and, of course, Ian Chappell and Greg Chappell. What a great contribution this school has made to cricket.

This school has also made a huge contribution and continues to make a huge contribution in the area of politics. Currently, we have two senators in the federal parliament: Senator Corey Bernardi and Senator Nick Xenophon from Prince Alfred College. Grant Chapman, is a former Australian senator from this fine college, as well as Sir John Lavington Bonython, a former lord mayor of Adelaide, and we have many current members of the South Australian parliament, including Mr Goldsworthy, Mr Treloar, Mr Venning, and the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place.

I was fortunate enough to attend recently (on 7 September) the renaming of the ANZAC Hall at this school and the opening of the Piper Pavilion. This night also included the unveiling of a sculpture by a prominent old scholar, Robert Hannaford. Prince Alfred College has now announced plans for a major initiative to establish a state-of-the-art health and sports facility on its Kent Town campus. This is an ambitious project which will, of course, build on the tremendous history this college has in providing facilities of the very highest order for all its boys.

It is a very great pleasure for me to be the member of this parliament who represents this college, and I am very happy to support this bill.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert, I am sure that you will have something say.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:59): Madam, on this occasion, I certainly will. I rise to support this legislation and, particularly, Prince Alfred College (PAC). This is quite a unique situation in the house. I think this is the second time in my long career that we have done a hybrid bill for Prince Alfred College, and it is quite a unique situation where an institution, a school such as PAC, has a link to the parliament. I am, indeed, as the previous speaker said, very honoured to be a Prince's old boy. In fact, I now have the extra prestige of being what they call a Vintage Red (I would prefer blue, but that is the other school), that is, an old scholar over the glorious age of 60.

I also acknowledge that many other old scholars of PAC have been prominent members of this parliament over many years. The member for Unley has listed them, as has the member for Norwood, so I will not reiterate those but, rather, talk about the old scholars who sit with me here today: the member for Kavel, the member for Flinders, and the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place. Over the years, a previous speaker, the Hon. John Oswald, was a great old scholar, as was minister Wotton and minister Buckby, as well as the Hon. Legh Davis—all prominent old scholars in this place.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The Hon. Peter Dunn was as well. PAC is a wonderful institution of learning and opportunity for young South Australian men. There is a long list of South Australian leaders who are old scholars, and it really is a list of who's who in South Australia. We are very proud of our school, and the old scholars' association is probably one of the most active and successful on the world stage. We have members all over the world who meet regularly, and the old scholars' dinner in London is a quite famous and well-attended event. It is comparable with old scholar associations at Oxford and Cambridge universities, etc.

I believe the original legislation in 1878 had certain expectations. Well, I thank our forebears because I believe that these expectations have been well and truly honoured, as PAC is today a most successful institution, arguably, and without bias, one of Australia's finest schools.

I was interested to read J.F. Ward's book, *The story of the first eighty years, 1867-1948*. Mr Ward was headmaster between 1930 and 1948. On page 54 of the book (which was borrowed by the member for Flinders), it tells of the school's very early days and of how they severed the direct link to the Wesleyan Conference—which was then the Methodist Church—of the discussions that followed and of the relationship between the conference and the trustees, who hold the property for the committee.

Legal advice was sought in 1876, and it was decided that the simplest way was for PAC to become an incorporated body, the same as the unmentionable school—St Peter's. A subcommittee was appointed to discuss this plan with the lawyers and, finally, in 1878 a private member's bill was passed in the South Australian parliament whereby PAC became an incorporated body. This not only simplified the situation but also gave stability to the college. The act of incorporation sets out that the school shall be governed by a committee appointed annually by the conference, consisting of an equal number of Methodist ministers and laymen.

I would now like to read out the actual *Hansard* of that day in 1878. Under the heading 'Prince Alfred College Incorporation Bill', it reads:

Second Reading. Sir H. Ayers, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said since he last addressed the Council on the subject the Bill had been referred to a Select Committee. The Committee had reported that the preamble was proved, and it would be seen from the evidence that the objects of the Bill had been fully supported. Shortly stated the Bill had reference to an institution known as the Prince Alfred College, possessing a property valued at £20,000. Up to the present time no settled form of trust had been entered into by the persons having the management of the institution or those contributing towards it. Hitherto the institution had been governed by a Board of Management under certain rules and regulations drawn up for their guidance, but which in themselves had no legal effect.

The Bill before hon. members was to give the Governors of the institution legal powers to make regulations according to the principle laid down in the Bill. The only point in the Bill that would affect the public in any way was that which limited the liability of the management and subscribers to the institution to the property itself, but he would point out that the property was of a value far above what the liability incurred was likely to be. The liabilities of the college it would be seen were very small. The value of the property, as he had said, was £20,000. The liabilities were nominally £4,000, but the mortgagee having allowed £1,500 to be deducted the liabilities were really only £2,500.

He thought it would be seen that there was not much probability of the public being put to any difficulty with regard to the recovery of any debt that might be incurred by the management of the College. The institution was self-supporting, and provided for the education of 250 pupils. It had never received any aid from the State, and it was not at all probable that it would ever ask for such aid. He thought hon. members were not at all likely to oppose the motion.

And it was then passed. How interesting it is to read this and look back and reflect on the school's progress since then—from those 250 pupils to now over 1,000 boys, aged four to 18.

As regards the school's indebtedness, as one of the member's of the foundation, can I say that the proportion in relation to debt over equity is probably as good today as it was then. That school has been in excellent hands. I extend my best wishes to the current principal—can we still call him headmaster?

Mr Goldsworthy: Headmaster.

Mr VENNING: Headmaster. It always was headmaster, so I think it is good enough. My best wishes go to Kevin Tutt, all the staff, the board and the students. I have three grandsons, so far, and I hope that they are able to attend, making it five generations of our family attending this school. I also express my concern at the difficult time that our sister school, Annesley, is going through. I am a loss to know how this can be with PAC so successful. I only hope that enrolments at Annesley will lift and keep this fine school viable.

Finally, I again commend this bill to the house. I am pleased that the government is going to allow a select committee. I am happy to serve on that committee, if required. It is a bit of history that I do not think we should change. I am sure that the select committee will not take too long nor cost the taxpayer a lot of money. I am pleased that we are going to have a select committee, because it will keep the history alive and it will keep the connection of this parliament to this fine school. I support the bill.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (16:07): I, too, am pleased to make a brief contribution to the debate in support of the bill. The members for Unley, Norwood and Schubert have all spoken in support of this bill, obviously. I am pleased to speak to the bill, being an old scholar of the school. I attended Prince Alfred College from 1969 to 1974 inclusive, and I am thankful that my parents gave me that opportunity. I believe it was, and still is—right through the history of the school—an outstanding educational institution.

As a result of attending PAC, I was provided with many opportunities, such as a good academic education. It also exposes you to many other opportunities. It has a broad academic curriculum and many extracurricular activities, particularly sports. Every boy was encouraged to play sports. In fact, in the first three years of secondary school, you had to play both a winter and a summer sport. I played cricket and football and, although I was not by any stretch of the

imagination an outstanding sportsman, the school provided an opportunity for every boy to participate in the sports that were provided.

I think in the senior teams, in years 11 and 12 (what we called Leaving and Matric), they had a sixth cricket team, so you could play for the sixth if you wanted to. Those opportunities were made available to the Leaving and Matriculation boys if they wanted to avail themselves of playing cricket for the school. It did not matter how good or how bad you were at anything, the school provided an opportunity for you to participate.

I think many boys who attended the school have carried that with them since leaving: the fact that if an opportunity presents itself and you are interested and think you are equipped to take that opportunity, then you have a go. There is nothing that should stand in the way of availing yourself of an opportunity. Many boys, after leaving school and pursuing careers, in whatever fields they moved into, have carried that with them: whatever opportunity presents itself, you avail yourself of it, if you so wish.

I also want to talk about some of the other things that the school promotes. I strongly believe that the school fosters the ideals of an egalitarian society. Some people may disagree with that, but it is my opinion, having gone to that school for six years and witnessed what takes place and what is instilled in the boys at that school, that no-one is any better or any worse than anybody else at that school. That ideal is carried from the school out into the community.

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am hearing some interjections from the other side of the chamber. I was going to resist the temptation to respond, but I remember in my first term in this place (2002-06) a debate took place where the other side was trying to pursue the notion of a class structure in the state. I do not believe that is the case; other people may, but I do not. As I said, it is my belief that a school such as PAC fosters the ideals of an egalitarian society because that is part of what has been taught to each of those boys at that school: that nobody is any better than anybody else and nobody is worse than anybody else, and that is what people should look to when they move into the community. I do not mind if people disagree with me, but that is what I believe.

In 1969, when I was in year 8 (or what we used to call first year in those days), the school celebrated its centenary. I clearly remember there were some really tremendous events to celebrate the centenary. There were some new science, physics and chemistry facilities opened that year. I clearly remember attending that, as a 12-year-old boy, with my parents. It was only last year in 2009 that the school obviously celebrated its 140th anniversary.

My son is a student at PAC at the moment in year 10 and he is enjoying the opportunities and facilities the school provides. As the member for Schubert said, he would like his grandsons to attend PAC, and that would make for the fifth generation of the Venning family to attend the school. My son is the fifth generation in my family to attend PAC, which is a good thing. We do not hold a candle, though, to some members of the Cooper family—I think about the eighth generation is there now—and we all know the Cooper family from their brewing enterprises and other significant contributions they make to the state.

I have been pleased to provide my opinion of what this school has offered to its scholars and students over the years. As I said, I received a good academic education. I completed my matriculation year. I did not want to pursue any tertiary studies, so I looked to enter the corporate world, and that is exactly what I did. I went and worked for a fairly large corporation in the banking sector, and I did that for 22 years.

As I said at the start of my contribution, I am certainly pleased to support the bill. I know the school has asked for this legislation to be brought to the house. They want some changes to their constitution, so we obviously do not have any issue with that and are pleased to support the bill.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:16): I, too, rise to support this amendment bill. I am another old scholar. I should declare also, as I have been asked to sit on the committee to sign off on this amendment, that I have two boys at the school at the moment. Both are boarders, as I was—five years a boarder, in fact—and I can honestly say that I enjoyed every single moment of it. It was certainly a wonderful experience and one that I have appreciated for all these years since.

I did ask myself, when I saw this amendment bill listed, why it required an act of parliament for Prince Alfred College to come into being; in fact, it did not quite. I made reference, as the member for Schubert has, to Fred Ward's book, *Prince Alfred College: the story of the first eighty years*, and I dug deep and found, as the member for Schubert did, on page 54—

Mr Venning: You tipped me off.

Mr TRELOAR: I tipped him off. That's right. I congratulate the members for Schubert, Unley and Norwood on their research, and the member for Kavel for his recollections, no doubt. The book states:

Prince Alfred College owes its existence to the vision and determination of a group of Methodist Ministers and laymen in the early days of South Australia.

In those days in South Australia—and it is probably still the case now—the Methodists (what was to become the Uniting Church) were, in fact, one of the dominant denominations. In thinking about this, I realised that in those days, of course, copper had been discovered in South Australia and a lot of Welsh and Cornish people came out to South Australia to work in the copper mines of Kapunda, Burra and, later, the Copper Triangle on Yorke Peninsula. These people were stoically Methodist or Wesleyan in their approach to life, which considered hard work and temperance virtues.

Mr Venning: No wine.

Mr TRELOAR: No wine, no beer, weak ale occasionally and medicinal brandy perhaps at a push.

Mr Venning: How things have changed!

Mr TRELOAR: 'How things have changed!' the member for Schubert says. In 1865, after discussions that had begun as early as 1854, an area of 13 acres and 12 perches was purchased at Kent Town for £2,750—quite expensive, I would have thought. Unfortunately for the purchasers, there were no funds available for the express purpose of establishing a school, so they went to the sale, bid to the price of £2,750 but had no money to fund that. One of their supporters, Mr Thomas Greaves Waterhouse, put up the funds to be paid back with interest at the going rate of 8 per cent at the time.

Mr Bignell: They should have gone to the bank.

Mr TRELOAR: They should have gone to the bank, you reckon? Mr T.G. Waterhouse very kindly loaned funds and, in fact, in the 1870s had a wing of the new wing of the school named after him. So, there was method in his madness, I would suggest.

In 1867, it became known that Queen Victoria's second son, Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, was to visit South Australia. Prince Alfred was invited and consented to laying the foundation stone of the new school. This was interesting because it was the first time that a member of the royal family, a member of the established Church of England, had consented to be involved in the foundation of a new school that was, in fact, associated with a denomination that was nonconformist, that was not of the established Church of England. So, getting Prince Alfred to agree to this was a considerable coup.

On 5 November 1867, just four days after laying the stone in the tower section of the GPO here in Adelaide, he laid the stone of the original school building at Kent Town. The year 1867 was a drought year here in South Australia and the poor harvest impacted on the development of the school and the building actually slowed. The school was finally opened in 1869, initially in Pirie Street because the main building was not completed, but it opened with 28 boys. By the end of that first year, 1869, the school had moved to its current position, the main building was completed and there were 69 boys enrolled plus 20 boarders.

On further reading, although it was a church school established under the Wesleyan traditions, it was determined very early on—and I found this particularly interesting—that the teaching of religion was to be non-sectarian. I think, considering the men and the people who set up this church and the tenets they established the school under, it was particularly forward thinking of them to consider that the teaching of religion should be non-sectarian.

The 1870s saw considerable growth in the school with enrolments continuing to rise. The addition of the said Waterhouse wing to the main building was completed. Interestingly also, in the province of South Australia, there was no government system of compulsory education until 1875. It was in 1875 when discussions began about the relationship between the Wesleyan Conference and the trustees of the school who held the property for committee.

This is where the act of parliament becomes necessary because, as the member for Schubert quite rightly quoted, legal advice was sought during 1876 to, I guess, distinguish this

relationship and preclude it from any difficulties going forward. In 1877, it was suggested that the simplest way out of the difficulty would be for Prince Alfred College to become an incorporated body. A subcommittee was appointed to discuss this plan with the lawyers and finally, in 1878, a private bill was passed in the South Australian parliament by which Prince Alfred College became an incorporated body. As the member for Schubert quite rightly pointed out, it defined quite succinctly the terms within which the school was to be governed.

Mention has been made of many famous and renowned old scholars. I will not go through the list that has already been gone through, but I would acknowledge one other who has not yet been acknowledged today. He is sitting here in the chamber with us, and he is Richard Dennis, parliamentary counsel. Richard, I cannot say that I remember you at school. You were way older than me, I am sure.

Mr Venning: His father was a master. He taught me English.

Mr TRELOAR: In fact, Richard's father, 'Argus' Dennis, taught me, the member for Schubert, the member for Kavel and my father. Richard, your father taught my father. So, there you go—a long association.

The member for Norwood spoke about cricket and the four Australian captains Prince Alfred College had produced, most recently Ian and Greg Chappell, previously Joe Darling and Clem Hill. I would just like to highlight and go back a little to Joe Darling. In 1885, he scored 252 in the intercol game with St Peter's. In 1893, Clem Hill made a record 360 not out on the Adelaide Oval in the annual Saints versus Princes intercol game—two fine cricketers, along with the Chappells and all the others who have gone on to play state cricket as well.

One of the highlights of the school for me now is the old scholars association. It has been mentioned already but there is no doubt that—

Mr Venning: The annual dinner!

Mr TRELOAR: The annual dinner is a highlight of the old scholars' year, there is no doubt. The old scholars association hosts smaller dinners in the regions right around the state and, in fact, there is an annual dinner on Eyre Peninsula usually held in Port Lincoln which I certainly try to get to most years. It is a strong association and it is well supported. I understand it is the biggest association of its type in the southern hemisphere and would be rivalled only by similar associations in the North.

Obviously, old scholars have made a significant contribution to this state, but I would like to say that, in my opinion, the school itself has made a contribution to the state—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: —and will for a long time yet, as the member for Bragg says. I would like to finish off with the school motto which in Latin is '*Fac fortia et patere*' and translated means 'Do brave deeds and endure.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the old scholars please contain themselves?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (16:26): It does raise the competitive ire and makes me want to speak about my old alma mater, Henley High, but I will resist the temptation and just thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate. Clearly, many of them strongly identify with the school, not only for themselves but also for their ancestors and, in some cases, those who will come after them. I acknowledge the strong sense of connection that honourable members feel, and I am pleased to offer the support of the government to facilitate this small change to the constitution to assist the college to carry out its functions.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER (16:27): I have examined the Prince Alfred College Incorporation (Variation of Constitution) Amendment Bill. It seeks to amend a private act and, consistent with precedent, is deemed to be a hybrid bill within the meaning of joint standing order (private bills) No. 2.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (16:27): I move:

That this bill be referred to a select committee pursuant to joint standing order (private bills) 2.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PRINCE ALFRED COLLEGE INCORPORATION (VARIATION OF CONSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Bill referred to a select committee consisting of Mr Piccolo, Ms Thompson, Mr Treloar, Mr Venning and Hon. Mr Weatherill; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on the next day of sitting.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (16:28): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Prince Alfred College Incorporation (Variation of Constitution) Amendment Bill have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Ms CHAPMAN: Madam Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: Clause 1, of course, is the general clause and, before we move on from that, I was having some discussions with the member for Flinders, who represents a magnificent part of the state, and some of his constituents have raised some questions as to how far this will extend. Accordingly, I advise you, Madam Chair, that he has a few questions and would like to raise some matters.

Mr TRELOAR: If I may, I would like to read into *Hansard* some of the concerns that have been raised by a constituent of mine. If you will bear with me, I will read those concerns. My constituent wishes to raise—

The CHAIR: I am so sorry, member for Flinders, I am being advised of something by the Clerk. Apparently, this is not an opportunity for debate; it has to be relevant to the clause, which I am sure it will be.

Mr TRELOAR: Thank you, chair. It states:

I wish to raise with you my concern about draconian and inappropriate laws that are being brought in by the South Australian government to allegedly control knife crime. I believe the government's approach of vilifying specific knives and other devices is misdirecting the energy and resources needed to solve the real problem.

While we all want to live in a crime free society, I believe that they are going in the wrong direction. I have recently carried out an extensive search of the Sydney Morning Herald, the Daily Telegraph, the Melbourne Age and the Adelaide Advertiser websites searching under the word 'knife' and 'flick knife'. I have found hundreds of incidents all over Australia where knives were used in the last two years. Unfortunately, most of the incidents do not identify the knife used. I did however find 17 that did describe the 'weapon' used. Of them, nine were kitchen knives; the remainder, were two box cutters, one screwdriver, one broken bottle and one hunting knife or machete. That is fourteen out of the seventeen. The majority of these knife attacks occurred with the sort of knives that you pick up in the kitchen.

Over the years we have had discussions with former and serving police officers. To a person they have informed me that the most common knife that they saw used in attacks came from the kitchen.

One thing that was glaringly obvious in these news reports was that mental health and drug issues are significant factors in many of the incidents. A large percentage of incidents also involve people known to each other, such as family, friends and neighbours and were not gang related.

It is alarming that many young people see it as necessary to carry a knife for self defence. It would seem to us that identifying the threat that the youth live under and taking steps to remove it, might be a more substantial way of solving the problem. Where there is no threat there will be no need to carry a knife for defence. Our society needs to change in its base values.

I hope you will assist in getting proper remedies in place that will address the real problems and result in making the streets safer, that concentrate on the offender and do not just look at ineffective cosmetic measures that will only make life difficult for law abiding people.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question from that contribution—

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: He has not posed the question yet; I am going to pose it for him.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Is this some sort of tag team, is it?

Ms CHAPMAN: It is a bit, yes. I would like to ask the minister whether he could explain in what circumstances, first, a 14-year-old boy can carry a pocket knife if this legislation goes through?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I just wanted to explore some of the matters that were raised in the preamble to the member for Bragg's question, which was delivered by the member for Flinders. The preamble described the problem of drug abuse, alcoholism or other social ills as being major contributors, and, of course, that is absolutely true, and no-one would argue about that. However, the police are not the agency primarily charged with dealing with those many very serious issues. Others are charged with that and, hopefully, their efforts will be successful over time.

However, history suggests that they will not be successful every time, so there needs to be some safety net in case these people are not fixed up. I agree entirely with the thrust of the comments that were made about that. Yes, that is important.

With respect to the second point about kitchen knives, well, when we were last here we went around the kitchen and we examined all the paraphernalia that one might find in the kitchen and, undoubtedly, a kitchen knife can be a very dangerous thing in the hands of a wrong person, as can a handkerchief, a teatowel or any number of other things. So, yes, that is true.

I have to say that we did not seriously consider taking things to the extent that Qantas has and require everyone to hand in their metal knives and have plastic ones.

Ms Chapman: Except in first class.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Except in first class, yes. Realistically, I do not think that we were really going to do that. The question really here is the regulation of the sale of knives to people who are young people, and the regulation of particular types of knives generally and their promotion, advertising or whatever. That is really the issue. We are talking here about, in particular, where people have these knives on them.

I find it very worrying that someone living in South Australia today would accept as a valid proposition that any young person should need to carry a knife for their own personal safety. I reject the idea that young people in this state live in an environment that is so dangerous they have to carry with them implements of that type for personal safety. There are some countries in the world where people say the same thing about pistols or machine guns. I assume that in Afghanistan people would say, 'Well, it's necessary for me to walk around the streets with an Uzi in my pocket because there is a fair chance that someone is going to pop out from behind a building with one and have a crack at me.' Hopefully, that is not the sort of place we live in.

Whether we like it or not (and I said this the last time we were here) there are certain groups of young people, usually young men—some of them having a common heritage, some of them just deciding to hang out together—who think it is cool to be out and about with a knife. When they are out and about in a mob, with a knife, and they get charged up with alcohol or amphetamines or whatever else they are charged up with, you start to have a very dangerous and volatile situation.

I do not think we should be ambivalent about that going on, and I do not have any problem with the idea that we, as members of parliament, should say to the community, 'We don't care what you young fellows think you should or shouldn't be carrying around the place to make you feel good, if you have to carry something, carry an umbrella or a skateboard or something like that, that is fine'—although even umbrellas can be dangerous, of course.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed. Even umbrellas in the wrong hands can be dangerous, particularly if it is a Bulgarian chap and it has a little ball bearing on the bottom with terrible poisons on it. However, I think we are digressing slightly. The point is that I really do not think we should tolerate or in any way accept irresponsible behaviour by any person, particularly young people. They are out and about in the streets armed with knives; and, inevitably something will happen some time and they will use them. I do not take a step back from saying, quite clearly, that that is unacceptable.

As to the second part of the tag team, the honourable member for Bragg asked a question, I am advised that a pocket knife is an offensive weapon but can be carried with lawful excuse, including by minors. However, it is up to the court to determine what is a lawful excuse. Self defence generally is not, for the reasons I have just explained, but lawful excuses could include any number of things: for example, that the person is an apprentice and is required to have a knife, or that they are on a camp and need to have a knife, or that they are down at the jetty fishing and they need to have a knife. There could be any number of legitimate reasons for carrying a knife. So, that is the response to those collective matters.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Page 3, after line 27 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1)]—After the definition of *dangerous article* insert:

District Court means the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court;

I think I have already explained the reasons for this to the member for Bragg.

Amendment carried.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Page 4, lines 1 to 7 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1), definition of *offence of violence*]—

Delete the definition and substitute:

offence of violence means an offence where the offender uses a weapon, or threatens to use a weapon, against another for the purpose of committing the offence, or escaping from the scene of the offence;

Essentially, this inserts a new definition of the offence of violence. Members would recall (I hope), from my contribution, that it was the opposition's view that the application of the weapons protection orders, which are proposed as a new regime in this legislation, should be restricted to people where the offence of violence actually involves a weapon. The purpose of this amendment is to redefine the offence of violence, and I hope the government considers accepting it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: At this stage, I am still of the view, as I expressed before, that this unnecessarily narrows the scope of the operation of the bill and, for that reason, we do not support the amendment. However, I am happy to make the offer to the member for Bragg to have further conversations about that matter between here and the other place and see where they take us.

Amendment negated.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Page 7—

Line 16 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(2)]—Delete 'subsection (1)' and substitute:

subsection (1)(a)

After line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 21F]—After subsection (2) insert:

(2a) It is a defence to prosecution for an offence against subsection (1)(b) to prove that the defendant was, in accordance with—

(a) subsection (2b); or

(b) a regulation made under subsection (3); or

(c) a declaration made by the Commissioner under subsection (4),

an exempt person in the circumstances of the alleged offence.

(2b) The following persons are exempt persons for the purposes of subsection (2a)(a) in the following circumstances:

(a) a person who uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose or in the course of conducting his or her business or for the purpose or in the course of his or her employment, but—

(i) only if the use and possession of the weapon is reasonably required for that purpose; and

- (ii) not if the use or possession of the weapon is for the purpose or in the course of manufacturing, selling, distributing, supplying or otherwise dealing in the weapon;
- (b) a police officer who uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose or in the course of his or her duties as such an officer;
- (c) a person who has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purposes of a museum or art gallery;
- (d) a person who uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose or in the course of providing a lawful form of entertainment of other persons that reasonably requires the use or possession of the prohibited weapon;
- (e) a person who uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose or in the course of participating in a lawful and recognised form of recreation or sport that reasonably requires the use or possession of the prohibited weapon;
- (f) a person who uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose or in the course of an official ceremony that reasonably requires the use or possession of the prohibited weapon;
- (g) a person who uses or has possession of a dagger for a religious purpose.

Amendments Nos 2 and 3 essentially relate to the opposition's view that we need to ensure that people who are relying on the exemptions are not hindered. So, what we have done is introduce a regime here under these amendments to facilitate that, rather than essentially the government's bill providing for regulations to be made and just praying that everything works out okay.

As you can see, particularly from Amendment No. 3, this would insert a provision that it would be a defence to the prosecution for an offence under certain circumstances as an exempt person in the circumstances of the alleged offence. It then lists a whole group of people who are exempt persons for the purposes of the act. We feel this is a more comprehensive and secure way of ensuring that we do not have a problem here. Accordingly, we would either invite the government to consent to these amendments or, if it does not see fit, at least to consider them between houses.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: These are not issues of substance between the member for Bragg and myself. They are questions of style, I suppose. At this stage, we oppose the amendments for the reasons that I have indicated previously; however, if it is of any comfort to the honourable member, I can indicate that we do not propose to have this legislation made operative absent the regulations. It should be possible, we would hope, for the regulations to be in a position where we can show them at some point fairly soon, and the intention would be to allay any concerns that the honourable member may have about that. For that reason, we would like the matter to proceed as is with the regulations already known and seen, with any discussion the member for Bragg might wish to have about the form of the regulations. That, hopefully, will cure most of the concerns about that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I just place on the record our appreciation of the minister's indication. It seems that we have a new era, where we are going to be seeing draft regulations before bills go through, which is very much welcomed by the opposition. We feel that this is an important way of ensuring that there is no opportunity for there to be even inadvertent omission of things to be covered. If this is a sign of things to come, it is welcomed by the opposition.

Amendments negatived.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Page 12, after line 13—After section 211 insert:

211A—Reports relating to prohibition orders

The annual report of the Commissioner under section 75 of the Police Act 1998 must include the following information in respect of the period to which the report relates:

- (a) the number of weapons prohibition orders issued under section 21G;
- (b) the number of weapons prohibition orders revoked under section 21G;
- (c) the number of appeals under section 211 and the outcome of each appeal that has been completed or finally determined.

This is really to ensure that the reports relating to the prohibition orders, which is the new regime to be introduced under this legislation, include extra information. I have referred to this in the debate. We consider that this information can be provided without any great difficulty and we ask that it be included in an annual reporting procedure.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: On this particular matter I would like to express my thanks to the member for Bragg for bringing forward a very sensible point; namely, that there is appropriate reporting. I agree with that and think it is a good idea. However, the only point I raise is the form in which the reporting is required. I am advised that the proposed amendment takes a slightly different approach to that used for sections 72A and 72B as it requires the commissioner to include the information in his annual report under the Police Act. For consistency, it would be preferable if the bill were amended to require the commissioner to provide an annual report to the minister on the number of weapons prohibitions orders issued and revoked under section 21G, and the number and outcomes of appeals lodged under section 21I. This is in keeping with the reporting obligations under 72A and 72B.

I was going to suggest that, if the member for Bragg is happy to do so, we would be keen to have a go at drafting an amendment which gives effect to those changes which would, I hope, largely meet the honourable member's requirements but still leave us with a fairly consistent reporting regime. We will attempt to do that between the houses but, for that reason, I oppose the specific form of the amendment without opposing the principle behind it.

Ms CHAPMAN: On the basis of that information and the assurance of the Attorney that it will simply be placed in another provision under the Police Act, we are happy with that.

Amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Page 16, after line 26 [clause 7, inserted section 72B]—After subsection (6) insert:

- (6a) An authorisation granted under subsection (3) or a variation or revocation of such an authorisation must be by instrument in writing unless the police officer granting, varying or revoking authorisation is satisfied that circumstances of urgency exist in which case the authorisation, variation or revocation may be oral, provided that it is reduced to writing as soon as reasonably practicable.

Again, I think we have already canvassed the reasons for that.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 and 9), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:55): An unusual situation has arisen with this legislation being dealt with when we are still dealing with other legislation in respect of criminal intelligence. My purpose in placing a few matters on the record is that, whilst I do not propose to traverse the detail of another bill, which of course is pending before the house, there are a number of different areas of our criminal and licensing laws that currently apply different standards of criminal intelligence. They are currently being dealt with in other bills before this house, and this morning a judgement was delivered by the Chief Justice of the High Court in the case of Totani & Anor v the State of South Australia on matters relating to the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act.

One of those matters, which has come up in the course of the debate in the other bill and which is being proposed in this bill, is the terms under which criminal intelligence may be used; in this specific case, for the purposes of deciding whether there be a weapons prohibition order and a prohibited weapons declaration. The bill before us provides:

If a decision was made because of information that is classified by the Commissioner of Police as criminal intelligence, the only reason required to be given is that the decision was made on public interest grounds.

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

Ms CHAPMAN: What is to happen in circumstances where criminal intelligence is received and taken into account comes within what I would describe as the lowest threshold of the obligations of the determining person. In this case, the only reason required to be given is that the decision was made on public interest grounds. So, the person who may be adversely affected by the use of criminal intelligence—usually an applicant or someone who, in this instance, might be the subject of a weapons prohibition order—really does not get much chance to know what the process is and what application is being made for the use of that criminal intelligence. For obvious reasons, they do not know most of what the criminal intelligence may be, but it is at the lower end of what is required.

I just flag at this point the need for the consideration of this bill to take into account what may transpire in other legislation, which may conclude before we conclude this matter. There may be time in another place to look at this issue again, but it is important because whilst the Chief Justice's judgement published this morning does not specifically address the K-Generation case to the extent of, in some other way, redefining the criminal intelligence rules—if I can put them as crudely as that—although I understand some submissions have been made, it does not appear, at least from his judgement, that there is any attempt by the High Court to deviate from its provision in K-Generation.

In which case, I think we are left with a fairly high standard, and whatever is going to be applied within it will be in the debate in the other place. If it turns out that we are going to have one formula across the board, then I suggest that the provisions in this Summary Offences (Weapons) Amendment Bill will not be a high enough standard. I think we need to tidy that up, so I just bring that matter to the Attorney's attention.

I cannot help but note that in the Chief Justice's judgement he sets out, at pages 13 and 14, a number of historical analogies to the serious and organised crime act which may be of interest for the Attorney or other members to read. It talks about the history of statutory provisions in laws which have restricted the freedom of association of persons. Remembering that in this bill there is going to be some of that, unless various notice is given to other people including co-tenants of buildings, etc., South Australia seems to be leading the charge through the last century, including from legislation which commenced back in 1928. What is important is that if we go first, we do it properly.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (17:02): I am very grateful for the honourable member's comments. I agree that we do need to have a good look at all of our measures of this type in the light of what the High Court has said today.

I have had a chance to read some of the judgements today and some of the remarks that have been made by His Honour the Chief Justice, are not necessarily picked up with the same emphasis by other members of the court. That does not necessarily mean they do not agree with him, and I think it is going to take some time for me to satisfy myself that I understand what they are all saying. Indeed, I have indicated to the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor that I wish to have a lengthy discussion with them in due course when they feel they have satisfied their own needs to read and understand the judgement.

I can assure the member for Bragg that it is my view that the good thing to come out of this is that, hopefully, we now have a sound constitutional platform on which we can build whatever provisions we need across the board in South Australia. It is certainly my view that it would be prudent for us to do that very well and apply it across the board, wherever these types of provisions exist.

I am very pleased that the honourable member apparently has a similar view because it may well be that one of the things that we ultimately wind up bringing back to the parliament early in the new year is a bill which, amongst other things, seeks to establish these identical regimes across the board in a number of different areas. I think the honourable member is quite right in saying that the bill we were looking at the other day deals with a number of those—there may be more. There may be more of them sitting around the place, and I agree with her that this is a great opportunity for us to take stock with that. Again, that is something that, hopefully, we will be able to advance between the houses.

I would like to say on the record that I am very happy that we are at that point to have a conversation with the honourable member about that. Whatever issues are there, I would be happy to informally try and tease them out, rather than us having a disagreement about them in here.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (17:06): I want to raise a serious matter here and I thank you for the opportunity to do it. I want to talk about the wine industry and I think most members would understand and know that there are problems, but you just do not understand how serious this is at the moment.

Mr Piccolo: Tell us why.

Mr VENNING: I will. The wine industry has been experiencing difficulties for a long time; oversupply coupled with low prices, protracted periods of drought and water shortages have all contributed to a difficult period for the industry. Now the rise of the Australian dollar is creating further challenges for those in the industry. Today, the Australian dollar was buying just over one American dollar and the Australian dollar has also been strong against the pound. The United States and Britain are the wine industry's two biggest export markets, as we all know.

The strong Australian dollar will have a major impact on our Australian wine industry, as it will harm our sales versus our competitors' on the international market, because it makes our wines more expensive for overseas buyers. Australia exports 65 per cent of our wine production, so if our exports fall because of the strong Australian dollar, it will be catastrophic for the industry, making it even worse. The Australian Institute of Export director, Mr Ian Murray, said last week:

Particularly those that depend on price are now having trouble selling to Europe and to the United States.

The strong Australian dollar also makes imported wines cheaper, which means that our domestic wine producers will be competing against cheaper imported wines. We have all seen this, particularly with New Zealand whites, which are readily available, very popular and cheap. That is really causing great havoc.

I remind members that our white wines, particularly that of the Adelaide Hills and the southern Barossa, are equally as good as any white wines in the world; yet, the New Zealanders seem to have this trendy promotion and the young ones seem to think that New Zealand whites are the way to go. Well, I remind them that we have some magnificent white wines available and grown by our producers here in South Australia.

Experts predict that we already have a 20 to 25 per cent surplus of grapes, which equates to approximately 800,000 tons of surplus grapes across the country. This will only be exacerbated by such a strong Australian dollar. This has a large effect on my electorate, and I know many others whose electorates cover wine regions would be experiencing the same hardships.

South Australia produces 731,000 tons of grapes, and many grape growers are really, really hurting. It was bad enough in year 2007, when we were first aware of the problem and the Australian dollar was equal to 70 American cents. What do you think it is like now, when we have parity? It was bad enough in 2007; just consider how bad it is today. The Winemakers' Federation of Australia Chief Executive Stephen Strachan said recently, 'Viability of the industry is at an all-time low.'

Based on the feedback that I am getting from my constituents, I would have to agree totally. Wineries were already reducing their intake of grapes before the Australian dollar reached parity with the US. With the dollar remaining high, I can only see wineries further reducing their intake on the upcoming vintage, and, to remain viable, increasing the level of imported product, and either market it or even blend it with the Australian product and sell it as Australian. I know there are laws about that, but you cannot blame them. It is all about surviving, and companies will do this just to keep their brand name out there.

This will have a significant adverse effect on many growers within my electorate. Many are struggling to pay their bills, let alone make a profit. I have been personally involved—that is why I am moved to make this speech now—in discussions with some families who have been involved in the wine industry for many years, some for over four generations, and they have said that they have never seen it as bad as this. Most made big losses last year; one grower in particular made

an over \$300,000 loss, and it is going to be the same this year. This is not sustainable in anybody's business plan.

Some have long-term contractual arrangements with the BIL water scheme, a scheme that I pushed. To some that is now a liability because they cannot use the water anyway. So, it is a gloomy picture. They have to pay their contractual things out. I still commend the BIL scheme; it has been a great scheme, but for some of those people who bit the bullet and went in deep to buy water that is now a liability.

Without doubt, over-planting and oversupply is a large part of the problem, as well as the dollar. Why did we do this? These management investment schemes are an absolute blight on the industry. They are still planting vines at the moment, as a leftover from the MIS schemes that were abolished a few years ago. They are still planting them; it is absolutely unbelievable.

Previous governments, and that includes the Liberals, should have removed section 75AA (the management investment scheme taxation arrangements) many years ago, but they did not. I can only condemn governments—all of them; us, them. I will mention one particular person, Mr Leo Pech, who advised me as far back as 2007 that this was going to happen. Mr Pech is a grower of longstanding, for whom I have great respect, and he said that section 75AA should be taken off immediately. It was not; it hung around for another five or six years.

Part of the problem is that we are seeing grapes grown where they were never grown before because the taxation arrangements encouraged people to do that. It is a disgrace that it was not removed. On Saturday afternoon I sat at the foot of a bed of a woman who was totally distraught about the situation. She cannot pay the family's bills. The property is up for sale; they cannot sell it, so they are selling off pieces of machinery just to get enough money to pay the family's bills. This was a very large and productive enterprise in the Barossa Valley.

I, personally, get very emotional about this. I hope that members of parliament can understand that I am very lucky in my position because I am a broadacre farmer. I have a lot of other options. If wheat is bad, as the member for Finniss will tell you, because he would be the same, if we have bad wheat prices or bad barley prices then we have other options: we can swing to sheep, we can swing to hay, we can do pastoral, there are so many other options, but a grape grower has no option other than to pull up the vines. That raises the issue of a vine pull; whether we go back to that. I hope that we never will. This is a situation where I cannot see what the solutions are.

Over 40 per cent of growers that I know of could be classed as not viable—close to bankruptcy. They say that by the end of this vintage it will be 60 per cent. So, what is the answer? You cannot sell the properties; no-one wants to buy them, and all these vineyards are for sale. I do not know. I still believe that some sort of finance has to be given to these people, even though they have a lot of assets—vineyards that were worth a lot of money, millions. You cannot eat them; you cannot sell them. I think that we must have some sort of scheme that says that we are not going to take into consideration so much the asset value, because we have to look at the income these people are making.

It might get worse. These people are very confident people. A lot of them made their own wine out of their own grapes. They could not sell the grapes, so they put it into the bottle themselves. That is a huge cost. Now they have it in storage—still cannot sell the product. So, now they have the cost of having to pay for what they have done as well as the storage. Really, those people who bit the bullet and were brave are getting burnt as well. It is a sad story.

We are so proud of our wine industry, yet here we are. It is desperate. I do not know what to do. I am open to hear any advice from any member of this place, as long as the members of this place understand and realise how serious it is. You hear about it, you read about it, but you have just got to see it firsthand to realise how terrible it is when you see families absolutely on their bones, too proud to make any public comment, too proud to call me up. I go there and stand in this bedroom with the husband and wife, just trying to gee the lady up because she really was despairing, saying, 'What can we do? I can't pay the bills.'

It was a worthwhile exercise for me. It certainly was an education. I only hope that I am able to say to the lady that there is a chance. Let us hope there is.

Time expired.

PORK INDUSTRY

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (17:16): I rise to my feet to talk briefly about a decision made by Coles Supermarkets earlier this week. Coles Supermarkets announced that it intends to broaden its sow stall fresh pork initiative to include all forms of Coles brand pork, including processed ham and bacon products produced in both Australia and overseas from 2014.

This is a welcome announcement from Coles. It is a matter which was debated in this place only a fortnight ago, when both this side and a majority of members from the other side of the house combined to support a motion to bring to the public's attention the unilateral decision previously made by Coles to cut out the use of stalls by 2014, which affected only local producers; and that is what really angered the pork industry and others. The decision previously made by Coles affected only local producers.

The other thing was that Coles tried to sell that decision on the basis that it was improving animal welfare. We were able to establish in this place that, overall, that decision could actually reduce animal welfare if we imported more product as a result, because the standards overseas are not as high as those in Australia. The decision was exposed for what it was: it was a marketing gimmick. It was about Coles trying to increase its market share; and that was also displayed by its correspondence to the *Stock Journal*, which I detailed in this place.

We quite rightly called on Coles not only to support our industry but also to support animal welfare by the decision that it subsequently made. It is good to see that it made that decision. The previous decision by Coles has been described by many as a double standard and, clearly, it was, because it imposed a higher standard of care on our local producers than is required overseas. What it did was to let down our local producers. It was prepared to support an increase in imports and a reduction of locally-produced pork.

The issue was never about improving animal welfare, because we all support endeavours to maximise the welfare of animals in our care. It was to ensure that the decision affected all producers, whether they are here, in Australia, or overseas—in other words, create a more level playing field. This subsequent decision by Coles will still cost local farmers money in terms of redoing their sheds, farms, etc., to meet that requirement. However, it actually gives our local farmers a bit of a fighting chance because it creates a more level playing field.

As I said, we were right in this place—both Labor and Liberal—a fortnight ago to bring this issue to the public's attention. We were able to assist by passing a resolution in this place to ensure that Coles knew that we would not stand by and allow our local industries to be destroyed with no net improvement to animal welfare.

I think that this subsequent decision produces a win, both for our farmers and animal welfare, and I commend the house for doing so. I would also like to acknowledge the contribution made by the member for Hammond in that debate. I enjoyed working with him on that issue.

Time expired.

At 17:20 the house adjourned until Tuesday 23 November 2010 at 11:00.