

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Thursday 16 February 2012**

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

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 15 February 2012.)

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (10:32):** I will continue on in terms of the court system. I must say that, based on my experience, I do not have a lot of confidence in our judicial system. I am talking about the need for magistrates, when they are selected, to be carefully selected. I do not believe the current arrangements are adequate or appropriate, and there needs to be proper training once magistrates are in place.

I go back to my situation, because it is the only one I am familiar with. Before I attended the court, a former senior police officer said, 'You won't win because that magistrate hunts with the other side.' They were his exact words. He is a very prominent member in the Lions Club movement, an honest and decent police officer, and that is what he said to me: 'You won't win because that magistrate (Joanne Tracey) hunts with the other side.'

That is a pretty outrageous thing for someone to suggest, but the point is that, in South Australia, we do not have a judicial commission to review the behaviour of magistrates and judges as they do in New South Wales. Members might recall that recently magistrate Pat O'Shane in New South Wales was called before that body to explain her behaviour in refusing to hear evidence from ambulance officers in a case where, allegedly, someone spat on the officer and assaulted that officer.

In terms of the appeal system we have here, I believe that federally it has been suggested that the courts should be able to admit new evidence. That is a bit of a two-edged sword, but I think it needs to be considered. What I find unsatisfactory is that we have a system where dodgy documents can be submitted and the court will accept them, where certificates have been whited out in part, written and changed with a biro, and the Magistrates Court will accept that as a legitimate certificate and so will the Full Court. I must say that I do not have a lot of confidence in the system here.

Moving on to other issues, I notice that the young lad from Callington was sentenced yesterday to 15 years nonparole. The question I think we should all ask is: how is it that at the age of 14 we have someone committing a crime as serious as that? The lad would not have been born a criminal; he has been turned into a criminal by society. I will not go into a lot of the personal details relating to him, but apparently he was suspended from school on the day of the offence, which highlights a policy of the department I have been critical of for a long time, that is, suspending students who are causing trouble at school and who are then out in the community causing more trouble. It is not good enough.

You cannot just release someone out in the community, particularly when there are not parents at home. As a society (and I mentioned this earlier in my speech), we need to take a more interventionist approach to ensure that, for young people who are put at risk because of their upbringing, the processes at home, that is, being subjected to a constant diet of violence and so on, do not continue. While I am not taking away responsibility from the lad, I think society has a lot to answer for in allowing a lad to go through the experiences he did, which resulted in the tragic death of a lady at Callington.

Just changing direction, in terms of the Burnside inquiry, I believe that should be released. The judge did not rule that it should not be released at all—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** What the judge said was that it could be reworked—I am paraphrasing—or parts of it could be left out. So, there is no excuse for not releasing that report. I understand there are recommendations for many criminal prosecutions in that report. One would have to wonder why it continues to be suppressed and why the government will not release it. It

should be released. While it stays suppressed, there will be a lot of suspicion in the minds of the public.

In relation to the Arkaroola compensation, that was completely unnecessary. I do not believe Marathon Resources was genuinely in the search for uranium there. Experts have told me that CRA had investigated that area 20 to 30 years ago, that uranium of any substantial quantity had leached out and that where it is now is where it is being extracted through a leaching process on the plains surrounding Arkaroola. I do not understand why the government is paying money out when it does not have to and when we have so many things in the community that need financial support.

I understand the government is going to bring in an ICAC package soon. I hope to see it. I hope it is comprehensive. We certainly need it. We are the only state that does not have a body the police answer to. Theoretically, they answer to a minister but, when you look at some of the ministers we have had in the past, that is not worth the paper it is written on. They have not been accountable to anyone.

Likewise, the Police Complaints Authority—and I have raised this issue before and I raise it again—should be abolished, as should the Anti-Corruption Branch, and replaced by a genuinely independent group that can investigate not only police but other matters impartially and effectively. That is not happening at the moment.

Modern technology has provided us now with pilotless aircraft (unfortunately used mainly in modern warfare) which are readily available. I suggest that they be considered for use as fire spotters. They can be flown at relatively little cost over fire-prone areas, and immediately they detect smoke or fire they can report that back. I would urge the government here to have a look at the technology available in those pilotless drones to see whether there is an effective and useful role for them in helping to detect fires before they get out of hand.

Another matter, which may not seem top of the list, relates to the lack of toilet facilities in the metropolitan area. In particular, the new railway stations that have been built and are being built do not have any toilet facilities, and I think it is disgraceful. I have had women say to me that they have had to squat by the railway line or somewhere because there is no toilet facility.

I do not think we should give way to vandals. It is possible to design toilets that are relatively vandal proof. In particular, we can use those new electronically-controlled toilets. I think it is outrageous that in stations like Oaklands Park, Mawson Lakes or any of the other stations there are no toilet or baby-changing facilities. In a civilised society, if you want people to wait and catch a train, you would expect that they would at least be able to go to a toilet. As members will—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Who is going to look after these facilities?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** Well, we've got plenty of people. We have got unemployed people we can employ to look after these things.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** So they should be staffed?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** No, you do not need anyone in them. We are an affluent community. If you go to Holland, they have people working at railway stations. They give jobs to people. We used to have attendants at railway stations. I do not say we need someone to—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** It's going to have to be three eight-hour shifts.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Fisher, if you would like to finish off, I will give you a few moments because you did get an interruption.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** You do not need to have someone there with the new electronic toilets. I do not know where the member for Croydon has been—he's been on his bike too long, I think—but we have electronic toilets in the city. With the electronic toilets, which are self-cleaning, you do not need to have someone in the toilet. I do not want someone in the toilet when I go to one either. I think it is a basic, fundamental thing—not only toilet facilities but places where people can change babies' nappies and so on. Let us get civilised and let the transport system provide.

#### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I notice we have a group in the gallery from Sunrise Christian School, who are guests of the Hon. Dennis Hood. Welcome and we hope you enjoy your time here. It is nice to see you there.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (10:42):** I thank His Excellency for his address to the parliament this week, for the opening of the 52<sup>nd</sup> parliament, and also for his attendance this morning at the special service at the Pilgrim Church to bless us all and, of course, give us wise counsel in our deliberations—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** He is not authorised to do that.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I didn't say he did—in which we as members of the parliament received the blessing of the church leaders and for wise counsel in our deliberations in this place. I thank him for that. My message to him is: suffer the little children, and women and truck drivers.

In reading this contribution, one stark omission was any consideration to the startling statistics in the area of suicide, juvenile crime, murder in particular and domestic violence. As you are aware, Madam Speaker, we have law enforcement agencies that are funded by the government, such as our courts, police, Director of Public Prosecutions, Parole Board and Correctional Services, all of whom work to ensure that we have the safe communities that we all aspire to.

Safe and active neighbourhoods were a feature in the address that we had from His Excellency. However, what was omitted was the startling statistic of suicide in this state, of which there are some 200 per year, and which seems to have had no impact on this government as to how it is going to be addressed. Much is said about the road toll in this state and the deaths of our young people in particular. The media have picked this up, and it is not unimportant, but understand that it is only half of those that take their own lives. We must have this addressed. Much more has to be done than the government has done in its first 10 years, which was to bulldoze what facilities we had at Glenside Hospital and fill it up with supermarkets, the Film Corporation and churches.

In relation to juvenile crime, whilst the government, in the last 10 years, has committed to building an extra juvenile facility out at Cavan (the government is spending over \$60 million on that), there has been little provision of support services within those institutions. This is evident day after day after day, not only in the inquiries this parliament has convened on juvenile justice but also by what we see as a stark reminder in this morning's newspaper, that is, that a 14-year-old boy (I think he is now 15) has been convicted and sentenced to a period of some 15 years nonparole for the murder of one of our most senior citizens, a woman, I think, in her 60s. This is a stark reminder of the government's failure to address these important issues, which I am very disappointed to note was effectively omitted from the government's presentation of what it is going to do in the forthcoming term.

In relation to domestic violence, again, we have not even heard an announcement of a register for those women and children who are the victims of the murders and manslaughter that take place in this state. It is fair to say that the government needs to address bikie gangs and organised crime; they are out there responding to polls and, of course, to outrageous events. Indeed, the statistics for murder for this state show that 37 murders were committed last year, some 12 of which involved family members or friends and 21 of which involved strangers and that the profile, not surprisingly, is still very similar in that 16 were females and 23 were males.

What that probably tells us, if we look at what the situation was 10 years before, is that there has been a very significant increase in the profile of our murder victims in this state. There has been an increase in males as victims and an increase in stranger murders. So, it is not unreasonable that the government addresses issues in relation to organised crime; that is quite acceptable. We just wish to goodness the government would get on with it, and not waste year after year, not just in terms of legislative reform but ensuring that there is enactment—and I will come back to that in the moment.

However, it is also important that they do not overlook that last year at least 12 people were killed by their spouse, usually, or their partner or ex-partner and that it was predominantly women and children in this category. That cannot be overlooked, and it is time that the government actually got serious about this and that it not just try to pretend some interest. It has had inquiries. It took them two years to even implement a police injunction order procedure in the time it says it takes to train police to do it—years after they had received Ms Maurine Pyke QC's report.

So, again, it is very disappointing that we did not have it. Here is an example of what I see as complete ignorance of the real world. Just last week, I think, evidence was given to a coronial inquiry into the death of Shane Robinson. Members would remember that Shane Robinson killed himself in July 2009, at Yunta, after he had stabbed a police officer and had held a 75-year-old woman hostage—a most despicable crime—and he had done so while he was out on parole.

The first response to this was that the former attorney-general rushed out and bleated to the world about how inept the Parole Board had been in dealing with this. What transpired later, in fact—before we even get to the coronial inquiry—was that there was an acknowledgement that a warrant had been issued and had been laying out there for some two weeks before the police had acted on it.

When we came to this place last year to discuss the Correctional Services Act reform, which was to give the Correctional Services Board extra powers to deal with Shane Robinson-type incidents, we found that there had been promises made, thankfully, that these warrants would now be acted on promptly. Whilst the Parole Board has a role to play in this, when they issue a warrant for the arrest of a parolee all law enforcement agencies have to take some responsibility. So, I say to the government, 'Don't put your head in the sand and just start blaming someone you think you can pick on,' when, in fact, we all take responsibility, including the police who have now made a commitment to ensure that they will execute those warrants. But the evidence a week ago at the coronial inquiry was the startling evidence of the Chief Executive of Correctional Services, namely, Kevin Hill. The executive gave evidence that—this is very important—after the attacks and death, questions were raised and there were allegations also by minister Koutsantonis that the Parole Board had spectacularly let down the people of South Australia.

He told the inquest that the Department for Correctional Services, in fact, had been slow to pass on crucial information about Mr Robinson's past. In fact, he specifically said that the department did not immediately notify the board of a serious breach just a month earlier when Mr Robinson had strangled his girlfriend. Now, that information was critical. What does the government do about it? It puts its head in the sand on these issues. The ministers sit here: minister Rankine, minister Koutsantonis and minister Rau. These three people are responsible for the law enforcement out there.

We want answers, obviously, as to why there is no mention of the reform in this area; why they just come along here and want to give more power to bureaucrats to be able to act in the face of evidence that has been given at inquests that, in fact, there has been a major breach on behalf of the very bureaucrats they ask to give more power to.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I say to His Excellency, 'Inform your government, please, that it has been monumentally deficient and negligent, I suggest—'

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Point of order, ma'am.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —in its application of this area of the law.'

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. Member for Croydon.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It is contrary to standing orders to place the vice-regal representative in an invidious position, or to make reference to the vice-regal representative in a polemical way; and I ask you to caution the member for Bragg not to instruct, via her Address in Reply, the vice-regal representative to say something to the government.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Croydon.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** If I may speak to that, Madam Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** There are standing orders relating to the vice-regal, so I would ask you to very careful.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Indeed, there are, and to make any offensive statement to Her Majesty or her representative is in breach of standing orders. I, however, indicated a request. The Executive Council, including the Governor, is a very important part of the trilogy of institutions that represent this state. They meet, I think, still once a week, and they have a responsibility, as His Excellency has. All these speeches, of course, are going to be conveyed to His Excellency, and we thank you for that; and I hope that he reads mine with some application.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Croydon!

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Let me say that the other aspect I want to speak about is what has transpired after 10 years. It has really become a totally dysfunctional and incompetent rabble of a government—the pale imitation of what we have today from the Rann era. Remember, we had Rann, Foley and Atkinson. The great three amigos of the parliament were in here during the previous government to present to us their stamp on that era. I would describe them as arrogant, rude and dismissive—and that is to be kind to them—of that era.

We are glad they are gone; that they are out of the way and that they are no longer going to be so dismissive and rude and arrogant towards the people of South Australia. But gone are the three amigos, and what have we got now? We have the three blind mice. We have got Weatherill, Rau and Snelling in charge. They are the three who have replaced them. What have they replaced it with? They are clearly the people who are ignorant, amateur—

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Point of order, ma'am.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —and insincere.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. Member for Croydon.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It is contrary to the long-established practice of the houses of parliament in the English-speaking world for any member to refer to another member as an animal. I refer you to Erskine May, and I ask you to ask the member for Bragg to withdraw the reference of three members of this house as 'three blind mice'.

**The SPEAKER:** I am very concerned that the member for Croydon feels so wounded by those comments, but I would ask you to just withdraw it.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am happy to do that.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm glad.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I notice he did not have any complaint about himself being called one of the three amigos, but in any event—

**The SPEAKER:** He is obviously very sensitive this morning.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** What we have is a replacement government, under the leadership of these three men, which is a demonstration of ignorance, amateur behaviour and insincerity. It is of great concern to me, when I read this 'visionary statement' which is to be some tabloid of a patent for the next four years from this government, that it should be so wanton in its omission of important aspects for this state.

Not only is it clear from me and the members on this side of the parliament, but I note even the press this morning were quick to criticise the government in identifying question time as having degenerated into a farce even though, when he took over as premier, Jay Weatherill pledged a spirit of cooperation. The publication this morning indicates that he has not only deviated from his own code of civility, but also simply avoided any scrutiny of his government by this parliament in question time. I quote:

Every question asked by the opposition resulted in nothing more than a tirade from the government's front bench about poor Liberal performance.

They have been caught out and what we have is this 'visionary statement' which has obviously been identified as nothing more than a squint.

Now I come to the claim that there will be a commitment to advanced manufacturing which is a most disturbing aspect of this contribution in that we do not actually have any blueprint in this. We have a promise for another committee to be set up to develop advanced manufacturing, we have commentary about the importance of salvaging what we have left of manufacturing, but we do not actually have any indication, other than setting up another committee, to advance manufacturing in this state.

When the government undertakes this commitment to advance manufacturing in this state I would ask that they read an article by Paul Cleary that was published in *The Australian* last weekend. It is an article which my office has done some research on in respect of real issues that

are facing South Australia, indeed across Australia, but South Australia because of the manufacturing industry and the dearth of opportunities here. It starts:

When it comes to giving us our daily bread, the single biggest cost is not the ingredients, nor even the manufacturing process that includes labour and power. For one of Australia's biggest food manufacturers, Goodman Fielder, distribution accounts for almost half the delivered cost of the loaves it bakes every day of the week and then trucks to 20,000 retail outlets.

It refers to the company's 'decentralised network of 19 industrial bakeries' stretching across the country. It goes on:

...delivery costs account for 43 per cent of each loaf, well ahead of raw materials at 30 per cent, and manufacturing at 27 per cent.

This is a company which is not completely centralised. It has 80 distribution points and it trucks out to 500 delivery runs to retail outlets. It goes on to say:

...freight must be an even bigger cost on companies that have consolidated their operations to achieve economies of scale. In the era of high protection, Holden had plants in several states; but it has now consolidated its vehicle manufacturing into one plant at Elizabeth...

that of which we are proudly the host, the last remaining manufacturing base here in South Australia.

Whilst the article goes on to talk about ways in which manufacturing may be assisted—the abolition of payroll tax, the opportunity for competition, exposing the importance of having food labelling for companies, 'Made in Australia' and all sorts of other answers—it points out the following in respect of the manufacturing survival against the mining industry. It says:

Indeed, as the capital-intensive mining industry soaks up more than half of all investment, the labour-intensive economy is not only smashed by the high dollar, it is also starved of capital and is shedding jobs. While the government is focusing on the iconic car industry...(and other manufacturers, it needs to consider this challenge) Australia's food industry employs about 300,000 people and accounts for one in three manufacturing jobs, yet it barely rates a mention when politicians talk about what needs to be done to maintain a viable and diverse manufacturing base.

When primary producers are included, the industry is facing a triple whammy of competition from powerful retailers, increased food imports and higher transport costs as the mining boom pushes farmers off the rail lines...The loss of food manufacturers will have a bigger effect over time than the closure of a car plant.

That is the claim that is made. I think it is important that the Premier and his cabinet understand that, whilst there might be a meritorious case to save our own remaining car industry here in South Australia—and, of course, we are not allowed to have a business plan for that, we are not allowed to know what they are going to do until they have done the deal and all that, so there is the usual secretive way that they are keeping it under wraps—there is a much bigger issue out there for the manufacturing industry of this state, which is important for our state (that which is left).

There is a major problem against imports. There is major competition for our rail links. It is established that the production cost of even a loaf of bread is 30 per cent for the producer for the raw materials, 27 per cent for the manufacturer, and a staggering 43 per cent for every loaf of bread that is distributed—the cost of getting it out to people. Bearing that in mind, we have to accept and understand that consumers are going to look to cheap imports. We have a spiralling descent in both consumer choice and food security in this country, as well as a significant problem for our manufacturing base.

I ask the government to look very carefully at this, and be reminded of what we were told at the service this morning, the blessing we received and to have wise deliberations—'Give us this day our daily bread.'

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:03):** The Governor's speech on Tuesday is in no way any reflection on His Excellency. It was written by the government to be read by the Governor, and I must admit that, in 10 years in this place, it has to be one of the flattest I have heard, which is a disappointment because I have a lot of respect for the ability of some people opposite but that ability does not seem to be coming forth. I can say that the Governor we have in South Australia at the moment, His Excellency, Kevin Scarce, has been doing an excellent job. I am very pleased that he has been re-appointed for another two years. I thought it might have been for another complete term, which I think is five years, but I understand how hard he and his wife, Liz, work so it is very pleasing to see that they have been re-appointed.

I notice that the mover of this motion on the Address in Reply, the member for Little Para, who represents Elizabeth and some of those suburbs around there, mentioned that the Governor is

from Elizabeth, a northern suburbs boy. When I was very small, I think in late 1955, we moved to Elizabeth South (Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South) and I went to Elizabeth South Primary School. When we moved to Salisbury in 1960, I went to Salisbury Primary School and Salisbury High School, as did the member for Unley—we are boys of the northern suburbs—and I am very proud to have that history as part of my roots because it is a great part of South Australia and a great part of the state to have come from.

I refer to what the member for Little Para said about 'breaking down barriers and showing local kids that they have the same opportunities as people from more affluent suburbs'. He was talking about the way the universities work with the schools in the northern suburbs to try to get the kids to achieve their full goals, ambitions and potential. If you want an example of the fruit of that you need look no further than His Excellency and members of this place, because it is a fine example of what can be done if you set your goals and work hard to achieve those goals.

The welcome to country is sometimes a bit controversial. There is a thought out there that it is a bit of a sop to our Aboriginal friends and communities. Can I say, for one, that I acknowledge the close relationship our Aboriginal friends and communities have with their land. The need to recognise this true relationship is something that I think none of us should overlook. We had Kurna elder Lewis O'Brien, Uncle Lewis, come and give the welcome on Tuesday. It is disappointing that members of the lower house do not get to see that—we go in there after that. It is great to see a man like him representing the Aboriginal communities of South Australia.

I congratulate Uncle Lewis O'Brien on being awarded an honorary doctorate at Flinders University for his contribution as an elder on the Indigenous Health Professional Education Advisory Committee and as Patron/Elder in Residence to the Indigenous Preparation for Medicine Program at Flinders. My son is doing second-year medicine, in fact he has just deferred for 12 months, but he was telling me—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** He is a specialised vet! He was telling me that the program there, including the cross-cultural work they are getting, is very worthwhile. As I have said, the speech that was handed to the Governor to read out this year was quite flat. I will have a quick look at it. One thing that really blew out at you was on page 13—unlucky for some—of the speech:

The government believes that our public discourse should be more civil—that we should be slower to attribute blame, and quicker to accept responsibility. Parliament should demonstrate how debate and dissent can be constructive—and not be a forum for endless squabbles that lead nowhere. To this end, the Government will call on all Members to maintain the proper standards during this session. And beyond this, we will enact a Code of Conduct for all Members, to ensure that their public lives are beyond reproach.

That did not last very long at all. Just read the article in today's *The Advertiser* about the farce that question time has become, because it is question time, not answer time. That is the problem. If it became answer time and short, sharp and factual answers were given, then things would go a lot more smoothly. But what do we get? We get the politics, the tirades from the other side, making political points from, sometimes, things that are completely untrue, particularly our policy on GMH. There is no stronger supporter of GMH than I.

I remember them building the Pinnock sewing machine factory opposite 85 Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South, when I was a young kid, even before Holden's was thought of. I remember them building the Holden's factory and what a great thing it was for Elizabeth, what a great thing it has been, and still will be, for this state. To say that the Liberal Party does not support that is completely wrong, but that is what we had. We have seen episode after episode, since the Governor's speech, where this Premier and his government have not lived up to what was written on page 13 of the speech.

On pages 2 and 3 of the speech there is mention that, 'South Australians are troubled and uneasy about the shifting and uncertain times the world now faces.' When you have high water prices, high electricity prices, high land tax, high government charges all the time, the cost of living is a significant issue for each and every South Australian. It does not matter where you come from or where you live, each and every South Australian is very aware of the costs that are imposed in this state.

The Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Isobel Redmond, mentioned someone she knew moving their businesses and real estate portfolio interstate because of costs in this state, and I had exactly that put to me. People who live at Somerton Park had businesses in the Northern Territory

and were selling up just because of the logistics; they said that there was just no way they would invest in South Australia because of the costs and charges here.

On page 3 of the Governor's speech it said that the government had comprehensively reviewed where the state now stands and made decisions about where its focus needs to be for the future. Well, the focus for the future is not the sale of the forests, it is not the sale of the lotteries; if you want a future fund what better thing than the forests? That is \$40 million a year, and year after year after year it will come in. It will certainly increase with CPI, as it does, but it is there. It is the whole stupidity of it, when the federal Future Fund is looking at investing in the forests here. Where is the sense in that?

Regarding the sale of the lotteries, I just remind the house that I think the figure was \$97 million—it is about that anyway—that the state lotteries put into our public hospitals last year; just about every year they are putting in that sort of figure into hospitals. Where is that money going to come from? There is also the \$24 million that the agencies pick up through the sale of lottery tickets and scratchies, that sort of thing. They do not get much out of me, unfortunately for them, but they do reap a lot from the Lotteries Commission agencies. There is not a lot of foresight, looking towards the future, there, but this government seems to be set on that. It will rue the day when it makes those final decisions.

'Seven primary areas of focus for action,' doesn't that sound good? That sounds really good; what a motherhood statement that is. It is the sort of stuff we have been seeing from day one. Clean, green food industry—

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Look, we all agree with that. It is all motherhood but we all agree with it: a clean, green food industry; the mining boom and its benefits; advanced manufacturing; a vibrant city; safe and active neighbourhoods; affordable living; early childhood development.

What happened to Fraser Mustard's report? Where did that go? It sat for a long, long time. I hope the Minister for Education resurrects that report because there is some fantastic stuff in there. I had the pleasure of having dinner with Fraser Mustard down at Glenelg, and I had a chat with him about some of the issues. The late Fraser Mustard was a man who will be missed. He was a fount of wisdom on early childhood development and it is a tragedy that now, many years after he came here as a Thinker in Residence, this government is mentioning early childhood development. There is no doubt that these seven areas are areas that we need to focus on, but we should have been focusing on them for the last 10 years of this government.

The cost of living in South Australia is one thing this government will have to look at, and it will be something that this opposition will be focusing on very strongly. As I said, the future fund sounds good but why didn't the government accept the Liberal proposition three or four months ago was it now, when the shadow treasurer proposed it?

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I can understand the politics, I can understand the interjections from the member for Croydon, the banter that goes across this place. I understand that there is a bit of theatre involved in here. The kids that I bring in from the schools, we show them the blood line, the sword line, we show them a copy of the execution warrant of Charles I, and those are the sorts of things that they remember. Even my granddaughter's grade 1 class remembers the blood line, the sword line, and the execution warrant, but not much else.

We understand that there has been robust debate in here for many years, but let's move forward. Let us go back to page 13 of the Governor's speech and let us actually see the Premier, the leader of the state, put that into action, and if there is a good suggestion from this side or from the government I think we do ourselves a disservice not to at least examine it and critique it, and also accept it, if that is the thing we should do—not might do, but should do. I think it was Sir Thomas Playford who said, 'Give the people of South Australia what they need, not just what they want,' and I think those words really show what we should be doing. I suppose it is the same as JFK's words, 'Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country.' They are similar sorts of thoughts.

The state of the economy in South Australia is going to continue to suffer under this government while we have the faceless men and women of the union dictating to the Labor Party.



We have seen it with the change in premiers and we have seen it now with this bizarre decision to make two half holidays on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve. I cannot understand why the government does not examine this deal much more closely, and its effects on the people of South Australia, with the imposition of the 2½ times penalty rates for relatively normal hours. They might be very busy hours but they are relatively normal shopping hours.

I will just read some of the emails I have received from just a few of my constituents who run businesses. I boast to people that I have 106 restaurants and cafes within walking distance of my office in Glenelg—and I am trying to keep my weight down by walking between those restaurants and cafes. They are all very hardworking people and some of them pay extraordinarily high rents and overheads, and now we have this other impost on them. I will not read out the names of the owners and their businesses but just the content of the emails. One email states:

Dear Sir

We operate a number of stores in South Australia. This proposed legislation is another example of this state government's...intention to take business back to the 'dark ages'. At the least, this legislation will mean our business closing at 5pm on those days...this will guarantee the demise of many small businesses in this state.

Another one states:

Hi Duncan, I would only support the amendments from 6pm, not 5pm, but most traders I have spoken to are against any change at all.

That was from a hotel owner. Another email states:

...we would like to voice our opposition to any additional public holiday penalty hours for employees (Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve).

Business just cannot sustain such costs and it would adversely affect the purpose of even opening during these times. You may think, 'Well just don't open' but then we lose market share to the bigger chains and department stores who can put on skeleton staffing numbers. As a business, we cannot put on .5 of a staff member—so our costs are inordinately higher than department stores...

Fair enough for additional outside core hours of trade, but core hours should be at normal pay rates, regardless as to whether these hours are considered 'significant socialising hours'...As it is, I haven't paid myself for the past three years. It leaves me wondering in the wee small hours of the morning why I am doing this at all. I may as well give up and stay at home gardening. At least I'd live a lot longer.

Another email states:

Having read the proposed changes to the Holiday Act I am thoroughly opposed to any change. At this time, small business is doing it tough, I know of very few traders who would speculate that times are better. To increase costs unnecessarily is both unfair and irresponsible. Staff costs for my business represent almost 10 per cent of sales, with a 25 per cent margin this leaves very little to cover rent and other outgoings. We already face competition from major chains who price unrealistically and take dollars from farmers and other suppliers to fund this. Please do all you can to discourage any change.

And one more states:

For what it's worth we would like to mention the proposed changes to Christmas and New Years public holidays will have an overall detrimental effect on our trade, and furthermore staff remuneration too. Since the federal government's changes to public holiday rates in early 2011 now means we pay casual staff approximately \$42p/h...on public holidays.

Since these changes were implemented we have since decided to close our two city restaurants...for all dine-in trade, and only trade takeaway...

The emails go on and on, and a lot more are coming in every day from businesses I represent in the electorate of Morphett, particularly in the Glenelg area. This decision by the government is really something that it needs to think about.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What about Business SA?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I understand there is quite a split in Business SA. The member for Croydon talks about Business SA. I think this is a bizarre announcement from Business SA. I do not think it represents the true membership of Business SA, and I will certainly be interested to see how many of my businesses down at the Bay are members of Business SA. I do not believe they are represented by Business SA.

I am really excited about my new portfolios—police, emergency services, corrections, road safety, volunteers and Aboriginal affairs—and I will talk a bit more about these later. On page 10 of the Governor's speech, it states:

We know that there is now 36 per cent less victim-reported crime than there was in 2001...And securing the safety of the people is a primary role of government.

If that is the case, why would you cut back on police recruiting? Why would you impose the efficiencies on the police department that are being required? The numbers of police on our streets should be maintained, should be given the highest precedent by this government, and we need to make sure that the South Australian police are given every support they ask for and deserve. I have the highest regard for the South Australian police, as I believe everybody in this place does. I will be looking forward to having further briefings by the police and to making sure that issues are raised in this place on behalf of South Australians and the hardworking men and women in our police department.

I was pleased to be with the minister and the member for Finnis at the opening of the new police academy last week. It is a fantastic building.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** It is a good thing that the government has done it. It is a fantastic thing, but well deserved. The member for Croydon should know that I am one person in this place who will criticise whenever I can—it is my job in opposition to scrutinise the government—but not if it does something that is really good. The police academy is something that is really good, and I am pleased that the police department has got what it deserves.

One of the other portfolios I have is emergency services. My father was in the MFS for a bit over 30 years, I think it was. My nephew is in the MFS now. I have a terrific working relationship with the MFS. I think that they do a fantastic job. I will say that I am looking forward to further discussions with them on simple things such as the name change to a fire and rescue service, because they do far more than put out fires. It is a much more technical job than it used to be many years ago when my father started in 1956.

Today is the anniversary of Ash Wednesday 1983. My father was the superintendent in the fire service and in charge of the Metropolitan Fire Service response on Ash Wednesday. He received a Governor's commendation for the work he did on that day, and I am very proud of my dad.

I put on the record that I first joined the CFS in 1984 at Kangarilla when we moved down there, and I am still a member. When I was at Salisbury primary school, the Salisbury EFS station was over the road. It was one of the old Nissen huts. When the siren went off, nothing went on in the class for that minute or so whilst the siren was going. There is an issue about fire sirens, which I will talk about at another time.

I have been a member of Kangarilla CFS and I was captain of the Happy Valley CFS for eight months. People say, 'Well, only eight months?' Yes: because I realised that my business—my veterinary practice—was very demanding and I could not afford to spend what was amounting to about two days a week doing paperwork for the CFS. The burden of paperwork, the red tape, is still there for volunteers and we need to be very conscious that we are not asking too much of them and that they are given every opportunity to do what they want to do, that is, help their communities.

The Kangarilla CFS is a great group of men and women. Some are older like me and some a lot younger. Ken Best runs the servo down at Kangarilla and was the captain of the Kangarilla CFS for nearly 30 years. He has retired from that position and Jeff Benham has taken over now. Ken has been a stalwart of the Kangarilla community, through both the service station and as the captain of the CFS.

I went out the other day to the Toops Hill fire, driving the bulk water carrier, as they call it now—the tanker. You need a heavy truck licence to drive some of these vehicles and I have one of those, so I went out for the day. It makes you realise what idiots are out there lighting these fires. Your blood boils when you realise the damage that could be done by idiots lighting fires. We need to make sure we support all our volunteers and full-time professionals in the MFS and CFS.

The SES does a fantastic job. I am looking at variations on their roles and I have spoken to officers in the SES about how we can improve, enhance and modify their roles because we cannot do without the volunteers in floods and other disasters.

Listening to Radio National last night, there is going to be a flood of devastating proportions at some stage in South Australia and we are going to need every man and woman on deck to

make sure we are able to respond as best we possibly can. That will be both the full-time professionals and also the volunteers.

My other portfolio is Corrections. The first thing I should say about that is we have seen a few examples of where this government has had to pay out contractors and pay out miners because of changed attitudes and, should I say, bungled negotiations and political decisions. In Corrections, we saw the \$10 million payout to the various consortia that were wanting to build our new prisons. We do need new facilities in South Australia—not just adding on, not just repairing, not just refurbishing.

One of the big issues that has been raised with me by various people throughout Corrections and other places is the age of our prisoners and the numbers of prisoners. Thanks to Family First's Hon. Mr Evans, when he had the government change the statute of limitations on sex offenders, we now have many, many aged offenders in our prisons. Some of them will need intensive elderly care. They will need wheelchairs; they will need a lot of additional facilities. Some people may say, 'Well, damn them,' but I think you have to be humane because, while you want to punish them and the incarceration is part of that, it should not be the old bread and water in the dungeons style now.

The people in Corrections are working very hard. I aim to visit all of our prisons within the next few months—just as a visitor, for no other reason—and see what we can do to assist the rehabilitation of our prisoners. It costs \$194 a day for a prisoner. We cannot keep paying that. It is like hospitals. The most efficient hospital is a hospital with no patients, according to *Yes, Minister*, and I think in some ways it is the same with a prison. If you could reduce prisoner numbers, the reduced burden on the state's coffers would be significant.

Road safety is a massive issue for us all. I do a fair bit of country driving and I leave my lights on all the time. I think we should be running a campaign of 'light up your life: have your headlights on when you are out in the country', because, particularly with darker coloured cars, these steely grey cars, flashing through the shadows of our gum trees and things, it can be difficult to see them coming out of intersections. If you have got your lights on anytime, 24 hours a day, it is much easier to see these vehicles. I do not know whether it would have a massive effect but, if it saves one life, I think it is one of those things we should be looking at because the cost of deaths and injuries on all of the portfolios in this place is very, very significant.

The cost of injured road accident victims being in our health facilities must be in the millions and millions of dollars, so we need to focus and not have this silent mentality. I do not like using the word 'silent' but it appears we do have concrete walls between departments in this place where they are not going to spend money in one area to try to save money in their own area. The silent mentality has been broken down, so we are looking at road safety across all portfolios. It is not just a thing for the shadow minister or the Minister for Road Safety.

Volunteers in South Australia is another one of my portfolios I am getting back, actually, and I am pleased to have it back. We have the highest number of volunteers per capita of any state. Our volunteers are worth \$4.9 billion per year and that is an amazing figure. We could never replace our volunteers, whether they are CFS, Meals on Wheels—you name it. There are hundreds and hundreds of organisations, thousands of volunteers and billions of dollars involved in this.

It is an important area we need to focus on and I will certainly be looking very closely at the occupational health and safety legislation and the work and health safety legislation that is going through this place. The fears are quite genuine amongst our volunteer organisations because of the impost of further responsibilities and regulation. Nobody can be allowed to act in a cavalier fashion or recklessly but, at the same time, let us not kill off the goose that is laying the golden eggs—\$4.9 billion worth of golden eggs.

I am very pleased to have the Aboriginal affairs portfolio back again. As people in this place know, I have bent over backwards to try to be bipartisan on Aboriginal affairs. I am unfortunately having to admit that that really has not worked as well as I had hoped and I will be taking a more aggressive attitude on Aboriginal affairs. I will be very fair about it. I will be very focused about it, so that the Aboriginal communities in South Australia can rely on me to be their spokesperson and hopefully their champion.

There are many issues that are going nowhere. I have a song at home by a calypso singer. It is called *Dance of the Politician*. It is one step forward, two steps back, and then sidetrack. We cannot do that with Aboriginal affairs. Even former premier Rann said to me one day, 'Aboriginal affairs always seems to be one step forward and three steps back.' We cannot do that. We have to

move forward. We cannot keep spending. I think the global budget is \$200 million a year on 3,000 people in the APY lands and we still have not really improved the conditions up there.

We need to make sure that the decisions we are putting in place, the legislation we are putting in place is effective. Just as the DPP said about the bikie legislation, it does not have to be tough, it does not have to be strong (and that is the word I have used) legislation, it has to be effective legislation. We need to make sure that we discuss and liaise with the Aboriginal communities to put effective legislation in place so that they are going to move forward.

The Prime Minister made some announcements yesterday on Closing the Gap. It is a very large gap. We have reduced it just in a very small way, but as Winston Churchill said in his short and best speech, 'Never give up, never give up, never give up.' That is what we can never do in South Australia; we can never ever give up on giving South Australians—whether they are Anangu, whether they are pirinpa, so whether they are black or white—the very best of what this great state can offer.

I just hope that this government does not offer us the bland outcomes that we have seen in this bland speech, which, unfortunately, had to be read by the Governor on behalf of this government. We need better leadership; we look for better leadership. I do not see it, unfortunately. I just see the same old, same old, and I look forward to seeing the opposition hold this government to account, to make sure that they are responsible for their actions, because with power comes responsibility and at the moment I just see an irresponsible government. They did not expect to win the last election and I guarantee I will be doing everything I possibly can to make sure they do not win the next one.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:32):** I also take the opportunity to wish the Governor well for his extended two-year term and for his efforts on behalf of the people of South Australia. I think Kevin Scarce and his wife, Liz, both do a good job in that office, ably assisted by their staff. When the time comes for him to step down, his replacement will have to be admirably suited to the position, as it appears that Kevin (I should say His Excellency) has fallen into it.

There are a number of issues that I want to touch on. Firstly, I found it a somewhat disappointing speech. Others have different views on it. I found it, as I think the member for Morphett said, fairly disappointing in its content and fairly blandly delivered, but that is the way of the world. I am not so sure that the government will get to achieve what it is talking about and I guess there is no greater evidence of that than what is taking place in South Australia now with the outlaw motorbike gangs and the fact that they seem to be perpetually at war and that we are having shootings and deaths in the streets.

I wonder whether, at the end of the day, the police are not going to be found a little bit wanting on this, unfortunately. We can put all the legislation in the world into place—and the opposition has supported the government on most of this legislation and tried to firm it up, make it better and produce amendments—but, quite frankly, when shootings take place, people die and bikies such as Mr Focarelli are put in protective custody, I seriously wonder where it is all going to end.

I was talking to some police officers last week, and I suggested to them that they should go to these bikies and tell them that the weapons they are using are not big enough, because clearly they are not getting their intended targets. It is a dreadful thing to say I suppose, but the reality is that these things go on—Cafe Paesano and this poor lad who was shot at Dry Creek. Vince Focarelli has been shot a number of times now and is still surviving. One police officer did say that he thought that when he retired he might go as a consultant and teach them to shoot straight. I know we jest about it, but it is an extremely serious matter.

It is an extremely serious matter that Vince Focarelli I suspect is now in G Division and will probably be there for some time. Having visited G Division a couple of times in my role as a parliamentarian, I can tell you that they will not get him in there.

**Mr Sibbons:** For how long?

**Mr PENGILLY:** Brief visits, Sibbo. They will not get him in there, but ultimately he will come out or go into mainstream prison or whatever, and his future is not bright. We have to stop this sort of thing. The former premier puffed and blew and made lots of noise about knocking down bikie fortresses, but from my observations they are all still standing there pretty well and still operating fairly successfully, so in that respect it has been a dismal failure.

I also read in the press, even this morning, of what is taking place in Sydney. It is a disease. These mongrels of bikies peddle drugs and violence and do not care who is in the way. The poor old bystander can end up being the victim. They are a blight on society. I sometimes wonder whether they should all be invited to an oval somewhere, and the last one left standing goes to prison. If that is the way they want to behave, they should take it out on each other in a big group and let the rest of us get on with our lives.

Mr Speaker, the car industry in South Australia has long been a critical industry—Mr Deputy Speaker, I beg your pardon: the speakers change quite regularly up there and I did not take a lot of notice of you. We had the former transport minister, who was unfortunately sacked some time ago, there yesterday. The car industry has come in for a lot of discussion in the last week or two. It is a critical industry to South Australia and to Australia. I just wonder how much longer governments of all persuasions can go on putting in place bail-out packages to keep the car industry running.

I know that my federal colleague, the member for Mayo (Jamie Briggs), has had quite a bit to say about the car industry and his thoughts on the matter. I get people in the rural or tourism sectors or other industries coming up to me and saying, 'Look, the government of the day is continuing to bail out the car industry. We are about as efficient as we can be in our industries, yet we see no bail out,' so it leaves the rest of the community extremely ill at ease while this goes on.

Anyone who had the opportunity to watch *Foreign Correspondent* on Tuesday night about the car industry, the Audi industry in Bavaria which I think employs 22,000 workers—they are going gangbusters. It was an extremely interesting program. If you did not see it, it is worth going back and having a look at it. It is worth noting, particularly the way Europe is going, how Germany (and in particular Bavaria) is still powering ahead.

We are still to have a lot of pain and agony yet in the car industry. There is no question that they produce good products. For the record, along with many other members in this place I drive a Commodore, and it is quite a good car. I would have to say that it is not really suitable for my electorate: I am continually hitting kangaroos, wallabies or some other form of stock, and it is too low, and I had to get a new exhaust the other day. The point I make is that, while members of parliament are required to have Australian-produced vehicles and Holdens in South Australia, there are far more suitable vehicles around, so it is an issue and something we will have to look at.

I was interested that in the Governor's speech he talked about health plans in conjunction with local councils in South Australia. I am not sure where this is going to run, but let me say that local government in South Australia in most cases has little money. They are not likely to have any more money. I am very much of the view that across the nation—whether it be federal, local or state—we have to start trimming budgets, and CPI increases only, and that applies to local government at the grassroots. I hope that they take note of that.

Quite frankly, the people of South Australia, the ordinary Joe and Josephine Blow in the street or out in the country, are struggling like they have never struggled before. I have a constant stream of people coming through my office who cannot pay their power bills, they cannot pay their water bills, gas bills or registration bills. The list goes on. It is simply not good enough that charges continue to go through the roof on such things as gas, water and electricity, and the poor average person of a family with two or three kids or pensioners are absolutely struggling to be able to live satisfactorily and, in many cases, this is after they have spent their life in the workforce. If they are on the aged pension, they really have no disposable income whatsoever.

I say to the government that if they are putting in place health plans with councils, who is going to pay? Where is the money going to come from? Are you expecting the local government sector to pick up on this and even rate people higher to pay for it? Are you providing the money? I will be interested to see the details.

That then translates also very much in my electorate to public transport. Public transport is an enormous issue—or more to the point, the lack of it. In the lead-up to the last election, the government promised some money to put in some public transport in the Victor Harbor and south coast area. We have the LinkSA bus service which seems to be working particularly well.

I say to the Minister for Transport Services: get over the catfight in the office. There is an enormous catfight going on in that office between the minister, the chief of staff and, I understand, poor Nicole Cornes. I understand that Nicole Cornes is on the point of a nervous breakdown. It is out in the open. It is an absolute drama. Nicole is a very pleasant person, and I feel very sorry for her; it is circulating out there now that it is taking place—a catfight at the O.K. Corral. I hope that

Nicole comes out at the end in a satisfactory condition because she deserves better. She is a failed candidate, but I have always found her to be very pleasant. For a minister to have a catfight going on between her, the chief of staff and one of her other staffers is not good enough. Public transport is a—

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. How on earth is it appropriate for the member to describe activities going on in a ministerial office as a 'catfight'? How on earth is that appropriate?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think the point of order is around relevance. I ask that the member for Finniss perhaps continue his speech.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The fact of the matter is that I was told it was a catfight by a member of the Labor Party. Sorry, I will keep going. I have had my two bob's worth on that. Can I also talk about earlier this week the payout to Marathon Resources over the Arkaroola debacle. This would have to rate as one of the sorriest states of affairs in South Australia's history, what was done to Marathon. I am actually fed up to the back teeth with the way Marathon have been accused of this, that and everything else including waste disposal a couple of years ago.

The reality is that a contractor who was working for Marathon did that. That contractor put a few bags of material under the ground; there was not very much. It has been blown out of all proportion to what it really is. They went ahead and they were issued with another exploration licence and the government stuffed it up. The former premier Mike Rann had to go out and make a big man of himself and announce that Arkaroola was going to be declared a sanctuary and part of the world heritage area and out of that he was hoping to get a job with David Suzuki. So, we have a good South Australian company that was shafted. Mark my words: ultimately, when we are all long gone and the world's resources are running low, I have no doubt that they will get uranium out of Arkaroola, whatever they say at the moment.

I think it is a sad moment. I am glad that there has been an agreement that Marathon will get \$5 million. My personal view is that it should have been paid a lot more. I am not aware of the negotiations that took place or anything else, but I thought Marathon was given short shrift and its directors have my sympathy. It is a good company and I hope it goes on to greater things. I thought the way they went about all of that was very cynical.

Earlier I mentioned the police issue, and currently that issue around the state, particularly in my electorate, is causing a bit of angst at a local level on both sides of the electorate. I have stations where other officers urgently need placing, such as Yankalilla and on Kangaroo Island. The officers who are in place there are doing extraordinarily long hours. The situation on the island has been resolved to some extent but there has not been much resolution at Yankalilla.

An issue taking place at the moment is the activity of one officer in the Fleurieu who is making life hell for farmers and other people. I am having some communication with others at the moment about this to see if we can expedite some sort of common sense. As has been pointed out in this place, this is the Year of the Farmer. There is no greater need in this nation than to produce food for us and for the world and to avoid starvation overseas, and we have some of the most efficient and wonderful farmers in the world in Australia and, more particularly, in South Australia.

Farmers have to move between properties; they have to move their machinery between properties; they have to go up and down the road between blocks and they carry firearms with them for vermin control, and they are getting clobbered on these matters, which I do not think is at all fair. I think this needs putting on the record in the house for the benefit of those opposite. The Governor's speech talked about law and order. Farmers have to drive down the road with a tractor and a roll of hay on the back or with a roll of hay on the ute and, by its very nature, pieces blow off. In the Mount Compass area farmers have been booked for having hay blow off rolls that they are transporting. It is absolutely ridiculous.

In high rainfall country it is also ridiculous when they are singled out (and this has happened in my electorate) because their numberplates are unreadable because they are driving down dirt roads with mud going everywhere, and they come out onto the road and they have been pulled up and booked for having an obscured numberplate. I find that totally ridiculous and a lack of common sense.

People have also allegedly been taken to task by police officers for having a firearm in their ute when they are driving around. I have yet to find out whether or not they have been booked but I

will find out. As I said earlier, if you are driving around and practising good property management and you have foxes or rabbits on your property, or you have a permit to shoot kangaroos, wallabies or possums, or you find stock down that cannot recover and you have to put out of its misery, you need to carry a weapon around in your vehicle. You just have to do it. It is like carrying a broom around on the back of your vehicle for cleaning out troughs: you carry a rifle around in the front. I think it is time some common sense came back into it.

Why I raise that issue is that it is my belief that what is taking place is that there are orders to blatantly raise revenue for the government through SAPOL and for officers to have targets. They will deny it but I believe they have targets. Similarly, with speed cameras, they are supposed to save lives but they put them in the most obscure places. They are now trying to reduce speed limits on country roads. One of my councils (Yankalilla council) has been asked to have a trial period of reducing speed on some roads to 80 km/h. It is just madness.

People actually have to get from A to B. If they think they want to run around and make fools of themselves like that, well, that is one thing, but all I want is a return to common sense in South Australia. Many of the police officers who live in our country towns live, work and play in the community. They are an integral part of the community and they do a great job, but every now and then we have someone who wants to drive around to create chaos, and it makes life difficult for the rest of the officers in that area.

There are a couple of issues I would like to refer to in relation to that part of the electorate contained on Kangaroo Island; one is the surf event that took place last year. Let me leave this house in no doubt whatsoever: we need to have that surf event continue. It needs to be as successful as it was last year, but the bugs need to be ironed out.

I have no problem with finances being brought under tighter control or questions being asked about why it ended up with this mess regarding bills not been paid, which has been attended to by the government through SATC. We need to put in place a better structure for that, and there is no argument from me whatsoever. It rests on the government's shoulders that they did not put in place the correct controls; but I will not tolerate this event being talked down.

It was a great event. It was a significant achievement that it was put on over on the island. It attracted around 4,000 people. It gave islanders an opportunity to listen to music, which they never get the opportunity to do, particularly the young people. It was terrifically good for business despite the hiccups in payment, which are now being attended to; a lot of others have been paid, I would say. We need it again.

It was good for the Fleurieu Peninsula. It took a lot of people down through the Fleurieu. A lot of people stopped at Yankalilla and Normanville. Some people stayed overnight at locations before they went over on the ferry. It was wonderfully good for business. The ferry company has about 100 employees up through the Fleurieu and into the metropolitan area who work on the vessels, in the offices, and tie up the boat. It added life to the economy and it did the same on the other side of the water.

I urge the government, when they consider their budget, to continue with that pro surf event. I say to those who want to knock it: for sure, if you want to question the financial accountability, that is one thing. I have no great problem with that, because it was very poorly handled; however, do not knock the event.

Tourism is hard enough work now. It is a people industry. It is an industry that goes by word of mouth. So, Mr Deputy Speaker, if you get, people running around knocking the event it spreads, and it is bad news. It may well happen up in Gawler with something; I do not know, but tourism is word of mouth. It is quite simply at the moment cheaper, or as cheap, or around the same sort of money, to jump on a plane and fly to Bali as it is to go to many of our destinations in South Australia to enjoy yourself.

Our jobs are local jobs. We need those local jobs across the state and in my electorate. In my electorate, along with primary industry, tourism is an enormous stimulator of economic activity. The jobs down through the South Coast, through Yankalilla, Normanville, and right through that area, are reliant on tourism. They are growth industries, which brings me—I will be very careful about what I say here because we have a motion in the house—to the fact that we need to do something about the management of fur seals. This issue will come up in a week or fortnight's time, and I have an answer to it, but it will probably not be popular.

It is really important that we get on top of what is going on in relation to bad vibes in tourism and encourage South Australians to stay local, to take their holidays in South Australia wherever possible, to go to one of the great spots on the West Coast, in the Flinders, the Barossa, Fleurieu, or Kangaroo Island, the South-East, the Murraylands, wherever—it does not matter much where.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**Mr PENGILLY:** I think most of Adelaide goes to Yorke Peninsula. It is an enormous industry that creates thousands of jobs, and it is a word of mouth industry that needs support and encouragement, and it does not need knockers for anything.

I thoroughly enjoy the Clipsal. I freely admit to being a petrolhead. I love the Clipsal and I look forward to it in a couple of weeks, actually. It is wonderful for the state. It was a good Liberal initiative as I recall along with the Tour Down Under. The Governor in his speech talked about investment in South Australia and that is one of the good ones.

Sellicks Beach is also in my electorate, and in the speeches this week much has been said about the Barossa plan and the McLaren Vale plan as far as planning goes. Let me tell you that I have circulated amongst some members a motion that I have received from the Sellicks Area Residents Association. They have grave concerns about some aspects of that McLaren Vale plan and I hope that the government picks up and takes note of their concerns. They are writing to the minister.

These outer suburban areas are filling up with people rapidly and, as much as we value and need to save farmland in some areas, they have concerns that in times to come they will not be able to build on land that they have held for a long time, and likewise in the Barossa, I understand, but the member for Schubert can talk about that.

I would just like to talk about the government's announcements last year about the formation of a Kangaroo Island Futures Authority. I am not completely sold on this by a long shot. It is fine to have ideas and I think the former premier puffed and blew again and came up with this wonderful idea, but if all the plans in the world and all the meetings in the world and all the people given jobs in the world on these instrumentalities do not translate into funding for projects, you are wasting your time having them, quite frankly.

If we are going to spend a couple of millions of dollars on administration and creating positions and putting more bureaucrats in place, it is a total waste of time. I have expressed my thoughts on the formation of KIFA. I think the government has missed an ideal opportunity to get people on there such as leading businessmen or leading farmers who actually know something about where they are going. I do not knock those who have been put on it, but I think they could have done a lot better.

I understand the local press this week, which came out yesterday on Kangaroo Island, has said that minister Rau is consulting with business leaders next week. I rang a couple of the leading farmers on the island this morning just to ask whether they had been invited. They knew nothing about it, so heaven knows who minister Rau is meeting with, but what will happen is that we will get a heap of puff and blow once again and heaven knows what the press on the island will write about it. Unless this thing works properly, unless they clearly identify projects and unless they are funded, it is a waste of time. It is not something that I think we need to waste money on unless genuine outcomes are going to come out of it.

I return again to the CPI and the over and above CPI increases that are impacting on residents in my electorate and, indeed, on residents of other members' electorates, whether they be Labor or Liberal or Independent or whatever. I am having a growing stream of people come through my office who cannot cope with where things are going. They simply cannot cope, and I say that it is not good enough.

I do not know about members opposite but I can assure you that, in my area in my electorate, there are many, many people who have very little money. You can talk about Victor Harbor, and the press talk it up as being a rich man's paradise, but there are many people in Victor Harbor on very limited incomes, and that is so right through Port Elliott, Middleton, Yankalilla, Normanville and across on the island. In fact, the island is one of the lowest socioeconomic places in the state.

Let me use Victor Harbor as an example. There are significant numbers of retirees down there. Some of these retirees are self-funded retirees who suffered through the global financial



crisis and had their incomes trimmed back, but by and large they have survived, and then you have those on the government pension. Let me say that those on the government pension are at the lowest end of having any money available for too much at all.

It is a sad indictment of where we have gone in Australia, where we have super wealthy people, particularly in the Eastern States and in Sydney and Melbourne, but we have people who have worked all their lives, whether it be at Holden or Mitsubishi or in manufacturing—whatever they have done, it does not matter. Simply, a lot of them worked through without having superannuation and brought up families for the benefit of this state, and they are now on the aged pension and simply cannot make ends meet. I think it is disgraceful and absolutely outrageous, and I do not know where it is going to finish up.

It is a sad indictment and I think this government and future governments, both in this state and across the nation, have to come to grips with this. If we did not have volunteers in this state—and volunteers were talked about, I think, by the member for Morphett earlier—taking up so much of the slack and picking up on what is required, we would be in an even worse mess than we are now. I will conclude my remarks. I thank the house for the opportunity and I thank members for listening to me, and I will listen to other members with interest.

**The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (12:01):** Mr Deputy Speaker, I stand before you as the inaugural Minister for Transport Services.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** And a wonderful inaugural minister you are.

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. A compliment is always welcome. I would like to congratulate Premier Weatherill for creating this new ministry, the ministry of transport services. I am very proud to be the inaugural minister. This new ministry reflects the Premier's own focus on serving the people we are elected to represent, and I note that my department and my staff are a crucial part of that team.

This Weatherill Labor government is taking unprecedented steps towards transforming Adelaide's public transport network into the best in the nation. Just four years ago Labor made the largest ever investment by a South Australian state government in this city's public transport. We committed \$2 billion to a decade-long program to modernise and revitalise our train, bus and tram networks.

What began as a state-based program was subsequently uniquely recognised for its vision and vibrancy by the federal government. With this recognition came federal investment in our system, worth in excess of half a billion dollars. We are steadily transforming the network into a vibrant state-of-the-art system providing faster, more frequent, greener and more efficient services for train, tram and bus customers, and a safer public transport environment for us all.

I know that in time we will indeed boast the best public transport system in Australia, one renowned for the connectivity of its buses, trains and electrified rail. Electrification is one of the most complex transport projects ever undertaken by the South Australian government. It will deliver a more modern and efficient network, along with environmental benefits, such as reduced noise, vibration and local air pollution.

The new electric train services will open up the opportunity for increased housing along public transport corridors. This government understands and values the ideas of growth and sustainability. We do not seek to create ghettos of wealth or poverty, but rather to connect and further integrate our already diverse society. By bringing increased public transport closer to new housing, we open up our towns and cities in more ways than one.

Our multibillion dollar investment stretches out over more than 200 kilometres, from Blackwood to Birkenhead and from Seaford to Gawler. This Weatherill government will soon introduce 66 new railcars specifically designed and purpose built for our fully upgraded and electrified metropolitan rail network.

The A-City will be the first railcar in Australia to use an advanced best practice crash protection system now in use in Europe. It is a wide-body train, which gives passengers more room. To be delivered as 22 three-car trains, the A-City trains will seat around 240 passengers, with standing room for another 300.

The 66 new railcars will be complemented by the state government's ongoing program to fully refurbish 70 vehicles within the existing fleet, converting 54 to electric propulsion. These railcars will be kept at the brand-new multimillion dollar Dry Creek railcar depot, which was

completed earlier this year. Electric services will commence from 2013, and all existing converted railcars will be electric by 2016. So, Adelaide will, within three years, be home to Australia's newest electrified rail network, serviced by the nation's most modern and safest electric train fleet.

Understandably, South Australians want to know what is being done to improve public transport in Adelaide right now. The future is exciting, but so are our current achievements. We have more buses on our roads than we have ever had before; we have effectively doubled the size of our tram fleet; and we are well advanced on an ambitious program to first rebuild and then electrify our rail lines and rail fleet, as I said before.

Late last year, the new contracts for the provision of bus services across the city were activated. These contracts were signed in June 2011 and were part of a very rigorous competitive tendering process. The intention is to ensure that these new contracts are providing—and will continue to provide—a greater level of bus service across the city, importantly, at a much better price for taxpayers. It is worth noting that the legacy of the Liberal Party's privatisation of the bus services in the late 1990s has been a difficult burden to carry.

As minister, I acknowledge, and have always done so, that the issues resulting from new contracts have been disruptive to public services. While I think that all users acknowledge that any mass transit system cannot meet everyone's needs, they also expect that the majority of expectations should be met. The issues which emerged during this service changeover period have been given considerable media attention. Far from decrying this attention, I think it is understandable that the fourth estate examine one of our most significant services to the people of South Australia.

We as a government do not shy away from difficult issues. I acknowledge that there has been some disappointment and dissatisfaction, so my attention to these matters during the first reporting period has been unwavering. I have pursued a determined campaign to ensure these contractors meet the justifiably high standards the public expects of them. As a government, we demand the best possible outcomes for every South Australian. Standards are set and standards must be met. We cannot shy away from potentially inadequate outcomes, nor do we intend to.

Returning to approaching change for the better, additional improvements to public transport will flow in 2012, through the introduction of a brand-new smartcard ticketing system on all our Adelaide metro buses, trains and trams. The arrival of the aptly-named Metrocard will provide customers with a range of new options, speeding up boarding and facilitating the provision of real-time passenger information across the network. In London, it is the Oyster card; in Paris, it is the Navigo; in Hong Kong, it is the Octopus card; and in Adelaide, it is the Metrocard, perhaps because our great fishy export, tuna, did not lend itself well to the appellation of a transport pass, which would make it 'Tuna card'. Along with continued investigation opportunity to provide—

*Mrs Vlahos interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** Tuna card? Well, it might have been called 'Tuna card' but, as it so happens, it's not—greater bus priority as part of plans to revitalise the City of Adelaide, it will be a crucial part of the state government's ongoing commitment to improving on-time running. The continued flow of even more buses and our work to develop expanded capacity at our most popular park-and-ride facilities along the O-Bahn busway at Klemzig and Paradise is of particular importance to those living in the north-western suburbs of our city.

Next month we will complete the second stage of our total rebuild of more than 40 kilometres of the Gawler railway line and build on preliminary work to electrify it. I take this opportunity to thank the Deputy Speaker and member for Light, Mr Tony Piccolo, for his unflagging determination to see these changes through. Mr Piccolo uses the line on an almost daily basis, and his suggestions and constructive criticism have been invaluable in this process.

The state government is introducing extra Sunday services to the Glenelg tram timetable for weekend commuters, in time for Adelaide's busy festival months. The tram's new sectors have also been very popular, which is interesting when considered in the retrospective light of the opposition's furious and vehement campaigning against these developments, with the notable exception of the member for Morphett, who has always been very pro-tram.

Later this year the Weatherill government will take delivery of another two brand-new trams, bringing the state's tram collection to being even larger than it was previously. The public transport spend comprises—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** It is double, and that can only be a good thing because double is more than we had before. The public transport spend comprises one of the biggest departmental budgets in this state, but investing in infrastructure must be reflected in an equal investment in end-user satisfaction; and I am proud to be able to represent these people to the best of my ability. I have noticed with some surprise that some members of the opposition have referred to this role in derogatory and patronising language, which in my opinion is a contemptuous and self-annihilating approach to the commuters of this state.

When the role of transport services is belittled every commuter in this state is belittled, and I believe that we owe people the best service possible, not curt dismissal. The \$2 billion investment is a decade-long investment program, and I and this government should be proud to see this happening, and indeed we are. My message to the people of South Australia who rely on us for public transport is clear: I will do everything I can to deliver the system of tomorrow, but in doing so never take my eye off the reality and requirements of today.

Why shouldn't we strive to be home to the best public transport network in the country? Indeed, why shouldn't we pursue the iconic status and networks in Europe and American cities? Yesterday I think I heard the Liberal opposition leader dismissing vision with disdain, but why shouldn't we harness our vision for practical outcomes? Why shouldn't we strive to give our very all to the people of this state? If no-one had ideas and foresight and passion then our state would grind to a halt. There is no reason why it cannot be done, but a commitment from me as minister and this government will ensure that it can be.

#### POINT OF ORDER RULING

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (12:11):** Before I call the next speaker, who will be the member for Norwood, I would just like to report on a matter which arose in the chamber yesterday when the member for Unley made a comment which the member for West Torrens and the minister took offence to. I have looked at the transcript provided by Hansard and I must confess that it is less than clear as to what transpired, so I will not take any further action on that matter. However, just to reinforce my concern, not so much about the original comment but the explanation, in future should I find an explanation which is dishonest or less than truthful, that will be punishable. The member for Norwood.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (12:12):** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is with great pleasure that I rise to support this motion and sincerely thank His Excellency the Governor for his opening of the Second Session of the Fifty-Second Parliament of South Australia. I am a strong supporter of a non-political head of state, and I pay tribute to His Excellency the Governor, the Lieutenant-Governor, their families and their entire office in supporting both the legislative process in our parliament and, more broadly, the people of South Australia. I think they do an excellent job, and I am very pleased that he has been appointed for a further two-year term.

Historically, the Governor's speech to open a session of parliament outlines for the people of South Australia what the legislative agenda for the government will be for the coming session. This is a long-held tradition, but, of course, anybody who was there on the day, or anybody who has had an opportunity to read the Governor's speech, will see that there has been quite a marked break in tradition with regard to that speech. In fact, the Premier went on radio that morning to actually tell the people of South Australia that there would be surprises in this speech.

It begs the question: why didn't the Governor outline the legislative agenda for the government over the coming session? Well, I would put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that is because the government has a very, very flimsy legislative agenda for this coming session. In fact, this is something that has occurred since I was elected to parliament. In my first year in this place the government sat for only 31 days. Last year, and indeed this year, it is up to just over 50 days, but this to me demonstrates quite clearly that this government does not have a vision and does not have a legislative agenda. It is quite often abrogating its responsibilities to the federal government. I do not think that this is good for the people of South Australia, and I do not think that this is good for the parliament. So, what did the Governor talk about? He did not talk about the legislative agenda so what did he talk about in this speech which was, of course, prepared for him by the government?

He talked about the government's vision. It is probably logical to assume that, after a government has been in power for 10 years, it would not be a government which talks about what is going to happen in another 10 years; it could actually rely on some achievements and talk about how it is going to build on those achievements. Of course, it has been a very poorly performing government over 10 years and so the whole substance of the Governor's speech was really about what is going to happen in the future.

The Premier came into this place yesterday and not only said that this was a vision statement but that it was going to be very difficult to achieve a lot of the things which were outlined and some of these things were not going to be able to occur for another 10 years. The reader of this document is left wondering, 'What is this government going to do?' A very flimsy legislative agenda and a lot of things pushed way into the never-never.

Let us look at some of the detail of what was presented. One of the first things that was outlined by the Governor in his speech (one of the few references to new legislation) was that the government would introduce new legislation to replace the Aboriginal Heritage Act. This is something the government has been dealing with since 2009; this is certainly not a new announcement. You can go onto the website at any point in time and see not the current minister but the minister before, the Hon. Grace Portolesi, who was the previous minister for Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation.

As I said, one of the first things that this government outlined in its broad vision was really an announcement from 2009. This government has been revising the Aboriginal Heritage Act since 2009. This is not a new announcement: this is a very old announcement. It really points to the incompetence of the government when dealing with matters related to Indigenous affairs in this state. Not only has the government been revising the Aboriginal Heritage Act since 2009 but it has been revising the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act since 2009.

This is something that I have raised many times in the parliament. The government often puts it in its highlights list, when the minister presents the highlights of what they have achieved throughout the year. Last year, the former minister said that it was a highlight that they were continuing with the ongoing consultation for these acts. Under an FOI it was revealed that there had been no such attempt for over 18 months.

I have proven with the very first item mentioned in this vision that this is just a re-announcement, and a very poor one, that really highlights that this government has not been doing its work. The issues related to Indigenous affairs are complex. The opposition fully understands and appreciates that. The guts issue is that we want a government that does not say, 'This is hard so we are not going to do it.' We want to work with the government in these areas in a bipartisan way to advance the cause of Indigenous South Australians and to close the ever-widening gap which exists. I look forward to working with the new Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. Paul Caica) on this matter.

The second great revelation that is contained in the Governor's speech is the revelation of manufacturing. It has taken a while for this government to understand the importance of the manufacturing sector. Do not forget that this is the government that closed down the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing, which was an incredibly important organisation and instrument of government. It was, of course, established by the former Liberal government. It was a world-class facility that helped our manufacturing sector in South Australia make a transition during that period of globalisation.

Well, the Labor government came to power, that is fine, 'We are going to close that down.' This is a Premier who I do not think has very strong credentials in the manufacturing sector. I myself came out of the manufacturing sector. As a previous member of the Manufacturing Industry Advisory Board under both Labor government and Liberal governments, I feel very strongly that this is a very important sector.

It is great that after 10 years in power we get a paragraph about the importance of the manufacturing sector in South Australia, but of course there is no detail. The government will point to the fact that they have renamed the department and included in its very longwinded title one word which says manufacturing. But changing a title does not change the government's attitude towards manufacturing. We need to see something far more significant.

When pressed on this issue, the Premier says, 'Well, we are going to start an advanced manufacturing council here in South Australia,' but of course there is no detail whatsoever and begs the question: what is going to happen with the Manufacturing Consultative Committee? Is that

going to go? As always with this government, is it just changing the name of something, making a re-announcement but actually doing nothing to assist the underlying importance of this sector?

While I am talking about manufacturing, I would like to make a comment on the situation that exists at the moment in regard to Holden's because the Premier again on radio this morning wanted to go on and verbal the Liberal opposition, verbal me, and say that we need to work in a bipartisan way. I want to put on the record of this parliament that for more than a month we have been calling for a briefing from the government in regard to the situation at Holden's.

I want to make very clear that the Liberal opposition is 100 per cent committed to the manufacturing sector, 100 per cent committed to the automotive sector, and that we want to see a strong, vibrant and sustainable sector here in South Australia. I personally have a long association with Holden's; in fact, my father was an apprentice at Holden's and completed his trade there. I grew up in the Port, and I understand the importance of the automotive sector here in South Australia.

Let's make no mistake about this. We cannot just abrogate our responsibilities as the opposition to the government and say, 'Yes, write out a blank cheque, we will give you carte blanche with that.' I think it is completely reasonable that, on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia, we asked that the Industry Development Committee, a subset of the Economic and Finance Committee, be formed to look at assisting this important sector in a bipartisan way.

Exactly what the Premier is calling for we would support, but it is just playing politics with the important role that Holden's plays in South Australia by coming out and saying we are not supporting it. Of course we are supporting it, but let us see the details. The Premier is asking taxpayers to put their funds in without knowing what they are going to get in return, and that just does not cut it.

I was very pleased to see, though, that the importance of the defence sector was highlighted. There is often argy-bargy between government and opposition in a lot of areas in the parliament, but the importance of the defence sector is 100 per cent agreed on by both sides of this parliament. I look forward to working with the Treasurer, who is also the Minister for Defence Industries in South Australia, to support this very important sector here in South Australia.

The defence sector has huge number of people directly employed in it and, whilst the Premier wants to talk about the importance of establishing—'establishing', he said—or creating an advanced manufacturing sector here in South Australia, I would invite the Premier perhaps to take a look at the defence sector because it has been operating in a very advanced manufacturing orientation for many decades in this state, and I hope that he gets out to have a look at it.

I just raise the issue, though, of ongoing funding for the Defence Teaming Centre, which was established in the mid-1990s and has enjoyed strong bipartisan support since its establishment. In fact, the Minister for Defence Industries has spoken in this parliament on many occasions—both the former defence industries minister, Hon. Kevin Foley, and the current defence industries minister, the Hon. Jack Snelling—on the importance of the Defence Teaming Centre in supporting our industries to obtain important work employing South Australians. So, it begs the question: why has this government not come out and said that there will be ongoing funding for the Defence Teaming Centre beyond 30 June this year?

We are getting very close to the end of this financial year and we still have no commitment whatsoever from the government in this important area. I call upon the government to make its intentions clear about ongoing support for the Defence Teaming Centre, both financial and otherwise, and continue to support this very important component of our defence industry in South Australia.

I will highlight very briefly an issue raised by the Governor about looking at improving liveable neighbourhoods. I was excited to read that the government will be looking at local solutions, such as better walking and cycling paths. This is something which is very dear to me, living in the great electorate of Norwood. Norwood is very close to the city and we would like to see improved cycling infrastructure to get commuter traffic into the city.

The proposal that I have been pushing, since being elected, is the concept of non-arterial road cycling routes. I think it is great that the government wants to grab a great big bucket of white paint and whack a line down Payneham Road, Magill Road, The Parade and Kensington Road, but in reality that is not an effective solution. Some very experienced commuter cyclists can use that but the vast majority of people do not want to be on the major arterial roads during key times when

traffic is very heavy. In fact, motorists do not want to see cyclists on the major arterial roads, and there is an obvious natural friction between these two groups.

The obvious solution is to look at the feasibility of using the non-arterial roads, which run between the arterial roads, as a sort of bi-modal bicycle boulevard to get people, in a safe and pleasant environment, onto the roads cycling to school and work in the morning. I look forward to holding the government to its promise to create better walking and cycling paths and I hope that some of them can indeed come to Norwood.

Another major area the government highlighted in its broad vision was ways to reduce the burden of living costs on working families. This is, of course, something that you will get no argument on from the opposition. So, it was with much surprise, when I attended my very first Economic and Finance Committee meeting this morning, that the government rejected an inquiry into looking at the concessions which are paid to people in South Australia.

It highlights to me that this document is something that was put out for the press, the opening of parliament and the cameras: 'This is what we are going to do,' but on the very first occasion when the rubber hits the road, in the Economic and Finance Committee this morning, at about a quarter to 10, the government used its numbers to block any inquiry whatsoever into this matter. That shows this government to be the sham that it is.

I have gone through a couple of the disappointments that the government outlined. Let us now turn our attention to what the government did not talk about in its broad vision, because I think that is also very instructive. What is this government no longer highlighting as its key priorities? The first matter I want to raise, being the shadow minister for sustainability and climate change, is the complete omission of reference to sustainability and climate change in this new Premier's vision for South Australia.

We know for a fact that the previous premier was a strong supporter of the environment and a very strong advocate on behalf of climate change and the things that we in South Australia should be doing to make sure that we prepare ourselves for the best. There was not one single mention in the Governor's speech about what the new Premier will be doing. Let us take a little look at what decisions Premier Weatherill has made since coming to power. First, the whole department of sustainability and climate change is gone. It used to be something that sat within DPC, so it had the imprimatur of the premier. Now it is completely and utterly gone.

Secondly, the green energy grants program that was announced by the former premier was axed within weeks of the new Premier coming to power. The climate change and greenhouse gas emissions act was not only due to be put out for consultation but was to be revised by November last year, and this is a legislative requirement of this act. That has completely failed; we have not heard a whisper, we do not even know what department is going to be responsible for the updating. The garden products rebate, which drove efficiency in terms of water use in our home gardens—axed.

We also see that the government has really been dragging the chain on the Tonsley Park redevelopment. Members should not forget what this was heralded to be at the outset. Mitsubishi left that site in 2009, and the government stepped in and said it was going to spend \$32 million of taxpayer funds to purchase the site, because it wanted to create a cluster, a green hub that was going to promote sustainable industries in South Australia. And you know what? The Liberal opposition supported that; we wanted to see that occur.

Fast forward to three years down the track; what do we have? I will tell you what we have: not much. The draft master plan that has been released is a shadow of its former self. The previous minister in this area, the Hon. Kevin Foley, said that he did not want this large parcel of important industrial land turned over to a bulky goods area with stores like Harvey Norman, Captain Snooze and others on this site; he wanted to see it as something that would be an engine room for South Australia to develop capability in sustainable industries.

Let us have a look at the master plan. About one-third of the site is actually turned over to residential housing; we are seeing high-density—up to four and five-storey—residential housing going onto about one-third of this site. What a disappointment. About a third of it is being turned over to commercial and retail outlets—again, this is a huge disappointment—and with the remaining third we have the TAFE redevelopment, of course. As members can see, there will be very little space down there to achieve the broad vision this government set, supported by the opposition, only a few years ago when it used taxpayer funds to purchase that \$32 million Tonsley Park site.

The redevelopment down there has been a huge disappointment, and part of the reason for that disappointment is that we have three ministers all dealing with the one project. We have minister Kenyon, minister Conlon and minister Koutsantonis all working on this project. It is quite clear that the one who has the most say on this is minister Conlon, because most of the project is now being handled by the LMC. Minister Kenyon has dipped his oar in the water with his recent announcement regarding the TAFE down there, and we are yet to hear from minister Koutsantonis about whether he really does support sustainable industries in South Australia, whether he is actually going to do some work, get his department off its backside and do something about this important sector in South Australia.

While I am talking about minister Kenyon I would not mind highlighting the appalling state of South Australian exports, which also falls under his remit. In fact, the government's State Strategic Plan set a goal to achieve \$25 billion worth of exports by the year 2013. I have consulted my calendar this morning and 2013 is next year, and the goal was to achieve \$25 billion worth of exports. This was probably a reasonably achievable goal when it was actually set, but what has happened since then? This government has been in complete and utter disarray in terms of exports in South Australia. It was revealed earlier in the year, after information that we provided to the media, that a quarter of all of our overseas offices remain unmanned at the moment. It is complete and utter disarray.

When this government came to power, South Australia had approximately 7.5 to 7.6 per cent of the national exports. Today, we are heading down towards 4 per cent. So, we have fallen well behind. The minister's defence on this is that there is a high appreciating Australian dollar. Actually, it is the same high appreciating Australian dollar used throughout the entire country, so if we look at it on a percentage basis, as I said, it is down from 7.57 to about 4 per cent.

We are not going to have any chance of achieving this government's very own goal of \$25 billion by 2013. The government moved it out to 2014. In the latest revision of the State Strategic Plan, the government moved it out to 2020. This is what the government does: if it cannot achieve the goals that it sets for itself, it just pushes out the completion date. It is not good enough.

Our export industries in South Australia need to be supported. They have been very poorly supported by this government. We have the highest taxation regime in Australia. The government has removed support for CITCSA. It does not have a plan in terms of exports, and our overseas offices are in complete and utter disarray. Again, this was an element which was not even discussed in this vision for South Australia.

Another area the Premier also failed to deal with is small business. I thought it would be almost obvious that anybody who has had anything to do with South Australia over an extended period of time would actually understand the importance of the small business sector in South Australia. I thought it would be incumbent upon our Premier to understand that we have 135,000 small businesses in South Australia providing the vast majority of private sector employment in South Australia. I thought it would be obvious that the Premier would understand the importance of this sector and support it, but when we read the Governor's speech and when we actually look at the Premier's agenda for this next session, there is not one mention.

Let us just have a bit of a look at what this government has done to support the small business sector since it came to power. As I previously mentioned, this was the government which closed the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing. It also closed the Small Business Centre, which was later called the Business Centre, which again was a fantastic instrument of government looking to support and nurture not only businesses through transition but also the start-ups which exist in South Australia each year. It has closed down Small Business Week. It has removed all funding for BECs, an important part of the ongoing support that this government had for the Small Business Centre—gone.

The government has announced that it is going to remove all funding from Innovate SA. In fact, part way through the cycle, it removed funding for key programs supporting the small business sector in terms of investing in infrastructure. It has closed down Playford Capital. Really, it is very difficult to see what the government has done for the small business sector. Of course, it has given us the Australian title in terms of how expensive it is to operate here. Numerous agencies have confirmed that, for three years in a row, we are the most expensive place to do business in Australia.

The government has also put a whole pile of other obstacles and barriers in the way of small business, and the most important among these at the moment is the issue of the government

and the payment of its bills. This government has been absolutely hopeless at paying its bills. It is getting slower and slower and slower. I can only assume that this is deliberate, because, as a taxpayer and as a member of parliament, I know that this is a government that has put a lot of money into Shared Services over a long period of time to improve our interface and our ability to actually pay our bills on time.

I can only assume that the fact that our bills are not being paid promptly and that the lag beyond normal trading times is getting greater and greater is a deliberate attempt by this government to actually use the funds of the business community to offset its own parlous debt problems. Make no mistake about this: this is a problem for business because, if you are holding up payment, you are increasing the overdraft costs for businesses in South Australia and also tying up capital which small businesses need to run and develop their businesses.

The two new public holidays announced by this government are a disaster for small business. I was down in Mount Gambier only last week and speaking to restaurateurs, hotels, aged-care facilities and people who operate petroleum stations and they all said the same thing: 'Why are we going to have an increase in our costs so that the government can get through its deregulation of shop trading hours in Adelaide? That's got nothing to do with us. That's going to put up our costs.' It is completely unacceptable.

I also had meetings with many people in the South-East who are very concerned about the implications of the Work Health and Safety Bill. This bill will cause huge increases in costs for the small business sector and they are yet to be convinced about any merits of this legislation whatsoever. I am sure we will be hearing more and more about this difficult legislation.

So, make no mistake, this is a government which is no friend of the sustainability sector in South Australia, it is no friend of exporters and it is no friend of the small business sector. This is a government which, after 10 years, really has no vision for South Australia. As I have been able to outline to the house today, there is virtually nothing new in here. There are a lot of re-announcements and a lot of spin and a lot of stuff that might look good for the television cameras and journalists but, in reality, what we want in South Australia, unequivocally, is a government which has a legislative agenda, which sits its full complement of days each year and gets on, in a quiet, prudent and efficient way, with running our state and moving us forward.

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (12:42):** I also begin by thanking His Excellency the Governor for his address on Tuesday and congratulate His Excellency on the extension to his appointment.

I rise today to speak about the future of our great state, to look back and reflect on where we were 10 years ago and where we are headed in the decade to come, and to look at the challenges that we face and the decisions that will need to be made to ensure the security and prosperity of all South Australians for the future.

George Bernard Shaw once said, 'We learn from history that we learn nothing from history.' I don't know much about the literary greats, but I think he was onto something there. We can learn a lot by taking a moment to reflect on the past. A considered approach to history can aid us in knowing what pitfalls to avoid and which successes we can build upon. So, what does the last decade have to teach us? If we choose to learn from history, what did South Australia look like prior to Labor winning government in 2002? Here are a few fast facts that may help you paint the picture.

In June 2000, ABS figures showed that unemployment was at 8.2 per cent and had been increasing since 1998. In 2000-01 alone, South Australia lost 11,000 jobs. There was no real investment in public health, with no new hospital beds, no cuts to waiting lists and no relief for emergency departments. In real terms, there were cuts to public education spending and a cut of 13 per cent in 2001 to vocational education, despite warnings from the Reserve Bank of skills shortages in the pipeline.

We had a decaying transport network, with a lack of investment in road, rail and port infrastructure. There was a lack of investment in water security and water infrastructure. There was a major sell-off of public assets to the value of \$7.45 billion, including ETSA, the public bus service, SAGASCO, Adelaide Airport and the Torrens Island power station. The net debt, as of 30 June 2000, was estimated at \$4.2 billion. We had the Liberals' crowning achievement of providing the good people of the south of Adelaide with the world's longest reversible one-way freeway.

*Members interjecting:*



**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SIBBONS:** Let us look forward to 2012 and see where we are today with Labor at the helm. South Australia's employment growth in 2011 was 0.7 per cent or 5,400 additional jobs. Since 2002, employment in South Australia has grown by 128,700. The unemployment rate is 5.4 per cent, despite a very fragile global economy.

There has been an increase in health funding every single year under Labor, with the health budget now 120 per cent higher than it was a decade ago. We have 200 more hospital beds than a decade ago, with 250 more on the way, and reduced waiting times in emergency rooms and for elective surgery.

South Australia has the highest gross state product growth rate in the country in per capita terms, with a 1.5 per cent increase versus a national average of 0.6 per cent. This is 32.4 per cent higher than in 2000. In 2011, the value of South Australian overseas goods exports rose by 29 per cent—the highest growth rate in Australia, at a record high of \$12 billion. Business investment was 41.4 per cent higher in 2011 than in 2000. Private new capital expenditure is at a high level in South Australia, growing by a solid 17 per cent in the year to March 2011. Business investment reached \$10.3 billion in the year to March 2011—a near record high.

Massive investments by Labor in critical infrastructure and transport projects are continuing to provide a boost to the construction sector through investments such as the new RAH, the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, the electrification of the rail network and the South Road superway project. There are currently \$109 billion worth of major developments underway or in the pipeline in South Australia. Net debt for the 2011-12 financial year is estimated at \$4.4 billion and the beginning of construction to duplicate the Southern Expressway will end a decade of embarrassment at having the world's longest reversible one-way freeway.

I do not claim to be an economist, but it seems to me that a decade ago, even after flogging off as many assets as they could, the Liberal government was still carrying around the same level of debt as we are now and they did diddly-squat to show for it. They had diddly-squat. There was no investment in jobs, no investment in health, no investment in infrastructure. Unemployment was up, private investment was down, government investment was virtually non-existent and the cost of living was on the increase.

I am not saying that things are totally rosy in the garden right now. We also have debt, cost of living pressures are real and they are increasing—there is no question of that. However, the debt we are carrying is based on the massive investment this Labor government has delivered to secure jobs and employment, now and for the future—investment in infrastructure, public health and education and securing our essential services for the future.

Crime has also fallen over the past nine years by around 35 per cent. ABS figures released in 2011 show that there were fewer homicides, sexual assaults, robberies, unlawful entries and motor vehicle and other thefts in South Australia compared with previous years. Since Labor was elected in 2002, 17 new police stations have been opened across metropolitan and regional South Australia. Just this year, a \$53.4 million new police academy and the \$3.5 million Yalata police station have been officially opened.

Yet while Labor has made a serious effort towards tackling all kinds of illegal activity, from graffiti to organised crime, often those opposite have preferred to sit on their hands. Part of this government's mandate when coming into office in March 2010 was a commitment to continue to fight against outlaw biker gangs and organised crime, and we stand by this. We are committed to working with police, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the commonwealth to ensure that the right tools are available to curtail these gangs and their criminal activities.

Before returning to office in 2010, the government already had a strong record of pursuing organised criminal gangs in South Australia and leading the other states to develop similar anti-association legislation. The Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008 demonstrated our commitment to dismantling and destroying crime gangs and removing this scourge from our community.

Unfortunately, in 2010 the High Court in the case of Totani did not support this government's effort to break organised crime in our state, but we have not given up on our attack. A decision of the High Court will not stop this government from working to protect the community from the insidious crime and violence perpetrated by these barbarians with no regard for the public.

While the work of this government to break outlaw crime gangs is ongoing, we are beginning to deliver. As the Premier stated the other day, the Attorney-General has introduced new bills to this parliament to address serious and organised crime. Not only is this government working to repair the 2008 act to address the concerns of the High Court, it is also introducing new measures to attack the criminal behaviour of these organisations and the individuals who create them.

The community expects that its elected representatives deliver safe streets, neighbourhoods and communities for them and their families, and this government is working to meet that expectation. The only action those opposite have taken is to try to block and obstruct the passage of laws which will make our communities safer.

If there is one thing I have learned in the short time I have been an MP in this place, it is this: it is politically easy to do nothing and go nowhere. It is much harder to have vision, much more difficult to act on that vision and to get things moving, get things done. It is much harder to spend money on prevention, much harder securing our state's water, energy and housing supplies for the future. It is about preparation and planning a long-term approach to government.

That is what I see as the fundamental difference in the attitudes of the Liberal and Labor parties to governing this great state. Liberals prefer to take the easy road: a do nothing, spend nothing attitude to governing, with no vision, no policy and no plan. This is not a harmless approach. It is damaging to our state's economy and to the social fabric in the long term. Unemployment, decaying public infrastructure and miserly public health and education budgets lead to an increase in generational poverty and a growing gap between those who have and those who have not. If we learn from history, we learn that this is the price we pay for a do nothing government.

On the other side, there is the Labor alternative: investment, renewal and a visionary approach, taking into account world's best practice. Our Thinker in Residence program is an example of the way in which a small investment in international experience and success can produce real and lasting results, from a reduction in the number of people sleeping rough on our streets to a world-class level of recycling and investment in renewable energy. We continue to punch well above our weight, both nationally and internationally. Such things require a serious commitment to government. Such projects can be complex to explain and they often result in calls for more to be done elsewhere. They can be difficult to deliver and the tangible results will sometimes be a long time coming.

But, while it is not an easy road to travel, results are achieved, progress is made. Achieving these things is not easy. They do not happen by accident but by design. They are the result of responsible and timely decision-making, of investment and direct action over the past decade by the state Labor government. Personally, I do not think you can put a price on the excellent delivery of essential public services in health and education. Our elderly and our children deserve that.

South Australians deserve a state-of-the-art brand-new public hospital. South Australians deserve world-class public education facilities, with the latest technology so that all kids can access a great education. South Australians deserve investment in their public transport network with new buses, trains and trams. They deserve better roads and they deserve a Southern Expressway that enables us to drive in more than one direction. Let us look now and see what the future holds.

What will the next decade hold for South Australians? Where will our economy, our health and education system, our housing sector and our precious natural resources be in 2022? So much depends on the direction and approach taken by the state government. There are some enormous challenges ahead of us. The impact of the global financial crisis is still being felt around the world. Australians have been cushioned from the full force of its impact, thanks largely to the quick and effective stimulus package put in place by the Labor government at the federal level.

However, we are not immune and there are further potential shocks on the economic horizon. The sovereign debt issues facing Greece and the EU are the most obvious but by no means the only challenge for global financial markets. In some countries it is possible that a high level of unemployment, combined with a lack of consumer confidence, may result in a resurgence of protectionist measures by governments and a decline in overseas investment by the private sector. That is, when things go bad people withdraw and protect their own backyards first.

In such circumstances it is vitally important that we have a government that is prepared to protect local jobs. We will not stand idly by and watch while investors move offshore and workers are dumped on the scrapheap. We must make sure South Australia continues to be a state that

encourages businesses, large and small, to invest and to operate here. We must make sure our economy is diverse enough so that we are not dependent on just one sector for our economic security. Agriculture, mining, tourism, food and wine production, manufacturing, tertiary education, defence, and science and technology are all areas in which we have the expertise. They all areas in which, with appropriate government support, we can actually create jobs, wealth and economic security for this great state.

Industry assistance should not be synonymous with government handouts. Co-investment, with industry matching public investment dollar for dollar, grants for research and development, and skills and training packages are all examples of modern industry assistance that is offered by governments all over the globe. This is an area close to my heart, and the recent debate over the industry assistance package for Holden's showed only too clearly that the Liberals are missing in action when it comes to standing up for local jobs. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

### **PUPPY FACTORIES**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** Presented a petition signed by 82 residents of South Australia requesting the house to support legislation to abolish puppy factories and ban the sale of factory farmed companion animals from pet shops and online.

### **CHAMBER MICROPHONES**

**The SPEAKER:** Members, I will just let you know that we are having problems with our microphones. There is a problem with the loop apparently and every second microphone will probably not work. When you stand in your seat, if your microphone does not come on, please move to the one next to you. The matter is being rectified as quickly as possible. We might only hear half the noise today perhaps.

### **ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

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

#### **INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE**

**230 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (15 March 2011) (First Session).

1. What plans does the Government have for the future use of heritage listed buildings currently used by the IMVS and what is the budget for the implementation of these plans?
2. What are the results of the amalgamation of Government pathology services and what is the current market share held by IMVS?
3. How many IMVS research projects have been commercialised in each year since 2000?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts):** I am advised:

1. The future use of heritage buildings on the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital (RAH) site (including those currently used by IMVS) will be considered further as part of a master planning process to be undertaken to determine the best use of the current RAH site, once the majority of services relocate to the new RAH. Determination of funding mechanisms for any such development will form part of that planning process.
2. Since the formation of SA Pathology, staff numbers and services have expanded. SA Pathology has now taken over the provision of pathology services at Modbury Hospital, as well as increased clinical services in haematology at Lyell McEwin Hospital and genetic medicine at the current RAH.

SA Pathology increased its market share in South Australia from 32.94 per cent in June 2008 to 37.51 per cent in June 2011. This added over \$20 million to Government revenue at the same time as delivering efficiencies of over \$7 million per annum since 2008.

3. The following table shows the number of IMVS projects commercialised in each year since 2000 to June 2011:

Year	No. of Patents Commercialised
2000	16
2001	38
2002	51
2003	22
2004	40
2005	58
2006	39
2007	49
2008	14
2009	17
2010	10
To June 2011	0
Total	354

### EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**231 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (15 March 2011) (First Session).

How many code black calls were made in each major South Australian Metropolitan Hospital Emergency Department in each month since January 2009?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts):** I am advised:

1. The following table provides a summary of Code Black incidents for all metropolitan hospital emergency departments in each month for the specified period.

Any aggressive behaviour towards staff or patients in hospital is taken extremely seriously.

Code Black is the term used in hospitals when staff call for assistance in dealing with a patient or visitor who is acting in a way that may compromise their safety or the safety of others, including disruptive and intimidating behaviour.

A Code Black does not always indicate a violent incident has occurred. They are also used as a preventative measure to stop people who may be showing signs of aggression.

Most aggressive incidents involve patients whose illness, injury or treatment may cause behavioural changes. Very few incidents are the result of deliberate aggression towards staff.

Appendix 1—Monthly breakdown of Code Blacks in South Australian Metropolitan Hospitals January 2009—February 2011

Table 1—Code Blacks for South Australian Metropolitan Emergency Departments in 2009

	Flinders Medical Centre	Noarlunga Hospital	Repatriation General Hospital	Lyell McEwin Hospital	Modbury Hospital	Royal Adelaide Hospital	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Total
Jan 09	47	3	0	41	11	56	66	224
Feb 09	32	4	0	76	17	51	72	252
Mar 09	72	9	0	55	6	109	56	307
Apr 09	26	9	0	45	12	75	69	236
May 09	49	20	0	37	11	68	67	252
Jun 09	66	2	0	43	11	81	48	251
Jul 09	53	2	0	31	15	100	57	258

	Flinders Medical Centre	Noarlunga Hospital	Repatriation General Hospital	Lyell McEwin Hospital	Modbury Hospital	Royal Adelaide Hospital	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Total
Aug 09	28	8	0	62	17	125	56	296
Sep 09	40	5	0	85	18	138	48	334
Oct 09	38	7	0	48	4	113	64	274
Nov 09	75	4	0	52	8	131	68	338
Dec 09	59	17	0	39	22	79	70	286
Total	585	90	0	614	152	1126	741	

Table 2—Code Blacks for South Australian Metropolitan Emergency Departments in 2010

	Flinders Medical Centre	Noarlunga Hospital	Repatriation General Hospital	Lyell McEwin Hospital	Modbury Hospital	Royal Adelaide Hospital	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Total
Jan 10	62	3	1	54	13	98	90	321
Feb 10	50	4	0	49	17	125	56	301
Mar 10	55	9	0	85	10	102	63	324
Apr 10	58	9	0	49	6	67	58	247
May 10	62	20	0	75	4	155	57	373
Jun 10	39	3	0	52	6	97	65	262
Jul 10	49	9	0	80	6	121	49	314
Aug 10	44	17	0	67	0	117	45	290
Sep 10	44	23	0	59	14	100	41	281
Oct 10	54	9	0	84	3	87	31	268
Nov 10	94	15	0	86	5	95	51	346
Dec 10	96	12	0	82	12	96	56	354
Total	707	133	1	822	96	1260	662	

Table 3—Code Blacks for South Australian Metropolitan Emergency Departments in January and February 2011

	Flinders Medical Centre	Noarlunga Hospital	Repatriation General Hospital	Lyell McEwin Hospital	Modbury Hospital	Royal Adelaide Hospital	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Total
Jan 11	53	15	0	71	9	74	48	270
Feb 11	51	12	0	102	5	62	45	277
Total	104	27	0	173	14	136	93	

### PUBLIC BUILDING WORKS

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (5 April 2011) (First Session).

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure):**

The policy for public building work is that payments are made in accordance with the conditions of contract applicable to the particular work. Contracts for public building work generally provide for progressive payments (usually monthly) for work completed up to the date of the payment claim.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services):** I have been advised the following:

The estimated patronage levels by transport mode for 2010-11 are as follows:

Bus	Train	Tram	Total
51,138,000	10,661,000	3,149,000	65,949,000

The actual patronage levels for the O-Bahn for 2010-11 are 8,212,916. This is the total patronage figure for all bus routes that service the O-Bahn.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services):** I have been advised the following:

The estimated patronage levels by transport mode for 2011-12 are as follows:

Bus	Train	Tram	Total
51,617,000	10,021,000	3,369,000	65,007,000

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

In reply to **Mr VENNING (Schubert)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services):** I have been advised the following:

The projected passenger journeys in regional areas were revised from an original target of 1.57 million in 2010-11 to an estimated result of 1.48 million. This revised forecast reflected the actual patronage outcome achieved for 2009-10 and the general downward trend that has occurred in patronage across regional services.

Patronage levels have been impacted on by an increase in community based services given an aging population and a greater need for one on one support rather than using regular passenger services, as well as competitive fares from regional airlines for long haul services.

It is important to note that the level of services provided has not been reduced.

### HIGH SCHOOL MODERATION PROCESS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):**

In 2010, a total of 6,490 classes were delivered in all of the available Stage 2 SACE subjects.

Of the total number of classes, 2,658 had no moderation changes.

Of the total number of classes, 427, or 7 per cent, were marked up as a result of the moderation process.

Of the total number of classes, 3,405, or 52 per cent, were marked down as a result of the moderation process.

Note: The figures given do not represent discrete classes, because more than one form of moderation may be used for the same subject. Thus, in some instances classes have been double-counted to reflect total moderation effects.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION BOARD TRAVEL**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):**

1. Malaysia—March 2010

From 14 to 19 March 2010 a total of four SACE Board staff travelled to Malaysia:

- Dr Paul Kilvert, Chief Executive
- Mr Graham Bengler, Executive Manager, Information Systems
- Ms Kate Cooper, Manager, Learning and Assessment Design
- Ms Lois Ey, Curriculum Officer

Purposes of travel:

Mr Bengler undertook site visits to two colleges (one located in Johor Bahru and the other in Ipoh) that had applied to the SACE Board to become accredited providers of the South Australian Matriculation (SAM) Program.

Mr Bengler and Dr Kilvert met with the senior management of the SAM schools to provide information and advice relating to the SACE and the delivery of the SAM Program:

- Taylor's College Subang Jaya
- Taylor's College Sri Hartamas
- INTI International University
- Institut Sinaran
- Kolej Disted
- International Education College (INTEC)

Ms Cooper and Ms Ey provided professional development workshops and training to staff of the SAM colleges on changes to the SAM Program resulting from the introduction of the new SACE.

2. Malaysia—September 2010

Mr Graham Bengler travelled to Malaysia from 1-3 September 2010 to meet with senior management of the SAM schools to discuss issues of importance identified by the SAM schools:

- Branding and marketing of the SAM Program
- Assessment and quality assurance processes in the context of the introduction of changes resulting from the new SACE
- SAM College operational matters

3. China—September 2010

Dr Antonio Mercurio, Executive Manager, Curriculum Services, travelled to China from 27-30 September 2010 for the following purposes:

- Annual visit to Qianhuang International College, located in Jiangsu Province, to provide the schools with information and professional development in the delivery and assessment of the SAM Program.
- Site inspection visit at Ningbo International School, located in Ningbo, south of Shanghai. Ningbo International School has expressed interest in seeking accreditation as a SAM school.
- Dr Mercurio also held a meeting with staff from Dipont, another educational institution which has expressed interest in the possibility of offering the SAM Program.

4. Singapore Third Languages Project: 5-9 July 2010

Dr Antonio Mercurio, Executive Manager, Curriculum Services,

Fayrouz Akaja, SACE Examiner for Arabic

Lee Pereira, SACE Examiner for Bahasa Indonesia

Over the past six years the SACE Board has worked with the Singapore Examinations and Assessment Board (SEAB) and the Singapore Ministry of Education (MOE) in the areas of assessment, curriculum development and languages education. In September 2007 the SACE Board entered a commercial agreement with the SEAB to conduct the setting of the syllabus and examinations for Arabic and Bahasa Indonesia as third languages of the SEAB.

The purpose of this trip was to set the standards for the Third Language subjects, and to carry out a site inspection visit of a prospective new SAM school in Singapore.

Note: Travel, accommodation and consultancy fees for 5, 6 and 7 July was funded by the SEAB, not the SACE Board.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION MERIT AWARDS**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):**

The amounts spent against the Merit Ceremony were:

- 2010: \$115,787.00
- 2011: \$110,969.00

### **TEACH SA**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):**

The Department for Education and Child Development has awarded the tenders for provision of the Teach SA strands:

The tender for the Recruit strand has been awarded to the University of South Australia;

The tender for the Reskill strand has been awarded to the University of Adelaide;

The tender for the Retrain strand has been awarded to the University of South Australia;  
and

The tender for the Assessment Centre has been awarded to PKF Organisational Development (SA) Pty Ltd.

The budget for Teach SA was announced in the 2010-2011 Budget measures Statement Budget Paper No. 6. It forms part of the department's operating initiatives announced in the 2010-2011 budget. This provides \$8.7 million over four years for the Specialist Maths and Science Teachers—Support budget allocation, which also includes a component for the Royal Institution of Australia (RIAus).

### **EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):**

The Department for Education and Child Development budget includes costs that can be directly attributed to Program 1—Early Years Education and Care (Birth to Preschool) as well as allocations of other indirect costs incurred by corporate and regional offices and other costs allocated across programs.

These costs will vary from year to year, depending on actual program approvals in previous budgets.

The \$8.2 million variation is included in the overall variation for Program 1. The overall variation is due to:

- Delivery of the National Partnership Agreements on Early Childhood Education and Indigenous Early Childhood Development with the Commonwealth, and Commonwealth funded Aboriginal Children and Family Centres;
- Higher employee expenses from the latest enterprise bargaining agreement;



- The Commonwealth funded family day care program;
- Commencement of the Government's election commitment to establish ten new children's centres; and
- Increase in other expenses which is primarily related to the allocation of workers compensation expense budgets.

#### EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):** The Preschool Bilingual Program provided support to 3,375 children per term in 2010-11.

Early Childhood Workers-Bilingual are not employed as teachers, but are employed to provide first language support for preschool children and families.

#### CENTRAL PETROLEUM

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee A).

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business):** I am advised, based on ASX records, the price of shares in Central Petroleum traded in a rather narrow range before and after my media release.

#### SA UNIONS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (21 July 2011) (First Session).

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):** The provision to notify SA Unions of details relating to student placement for work experience has been in place since 1996 under the Workplace Learning Guidelines. It appears the provision was adapted as an additional level protection against injury, exploitation and harassment of students in the workplace.

The Workplace Learning Guidelines were revised and updated in 2004 by a working party with representatives from Business SA, WorkCover, union representatives and the three schooling sectors. The 2004 Guidelines ensured that the notification to SA Unions was at the discretion of the employer.

Regarding what happens if the box agreeing to inform SA Unions is left blank; Appendix 1 of the Workplace Learning Guidelines (2004) there is a 'Checklist for Schools' and in item (b) 'Prior to work placements' the document states:

All schools must ensure that the Workplace Learning Agreement Form has been completed and signed by all parties and the student and the workplace provider are provided with copies of the form prior to the commencement of the work placement.

It would be the school's responsibility to follow up a Workplace Agreement Form which was not completed correctly. This would include the case where neither box was ticked in the Employer Approval for SA Unions Notification section.

#### TOTAL RECONCILIATION SOLUTION

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (8 November 2011) (First Session).

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure):** I am advised:

The cost of putting Total Reconciliation Solution (T-Recs) in place as of 1 July 2011 was \$953,000. This amount includes an accrual of \$54,368 for the final payment following full acceptance testing.

T-Recs is a commercially available database. The development component of the installation of the T-Recs database was required to enable it to automatically reconcile TRUMPS information. Minor customisations of databases, such as T-Recs, are common in the financial services sector.

**ADELAIDE OVAL**

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (8 November 2011) (First Session).

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure):**

The funds expended were on professional services contractor fees for the Schematic Design and Design Development which included the delivery of tender documents for the first phase of the tender call process.

This activity was included in the broad scope of services provided by these contractors and it is not possible to provide a discrete sum attributed to the tender call alone.

**PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (9 November 2011) (First Session).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs):** Further to my response on 9 November 2011, I advise the positions with a remuneration level over \$200 000 are:

- Chief Executive
- General Manager, Business Development
- General Manager, Project Delivery
- General Manager, Corporate Affairs and Government Relations

**STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (23 November 2011) (First Session).

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport):**

The contract amount of \$18.031 million over 10 years covers the purchase and ongoing licensing of software to implement the Student Information System, as well as vendor support for implementation and 10 years of maintenance support. Two contract variations have been added, covering the licensing of UC4 Job Scheduler (\$6,000) and licensing of Procedural Language/Structured Query Language (PL/SQL) Script Editor (\$5,600, plus annual maintenance of \$1,027). UC4 allows for daily tasks in the student and finance systems to be automated as an overnight process without staff intervention. PL/SQL Script Editor is a technical software tool that allows PDF documents such as student invoices to be made available for students on Self Service. There are no other variations to this contract.

The implementation budget of \$20.4 million over 3 years covers the cost of configuring and implementing the system to meet TAFE SA's requirements. The implementation budget includes \$9.321 million of the SunGard contract, covering Initial License Fees and Professional Services provided during implementation. Other costs in the implementation budget include hardware and infrastructure and project staff drawn from within TAFE SA and the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology, as well as external contractors.

**URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:03):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** As outlined in the Governor's speech this week, our government has identified seven strategic priorities for the government's forward agenda. I am pleased today to announce the creation of an authority with a specific mandate to work on three of those key priorities—creating a vibrant city—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —maintaining our safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods, and having an affordable place to live for everyone. The government has approved the creation of an urban renewal authority to be established under the Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements) Act 1985, starting from 1 March.

South Australia has a reputation for being liveable and affordable, and we want to keep it that way. An urban renewal authority will make sure we protect and grow what South Australians love about our healthy and safe neighbourhoods, as well as adding to the excitement of our city. The new authority will work cooperatively with communities, local government, the private sector and not-for-profit sector to achieve this aim. It will have a strong focus on community engagement.

The authority will be charged with all of the residential and industrial landholdings of the Land Management Corporation. Defence SA industrial holdings will be added to this portfolio. The authority will immediately take over delivery of current state renewal projects at Bowden and Woodville West and work on the releases of new opportunities in the inner city and Marden.

It will also plan all future significant redevelopment projects of assets currently owned by the South Australian Housing Trust and work with not-for-profit organisations to strengthen the community housing sector and allow them to—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —play a larger role.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Bragg, order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** These functions are about getting South Australians into houses they can afford in places where they want to live. In fact, key parts of the new authority's charter will be to increase the supply and diversity of affordable housing and to accelerate the renewal of social housing stock to improve the quality of housing. These functions are also levers to boost economic activity in the state, to create new energy in our city and to create jobs for our construction industry.

Today we have advertised for a new chief executive to lead the authority. In the interim, the Chief Executive of the Department of—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Mr Rod Hook, will act in this role and manage the transition of staff from various agencies from 1 March. Mr Hook will also take on board responsibilities pending formal appointments.

The new authority will contain planners, project directors, land managers and urban renewal staff from the three relevant government agencies. I thank Andrew Fletcher, who has chaired the group to create the authority, and all those who have contributed to the project thus far.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## QUESTION TIME

### QUESTIONS

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06):** My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier decided to break his government's promise to the opposition to give them 10 questions in question time, especially given the Premier's call for new parliamentary standards and accountability?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of Government Business in the House.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:06):** I could be rising to take a point of order—which I will take before I answer the question: standing order 97, and believe me it is not my responsibility to educate you because I can't put in what God left out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** The question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** The question plainly contained—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley has a point of order. What is your point of order?

**Mr PISONI:** No. 125: offensive words against other members—I ask that it be withdrawn.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I'm not sure what offensive words you are referring to. I don't uphold that. Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I simply point out that, just as the Leader of the Opposition was caught yesterday, her question contains argument—and argument of an inflammatory nature: breaking a promise. To answer the question—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I think that we have, just as I attempted to start answering questions, the best example of why we cannot guarantee these people 10 questions.

**Mrs Redmond:** You used to.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** We used to and that is because, in the past, the behaviour of your side was—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hammond you are warned.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Again, I barely need to explain it. They do all the explaining for this side. They have disrupted question time not by wit, not by humour but by a barrage of yelling. Having gone missing at every opportunity they have had to be a proper opposition, they believe somehow—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, you are warned also.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** They believe that they will somehow simply—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** They believe that somehow they will—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, can you sit down for a minute.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Norwood, stop yelling.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** This is the behaviour that proves my point.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order, Minister for Transport Services.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Norwood, sit down. I have already called a point of order.

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** I think my point of order is inappropriate language because last time I looked I don't think—and I quote—the word 'tossler' was not an appropriate word in this parliament. I may well be wrong.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. 'Tossler' is not an appropriate word. I didn't hear it. Other people obviously did. I don't know who said 'tossler' and because I don't know who it was we won't follow on with it. Member for Norwood.

**Mr MARSHALL:** We on the opposition benches heard very clearly what the Minister for Small Business referred to the opposition as, and we ask him to immediately withdraw.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister for Trade, I do not know what you said.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I will have a look at the transcript later and see if there was anything recorded.

**Mr MARSHALL:** It was very clear, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Sit down, member for Norwood.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Madam Speaker, as I have said, I do not think I could have programmed the opposition to behave in a way that made my point any more strongly than they have, that they simply interrupt question time—their question time, their opportunity to test the government—by their repeatedly disorderly behaviour. I would ask anyone who has observed this house in recent times to compare the behaviour on both sides, and it is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** —and this side. What is—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, you are warned for the second time!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I simply make the point that we on this side will be very happy to return to guaranteeing the opposition 10 questions when they cease to waste question time by their constant interruption. We will not reward—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** They honestly do believe, with nothing else to offer, that somehow they can yell their way to relevance. They cannot, and we will not extend question time for an opposition who have wasted it off their own bat. If they wish to return to some standards of behaviour, we will be more than happy to guarantee them 10 questions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Marshall:** We can't hear the next question.

**The SPEAKER:** I have not called the next question. I will not call the next question until we have some quiet in here and some order, which is eating into your question time. The member for Light.

**QANTAS**

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:12):** Can the Premier inform the house about the recent announcement by Qantas and the government's response in the current economic conditions?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:12):** I thank the honourable member for his important question. I think all members of this chamber would have been as disappointed as I was to hear the announcement by Qantas this morning that they will not be proceeding with the new catering centre in Adelaide when the lease from the current facility expires in March 2013. We obviously share the concerns of the 150 workers and their families as they go into the next year with this obvious uncertainty about their future. The decision, of course, was made as part of a broader announcement on the future of Qantas operations, which also included other cost-cutting measures around the nation, including reductions in non-aircraft capital expenditure, the deferral of some aircraft due to manufacturing delays, and the reduction in domestic capacity growth.

This morning I spoke to the Chief Executive Officer of Qantas, Mr Alan Joyce, and made representations on behalf of the workers who are affected by this decision. I have also spoken to representatives from the relevant unions and will be having further discussions with them. Qantas has indicated to my office that it will be using a local catering supplier to replace its current operations, and the government expects Qantas to honour that commitment.

We are hopeful that the majority of workers currently employed will be able to be transitioned to other jobs within Qantas or the new catering firm to help cope with the increased demand that will obviously result as a consequence of the new contract. Despite the announcement by Qantas today, our economic fundamentals do remain strong. The most recent labour force data released this morning shows that South Australia's headline unemployment rate has fallen to 5.1 per cent in January at the same time—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —as our participation rate has remained steady at 63.3 per cent. This strength in a global economic environment of such uncertainty is pleasing, particularly considering—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Bragg, you are warned!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —what we are seeing in Europe and the United States.

**FIREARMS PROHIBITION ORDERS**

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister advise whether any firearms prohibition orders have been sought under the existing firearms legislation against Vince Focarelli, Michael Syfris, Dylan Jessen or Danny Papadopoulos to ban them from carrying guns and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:15):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question about the firearms prohibition orders. We know that there have been assertions made by members of the opposition that the police have not been actively using this provision, and I can tell the house—in fact I am pleased to tell the house—that since we introduced the firearms prohibition orders, 60 have been issued by the Registrar of Firearms.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is there a point of order? Minister, can you sit down. What is the point of order?

**Mrs REDMOND:** The point of order is relevance. The question was specifically about four people who are known members of outlaw motorcycle gangs and whether prohibition orders have been issued against them.

**The SPEAKER:** Sit down. I do not uphold that point of order. The minister has just started to answer her question.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Twenty-three of the 44 current police-issued orders are against known outlaw motorcycle gang members. The courts have also issued a further nine orders with varying conditions and I understand that another 15 applications are currently under consideration by the police. Contrary to comments by the President of the Law Society that these orders are not used—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —in response to mental health concerns, I also want to reassure the house that in fact that is not the case. Doctors make separate notifications under section 27 of the Firearms Act, and I am advised that SAPOL acts on around 800—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order! The member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister's answer bears no relevance to the question. The question was specific to four named people, and the minister is failing to—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. You have made your point. Sit down. The question related to prohibition orders and the minister is answering that.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** That is right, Madam Speaker, outlaw bikies, but SAPOL acts on around 800 orders in relation to people who have mental health concerns. The police have reassured me and said on numerous occasions that the firearms protection orders provide them with extraordinary powers to stop—

**Ms Chapman:** Why don't they use them?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Here we have once again, Madam Speaker—why aren't they using them? 'Why don't they use them?' Again, they attack the police. The police have extraordinary powers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, can you sit down.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Norwood, you are warned. The member for Norwood and the member for Bragg are like never-ending records.

**An honourable member:** Music to our ears!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Aided and abetted by the Leader of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A continual barrage comes from my left. Minister, would you like to finish your answer?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** These are extraordinary powers to stop, search and seize and they are reserved for those people where there is a significant link between firearms and criminal behaviour.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** SAPOL has conducted a full internal review of the firearms protection orders in early 2011 to ensure that administrative law had been and will continue—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —to be applied correctly and professionally.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** They constantly attack. It's not me. It's the police they are attacking. The shadow attorney-general who criticised the low usage of intelligence is the same shadow attorney-general who has blocked legislation to expand the use of—

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Not only has the minister failed miserably to address the substance of the question, she is now debating the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, have you finished your answer or have you got some more?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** As I said, there are 23 firearms protection orders against known bikies.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### PORT PIRIE

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:20):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister explain to the house why the state government did not include Port Pirie in its RESIC Infrastructure Demand Study, which I have in my hand? I have had regard to the report by Parsons Brinckerhoff and I am very concerned that Port Pirie, an existing working port, has not been considered as an option to export mineral commodities. In fact, Port Pirie, under the proposed infrastructure corridors outlined in the report and demonstrated on a detailed map, is not even shown. The minister stated in his foreword, when releasing the report:

It is important South Australia captures the window of opportunity to expand the sector while global demand for our resources is strong.

Port Pirie is well placed for expansion. Port Pirie is open for business.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:21):** The member for Frome is a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —passionate advocate for his community and he has let me know privately in no uncertain terms about how angry he is about this. I can assure the member for Frome—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I can't hear the minister.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Morialta!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** First and foremost, let me reassure the member for Frome that, through his hard work, this government is completely committed to working with the community and industry leaders of Port Pirie to maximise benefits that will flow from the state's expanding minerals and petroleum industries. I feel that Port Pirie is well placed to prosper as a result of the impending resources and energy expansion. I think the people of Port Pirie are very lucky to have a representative like the member for Frome who is prepared to take the government on, and he has taken us on very, very well. Can I just say that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** She's been waiting to be warned for so long. She's been passed over so often. It's not fair. With a skilled workforce and with many sites capable of



accommodating key infrastructure requirements, I think Port Pirie's future is looking very bright. The 2007 Resources and Energy Sector Infrastructure Council (RESIC) was established by—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —the South Australian government as a key advisory body of senior public and industry representatives.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Have you fixed up your age on your website or is it still 41?

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I noticed last night on Twitter that the member for Norwood is so vain he lied about his age. He has got his age as 41; he is actually 44.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was close to Valentine's Day, so I assume that's what it was. The 2011 RESIC report—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —that Parsons Brinckerhoff has undertaken recently—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, can you sit down until we have some quiet. Minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In 2011, the RESIC engaged Parsons Brinckerhoff to undertake the Resources and Energy Infrastructure Demand Study. This study was the first of its kind in Australia and laid out some important information that will be vital to many stakeholders involved in the growth of our minerals and energy sector. This study, through direct engagement with industry, aimed to identify the strategic infrastructure needs for the resources and energy sector over the next 10 years and beyond.

The report identified that South Australia will need to overcome some unique infrastructure challenges to holistically address the needs across commodity value chains. Through this analysis, RESIC formulated a number of recommendations to the government covering: infrastructure corridors and utility hubs; the development of deep-sea ports, along with rail and road logistics, which is what the member for Frome is on about; electricity infrastructure; analysis of water resources; and, of course, government facilitation of investment in resources infrastructure.

On 8 February I launched the discussion paper to seek feedback from the community on those recommendations. This consultation process also includes a roadshow to hear firsthand from South Australians including the people of Port Pirie. In fact, the first of these regional consultations will be held in Port Pirie on 5 March. Further sessions are scheduled for Whyalla—the seat that you represent, Madam Speaker—Port Lincoln on 7 March, and Adelaide on 9 March.

Indeed, it is through a rigorous process of community engagement that this government will be in the best position to work with industry to form a sustainable resources sector. Port Pirie is well positioned to take advantage of the opportunities that we hope will arise from the exploration activity being conducted in the Braemar province and the potential to establish an infrastructure corridor along that region. That is why I want to encourage feedback across the region, and if Port Pirie can make a strong case for investment then the upcoming consultation session is just the venue to do that.

Of course, I strongly urge the member to provide his own submission as part of that consultation process so that his views can be incorporated into the government's response to the discussion paper. The government is listening to the community. We want to hear how they believe they can best share in the benefits of the rapid expansion of our mining sector. It is important that

South Australia uses the window of opportunity provided by the strong global demand for our resources to lock in the sorts of projects that will build up our capacity to export. By attracting developers and investment capital to support local companies, my department is well placed to target the investors required to deliver the megaprojects needed within our borders.

Just as the previous mining booms in this state provided South Australia with a legacy of road, rail and other infrastructure that benefited everyone for years to come, we need to use this opportunity to lock in those nation building projects that will last generations. Feedback can be provided online until 26 March 2012, and I look forward to receiving submissions on the RESIC recommendations.

#### FIREARMS PROHIBITION ORDERS

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is again to the Minister for Police. Why has the minister failed to table a report on the number of firearms prohibition orders issued as required under the Firearms Act, when the report was due in February 2011—12 months ago?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:27):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I was not the Minister for Police in February 2011—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Can I get more than three words out?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for MacKillop, order! I remind members of standing order 131.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Eight words before an interjection; eight words before they jump down your neck. I was not the Minister for Police when that report was due for lodging and, since becoming minister, in fact only in very recent times, have I discovered that that report is late, and we will have it ready for the next session of parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Reynell.

#### SKILLS FOR ALL

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:28):** My question is for the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister inform the house about state government initiatives to improve the skill levels of South Australians and to promote dynamic and demand-driven vocational education and training in our state?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:28):** I thank the member for Reynell, who I know has a very, very deep interest in vocational education and training, especially the adult and community education sector. She is a very strong advocate for that. As members would be aware, the state government's Skills for All reform of our vocational education and training system has committed \$194 million over six years to support 100,000 additional training places from 2010-11. To achieve these additional training places, we will need a vocational education system that responds to the needs of individuals, businesses and industry. We need more South Australians to be ready for high skilled jobs now and in the future. I am pleased to inform the house that under their Skills for All reforms more than 1,400 TAFE courses will be fully or partially subsidised, including about 600 extra courses not currently funded.

One of the most significant changes to our TAFE system is that most nationally-recognised certificate I and II level courses on the subsidised training list will be free for students. Students will not have to pay a tuition fee for those courses. This will maximise opportunities for people who want to enter training and who have no previous qualifications. This will not result in an across-the-

board fee increase in certificate III and IV. The cost of some level III and IV courses will stay the same, some will be reduced and some will be increased.

Those level III and IV courses which are identified as being a priority, where there is an identified need for more people with those skills, will receive a subsidy of around 80 per cent. For many of the key trades there will be no increase in fees and, in some cases, there will be lower fees. To be clear, under the Skills for All reforms there will be a 100 per cent subsidy for certificates I and II, an 80 per cent subsidy on average for certificates III and IV and a 70 per cent subsidy on average for diplomas and advanced diplomas. The state government has also today released draft legislation for public consultation to establish TAFE SA as a statutory authority. This legislation will be one of the key initiatives under the state government's Skills for All reform.

TAFE SA is also already recognised for the quality of its training, employment outcomes, student satisfaction and the highest level of course completions compared with other states. The establishment of TAFE SA as a statutory authority will give it the autonomy to dynamically respond to employment opportunities for South Australians, along with the training and skills needs of industry and business. Importantly, TAFE will continue to have a valuable and critical role in meeting the skills needs of our state, and it will continue to operate in public ownership.

As a statutory authority, TAFE SA will have the opportunity to dynamically grow in a much stronger demand-driven training market. Public consultation on the draft legislation will be open until midnight on 11 March 2012. The draft bill and supporting information, including how to make a submission, are available for download on [www.dfeest.sa.gov.au/skillsforall](http://www.dfeest.sa.gov.au/skillsforall). Submissions can be made by email, post or by using the TAFE SA Bill 2000 online feedback form. I look forward to the community consultation of the draft bill to provide the community, industry, TAFE SA staff and unions that represent TAFE SA staff the opportunity for further comment and input prior to its introduction into parliament.

### OCCUPATIONAL LICENCES

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Business Services and Consumers. Will the minister explain why over 200 plumbing and gasfitting apprentices and over 200 building licence applicants are waiting at least four months to have their licence applications processed, costing some apprentices at least \$300 per week in lost wages?

A fourth-year apprentice who has completed all the required training lodged his licence application in October last year, but when making inquiries this month to Business and Consumer Services about when the licence would be issued, the department could not advise how long it would take and said that the applicant would 'just have to wait'. The apprentice told the opposition that, because he has not been approved as a fully licensed plumber, his employer is still paying him the fourth-year apprenticeship wage and it has cost the apprentice at least \$300 a week in lost wages. Over four months, minister, that is in excess of \$4,000 in lost wages.

**The SPEAKER:** I think that is the Attorney-General.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:33):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the honourable member for that very important question. It is an important question, and I am very disturbed to hear complaints of that nature about any service provided by the government, and particularly if it is that agency which is being accused of having a less than satisfactory performance.

I undertake to go to the agency and find out exactly what problems are there. I would appreciate if the member could provide me with any particulars in relation to any of those approximately 200 people, or however many it is, that he is aware of.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am inviting you to give me any information you can about these because I take your question very seriously. I take the service the government offers to people—particularly tradespeople and people requiring licences—very seriously, and the matter will be investigated.

### POLICE PASSIVE ALERT DRUG DETECTOR DOGS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister outline the effectiveness of passive alert drug detector dogs?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:35):** I thank the member for Florey for this question about the vital work that is being undertaken by our passive alert drug detector dogs. Not only are SAPOL's five drug detector dogs a visual deterrent to any would-be drug taker or user but also they are responsible for getting drugs off the state streets.

These dogs are being used at a variety of festivals and events, including dance concerts, the Clipsal 500, the Royal Show and at AAMI and Hindmarsh stadiums. During the last financial year they were deployed on 462 occasions to places like Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Tanunda, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Tumbly Bay, Victor Harbor for Schoolies Week, and Balaklava for the cup, and they were used on potential drug transit routes as well. The dogs were also deployed at licensed premises on 120 occasions from the CBD to Noarlunga and Port Augusta. SAPOL used them at the Adelaide Airport, the Franklin Street bus terminal and various suburban railway stations.

The PADD dogs were introduced in South Australia in 2008 following amendments to the Summary Offences Act. These amendments were part of this government's broader initiatives to crack down on hydroponics, meth labs, drugs and drug dealers and, importantly, to help keep our community safe—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Bragg, you are warned for the second time.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** If the dogs detect drugs, their handlers have the power to conduct a search. As a result of their efforts over the last financial year, 11 people were arrested, 400 reported and a further 94 people diverted for drug related offences. They have detected cannabis, ecstasy tablets, cocaine and amphetamines, as well as drug paraphernalia.

What is not measured is the individuals who have been deterred from offending, saving resources for our police, courts and prisons, as well as the thousands of people who have been able to party and celebrate in peace and safety because the dealers have been kept out of events for fear of being detected.

The Department for Correctional Services also used six passive alert drug detector dogs in our prisons where drugs, home-made weapons and mobile phones have been located and confiscated. Every day, these animals, our police and corrections officers are helping to keep our community safe, and they deserve our appreciation.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Norwood, you now have a chance to make a noise legitimately.

### SA LOTTERIES

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Does the minister support the directive from the Lotteries Commission to prevent newsagents commenting on the impact on their businesses of his government's proposed Lotteries Commission sale and, if so, why? The Lotteries Commission has written to newsagents warning them not to speak out against the sale, and I quote from their letter, 'Agents are not authorised to comment to the media with respect to SA Lotteries or its products.'

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:39):** I was surprised to hear about this correspondence and I can say on behalf of the government that we would encourage any newsagent to say whatever they want publicly. We would not seek to stifle their right to speak out in any way.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Norwood, do you have a point of order?

**Mr MARSHALL:** I do have a point of order, Madam Speaker. My question was clearly to the small business minister, because I didn't want to know what the government's position was. That was very clear in the correspondence. I want to know what the small business—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you member for Norwood. Any minister can answer any question. You cannot direct that a minister answer a question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That's enough!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Kavel, behave. Stop waving fingers across the floor. I think I did see a finger from my side as well from the right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are 27 minutes left for question time. The member for Mitchell.

### SMART CARD TECHNOLOGY

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Transport Services. Can the minister update the house on progress to install smart card technology across the Adelaide metro train, bus and tram network and to provide public transport customers with real time travel information?

**The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (14:41):** I would like to thank the member for Mitchell for his question. We have committed \$2 billion to a decade-long program to modernise and revitalise our train, bus and tram networks, and in time we will boast the best public transport system in Australia. The new smart card ticketing system, known as Metrocard, not tuna card, is an integral—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** The reason why I say the thing about the tuna is because—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** No; it is a celebration of tuna. Hear me out. In London the smart card is called the—

**Dr McFetridge:** Oyster Card.

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** —Oyster Card. Thank you very much, member for Morphett. In Hong Kong it is called the Octopus Card.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** Well, we know about Victoria. We do not talk about Victoria. We are having a Metrocard and somebody suggested that we name it after a great fishy export, but then it would have been the tuna card and I—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** Tuna card? I don't think tuna card is a small business, but I stand to be corrected. The Metrocard will eventually replace multitrips. It will be used on all buses, trams and trains by simply touching the pre-paid card to a validator as passengers board. It can be topped up or recharged with credit at selected retail outlets, vending machines, on trains and trams and online. As I have informed the house previously—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. Don't be frivolous.

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** Is there a point of order?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, can you sit down. It is very hard to hear today.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have no idea what you just said. I just heard a blur.

**Mr PISONI:** What I said was I move that the minister's answer be inserted into *Hansard* without reading.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I rise on a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** It is a very frivolous point of order. You know you cannot do that in question time. Point of order, Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** If the member for Unley knew anything of standing orders he would know that was completely out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Absolutely.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is very hard to hear today with these microphones. They are obviously not working and with every second one not working it is hard to hear anyway. It is very garbled. Minister, can you complete your answer, please.

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** The new ticketing system is also revolutionised in the way that customers can use their tickets. What this new ticketing system is going to give our buses is a GPS tracking capability. That will mean that every single bus which is moving around our system will be able to be tracked in real time, and that is very important for those who are using the system. The 120 buses and two railcars now using that system are already successfully providing that level of positioning.

This GPS technology supersedes Smart Stops, the electronic signs that were located at several bus stops around Adelaide. By way of context, the Smart Stop technology to the new GPS technology is akin to audio cassettes and iPods. It is also worth pointing out to the house that the technology that the Smart Stops were using is now obsolete and not one that we can replicate. It was made in France. As many members will agree, the Metrocard represents a very exciting time for all of us associated with the public transport network.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:45):** My question is to the Treasurer. Has the government decided yet how to best provide incentives to recognise and retain experienced Public Service workers in response to the government's cuts to long service leave entitlements announced in the 2010-11 budget? If so, what is the cost to budget? In the 2010-11 budget, the government announced cuts to the long service leave for the public sector, totalling about \$30 million per year. In response to lobbying from the Public Service Association on 4 June 2011, the Treasurer told the media that he was setting up 'an urgent process to make recommendations directly back to me before the end of the year on how best to provide incentives that recognise and retain experienced public sector workers'.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46):** There have been a number of meetings between me and various public sector unions. Those meetings are continuing, and I expect it to be dealt with in the context of this year's budget.

#### **EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT**

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:46):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house how the government has responded to the recommendations of the 2007 Thinker in Residence, Dr Fraser Mustard, about early childhood development?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:47):** I thank the member for this important question. Members may recall that last year I spoke in this place to honour the enormous contribution made by the late Dr Fraser Mustard, someone who has profoundly influenced our community here in South Australia. It is why I am little puzzled when earlier today the very mild mannered member for Morphett questioned what the government had done in response to Dr Fraser Mustard's report. So I am very pleased today to thank the member for Morphett and look forward to working with him on this government's focus on early childhood. I would now like to outline to the house—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Bragg!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** —the long list of initiatives that are directly linked to the work of Dr Mustard. At the heart of Dr Mustard's policy ideas is the concept of using sound evidence and information to support decision-making and services and systems in order to assist young people and their families, and that is precisely what we do here in South Australia.

Our statewide network of children's centres for early childhood and parenting bring together health, family education and other services relevant to families with young children all at one location at local schools. In 2010 we committed a further \$26.5 million over four years for the establishment of a further 10 children's centres, building on our initial commitment of 24 children's centres.

In 2009 we began to implement the Australian Early Development Index, and this approach is enabling us to better collect information and data around the early years to assist in planning our services and support for children. We have also developed an early years system to help collect key information in the early childhood area with the capacity to link it to other data sources.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** To support our research and evidence-based approach, the de Lissa Research Chair in Early Childhood was established at Adelaide University two years ago, while two PhD scholarships in early childhood development have also been awarded. Again, I want to acknowledge the enormous contribution made by Dr Mustard. We have taken this report very seriously. The most significant response to Fraser Mustard's work is without question the creation of this new agency, the Department for Education and Child Development, that brings those key elements across—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** —the agencies of education and child protection, those that interface the most with families.

#### MINING ROYALTIES

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier reveal in which year South Australia's mining royalties, currently at \$203 million a year, will reach Western Australia's annual royalties, currently at \$4,800 million a year, and will he release the departmental advice supporting his statement on radio yesterday morning that, 'It's no exaggeration to say that we will be the next Western Australia in a decade or so's time.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:50):** In fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, can you sit down until we have some quiet.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes, thank you.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question was very provocative but I think the Premier has chosen to answer it.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I might just say by way of explanation, for those opposite who complain about the nature of our answers, when you get the sort of nonsense questions that you see from those opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** When you get the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! You have asked the question.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** When you get the scorn and ridicule associated with their questions—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —if you think you are going to get anything different back, then you are sadly mistaken. Madam Speaker—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I'm very happy to answer this question, Madam Speaker, because this goes precisely to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order, the member for Norwood.

**Mr MARSHALL:** It's a standing order of this parliament that all remarks are to be addressed through the chair. The Premier, after taking on the role—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you; you have made your point. You can sit down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Norwood, you are warned for the second time and if I warn you again you will go out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** You don't shout across at the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Madam Speaker—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Norwood—

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Send him out.

**The SPEAKER:** Sit down, Premier. Member for Norwood, you will behave or you will go. The next time I speak to you, you will go. You are shouting out and you do not shout across the floor at the Premier. You have asked the question, give him respect and listen to him quietly. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I think this question actually defines the essential difference between those sitting on this side and those sitting on the other. We are enormously ambitious for the future of this state and any rational analysis of our mining prospectivity over the period that we have seen it in this state is following precisely the same trajectory that exists in relation to Western Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We say that because we did not choose the words that the Governor uttered in the speech the other day—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!



**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We did not choose the words that the Governor uttered in his speech the other day without some care. We chose them because we seriously do believe that this is the decade that will define the decades to come within this state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** And that the decisions that we take—and I invited those opposite to participate in the debate of ideas. We made a range of choices—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —about what we thought were the most important things that would define the future of our state. Those opposite have chosen not to participate in that debate. They have, in fact, decided to descend into the invective and negativity that is characterised—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The Premier is clearly debating the answer. The question was very specific: when does he expect that South Australia will match Western Australia's mining industry—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** And what departmental advice did he get to support that statement—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —that non-exaggerated statement yesterday, and will he table the advice?

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I cannot direct the Premier in how he answers your question.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** You actually have to sit down—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order: in reality you can direct the Premier not to debate his answer, and that is what I was asking you to do.

**The SPEAKER:** It is a matter of relevance, deputy leader.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order: can I again point out to the other side, who refuse to learn the standing orders, that if they disagree with you there is a standing order with which they can deal with that, but they can't do it—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Sit down, member for Morialta, we have not finished hearing this one.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Can I say: they cannot do it otherwise. And before we get the usual hectoring, which number is it because they obviously struggle with that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** From memory, I think it is 135.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, we have another point of order. Member for Morialta.

**Mr GARDNER:** 134: the Minister for Transport continually ignores the appropriate process for putting points of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't know what the point of order was about; but I don't uphold what you're talking about. Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Can we have some quiet? You can listen to the end, and then you have 11 minutes to get more questions up.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Madam Speaker, can I repeat that we will not be deflected from our view that we are amongst the most exciting times that this state has ever faced. That is why we are preparing ourselves with the decisions that we announced through the Governor's speech the other day for us to take advantage of that future. I might say, Madam Speaker, these are not just my views. In fact, that well-known Labor supporter, Mr Kerry Stokes, at the opening of the Channel 7 building, described South Australia as the next Western Australia.

#### **DARWIN BOMBING ANNIVERSARY**

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. Can the minister inform the house about the activities to commemorate the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the bombing of Darwin?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:57):** I would like to thank the honourable member for Taylor for her question and her continuing interest in the sacrifices made by our forebears to defend our country. On Sunday I shall be speaking at a service to commemorate the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the bombing of Darwin. I will be joining members of the veterans community at the Repatriation General Hospital, Daw Park, to mark this important event in Australia's history.

On 19 February 1942 mainland Australia was directly attacked by an external enemy for the first time. In two air raids, Darwin Harbour and surrounding areas were bombed by 242 Japanese attack aircraft and bombers killing at least 243 allied service personnel and civilians and injuring between 300 and 400 more.

Those killed included nine South Australians in the Darwin Post Office. By the time the first raids were over, 10 ships had been sunk and 25 damaged, three hospitals had been bombed, shops, offices and the police barracks were flattened. The post office and the communications centres were shattered, government house was wrecked, and the harbour and airfields were left burning in ruins. It was the start of a sustained bombing campaign by the Japanese across Australia's north, which lasted almost two years and killed many hundreds of Australians and allies. Darwin endured 64 raids, and bombs were also dropped on Townsville, Katherine, Wyndham, Derby, Broome and Port Hedland.

Last year, the Prime Minister, the Hon. Julia Gillard, claimed 19 February as Bombing of Darwin Day to ensure the attacks across Australia's north are appropriately remembered and commemorated every year. Seventy years on from the day of that first shocking attack it is important that we remember the enormous courage of those who suffered during that time. I am honoured to be involved in commemorating this crucial event in Australia's history to ensure that the sacrifices made by our fellow Australians, including nine South Australians, are never forgotten.

#### **HEALTH BUDGET**

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. What is the current budget overrun within the health portfolio in this financial year? On 15 December, the minister acknowledged that \$35 million had at that time been overspent in the current financial year, on top of \$88 million in the previous financial year.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:00):** I am just conferring with my colleague the Treasurer to establish the detail of what I can say. The advice I have is that, of the \$4.6 or \$4.7 billion that we have in the health budget, we are currently running at around \$99 million over budget—

*The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Projected for the end of the financial year—we are not currently at that at the moment. That is made up of a range of elements. One of those elements which is part of most of the overruns associated with the health budget over the years, including when the other side was in government, is associated with demand that exceeds what was anticipated and what was supplied by the budget process. That is an element of it.

There are other elements as well, including cost savings measures that have not been able to be made. For example, the decision by the PSA to pursue car parking fees will figure in that, and we have not been able to implement that measure as a result of the PSA's unsuccessful challenge.

We are now waiting to see whether they will pursue that at a higher level. There are a range of elements like that. It is around about 2 per cent of the health budget.

A hundred million dollars is still a lot of money, but it is a relatively small percentage of the health budget. We are working with Treasury officials to do everything we can to bring our budget into balance, so of course I do note that every time we make an announcement about a savings measure, those on the other side criticise it and object. Yesterday I gave advice to the house about information systems that we are introducing whereby we will reduce 130 positions.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister was giving a very good answer and then he started to debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, I direct you back to the question.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I was making the point, Madam Speaker, that we have some new information systems—some technology systems—in place which will reduce positions in the department by 130 or so as I indicated yesterday.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When will an evaluation of the new SACE occur? What are the terms of reference and when will the findings be made available? Does the minister agree that a year 12 student should be able to bake a wedding cake as one of their five subjects for assessment under the new SACE?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:03):** I thank the member for this question. Very soon, all will be revealed.

### **CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:03):** My question is for the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, can you advise the house how South Australia is performing in relation to the delivery of education and childcare services for families with young children?

**Honourable members:** All will be revealed!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:03):** All will be revealed very soon—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** —as I have been maintaining publicly.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order! I asked a question and was refused the answer. A government question comes across and there is a written answer for the government member.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm not sure what your point of order is but sit down, member for Unley. I think you need to be here a bit longer to find out these things. Minister.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I would like to thank the member for Ashford for this question. It was only last night that I met parents and staff at a local kindy to talk about this very matter. There is no question that South Australia is a recognised national leader when it comes to the provision of early years childhood services.

The latest report on government services shows that South Australia is indeed a strong performer in this area. Our spending on children's services, such as childcare and preschool, was substantially higher than the national average. We spend \$499 for each child on children's services compared to the national average of \$291.

Fees charged by childcare service providers in SA were the lowest in the nation in both family and long day care. We are the only state in which all family day care schemes undergoing

accreditation met all the criteria. In partnership with the federal government, we are working to lift the quality of childcare services, the staff-to-child ratios and the qualifications of staff. I will take this opportunity to acknowledge all of those hard-working people that work in these centres.

We also lead the way, as I mentioned earlier, in relation to our outstanding network of children's centres that are bringing a series of services together in the one site. As the Premier has outlined—as we all have outlined—there is no question that we as a government are absolutely committed to every child having every chance.

#### HEALTH DEPARTMENT

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:06):** My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Now that the minister has had 24 hours to get an answer, can he tell the house what is the value of unreconciled accounts within the health portfolio in the current year 2011-12?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:06):** As I said yesterday, there were unreconciled accounts from the previous year because we were going from a range of legacy systems to one new system and there was a backlog of accounts that needed to be gone through. Under the new system, accounts are being reconciled on a regular basis, as is appropriate, and there is no issue, as far as I am aware, of any unreconciled accounts. Every month, of course, you go through the process of reconciliation and, depending on what time of the month, accounts will be reconciled. At the end of the month they are reconciled and then you move onto the next month.

So, the issue about accounts which had not been properly attributed to lines was a factor in relation to the previous year when we were moving from a series of legacy accounts into a new account. As I said, the opposition suggested it was \$200 million; I think it was around \$60 million or \$70 million. That has been brought down to about \$20 million and they are still working through that. They anticipate that will be completed by the end of next month. As I said to you yesterday—and I have checked again today—there are no outstanding issues. The reconciliation process is going as it would. There is no unreconciled amount, other than what would be expected during the normal process of monthly reconciliation.

#### HEALTH DEPARTMENT

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:07):** Supplementary, if I may. Is the minister then saying there are no unreconciled accounts for the current year?

**The SPEAKER:** It is the end of question time; however, minister.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:07):** I would refer the member to what I said, that in the normal process of reconciliation the accounts are being reconciled as they should be—which is on a monthly basis, as I understand it—and there are no unreconciled accounts beyond what would normally be done in the bookkeeping sense. Last year—the point I was making—there were a lot of unreconciled accounts because we were transferring from a range of systems to one new system and it has taken time to work out where all of those accounts should be placed, but that is still going on. There is nothing improper about that process; it is just moving to a new system.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

#### NEW ZEALAND FUR SEALS

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:08):** Madam Speaker, before I do speak on the topic of my grievance, I would like to share, along with you, my concern at the behaviour in question time. What particularly galls me is the gratuitous and dismissive way in which the government treats questions from the opposition, much in the same way I fear that they are treating in a gratuitous and dismissive way the people of South Australia.

I would like to talk today about the issue of New Zealand fur seals and what is certainly increasing numbers around the coastline of South Australia. Certainly, the broader public have been aware of increasing numbers around Kangaroo Island over recent years. This has been highlighted in particular by a reduction in the number of little penguins to be found on Kangaroo Island. There is no doubt that little penguins are very much a part of the diet of New Zealand fur seals. It has also been reported to me by wildcatch fishers, aquaculture ranchers and also tourist and environmental operators on the Eyre Peninsula, Upper Spencer Gulf and around the West

Coast, that fur seal numbers are increasing. Some suggest that they are increasing to a point where they are doubling every five or six years, so it is not an exponential rate of increase but it is a very dramatic rate of increase.

The history of the New Zealand fur seal is that they were hunted in the early days of Australia by the sealers and the whalers, and along the southern coast of South Australia fur seals were almost extinct by the 1850s. Here in South Australia, New Zealand fur seals have been protected since 1919 and we have seen their numbers grow. The concern we have is that they are beginning to have an impact on both the environment and various business operations around the coast.

There is competition for resources from New Zealand fur seals. Their natural diet consists of birds, little penguins—which we have already noted are a declining population—and also a large amount of squid. Much is known about their diet, behaviour and breeding. Squid forms a large part of their diet, so much so that there has been some suggestion that the recent decline we have seen in cuttlefish numbers at the top of Spencer Gulf can be duly attributed to the increasing number of New Zealand fur seals.

While much is known about their behaviour, diet and reproductive methods, very little is known about why their numbers are increasing or what we can do about it. There are analogies on the land with regard to abundant native species management plans, and I cite to you the instance of wombats, kangaroos, wallabies and koalas in various parts of the country where management plans have been implemented.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** And dingoes.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Dingoes is another one, thank you, member for Stuart. We are highlighting to the government that this is a serious issue. Although many studies have been done in the past and the suggestion has always been that management plans should be established, we have seen no attempt to establish a management plan at this stage. It is critical that it is done because we have reached a point, I believe, where a coordinated response is needed, and we are looking to the environment department, minister Caica and the Premier to do this.

It is time, indeed, for this Labor government to act and consider an appropriate management strategy for the future so that our wildcatch fisheries, our aquaculture and our marine habitat and environment generally are no longer impacted upon by what is becoming an abundant native species, so much so that they are becoming rogue.

#### WORLD YOUTH INTERNATIONAL

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:13):** I want to continue my comments from yesterday when I was talking about some of the amazing things that our young people are doing, particularly those who are overseas. I mentioned a young woman called Kate. As I was saying, she is a very caring, dedicated and enterprising young woman, and she is an incredibly strong young woman as well.

When she was in Kenya and she saw a family or a child in terrible circumstances, she went above and beyond to do what she could to improve their lives. As an example, Kate came across a deaf woman with children whose husband had died, and, as I understand about her culture—thank heavens we do not do that here; or maybe we do—if the husband dies, the woman is expected to marry the elder brother in the family. This lady called Lillian refused to do that, and she was shunned in her community and sent out. So, there she was, she was deaf, she had children and she had absolutely nowhere to live; so, she was homeless.

Kate, being the caring young woman that she is, contacted her mother and was telling her about this, and so between her mother and me we sent some money across and Kate set about ensuring that a house was constructed to house Lillian and her family. It might have been built out of wood poles and mud but it turned out to be a very lovely home. It is a secure environment for the family and, in fact, it was built a little bit larger to house Lillian's carer who also had a child and who needed somewhere to live. The construction of that home meant that two families have a very safe place to live, and they are extremely happy.

I might just also mention that Kate saved a woman from dying in the street because no-one seemed to be terribly interested and she needed urgent medical care. Kate held a child in her arms that she helped birth, and she stood up for the rights of people who were being abused in the streets. I think that we can make no mistake about it: this young woman can be formidable when put to the test. I have to say that it is an extreme pleasure to know her.

I know another young woman who is involved in the program. She was there as Kate was starting to move away and come home, and she continued the work that Kate was doing in a craft group. She taught the women in this group various techniques about dyeing material and other things they could do so that the women could market some of these new products they were making. While she was doing that, and as part of the reason she was there, she took the opportunity to talk to them about things like birth control, the transfer of AIDS and other things around health and hygiene issues.

She and Matt, who was there with her (another young man I know who is very enterprising), ran portable health clinics and treated hundreds of people in one session. It was amazing to read the emails they would send back and to see the pictures. Matt also told me that jiggers is one of the worst complaints over there. It is a parasitic sand flea that burrows under the skin and the nails of the feet and causes terrible infections, deformities, ulcers and gangrene. It creates walking difficulties, and, obviously with things like that, there can be limb loss.

The severe itching that comes with this causes insomnia and psychological discomfort, and it is the main cause of school absenteeism in Kenya. Prevention by good personal hygiene, wearing closed shoes, sweeping the floor, cementing the floor (where possible, of course) and keeping domestic animals out of the living area all help to eradicate this terrible disease. These are probably obvious solutions to us, but in a poverty stricken society it is impossible to enforce or even create these conditions, particularly for people who are really struggling. I still have more to go, and so I will take another opportunity because it is a wonderful story.

### **WILMINGTON BUSHFIRES**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:18):** I rise today on 16 February—which I trust everyone in this house knows is the 29<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Ash Wednesday fires—to speak briefly about the fires that we had in Wilmington in January. In no way do they compare to the devastation that happened 29 years ago, other than by explaining the wonderful support from volunteers from all walks of life who came out to support us near Wilmington on Wednesday 4 January through until Saturday 7 January.

The fire started around the middle of the day on Wednesday, and, as everyone would understand, the middle of the day on a Wednesday in early January is a time when a lot of people are away, either at work or away on holidays. It was a tough time for the local CFS brigade, which is exceptionally active, and I would say one of the very best in our part of the state. It was a tough time to get volunteers. I was working in Adelaide that day and got home late in the afternoon. I jumped onto the next three 12-hour overnight shifts. But, within 12 hours, there were CFS and other emergency service members, and also volunteers who are not members of emergency service teams, in Wilmington helping our district.

I think the appliance from furthest away that I noticed was from Inman Valley, well south of Adelaide. It is getting close to a 400-kilometre trip for those people to come up and help us. There were hundreds of CFS volunteers in Wilmington and, as members can imagine, as well as coordinating the firefighting that is a very big logistical exercise.

We were exceptionally well supported by the SES, the ambulance service, and MFS and DENR workers. I have to say that with regard to the MFS presence, while they came up to protect homestead buildings—and it is not their fault—the media managed to turn that into the appearance of more danger than there actually was. The town of Wilmington was never under threat.

We had five water bombers on the go, and I pay particular tribute to the Stirling North CFS brigade who, again, were well supported by the SES. The five water bombers were doing 20-minute round trips, which put the Port Augusta gliding airstrip under extraordinary pressure to refuel and reload with water and retardants. These planes had to turn around in approximately five minutes, so that put them under great pressure, and the Stirling North brigade did a great job.

There were community volunteers who came forward. People were driving trucks and councils supported with earthworks, and there were radio operators. People offered their time to drive people around to and from home to collect things and get food. The catering was a very big part of the logistical exercise, as members would expect, and I particularly thank the Salvation Army, who did what they very often do, which is set up their van and provide support. They provided hundreds of meals every day, along with very active support from the local community. People who had nothing to do with the CFS put several days aside to help with catering, cleaning and whatever was required.

In the end, approximately 20,000 acres was burnt, affecting primarily five families who lost an enormous amount of land. Fortunately, no people, homes or buildings were lost. There were other local landowners who lost land as well, but five families were most immediately affected. Obviously, human life is the most important, but it is sad to say that several hundred sheep perished in this fire, along with many kilometres of fencing, pipelines and water points all destroyed.

In any fire of this scale there is always some debate afterwards about whether or not it could have been fought better. I will leave that issue for another venue. In hindsight, it is often easy to see some things that could have been done better, but my particular point today is to thank all of the volunteers—the CFS particularly, but all the many volunteers who supported the Wilmington district.

The lives of the people who have lost stock and land will be difficult for a year or two. I understand, from speaking with all those families, that they are satisfied with their level of insurance, so I know they will bounce back. Even after the immediacy of the event, the broader community has been very generous, including, I must say, the member for Morphett, who donated hay, and many others from all around the state. Thank you to the CFS and all the other volunteers.

### VIETNAMESE NEW YEAR

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:23):** I would like to speak this afternoon about an event I attended to celebrate the recent commencement of the lunar new year of the dragon for the Vietnamese community of South Australia, otherwise known as Têt. On 21 January I was pleased to attend for the third time the annual Vietnamese Farmers Association of SA new year celebration in Virginia. This year's event was particularly celebratory as it was held in the new and impressive Vietnamese cultural centre in the heart of Virginia.

The centre was only days old when I visited and is the realisation for this community of over 20 years of fundraising and tireless volunteer work. Indeed, less than 10 days before the event, the building slab had just been laid. The land on which the centre is built was purchased with foresight some 20 years ago and is on the main street of the Virginia township. This forward thinking symbolises the strong and proud history of the Vietnamese in South Australia.

When the Vietnamese community first came to Australia, around 37 years ago, this community was starting over in a new land and since then it has created a solid and integral community within South Australia and in the north of Adelaide. At the same time, they have maintained their long history and culture and shared it with the people in the north. The Vietnamese community demonstrates one of our state's strongest and greatest assets; that is, multiculturalism, and I praise them for that.

I was very pleased to present two cheques on the evening. The first, for \$3,000, was towards the new year event on behalf of the state government. The second cheque was a personal one from me to this special community as their local state MP. The Vietnamese community in Taylor is strong and vibrant and I was pleased to present the inaugural Taylor Vietnamese Community Youth Leadership Award of \$300 to a young man called Robert Dang.

Robert is a 19-year-old software engineering student at the University of South Australia. He was chosen by the Vietnamese community in our area to receive this new award. Robert is a prime example of hard work, responsibility and leadership. He not only succeeds at his studies but actively supports his family with the care of his 13-year-old disabled brother Anthony and participates in the Foo Dong Vietnamese Lion Dance and cultural activities with the association. I know that his parents are extremely proud of him and were there on the evening to cheer him on, as was Anthony. It was a great pleasure to meet them and to recognise this modest and hardworking young man.

The dragon, to both the Chinese and Vietnamese communities, represents luck, determination, strong leadership and good fortune, and during this auspicious lunar new period, at the Zhu-Linn Buddhist Temple new year celebration, the Premier shared that he was born in a year of the dragon. I thank the Vietnamese community for their great contribution to this state in the areas of culture and economy, particularly in the north of Adelaide. Chuc Mung Nam Moi! Xin Kahm urn kwee vee.

### ROAD SAFETY

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:26):** The South Australia Police Annual Report 2010-11 shows that \$75.5 million in traffic fines were collected in the 2010-11 year, only a slight

decrease on the previous year, despite 694 fewer drivers being caught committing serious offences. Police have budgeted to collect over \$100 million in fines in the current financial year, despite fewer motorists being caught. This rise can be attributed to two things: one, that the state government introduced new fines last July for minor and major defects; and two, because South Australia's traffic fines are now some of the highest in the nation—fewer categories with the highest penalties.

The minister, when defending the projected rise in revenue from traffic fines for the current financial year, said on radio, 'Every dollar that is collected from these fines goes into the Community Road Safety Fund.' I would be very interested to learn from the minister what projects and road safety initiatives have been funded from this fine-generated revenue. I think that \$75.5 million would have funded many initiatives. It would be nice to have the detail and be assured that the moneys collected from motorists, paying some of the highest fines in the nation, is at least being expended on improving road safety and not just propping up state government coffers.

I would like to raise a very serious issue involving road safety in my electorate. There is a notorious intersection in historic Seppeltsfield—and you would have all seen this in pictures of the Barossa, Seppeltsfield is always front and centre—where car crashes are a regular occurrence. It is the intersection of Samuel, Stelzer and Seppeltsfield roads. The intersection is within the Light Regional Council, which has been successful in obtaining funding through the federal government's Black Spot funding program to improve the safety of the intersection.

The problem is that this work will not be fully completed until June 2013. In the meantime, more and more accidents are occurring. The long-term plan is to install a roundabout. However, this is dependent on the council, in conjunction with the department of transport, being successful in obtaining funds through the federal government's RDAF scheme. It is predicted that a roundabout would not be completed until June 2015.

The local CFS captain, Mr Michael Furnell, has warned that a fatality at the intersection is only a matter of time. The Nuriootpa CFS responded to four crashes at this intersection within a two-week period in January this year. Despite give way signs signalling an intersection on the approach to Seppeltsfield Road from either Samuel or Stelzer Road, visually it does not look as though you are approaching an intersection. Many of the crashes that have occurred have involved visitors to the region (tourists) who are not familiar with the roads.

I have been campaigning for a couple of years to have this intersection improved. I first contacted the Light Regional Council in October 2010 which resulted in some minor improvements—the trimming of the roadside vegetation to increase line of sight, etc.—which improved the situation slightly but the vegetation has now regrown. What is needed is increased signage warning motorists of the intersection to improve road safety. Stop signs and yellow crossroad signs should be installed immediately at very little cost as an interim measure until the intersection is upgraded.

Yes, unfortunately driver error may still mean some accidents occur but at least there has been an attempt to improve safety. I am aware that the RAA has inspected this site and that current signage meets the requirements of regulations. However, surely common sense must prevail. The crash statistics show that it is a dangerous intersection, irrespective of what the rule book says. I am not laying blame at anyone. This issue is much too serious for that. But how can we just sit back while more crashes occur. Do we need to wait for a fatality?

I understand that the roads are within the jurisdiction of Light Regional Council and not the government, but I implore both parties not just to submit an application for funds to install a roundabout by 2015 but to take some interim action now to prevent more injuries or worse happening.

Finally, I am very pleased with the announcement just last week that the Barossa Hockey Association at last will get a new synthetic pitch after 10 years of lobbying. Congratulations to Ms Courtney Ribbons and Mr David Smith from the Hockey Association, and thanks to the government for half a million dollars, with the other half a million dollars to come from the local council. It has been 10 years and well worth waiting for.

#### **MURIEL MATTERS**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:32):** Today is the 103<sup>rd</sup> anniversary of the balloon flight over London by South Australian suffragist Muriel Matters. Most of you will have some knowledge of



Muriel's adventure that day. In the afternoon of 16 February 1909 at the Welsh Harp, Hendon, armed with a megaphone and 56 pounds of handbills in the Women's Freedom League colours of gold, white and green, Muriel boarded a two-person basket attached to a framework under an 81-foot dirigible with the words 'Votes for Women' emblazoned on one side of the bag and the giant initials 'WFL' on the other.

Unfortunately, the aircraft, with its intrepid travellers, was blown off course, which was planned to be over the king's procession to Westminster to open the new parliamentary session—something we did here this week. Muriel and the pilot, Captain Spencer, landed in a field in Coulsdon. Boasting a less than 60 horsepower motor with a top speed of eight miles per hour, it is perhaps not surprising. The balloon flight lasted 1½ hours and rose to a height of 3,500 feet.

While I do not have time to relate the reason for the flight today, it is my pleasure to inform the house that new material has come to light on the flight itself, sourced with the tireless help of the Muriel Matters Society and the sleuthing done by Wendy Herbert on links sent by a Hastings woman, Marilyn Saklatvala, a new contact who lives in Pelham Crescent, Hastings, in a terrace house one along from Muriel's which now boasts a blue heritage plaque. Muriel lived there until she entered a nursing home shortly before her death in 1969.

It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the marvellous work of Marie Maddocks for all her research and support from the very beginning of the society and also Steven Anderson for his outstanding groundbreaking work. Research continues with the help of Matters family members and an ever growing team of international Muriel devotees.

While it is not yet known how much the WFL paid for the daring flight, a lot more is now known about the history surrounding it and the family of the aeronaut involved, Herbert Spencer. According to the web source *Flying Machines*, the first member of the Spencer family to be airborne was Edward Spencer, born in 1799, who made a balloon ascent from the Surrey Zoological Gardens on 28 May 1836—coincidentally, the year of this state's settlement. His son, Charles Green Spencer, born in 1837 (named after Charles Green, his famous pioneering balloonist godfather) was also an aeronaut. Charles founded the firm of CG Spencer & Sons, pioneering an ingenious safety envelope design for balloons, and he also made an important contribution to the development of cycling.

The already busy Charles fathered 11 children. His eldest son, Percival, was born in 1864, and founded Spencer Bros Ltd at Highbury with his brother, Arthur Charles, who was born in 1866. They concentrated on ballooning and parachuting, although Charles also made a glider in 1868. It was made from umbrella wires and wickerwork. The framework of the wings was covered with silk and it was a tight, uncomfortable contraption to operate. He also collaborated with a Mr W. Stirling to run an aeroplane factory in 1910. Percival held many records and had made 1,000 ascents by 1901. He crossed the English Channel many times and was internationally known. With his brother Stanley he made a world tour between 1890 and 1893, visiting locations such as India, Singapore, Egypt, Indonesia and Japan.

Arthur Charles has another claim to our interests. He visited Australia in 1897 making several sensational parachute descents. Early research also calls him a gold prospector while in Australia. We learn from the publication *Balloon History* that he broke his thigh in 1909, landing on a Melbourne tombstone, although we do not yet know whose. While here he also attempted an epic flight in a race with a balloon almost full, with 80,000 cubic feet of coal gas. Hit by a sudden gust of wind, it lifted 12 men and 220 sandbags before it escaped the net and was lost forever. There is definitely more to learn there.

The youngest son, Herbert, born in 1884, a contemporary of Muriel's, understandably became involved with his brothers with balloons and parachutes but he also made and flew his own aircraft, the Spencer Biplane, receiving Aviator's Certificate 124 in August 1911. He ran a flying school between 1912 and 1913.

With this background in place we can move to the subject of aerial advertising. According to J.F. Ptak Science Books the business of brand advertising and bombing people and places from airplanes was fresh in the history of invention when one of the very first examples—an advertisement for the laxative *Purgen*—appeared in *The Illustrated London News* on 18 May 1912. However, this is some three years after Muriel's flight and so the Spencer family history helps put it all in context.

Spencer Airship B was probably built around the time of 1908 but it was still in use in 1913, in time to advertise Bovril. It was in May 1908 that Spencer Airship B made an ascent from

Wandsworth in South West London but it crashed on 4 May 1908. It was the rebuilt Spencer B that became Muriel's dirigible in what was the first successfully landed passenger-carrying, powered flight over London. This was the most dangerous of Muriel's adventures in the quest for women's votes and shows the true pioneer she was, more than deserving the sobriquet 'that daring Australian girl'.

Time expired.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:37):** I will lead off by continuing on with my remarks that we are one of only 13 nations in the world today that can create a vehicle from the ground up, starting from the design right through to the showroom floor. It is important to recognise that every one of these 13 countries offers some form of industry assistance to their vehicle manufacturers. Why? Because they understand the strategic importance of this industry in terms of investment, jobs, skills, innovation, exports and research and development.

The Australian automotive industry accounts for around 10 per cent of the total business R&D and more than 20 per cent of R&D undertaken by the manufacturing sector. The value of R&D is that developments that may never end up being used in the automotive sector can often be picked up by other industries, including health, agriculture, defence and space science, just to name a few. Therefore, the spin-off value of a strong R&D sector should not be underestimated.

That is why countries that have the capacity to design and manufacture value this capability. They recognise that it is a contributing factor to the broader prosperity. Labor recognises this, too. We understand that our manufacturing sector is too precious to lose. We know the challenges are great, the competition fierce, but we will not take the easy road and abandon these industries that bring so much value.

There are many other challenges ahead. The impact of climate change and the shifting of the world's political and economic power from developing countries to emerging nations are both issues which in some way will determine how South Australia will look in another decade. The CSIRO has warned that as a result of climate change we face a future in which drought, bushfires and heatwaves will play an increasing part in our lives. Our relationship as a trade partner with the Asia-Pacific region will obviously become more important than ever before. At the same time, our positioning as a defence hub will also be paramount, providing new opportunities for increased employment and skills in this sector.

Water and energy security, housing affordability and supply, the development of contemporary law and order policies to address the emergence of cyber crime will require hard work, commitment, vision and the willingness to take action now and in the preparation for the years ahead. Boldness, courage and commitment to get the job done for the long-term prosperity of our state will be the qualities needed over the next 10 years, and Labor is the party to deliver them. We can not afford the short-term, easy road that history tells us that the Liberals will take us down.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:42):** I rise to congratulate the Governor on his delivery of the speech written for him by the government. I would stress that anything I say is no poor reflection of the Governor. I think he is doing an outstanding job for this state. He has given outstanding service to this country previously in the navy, and I applaud the fact that his position has been extended for another two years.

In relation to the Governor's speech, written for him by the Labor government, I refer to the phrase that 'the government understands that many South Australians are troubled and uneasy about the shifting and uncertain times the world now faces on so many fronts'. I think we see that when we look over at the other side at members of a Labor government that have a 9.8 per cent swing in front of their eyes, when they realise how many of them will not be here if that swing goes through at the next election. I think there is certainly a concern on the other side that that Labor seat, that bastion of Port Adelaide, has now become a very marginal seat.

Reflecting on the Governor's speech, the government have said that they believe they need to act and embrace bold new approaches. What have they been doing for the last 10 years? Just running the state bankrupt? That is what I think is going on. We are heading into a deficit of \$11 billion, and the state is going backwards fast.

The government indicate that they have reviewed where the state stands now and is making decisions about where the focus needs to be for the future. Why did they not start that a decade ago when they got into government, instead of just spending those rivers of gold that came with the GST that was coming into this state? They were rivers of gold, unallocated funding that this government did not bank on, and all of that has just been frittered away by this government.

I will start on the seven primary areas that the government is supposedly interested in. It was interesting that the speech was headed with reference to the clean, green food industry. We have a fantastic clean, green food industry in this state, and I should know: my family have farmed here since 1840. My property at the moment has been leased out since 2005 but we still live there and very much enjoy being part of the rural lifestyle, and I certainly enjoy the odd time when I can do a little bit of work on the property.

To think that this government thinks about the clean, green food industry of the state when we are in the current budget cycle where they have slashed \$80 million from Primary Industries funding. Towards 400 jobs have gone in the last two years from the primary industry sector in the government sector, and this is a government that comes out in the government speech trying to tell us that they are worried about the food industry. I really could not think of anything further from the truth.

This is a government that does not govern outside Gepps Cross and Glen Osmond. Hang on: they do govern up in Ramsay and Salisbury. They were fortunate to keep that seat, but it is a very short-sighted government, and I was actually shocked to see that they supposedly are concerned about a clean, green food industry.

When you talk about some of these cuts that have come out of Primary Industries funding, we see a slash of \$12 million in Rural Solutions which is the extension part of Primary Industries. We see that the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) has cutbacks of \$8 million over four years. We see cutbacks where fishermen have to pay more fees—and in aquaculture, more fees—just to run their businesses and here we have a government that just thinks they can pillage private enterprise because of these massive budget cutbacks to the food industry.

I would like to think of one issue where the government has actually helped out the food industry in this state because I am really struggling to find it. We see that the government has ceased funding the Advisory Board of Agriculture, and that will happen. The funding for the advisory board has been scaled back for this financial year, and that will completely cease to exist. I should say that the funding will cease to exist: the advisory board will not. The funding will cease in June this year and I think that is an absolute disgrace when this government comes out with one of its lead statements that it is committed to the food industry. It was because the former minister for agriculture, who believed that he was the greatest agriculture minister in the world—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** He certainly thinks so.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** No, he made the statement that he thought he was the best agriculture minister in Australia, and that is a fact.

**Mr Whetstone:** Better than minister Caica?

**Mr PEDERICK:** Better than minister Caica, by the sound of it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright):** Point of order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I am not quite sure that that is actually what the former minister said and I would just request that the shadow spokesperson be factual in what it is that the minister said, not what he thinks it was the minister said.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I am quite sure that he said he was the best agriculture spokesman in the country, and if anyone wants to prove me wrong I am happy to come back to protect the record. But I really struggle with how this government thinks it is supporting agriculture. This minister decided that he would cut the funding to the Advisory Board of Agriculture, so the board, which has been going for well over 100 years in this state, is going to have to rely on its own funding so that it can keep up this vital work of giving advice to the government. But when you have a government that believes it does not need advice, it is just totally outrageous.

The minister set up this higher level group, this business group, and there are a lot of good people on that group and I have no problem with the people on this higher level group, but they are at the next tier of primary production in this state. They should be listened to as well, but we still need to see the people at the ground level of primary production listened to in this state.

We also saw back in 2010 that the minister had no funding to replace the Premier's Food Council. The Food Council at that time was to be replaced with a new strategy group—as yet frameless and nameless—to consider the opportunities available. More Labor cutbacks, and here they are making out they are looking after our food industry, but I will expand on that later.

We have the state government talking about the mining boom and its benefits and the claim from the Premier yesterday—and he tried to back it up today in question time—that we will be matching Western Australia in a decade's time as far as money that comes back to the state in royalties. We will have to match \$4,800 million. We would have to be producing, on a gross value of mining, somewhere in the realm of \$80 billion to \$100 billion worth of mining to be anywhere near that mark. It is just ridiculous that this government thinks we can get \$4,800 million worth of royalties into this state in that time.

Olympic Dam will spend six years, when they get the go-ahead—and I know there is initial work going on—to open up that site. I know there is a lot of mining opportunity around the state as well and I hope a lot of the potential goes ahead so that it can help invigorate not only our mining areas but our regional areas and our grain growing, because we certainly need some more access to ports with our grain farming to get more competition into the market.

The government also talked about advanced manufacturing, and we see people that just cannot compete in this state and take their industry elsewhere. The government talks about a vibrant city. What about the vibrant regions, the powerhouse of this state that drives the economy in this state? The government talks about safe and active neighbourhoods, yet we see shootings and crime gangs out of control. You cannot even go out and have a cup of coffee and feel safe in this city.

The government mentioned affordable living, where we see the price of water going through the roof, for people not just in the city but also in country areas. Early childhood funding was mentioned. Let us see the early childhood funding that keeps the childcare centres open, unlike the ones that have closed in my electorate. The government is saying they must make these choices that are strategic and fundamental to the changed direction of this state. Well, they have a lot to do and I wonder what they have been doing for the last decade.

The government's speech talk about the innovation of the food industry and that the spirit of innovation needs to continue. Where is the support from government for that? They are walking away from SARDI. That will end up in Adelaide University's hands. What will become of the \$70 million to \$90 million worth of assets? I believe they will be gifted, quite frankly, and there is another loss of not only income but also income from the learning, the strategy and the teaching that we can have as a state.

There was also talk about the legislation that this parliament will bring in to preserve the districts of Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale. At first thought, a lot of people would suggest that that is a great idea, and on face value it does sound like a great idea, but what happened to Mount Barker? There was no planning there, with all the explosion of building and development, where development was going ahead of strategic roads and strategic infrastructure to keep that going.

We already have people that are concerned about their future in what they may do with their properties—people from the Barossa and the Sellicks area who are frightened that they will not have any option but to stay where they are, pay high rates and not have an option to leave their land. I have a fundamental thought that in a lot of ways we should not tell people how to manage their lives and how to manage their business, that we should let the market do the job.

I also question how people are going to make it work into the future. I actually got the price on 200 acres (or 80 hectares) of land at Bridgewater—\$1.8 million dollars the real estate agent quoted me—and I thought, 'Well, how can you make that work for primary production?' Do not get me wrong, we absolutely need primary production in this state but it has to be done in a viable manner. You have to do it in a cost-effective manner and I cannot see that you could produce enough off that amount of land to make it viable, but that discussion will go on.

The government says that it will take whatever means necessary to save the Murray, and the concern about the depletion and pollution of the Murray overallocation. Yes, there has been

overallocation. We saw the minister suggest only today that he cannot guarantee the allocation for this state's irrigators. I know as much as anyone, having the electorate at the end of the river, not only how much the irrigators but also how much tourism and the environment need this river. You only need to talk to anyone in the MDBA to find out that there will be at least 5,000 gigalitres coming down the northern basin side, out of the Darling. This will be coming out of the already full Menindee Lakes and down through Lake Victoria, and there will be a massive amount of water coming into this state. So, I cannot see why the minister—just on that amount of water coming through without the southern basin—cannot tell our irrigators that they can have full allocation this next year.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** It's called rules.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, there are rules.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** If the minister wants to make a contribution, I am quite happy for him to do that later on. He should give the industry certainty so that we do not have irrigators through the Lower Murray, the Mid Murray and up in the Riverland losing out because of poor decisions—

**Mr Whetstone:** Again.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Again—thank you member for Chaffey—because of poor decisions made by the state government in regards to allocation. It has really knocked people around in regards to carryover, whereby many people have lost a lot of money in regards to the programs around how carryover water could be managed, and about the water that they have lost, and there is a lot of anger right up and down the river.

We see the government and the Premier—he seems to have tempered his call on the 4,000 gigalitres for the river, and he is threatening a court challenge if we do not get it. Well, I think the Premier wants to be careful, and the Labor government wants to be careful, because this is just the type of language that the eastern states want to hear. They want South Australia to basically poop in its own nest so that they have an excuse to say, 'Bad luck fellas, you are not going to get the water.'

It is not so much the number that he has come up with, it is how we use the water: how we use it strategically for the environment; how we use it for irrigation so that everyone can win; and also for our tourism industries. If we do not get this plan right now we will never get the plan, and it will be on Labor's hands in this state if they put the boot in that hard, and the eastern states say, 'Sorry, you are not going to get enough.'

I want to talk about how the government says it will establish a bipartisan committee to explore the potential for a future fund. As the leader said in this house the other day, 'What are they going to do? Borrow some more money to put into the future fund?'—the great Liberal initiative from three months ago, because that is what it is. They will have to borrow some more money. because there is a \$9.1 billion investment basically going into the city, and it is sending our state broke.

I look at the Adelaide Oval program. We were going to build a city stadium on this side of the house, and the government panicked and had to come up with its own policy, but to fund it they will sell the forests and sell out the future of the South East. We still cannot get any clarity on how many rotations they are selling: is it one, two or three? I know the minister was asked in the other place, I think it was yesterday, how long a rotation was, and she had no idea. No idea. When you have a minister for forests who does not even know that a rotation is 37 years, that is tragic. It is a sale that will decimate the community of the South-East, and not just for the thousands of workers involved but for the thousands of other people reliant on that. It is the mainstay of the South-East economy. It is an absolute shame.

Then the shops are going to be open. Yes, the shops are going to open, and that is the new legislation the government is going to bring in. That is fantastic, but we have Peter Malinauskas from the SDA (he calls the shots over the other side) and Business SA saying, 'Yep, we'll do that. We're going to have two half-day public holidays.' But if you are running the Innamincka Hotel you have to pay those rates as well. You are nowhere near Rundle Mall or Adelaide or anywhere there. All those regional towns and all those regional areas throughout my electorate—whether you be at Pinnaroo, Goolwa or Taillem Bend, anywhere throughout there—have to pay those rates if this legislation gets through.

Then the government talks about being close to public transport, being near essential services. That would be great. I would love public transport. I would love the buses to come a bit further down the freeway to Murray Bridge. I think that would be a very sensible plan, especially in light of the development there—apart from other developments with respect to the racetrack—with 3,500 homes to be built there.

You do a bit of driving around the city and you look at where they are going, heading up to Freeling in the north and Aldinga in the south, and Murray Bridge is pretty equivalent as far as the distance out of town is concerned. People can get very affordable living. If we could only get public transport out there it would make it a lot easier for kids in terms of university education and for people to commute to work. It would be a fantastic initiative.

Then we see that the government is saying that it wants to find other ways to reduce the burden of living costs on working families by developing flexible payment options for service charges, well-targeted concessions and specific relief initiatives. Instead of hitting you with one big bang, they are just going to bleed you slowly to death. It is incredible—the rates, the power prices, gas and water.

We have farmers who have to get their water through the Murray off the pipes, off the reticulated system, paying close to \$3 a kilolitre. As one farmer budgeted, that is costing \$20 per animal, \$20 per sheep. It is just a good thing sheep are where they are, but it is getting very close to being uneconomic. I know that the member for MacKillop and I, as well as other members, fought in here when the Water Industry Bill was debated last year trying to get some reality in regard to the price of water, but the government will see nothing of it. It will not be happy until there is a desert of farms out there, right across this state, that cannot keep stock going.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Well, you just want to go out there in the real world. Say that someone has a pipe leak. I know that the Coorong council has a seminar coming up, and I notice that some technology is being developed so that people can be sent a message from a water meter when it suddenly goes berserk when there is a leak so that they can catch it, because you don't get too much sympathy from SA Water when you do have a leak. I know that I had a water meter that only lasted about four years and it had to be replaced the other day.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Well, they are not very sympathetic when you have an excess bill of \$3,000, I can tell you.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, that is what causes the excess bill, Tom. You want to get out there and have a look. I just want to talk about some of the issues which affect this state but which also centre on my electorate. I want to talk about the risk of branched broomrape. I have mentioned before that the government and the National Review Committee are walking away from the management program as far as branched broomrape is concerned.

We had a meeting the other night which one of my staff attended. Will Zacharin, the head of Biosecurity, has had a casual chat with Viterra. These are the main players in our grain industry and Will Zacharin tells our farmers that he has had a casual chat with Viterra about whether or not it will take our grain. They are having a meeting soon. What is happening there?

We have got people with stock. Will they have markets with their sheep—with their hoggets and young lambs? Will there be an issue with wool? At least the government is saying it is going to monitor some cropping ground for the next three years. Will Zacharin has actually made the comment that there are other major weed problems—well, they are not quite the same as broomrape—and he reckons there will be no problem trading and there shouldn't be any different stock demonising it. The problem is, Will: your job has been about cost recovery in the fishing industry and you are belting up the agriculture industry with the same thing, and these people will not be producing anything to be able to pay the bills.

This is a real problem. People are coming into a season where the main funding—the funding for 10 years of \$45 million—cuts out at the end of June this year, and I am afraid hundreds of farmers in my electorate, the electorate of Schubert, and there may be some in the member for Chaffey's seat—

**Mr Whetstone:** Yes.

**Mr PEDERICK:** —will be affected by this, and it is just a disgrace. This is what we see in the Australian Year of the Farmer. We see governments just walking away from their funding commitments to primary industry in this way.

I was talking previously about the payment plans for people with services. I wonder what the government is going to do with its debacle of Shared Services. It is an absolute debacle that was supposed to save tens of millions of dollars. I have almost had my phone cut off and I know some other members over here have had their phones cut off because they cannot even pay the phone bills. I have members on my side who have decided to fork out of their own pockets, who are subsidising this state Labor government by paying their phone bill so they can keep in touch with their constituency. That is an absolute disgrace, and I am sure it is happening on the other side of the house. You need to talk to your Treasurer and tell him to reverse this decision because this is an absolute disgrace.

How can the Treasurer manage the finances of this state when they cannot even pay politicians' phone bills? It is an absolute joke! That is why we are in such a mess in this state. The phone company rings you up and says, 'Mr Pederick, your phone bill was due last week. Why hasn't it been paid?' I said, 'Well, you ring Treasury and Finance to sort it out. Sort it out with the Treasurer. It's not my issue. It is my issue, though, if you cut my phone off.' Thankfully, I have not had to subsidise the state government and pay my own phone bill.

**Mr Whetstone:** I have.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I know the member for Chaffey has, and others.

**Mr Treloar:** I've had my phone cut off.

**Mr PEDERICK:** And the member for Flinders has had his phone cut off. So, come on, Jack, pick up the ball and just get on with the job and reverse this flawed decision of Shared Services. It is costing the state tens of millions of dollars. Put the money back into the regions, put the pay officers back out there in the real world and let's see something really happen.

As I said, the Australian Year of the Farmer is a great initiative. We see the nine vehicles heading around the country and we on this side fully support them and I wish them all the best. I think it is a great initiative to promote Australian produce, and we will certainly see them at all of our local shows.

I want to talk about the Dukes Highway which runs through my electorate to where it runs out just north of Coonalpyn. I have argued in the Public Works Committee and talked in this house about the simple fact that the Dukes Highway should have been duplicated. We are now in the middle of seeing \$100 million of overtaking lanes going in, and I must say there are a lot of them going in between my property at Coomandook and Taillem Bend, so that no-one thinks I am not declaring my interest. These will be good, but what a halfway measure.

The government could have bitten the bullet—and most of this was federal money—but it started putting in dual lanes at \$5 million a kilometre when it could have done the job properly. In fact, what is going on out there at the minute is we are going to have the road widened and there is going to be a metre wide strip in the middle so that you can poke your nose out a bit so you can see if you can overtake. What everyone has said to me when I mentioned that to them is that we will end up three abreast and there will be a bunny in the middle. So we will see how it goes.

I do wonder at some of these so-called safety upgrades when you see, I think it is, about 150 metres of wire rope go in on an island at Taillem Bend on the south side near the Meningie turn off. I have never seen anyone run up. It is a built up island, several metres wide, and obviously runs narrow at one end, and I think, 'The only man who made any money out of that was Mike Mason.' And, good on you, Mike, you do a good job. Mike Mason Fencing—I know he does a lot of government contracts and he does do a lot of those wire rope contracts, but I just wonder: why was it done there? I cannot see the need.

Regarding roads, we see the easy out by this government. Instead of carrying out road maintenance it reduces the speed limit by 10 kilometres. What do we do next year if it does not want to spend any money? Instead of coming down from 110 to 100, it will go down to 90? It is ridiculous.

In the few minutes I have left I want to talk about what is going on with the 5¢ grain levy paid by farmers. I think it has been disgraceful on all sides. That the industry has not been able to sort this out is an absolute disgrace. The South Australian Farmers Federation had a grand

opportunity to let the farmers of this state, all levy payers, not just SAFF members, vote to put people on the grains committee, but no, it did not take that opportunity. We had Grain Producers SA set up. SAFF decided to change its position. There was a document signed on 14 October by several people. Peter White from SAFF signed it and then he walked away. He is doing a deal now with Grain Growers Limited.

I offered to assist the minister to get a bipartisan approach to this issue and to sort it out, but that did not happen. The minister rang me up one day and said that she was meeting with SAFF and she was going to organise a primary industry funding scheme. So, the industry has stuffed it up because it has lost control of it, the minister has taken over and Labor has won the game. This is what happens with disunity. I hope that we get some common sense into this and the minister realises that we could have found some common ground and got on with this and got the job right. At the end of the day, I do not see much hope for this state under this Labor government.

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (16:12):** I would like to contribute and respond to the speech by His Excellency the Governor of South Australia on the opening of the Second Session of the Fifty-Second Parliament of South Australia. As the member for Fisher indicated yesterday, I also would like to congratulate the Governor Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce and his wife, Liz, on their reappointment and thank them very sincerely for their dedicated service to all of our state over the last few years and wish them well in the next couple of years.

I would also like to comment on some of the seven primary areas of focus for action by the government which were mentioned in that speech. I will start with the clean green food industry. Our state is already a leader in sustainability in many areas. I will mention one of those, and that is South Australia's own Spencer Gulf King Prawn Fishery, which has become the world's first king prawn fishery to receive the prestigious Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification for sustainability. That has been a great achievement and I congratulate everybody involved with that award. This is only one example of South Australia striving for excellence in terms of food sustainability and security.

Talking about food sustainability and security, the next issue is water. Not only is food security a challenge, but also our water security. I will continue to lobby for what I consider is best for our state and work with members of this house and the other place and also with regional South Australia. We must act as Australians, not as individual states, to ensure that we all survive. We should look at ideas that may not be conventional and to some may be controversial. We need to be innovative and look at increasing the amount of water that is in the system, not continually reduce what we use for food production and human needs.

We must have a vital and healthy River Murray system and Murray-Darling Basin. We must also ensure that the livelihoods of those people on the River Murray and the Murray-Darling Basin are not decimated, and that the food production future of our state and nation and also opportunities for exporting overseas are secure.

Regarding the resources, this state is on the cusp of a new beginning with regard to our resource opportunities, with many projects in varying stages of development, not only in the northern part of the state but in the different peninsulas. The world is demanding our resources for their own growth and existence. We, as a state, should not lose sight of the fact that we are in the box seat. However, to be able to achieve this great opportunity we need power and water. It is very easy to say that we need these resources but we cannot continue to take from the existing resource—in particular, from the Great Artesian Basin. These basins have taken millions of years to fill and if we keep extracting greater than the infill, then we will have a great environmental disaster.

Again, this is in line with my previous statement. We need to look at innovative ideas to be able to bring more water which will allow these activities to be able to be achieved. The top end of South Australia in particular is a gold mine. It is going to be a great opportunity for whoever is in government and for all of our state and our families. To ensure that we have those opportunities, we need to look at how we get extra water and not take it out of the basin.

With regard to manufacturing, along with other parts of Australia, this sector is competing with other regions, in particular China and Asia. We are competing to be able to produce consumables at a very realistic price. As a nation we have lost numerous manufacturing sectors—the whitegoods and textile industries to name two—and now our car manufacturing is under threat. Until recently this state was a proud supplier and builder of various marine projects. I mention the Whyalla shipyards. These closed many years ago and thousands of jobs were lost at the time.



Whyalla is only now starting to recover. The resource opportunity may overcome that, but we lost that proud industry in Whyalla, and it is something we really do not want to lose again.

Our defence industry has now started to get back on track with the activities in Adelaide. However, we need to work to ensure our jobs are protected, not only for ourselves but our future generations.

Regarding education, I am very passionate about young people and how we steer them through the formative years. Being a parent and a grandparent of 13 from my now extended and blended family, I have been blessed with a happy and healthy family. My family has not had to engage with specialist services such as speech pathology for our children but I have been lobbied by those directly affected by conditions such as autism and Down syndrome.

I mention these two issues as I have been meeting with the relevant ministers and although the government has allocated funds to allow these people to access services, there is in fact a shortage of allied health professionals to deliver the actual services. However, to the credit of both the ministers that I have spoken to, they are investigating this issue and looking at solutions. Every child deserves to have the best opportunity for their future and each child will achieve the best that they are able to achieve in their life. However, as legislators, we must ensure that there are adequate resources and funds.

Another area of concern is in regard to ever increasing pressures being placed on families, pensioners and the unemployed. Other people in this house have mentioned the ever increasing costs on utilities. These people are struggling to be able to pay for their increasing utilities costs. There are also issues associated with accessing medical specialists in terms of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS). The rate of reimbursement of this scheme has not changed for many years despite the significant increase in fuel and accommodation costs. I will continue to lobby the minister and my fellow colleagues for a change and an increase to the PATS.

Regarding land tax: whilst it may not have been on the list the other day, this is an area of concern, especially in regional South Australia, particularly for developers. Land was selling fast, then the global financial crisis hit and confidence started to wane in regional areas. I speak not only for my electorate but I know that other country members here also have the same concerns. Developers were left with many unsold blocks. Under the current system they are not only paying council rates but also have to pay land tax on each individual block, eventually eroding the profit.

I refer now to country roads, and, again, this has been brought up by other members. Regrettably, there are still too many accidents on regional and rural roads. Fatalities and serious injuries happen all too often. Some of the roads in regional South Australia are in a very bad condition. Whilst lack of maintenance continues to be cited as a reason for some accidents, consecutive governments have neglected our regional road infrastructure.

It is my belief that we should also be reinforcing school-based education programs aimed at road safety across primary and secondary schools. I can certainly speak from experience: if you lose somebody in a road accident it has long-term effects for many years, not only on yourself but also your family and your friends.

However, I would like to congratulate the government for the reconstruction of the main street of Bute. After negotiations with the minister and the department, the main street was not patched but reconstructed. I congratulate them for looking at the longer term and the best way of doing that which was not to patch up but to reconstruct, and also for the funds that will allow for the redesign and reconstruction of Anama Lane and the Spalding intersection just north of Clare over the next couple of years. I also congratulate the government on the major works that have happened on the Tarlee to Kapunda road. This state has the greatest opportunities for growth. It is our window of opportunity and we must not let it slip.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:21):** I would like to thank His Excellency the Governor for his opening speech. I congratulate him on the extension of his term as Governor for another two years. I acknowledge Kevin and his wife, Liz, for their exemplary service to the State of South Australia.

Just before I speak on the primary areas of focus, I would like to make one comment, through some frustration on hearing our new Premier asking for more etiquette in this chamber. Over the past couple of days it has been highlighted to every person on both sides of this chamber just exactly what is going on. The etiquette that has been asked for I think has been compromised

by what I have seen over the last couple of days, particularly the personal attack on the wife of one of the opposition frontbenchers on Tuesday. I think it was absolutely deplorable.

We sit here and see questions being asked with no real answers. We look at the Dorothy Dixers not being answered properly. There is a very legitimate reason why the opposition is so frustrated and vocal. It appears that the questions that are being answered are really just spin.

Also, we talk about having a cost-effective government. I have a particular concern, watching the two departing members for Ramsay and Port Adelaide. Both those MPs (formerly premier and deputy premier) made a four-year commitment to this parliament that they would be there for the people in their electorate. Albeit they were stabbed in the back and they moved aside, we now see that the former premier has been given a very comfortable package to sit in a staffed office with a chauffeur and a car, etc. They should be in their electorate office serving out their term. That is what they were elected on and that is what they were there for. We see now that this Premier has given them almost a jar of marmalade to keep particularly the ex-premier happy. After saying that in frustration, I will move along.

I am pleased that the government has acknowledged the contribution of our food industries to the welfare and sustainability of South Australia. It is unfortunate that in the Australian Year of the Farmer the government did not see fit to specifically acknowledge the state's farmers. Without farmers there cannot be a clean, green food industry in this state, let alone a capacity to meet growing world demand for food. This omission by the government, however, is not surprising. I feel that the disconnect between regional and metropolitan South Australia has never been greater than it is under the 10 years of this Labor government. Farmers will be an essential element in growing our food industries and taking advantage of increasing global demand.

Our focus must also be on the quality of South Australian food and exports if we are to be competitive. To maintain a quality edge we must have a strong agriculture research sector and a robust quarantine regime. I have spoken a number of times in this house on the need to restore government funding for agricultural and horticultural research in general and specific facilities in Chaffey like the Loxton Research Centre.

Farmers in Chaffey yearn for the days when Loxton was undertaking cutting-edge research and when the former department of agriculture was highly active, disseminating research outcomes and assisting farmers in adopting them. Loxton's research on issues like new varieties of fish, irrigation and salinity management was responsible for the Riverland region becoming one of the world's first-class horticultural regions, as it is today.

Loxton needs to thrive as a centre of research excellence once again. While much research and development is now conducted by the private sector, publicly funded research outcomes are more readily adopted by farmers due to their inherent impartiality. If the government is truly committed to making our food industries a priority, it must increase support for our food research sector. This does not mean cutting funding to SARDI and PIRSA. If this government gives them the appropriate support, they will respond.

This government needs to understand that South Australia's clean and green reputation is not something which fell in the state's lap because of our geographical isolation and favourable climate. It is the result of decades of innovative research and development, extraordinary vigilance against exotic pests and diseases, painstaking efforts to develop export markets and, not least, the hard work and sacrifices of South Australian farming families and their communities.

These foundations must be maintained and proved in order to grow our food industries. South Australia is indeed in a prime position to cater to the increasing global demand for food, for much of the world's population growth will be on our geographical doorstep in Asia. However, it is important to note that Asia's population is not only growing but becoming more affluent, and this affluence is seeing changing food consumption preferenced by a focus on quality.

We are continually told that we have to be competitive, we have to grow more with less. In saying growing more with less, that underpins my next point, that is, we need to have more water efficient food. We need to have fewer chemical inputs into that food, and we have to have fewer straight out inputs. When we grow food, the biggest barrier we have is the cost of production—the cost of chemicals, diesel, machinery and technology.

We have had two of the world's leading experts—I am privileged to have them living in my electorate—in Peter Magarey and Peter Gallasch. They both worked at the Loxton Research Centre over a number of years, and they are leaders in their field. Peter Magarey researched

growing plants that are resistant to disease. For instance, when we look at a grapevine much of the inputs into growing grapevines are as a result of mildew disease. We know that that creates a lot of input—a lot of chemical impacting on the environment and impacting on the health of particularly the farmer who has to apply those chemicals, extra diesel and extra labour time.

If Peter Magarey had been given the funding, he was on the edge of developing grapevines that were resistant to that disease. Again, that would make us more competitive on a world stage. If we look at Peter Gallasch, we would see his achievements in irrigation technology, his achievements in monitoring not only moisture but salinity and nutrients in plants, which would make it much more cost-effective to grow and be competitive on a world stage.

Really, we have to be driven by economic benefits. We have to be driven by the long-term strategy of research and development and not just rely on commercial industries to promote what product they want to sell to the farmers, what product they want to sell to keep our food production alive. We need more environmentally friendly solutions. We need to be able to cope in the lean times and I think, in saying that, the lean times are when we most need to be cost-effective. We need to have that cutting-edge technology. We cannot just rely on the private sector doing that.

In the Mallee Sustainable Farming sector at the moment, in my electorate and in the Mallee, in that marginal country, we have seen over the last five years something that was never thought of as being possible, that is, a huge amount of the grain crop coming out of marginal rainfall country, country that was just very light and very sandy and unable to really produce any viable crop at all. We look at some of the R&D that has gone into it, and we are seeing substantial crops coming out of that very marginal country. We are seeing fewer inputs, but it is also environmentally friendly.

Once upon a time, we would look at some of the news bulletins after a big wind event and we would see that half the country had blown away into neighbours' paddocks. Roads were covered with sand. Today, with some of that R&D and some of that technology, we see minimal-till farming. We are seeing that the country is stabilised, and that is all through research and development. That is all through farmers who are prepared to try different things, but it is coming at a great cost, and that partnership needs to be a publicly-funded R&D project in sync with commercial interests. When we look at commercial interests, we look at a commercial interest trying to sell a product, trying to make money for their own benefit, not for the entire economy.

What it comes down to is that we are looking at the government of the day to make long-term decisions, to make long-term investment in research and development. We do not want shiny-shoed bean counters sitting in an office here in Adelaide giving advice to government on a four-year election cycle. We want good government investing in food security through R&D and investing for our food production future, which is a huge economy driver. We do not want to see cheap import deals secured for unregulated and sometimes unsafe food products.

In this house, I have also spoken a number of times about the state's need for a robust quarantine and biosecurity regime. I have serious concerns that have been raised by this government's unrelenting attempts to shift the cost burden of quarantine and biosecurity to farmers and industry. A line has to be drawn. Quarantine and biosecurity benefits every South Australian, not just food producers, and this government must bear the cost on behalf of every South Australian.

At this point, I acknowledge the government's response to the locust plague in 2010. That was well received by farmers and industry, and I only hope that the government considers the enormous economic benefit this response had—one in which every South Australian shared—when it comes to funding ongoing programs that meet our other biosecurity threats. This government must also restore funding into Primary Industries and Resources of South Australia (PIRSA), particularly in rural services. It simply makes no sense to reduce funding and staff numbers in its department when South Australia's economy and exports rely so heavily on the agriculture sector.

South Australia's economy relies even more heavily on the River Murray and, as you well know, Madam Speaker, the River Murray is something that I am very passionate about, and I cannot emphasise this enough. Towns like Whyalla and Adelaide could not function any more than the communities on the river could without water from the Murray, but the difference here is that Adelaide and Whyalla's existence are not threatened by the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. The existence of South Australia's river communities are very much threatened by this plan, and the combination of anxiety, uncertainty, frustration and the sheer fatigue of river communities in

Chaffey caused by this exhausting and ham-fisted water reform process is almost beyond description.

There is determination to see it through, but there is also despair that our voice will ultimately be ignored. This fear is certainly justified. This process began more than four years ago, but South Australia's 40 years of responsible water use and reform, and its massive investment in state-of-the-art irrigation efficiency and its historic compliance with caps on water use has so far completely been ignored.

The fault for this lies squarely at the feet of the Labor governments in Adelaide and Canberra. The Premier and the water minister, and their predecessors, have had more than four years to press South Australia's case for recognition of the state's responsible water use, and they have failed. They cannot convince their own federal Labor colleagues. They cannot even get them to listen. All the Premier can do is copy his predecessor and make grandiose threats of a High Court challenge. All he can do is create an atmosphere of confrontation and community division in order to appear tough, and this is not in South Australia's interest.

Federal Labor, with its history of incompetence in the implementation of environmental policy, is not managing the Murray-Darling Basin reform process in the nation's best interest. However, from South Australia's perspective, this has been like rearranging deckchairs on the *Titanic*. South Australia is potentially going to be even worse off and its future even more uncertain under the latest version of the draft basin plan.

As with the previous version, the plan articulates no solution to the problems facing the Murray-Darling Basin. South Australia is being ignored, because this government will not articulate a solution. The entire process has denigrated into a pointless, highly politicised and divisive debate over a magic number. The number is not the solution, it is just a number—a compromise made in a panic, an untested figure that is supported by no-one.

The solution is a balanced, practical and elegant solution that delivers environmental flows as well as certainty and security for our South Australian river communities. It is how we obtain the water needed to save the Murray-Darling system that is important. This has been the opposition's position from the beginning, fully articulated in its submissions to the authority and to the standing committee on the regional Australia panel. This is where the focus in the debate must now shift.

The government must sell our infrastructure projects to recoup water back into the system. If we look at projects like the Menindee Lakes engineering solution, that is a \$400 million project and the money is on the table. The government is yet to have the will to spend that money. That will put 170 gigalitres back into the system. That is a huge amount of money. If we look at the viability of the South-East drainage scheme—60 gigalitres back into the southern lagoon of the Coorong. There is also the South Australian wetlands and river management.

We have to look at the issues in our backyard as to how we can best address water saving initiatives to help save the river. At the moment, we have governments that are looking at the irrigators and their communities as the solution, and that is not the answer. If we look at engineering works down at Lake Albert at the narrows, there are a huge amount of savings to be achieved down there, not by saving the water but needing less water to gain an outcome.

We can look at the salinity credits through the Salt Interception Scheme. I do not know whether the members of this house understand that the Salt Interception Scheme mines highly saline water from deep bores from all the states in the Murray basin, but all that saline water is deposited in evaporation basins here in South Australia. We need to be recognised for that.

What will the South Australian government's contribution be to the SDLs? We have a Save the River Murray levy—\$25 million a year—that is a junket account for administration, it is achieving nothing to actually save the River Murray. Where can SA Water make savings? Everyone across the board is being asked to look into their business management, look into the viability of their businesses, and the way that their communities are run to find savings. Where is SA Water on that? Again, we are looking at on-farm savings. There are many farms in South Australia that can still make on-farm savings and can still contribute to the sustainable diversion limits. We look at removing pumps off the backwaters so that we can manage our wetlands. We can put them into a wetting and drying cycle, and that is of huge benefit to this state. Of course, we need to buy-back water from willing sellers.

Premier Weatherill and environmentalists are absolutely fixated on a number and, again, I say that number is almost irrelevant. It is about the outcomes of what the environmental plan will

do. It is almost as though the Premier and the environmentalists are walking hand in hand into a lolly shop and they are looking at the top shelf saying, 'That's what I want up there. I want the lollies on the top shelf,' without really knowing what is in the jar. So, it really does prove that the number is highly political and we need to find solutions elsewhere.

The Environmental Watering Plan is still three years away, so with the environmental lobby and the Premier fixated on the science, where are we going to use 4,000 gigalitres? Where are 4,000 gigalitres going to be used? The balance is in the plan on the table, that 2,750 gigalitres will be put back into the environmental water holder for the benefit of the river. That is the starting point. While it might not be the ultimate number, it is the starting point. We risk derailing this plan and having no states agreeing to it, and if we do not agree to 2,750, what is the answer? Is no water the answer? No plan means no water. I have to ask the Premier, if he is listening in his office, whether he has met with the premiers of the Eastern States to discuss just how this plan is going to be implemented, and how we can have a benefit for all with the balance between the environment, the irrigators, its communities and the river's health.

Again, South Australian irrigators and their communities need certainty. It is like living on the edge without knowing just exactly where the edge is. We look at the huge amount of public money that is being put into a desal plant here in Adelaide—\$2.3 billion. I can ask anyone in this chamber, 'When are we going to turn the desal plant on? When is it going to be of benefit to this state?' Most people come out with an answer, but they say, 'Why would we turn the plant on when we have the River Murray there, and we can keep sucking it out of the River Murray at no cost?' But it is at a cost, it is an environmental cost, and in drought it is to everyone's detriment, particularly the communities and the irrigators that produce this state's food. We look at something that is a huge financial cost to this state but, even more significant than the financial cost is that, to date, three lives have been lost at that desal plant. Money cannot bring those lives back, that is something that needs to be highlighted.

The sum of \$228 million in federal funding has been put on the table for the desal plant. Unfortunately we had \$216 million taken away in GST funding, so in that \$228 million of funding, the state has had to give up six gigalitres of water. Where did the six gigalitres of water come from? I would imagine it has come out of the taxpayers' purse. So, again, that funding has been of no benefit to this state. Who really paid? I think it is South Australian taxpayers, and if only they knew, they will still be paying for many years to come.

Will the desal plant help the river? It is not looking like it. As the minister for water keeps telling us, the desal plant will take the reliance off the river but it will take no less water from the river. When will the government switch on that plant? That is another pressing question. What is the trigger for that state's investment on the desal plant? For \$2.3 billion when are we going to turn on that plant to have an impact on helping South Australia and helping the River Murray? I really do think that the 100 gigalitre desal plant was just a kneejerk reaction. They could see a bucket of money from the feds and they went with it, without even considering the diversity that this state could have embarked on.

When I say 'diversity' I look at recapturing stormwater, storing water in aquifers and reuse of grey water. Myriad diversification projects could have been used. Through the course of debate and an argument over the desal plant versus not using stormwater, people need to understand that river water—all water—was once from the sky, and it has all run down the streets, run down the hills and run down the creeks into the main channel. It is all stormwater. Again, diversity was always overlooked.

I will move from the water into mining and its benefits. Obviously, the mining sector is going to play a significant part in South Australia's future over the next several decades. It is going to be the economic stimulus for South Australia for quite sometime; and it is not just about the mining sector, it is about the employment base, it is about the jobs, it is about the regions that it will support, it is about the lifestyle that it is going to give this state and the opportunities that Chaffey has in the mining industry.

We do not have any mines as such in the electorate of Chaffey, but we do have a very good skilled worker base. We do have the good attributes of a workforce in the mines. We are accustomed to working in isolation. We have a great resource hub. We have great skilled businesses there that can complement the mining industry. There is the potential for the fly in/fly out. As I have said in other speeches I have given, I spent a number of years in a fly in/fly out exercise and it can be of huge benefit to regions, to a lifestyle, but there is a balance there.

For the mining employment sector to come to a place like Chaffey, it is a great place to live. It is an affordable place to live. It really does lend itself to mining. Just touching on advanced manufacturing, the electorate of Chaffey has significant advanced manufacturing through the food sector. I will just touch on a couple of businesses that have really shown world-class technology, world-class product. Look at the almond industry and the Almondco brand. It is a world leader in quality, it is a world leader with its name on a box of almonds, and that is why it is such a successful export driven business.

The biggest concern that all manufacturing has in the electorate is dealing with red tape. Red tape continually stalls advancement in manufacturing in my electorate. Look at Nippy's juice products, which is expanding its processing. It is using Australian citrus in its fresh Australian juice brand. It produces, in my opinion, the world's best orange juice. I have travelled in many countries and I am always keen to try an orange juice where ever I travel. Nothing beats Nippy's.

*Mr Treloar interjecting:*

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Exactly. Nippy's has just undertaken a huge upgrade in its packaging line. It is now packaging and processing all types of beverages; and, because it is in a central location, it can pack the juice products and ship them to all destinations, particularly on the eastern seaboard. We look at JMA—which has been a leading provider into the wine industry over a number of years—diversifying into mining and diversifying into concrete products, as is the business of high tech.

These businesses offer the mining sector and the state's economy a huge opportunity to decentralise and to come out to the regions where there is affordable living and a great lifestyle, and it is a good place for people who want to embark on new businesses to come and live.

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**Mr WHETSTONE:** As the member for Stuart acknowledges. Touching on the other points, yes, I want a vibrant city and, yes, I want affordable living and a safe neighbourhood. Many members have touched on the issue of safety within our local neighbourhoods and the debacle that we are seeing with the thuggery that is going on in the organised crime and bkie world at the moment. It is something that is really putting a threat onto the streets of Adelaide, particularly, but, mark my words, it could easily spread into the regions.

Of course, early childhood fundamentally underpins the regions of this state. This government seems to be hell-bent on centralising all those initiatives. Why wouldn't we decentralise and move to the regions? The cost of living is less. A lot of the regions are very central to the mainstream cities. We have hospitals that are not overcrowded and we do not have the waiting times. We do not have the huge infrastructure pressures on roads, and pollution. It is all about coming out to the regions and smelling a bit of the fresh air.

This government needs to perhaps get away from Gepps Cross and the Adelaide Hills and come out and smell the roses and look at the opportunities the regions of this state offer. They offer so much, yet we continually look at the pressures of living in cities, pushing people into hospitals, overcrowding hospitals and overcrowding our infrastructure, as I said. Come out and smell the roses.

*[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon]*

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:52):** I rise to make my contribution to the Address in Reply and, like many who have spoken before me today on both sides of the house, compliment the Governor on his delivery of the speech. There is no need to beat around the bush: we all know that he did an excellent job delivering the government's and the Premier's speech. I also would like to put forward my personal opinion that he is an excellent governor. I thank him for his contribution to the entire state. I congratulate him on his continuing appointment and would like to make the point that he is greatly appreciated throughout all of South Australia, not just in Adelaide. He attends a lot of functions in country South Australia, and I have personally been with him in Port Augusta, Eudunda and Morgan. So, thank you to him for that.

Of course, we are making these speeches because we had the proroguing of parliament, because we have a new Premier and because we have had two by-elections, so the Premier and the government decided it was time for them to try to pretend it was a fresh start, for them to try to

pretend that everything would be better and for them to try to pretend that the Rann-Foley era was over and some form of new Labor was going to improve everything for the state.

Of course, no-one is fooled by that. We all know that Premier Weatherill was in cabinet every single year and every single day for the whole of the Rann government, so he participated and supported and was in no small way a driver within that government and he contributed to all of the things that they did. It really is laughable and foolish for him to try to pretend that he is different, fresh and new.

Of course, the by-elections will not change anything, either. They will bring us two new members of parliament, and I genuinely congratulate those two people, Susan Close and Zoe Bettison, on their election. Regardless of who we are and what our political thoughts are, we all know that it is no small feat to be elected to this parliament, and they should be very proud of their achievement. Again, their coming here will not change the government. A new Premier and two new members in the Labor government will not change things at all. We will still be faced, as a state, with the same government waste and mismanagement that we have known for the last 10 years and that, no doubt, will continue under this new Premier.

Government waste and mismanagement leads directly to an increase in the cost of living for every single South Australian, particularly those people on low and middle incomes. It leads directly to an increase in the number of public servants on full pay but without a job. It leads directly to the continuation of this government's user-pays cost recovery system, which, as the member for Flinders quite rightly pointed out to me several months ago, is becoming a business model for this government. It is used as an excuse.

The government says to agencies, businesses and people who would like to access support, service and leadership by this government that, 'That is okay, but it is not coming out of general revenue anymore. That is okay, it is not coming out of the normal tax base. That is okay, but you will have to pay for it.' I understand economic rationalism and there is much of it that I agree with, but it is becoming an excuse. What it does is turn some government departments and services into organisations that can charge whatever they like, under the guise of: it is efficient user-pays cost recovery.

The questions need to be asked: do we need some of these services? Do we need to pay to regulate some of the industries and practices that take place? The answer, of course, is yes, for many, but the answer would be no for many as well. It is just an excuse to seem efficient. The government is using this process to get other people to fund things they do not want and, in many cases, do not need. So, we are not going to see any change in that.

With regard to government waste and mismanagement, one feature of the government's speech, through the Governor, was that public sector reform would be driven by an increase in ideas and creativity and rewarding risk-taking, but no decrease in numbers. I know that we have thousands and thousands of very hardworking, very capable, very good public servants supporting all of us in this state, but I also know that they are not all like that.

One thing I can tell you for sure is that their increase in ideas, their improved creativity, their reward for risk-taking will not be genuinely undertaken if their jobs are not at risk. If they can sit there on full pay with nothing to do, then why change? That is human nature. So, until that nexus is broken, until what is referred to as the waiting room or the departure lounge is addressed, the things that the Premier talks about regarding increased creativity and activity will not take place, because until people feel some pressure, some requirement to be better, to work harder, to be more innovative, it just will not happen.

To prove and to highlight what I am talking about regarding government waste and mismanagement and why we should have no expectations—and we should be under no illusion that two new members of parliament or a new Premier are going to change things—I would like to put some numbers on the record, and I have them here for *Hansard* if I do not speak clearly enough, but I think it is very important to get all of these numbers onto the record.

The budget for the 2009-10 year estimated that in 2010-11 we would have a budget surplus of \$78 million. The 2010-11 budget estimated that we would have a deficit of \$389 million in the 2010-11 year. Then, last year's 2011-12 budget showed us that we would have a deficit of \$427 million. The 2009 budget estimated that in the year 2011-12 we would have a \$96 million surplus. A year later, in 2010-11, for the same budget year (2011-12) they estimated a \$55 million surplus. Then, a year later again, the 2011-12 budget stated that for that same year the 2011-12 budget would finish with a \$263 million deficit. Only six months later, in the Mid-Year

Budget Review, concluded late last calendar year, it was estimated that we will actually finish up with a \$367 million deficit.

The forecast surpluses never eventuate, and this continues. The 2009 budget forecast for the year 2012-13 that we would have a \$304 million surplus. The 2010-11 budget estimated for the 2012-13 year that we would have a \$216 million surplus. The 2011-12 budget estimated for the same year that we would have a 2012-13 surplus of \$114 million. But guess what, six months later—surprise, surprise—the Mid-Year Budget Review tells us that actually at the end of the 2012-13 year it will be a \$453 million deficit.

This continues down to the point whereby we were expecting to get a surplus in the 2012-13 financial year but in actual fact we are now expected to get a surplus in the 2014-15 financial year. The reality is that people just do not believe these forecasts. We are told by the government that there is always going to be a surplus a few years down the track, but it just does not eventuate. In six months between the 2011-12 budget and the 2011-12 Mid-Year Budget Review late last calendar year, the surplus was delayed by two years. The predicted surplus was put back two years, and that surplus (the 2014-15 figure) is also now only half what it was going to be. Six months ago we were told that that was going to be a \$655 million surplus. Most recently, in the Mid-Year Budget Review just a month or two ago, we were told it would be a \$334 million surplus.

These numbers tell us that there is an ongoing, unavoidable pattern according to the government of predicting surpluses, but they just do not eventuate—government waste and mismanagement. Government waste and mismanagement has led us to the fact that we will have a greater than \$10 billion state debt in the current forward estimates. We will have approximately a \$700 million per year interest rate and, as the Leader of the Opposition often reminds people, that is about \$2 million per day. That is what all South Australian taxpayers spend just to service the government debt. Government waste and mismanagement increases the cost of living for every single South Australian. Before we do another thing, we have to spend \$2 million a day just to pay for the interest.

Of course, the government says that the global economy is to blame for this. The government tells us that it is not their fault: it is actually the global economy and it is Greece, the EU and all of those issues. The reality is that there are very serious economic issues overseas. There are great challenges overseas and, yes, they do have an impact on us, but this is just an excuse because the debt was entered into long before any of those overseas factors came into play. As you can see from the numbers I gave you before, we have been going down the tubes financially for quite a long time. Sure, the global economy has an impact today, but we have been heading this way for quite a long time, so it is just an excuse not to be believed. Our government overspent well before the global economy was an issue and it cannot use that as an excuse.

Government waste and mismanagement has led to the fact that the government owes hundreds of millions of dollars to private enterprise in this state. The government pays its bills late. The member for Norwood, the shadow spokesman for small business, outlined very clearly how this is not an accident. This is just taking advantage of basically big player versus small player. Small businesses cannot jump up and down. There is no pressure they can exert. There is nothing they can do. They just have to lump it, and that is dreadfully unfair on our small business community. Another example of government waste and mismanagement is that the health department, as of 12 February, still had approximately \$20 million of unreconciled accounts. Nobody can say that is good management.

The new Premier's first actions: the new Premier would have us believe that things have changed, that it will all be better and that we can forget Rann and Foley, that he will lead us on and make things better under his government. His first few actions after becoming Premier included a visit to the Riverland. I give him credit for that because I tell you that the previous premier did not go there for a very long time, so I give him credit for that.

He went there in the midst of what we all understand is the very biggest issue facing the Riverland at the moment, that is, the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. It is one of the biggest issues facing our state and our nation right now. He went there and people were expecting some good news; they were expecting some sort of contribution; they were expecting some leadership from our new Premier but they did not get it. All we know is that the state Labor government and the federal Labor government cannot agree on what to do. This is our opportunity, the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for all governments to work together.



The next thing the Premier did was to visit Mount Gambier. Again, the forest sale is one of the biggest issues facing that community and it expected some good news. The Premier went down there and had nothing for them. He went down there basically on a media stunt just to say, 'Well, I'm not changing. I'm not going to do anything. I'm sorry, we're selling your forests; we don't care.' So it was hardly great leadership, hardly great government.

Another fascinating move—and I cannot figure this one out; I have no idea why any new Premier would do this—and one of his first big public decisions as a new Premier was to say that ex-premiers would get all sorts of perks. This government is going to spend approximately \$200,000 over six months to support ex-premier Rann. First, it is a waste of money—government waste and mismanagement; and, secondly, I just cannot figure out the politics of that. Why would any brand-new Premier tell the public that one of his first big decisions is to provide all sorts of benefits for ex-premiers when he knows that he will be the very next ex-premier?

Another thing that confounds people whom I talk to in the city and the country is the government and the deals that it did in the Port Adelaide by-election. Everybody around the nation can look at the mess that we have federally based largely upon the deals and the operation of the joint Labor-Greens government together. I cannot imagine why anybody would think that that was going to work well in South Australia. However, it does show where the government is at. The Premier and the government will do whatever they need to do to support the Greens to get the Green preferences and to get whatever support they need from the Greens. Even without the Liberal Party running a candidate, they still had to do that. It still had to kowtow to the Greens—just the same sort of federal mess now coming to South Australia.

Another example of government mismanagement and waste and the fact that the new Premier is no different from the old premier was denying the parliament's Public Works Committee access to information about the Royal Adelaide Hospital project. Why on earth is that? This is the biggest, most important, highest profile, single infrastructure development in our state's history and parliament is not allowed to look at it. The secrecy continues from one premier to another with no change in style and no change in government.

The Port Adelaide walkway may very well be a very good project, and I am happy to say that I am not familiar with the details of that project. Was it an election commitment made by the Premier, made by the Labor government? It may well be a good thing. What I would like to highlight, though, is that this project was described by the Premier as a very important regional development project—a walkway in Port Adelaide was described as a very important regional development project.

I can tell you that that was an insult to regional South Australia. That was an absolute insult to regional South Australia. Perhaps the Premier does not really know much about regional South Australia, perhaps he just thought he had to say whatever he had to say to do his deals in Port Adelaide, but regional South Australia was insulted that their new Premier thinks that a new walkway in Port Adelaide is an important piece of regional development. In fact, the government's speech, which the Governor delivered, absolutely neglected regional South Australia entirely.

It also neglected small business, by the way: 135,000 small businesses in South Australia were not referred to and not mentioned in the speech. I also put on the record that there is not one target in the recently revised South Australian Strategic Plan that relates directly to small business either, which I think is no doubt no accident. It is not in the SASP and it is not in the opening of parliament speech, so that shows how much this government cares about small business.

The speech did not refer to the racing industry at all. This government made a very deliberate decision not to have a minister for racing anymore, to axe that position. I am a very proud shadow minister for racing. I think the government seriously undervalues and underestimates the importance of the industry to South Australia. It is one of the few sporting industries that competes, operates and runs all year round, 12 months a year, and it is also one of the largest employers in our state. It is incredibly important. I think it is a very unfortunate oversight that the new Premier has decided to ignore the racing industry, but I will do my best to fill that that void on their behalf.

I mentioned that regional South Australia was not included at all in the Premier's speech. I picked that up. I wrote it in my notes at the time, and we were talking about it in the office when I got an email from a colleague in regional South Australia, who did bit of a word search. He sent me the facts. The word 'country' was used once in the speech, and that was in reference to the official

welcome to country. The word 'region' was used once in the speech, and that was in the context of 'people throughout our region and the world'.

The word 'regions' was used once, and that was in reference to 'wine regions', specifically the Barossa and McLaren Vale—very important places, but hardly representative of all regional South Australia. The word 'regional' did not pop up once in the speech. The word 'rural' did not pop up once in the speech, but the word 'city' turned up 16 times in the government's speech.

I am very happy to say here or any other place that Adelaide is an exceptionally important city. I lived here for many years. I love Adelaide, but not at the expense of regional South Australia. As I said before, the Governor knows that the state includes Adelaide and the rest of the state. The Governor knows that very well. Adelaide is very important.

I can tell you that city people appreciate the country and country people appreciate the city. We come down to Adelaide for all sorts of services, whether it is entertainment, whether it is medical, whether it seeing family and friends, all sorts of very important things. There is a very important relationship between the city and the country in South Australia, but from the government's perspective it is all one-way traffic. By way of example, in our most recent budget, which includes over 1,000 pages, two pages are devoted to regional South Australia. In Western Australia there are 80 pages devoted to regional Western Australia in their most recent budget, and I think that tells a tale.

I would like to touch on a few important issues facing regional South Australia at the moment. This is in no way a conclusive list, but it includes some of the very important issues. Regional South Australia deserves equity of service. Regional South Australia makes up approximately 25 per cent of the population of our state, but it generates approximately 30 per cent of the economic wealth of our state.

I know that it is actually even more than is currently reported because I recently found out that if you look in the ABS figures at mining, there is an enormous amount of mining income generated in the inner eastern suburbs of Adelaide. I am sure that a large part of the wealth generated in regional South Australia is not reported under regional South Australia, perhaps because there are companies with head offices or accountants or registered addresses in Adelaide. Not only are we 25 per cent of the population, 30 per cent of the economic generation in rough terms, we are even more valuable than that.

Health, education, communication, roads and police are all very important issues, and there are many more, but they are important services where regional South Australia does not get its fair share. The Murray-Darling Basin draft plan report is very important, the most important single issue facing regional South Australia at the moment.

We have had, clearly, Labor division on that issue. Clearly, the state government and the federal government, by all reports, have different views and opinions on what needs to be done there. That is a great shame. There are three main areas of the river in South Australia, and I would like to touch on that very quickly. We obviously have the Riverland, broadly described as above Lock 1 on up to the border. We have the Mid-Murray from Lock 1 down to Wellington, and we have the Lower Lakes, essentially from Wellington down to the Murray Mouth, including the Coorong. All three of those very important areas are within South Australia, and anyone who thinks it is as simple as looking at just one or two of those areas is underestimating the size of this problem. All parts of the river need to be very seriously considered in this issue.

Regarding the South-East forests, the whole issue of selling three rotations of wood from our forests—most likely to overseas interests—is alarming. As we all know, they generate approximately \$44 million of income at the moment; as we also know, the need to sell these forward rotations is directly linked to the need for the government to find the \$530 million it needs for the Adelaide Oval. Let me say very clearly that my opinion on the Adelaide Oval has not changed. It is a wonderful project and an attractive project, something that every South Australian—city, country or outback based—would no doubt like to have in our state, but we just cannot afford it. Compared to all the other priorities that we have to spend state money on, it is not at the top of the list. It is a nice thing to have, a wonderful thing to have, but we cannot afford it and we should not be spending our money on it at this point in time.

Another very important issue for regional South Australia is Aboriginal affairs; very, very important. Reconciliation and improvement of opportunity and quality of life for Aboriginal people will not be improved if people are divided. I believe in some forms of positive discrimination to achieve specific goals in specific, finite periods of time, but we will never be able to say we have

achieved enough for any group of people until both negative and positive discrimination are not an issue. They both keep people divided.

Food production was a key feature of the government's speech, and I congratulate it on that; it is very, very important. Clean and green is very important, there is no doubt about that, but we must have access to the latest and world's best technology in our farming industries. We absolutely must have that. Some of the technology is already in place. We have some of the most efficient farmers in the world in South Australia and no doubt we will have others in other industries as time goes on, but there has to be a balance between clean and green and the very best and most modern available technology. We can never forget that.

I would like to quickly touch on the seawater greenhouse project, a wonderful project near Port Augusta where solar power is used to desalinate saltwater from the gulf to grow vegetables in a very large greenhouse. It is 2,000 square metres, but it is actually just a pilot plant. It is going very well and is a wonderful example, in the electorate of Stuart, of cutting-edge clean, green food production.

Of course, food production is very important in the outback. Our outback pastoralists produce an enormous amount of food, primarily through beef and lamb, but of course wool is also very important. I would like to say that in the rush to try to make up for government waste and mismanagement it appears that the government is trying, in many cases, to more than double pastoral rents at the moment. The Pastoral Board has not increased its formulas, the Pastoral Board has not changed its calculations. Most active pastoral leases incur a 2.7 per cent rent on the unimproved capital value, but it seems that years after values have declined—I think they reached their peak in 2007—the government is going back and revaluing pastoral leases. I suspect this is in an effort to try to increase those rents at a time when it desperately needs money.

Outback people are, of course, custodians of our environment in many cases, and I think people do not give enough credit, primarily to pastoralists but to lots of other people working in our outback, for the work, effort and conscientious way they go about protecting our environment. If we did not have pastoralists we would have more feral animals and we would have more pests and weeds in our outback areas.

Of course, communities are very important. There are approximately 30 communities in outback South Australia, ranging from Penong in the far west to Cockburn in the far east of outback South Australia, including very large communities like Coober Pedy and Roxby Downs. They all play an important part. In relation to resources in the outback, we all know, and I am sure both sides of the house agree, that resources and mining will be our greatest contribution in coming years to improving our financial situation. Whether it is food, fibre, minerals or petroleum, exports primarily from outback areas of South Australia will lead us forward into the future.

On that point, fly-in fly-out opportunities are marvellous opportunities. I really do ask the government to do everything it possibly can to make sure that regional communities in South Australia get the biggest bite of this. We do not want people flying in primarily from Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane into new mining ventures.

I would just like to say that infrastructure plays a very large part. Yorkeys Crossing in the electorate of Stuart is a critical issue. BHP is only one of the mining expansions that we will see in our time. BHP has got their deal through parliament. They have all the support that they need from state, federal and territory governments. It is now beholden upon all of us—MPs, communities, businesses, government agencies, everybody—to make sure that BHP is held accountable. They now need to be held accountable for every single commitment that they made in their Olympic Dam expansion at Roxby Downs. They must actually do all the things they promised they will do. I have no suspicion that they will try and shirk their responsibilities, but we must all make sure that we are vigilant in that area, too.

I would like to wind up by saying that one of the things that really hit me in the government's speech was that they take a view for very long-term decisions. We all know in all of our working lives that short, medium and long-term decisions are important and the long term should not be forgotten. The reality is that it is not just decisions but also actions that must be taken to ensure our future.

The government decided to have budget surpluses, but they did not eventuate. The government decided to build a prison at Murray Bridge but did not do it and it cost us \$10 million. The government decided to develop Port Adelaide via Newport Quays but did not do it and it cost

us about \$6 million. The government decided to renew Marathon's exploration licence at Arkaroola but did not do it and it cost us \$5 million.

**Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (17:22):** I would like to congratulate His Excellency the Governor Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce on delivering the opening address of the Second Session of the Fifty-Second Parliament. I would also say how pleased I am that Mr and Mrs Scarce will be continuing in the position for a further two years. In my speech I will address the seven primary areas of focus for action that the government has identified.

The first is a clean, green food industry. I welcome the fact that the government recognises the important contribution that our farmers and food processors make to the state. As a professional and not practising farmer, this is a matter dear to my heart. It is essential that we have secure and well-managed water resources, not only from the Murray River but also from other areas such as the groundwater resources of the South-East.

Our natural resource management boards must ensure that weeds and pests are controlled and that our natural resources are managed in a sustainable manner. I find it hard to understand why our government continuously reduces funding for research and extension in the agriculture industry. We must remember that agriculture is by far the largest contributor to the South Australian economy, and much of this has come about from the excellent work done by our researchers and extension officers.

Our farmers' right to farm must be protected and urban encroachment must be controlled. People who move into country areas for the lifestyle must realise that they are moving into a primary industry zone where they will experience different smells, noises and living conditions.

The red tape and hoops that farmers and businesses have to go through must be reduced. We must ensure that the infrastructure in our regions is of a high standard so that we can get our produce to the market in a timely and economical manner. The dumping of products into Australia and the totally inadequate food labelling laws that we have must be addressed immediately so that our producers can compete on a level playing field.

The mining boom and its benefits: I certainly recognise the contribution that mining is going to make to our state but can see no sense in setting up a future fund at this stage. Right now, we would be much better off reducing the massive debt that has been accumulated. Unlike the forest industry, mining is a finite industry and we must ensure that we get the best out of it for the future of the state.

For far too long, we have been selling our assets for our day-to-day living. Just imagine how much easier it would be today, if we still had the income from a State Bank, a TAB, an ETSA, yet we are about to continue the folly by selling our pines and lotteries profits for a short-term gain. Soon, there will be nothing left to sell unless we forward sell our mining royalties and taxes.

Advanced manufacturing: we must ensure that our manufacturers have access to well-skilled people with smart ideas. We must also make sure that it is not too onerous for our manufacturers to employ people and to carry out their business. They must be able to compete in the international market and dumping of products must be stopped in a more timely manner.

As an example in the South-East, Kimberly-Clark, a tissue manufacturer, has to compete with countries that have little environmental controls, poor worker safety and wage conditions and use old-growth forests, yet they can sell their products into this country for less than they sell them in their own country. Our timber mills are competing with the European mills that receive massive credits for environmental initiatives, and the sawn timber is now a by-product that they can sell into Queensland for less than we can cart it from the South-East.

A vibrant city: I agree that we must have a vibrant city, but it is also about time that we all recognise that both the City of Adelaide and our regions rely on each other and we should be more careful when making decisions that can have a detrimental effect on the other. As an example, one of my local restaurant owners sent me the following:

Dear Don,

Re: New Public Holidays introduced without consultation

I write to express my concerns about the recent announcement by our Premier of two new part public holidays on Christmas and New Year's Eves.

My concerns rest in two areas—with the fact that these announcements were made without consultation with our industry sector and also in terms of the economic impact on our industry if these changes are enacted.

If the public holidays are introduced at 5pm on those days the cost to my business will be approximately \$3,000 in additional wages for the two nights. These two nights are two of the busiest nights of the year and we rely upon them to earn a reasonable income.

In the restaurant industry, we are lucky to make 10% profit from each sale, with many restaurants earning significantly less. This profit is not evenly distributed out over the year, during the quiet times we are lucky to break even and rely heavily on the profitable busy times to see us through.

Given this huge impost, there is no way we could possibly generate a profit on these nights. This means that my capacity to generate revenue and cover costs on those evenings will be completely wiped out, so I will be forced to not open.

This leaves all restaurant owners with the unenviable choice of opening and making a loss or closing and losing out what are usually highly profitable nights.

The premise upon which these changes was introduced was in a deal forged between Business SA (who does not represent my industry) and the SDA Union in order to deregulate shop trading hours and bring life and vibrancy to South Australia. If it is not economically viable to trade on Xmas and New Years' Eves this will mean that many businesses will close those nights—creating the reverse of that intention to create a vibrant SA.

He goes on to say, 'Please do not support this initiative.' The point I am getting at is that every time we make a decision in the city we should also look at the repercussions it will have out in the country and, vice versa, when we make a decision out in the country we should look at what the impact will be in the city.

The government mentioned safe and active neighbourhoods. I support the idea that local councils and communities must be worked with to ensure that we have active neighbourhoods and, as a government, we must work closely with these communities to get the best bang for our buck. I also support the fact that the government is introducing legislation to come down hard on organised crime and the gangs that benefit from it. Our society and communities demand that these criminal perpetrators be dealt with so that we are all safe.

Another issue is affordable living. Public and community housing must be more readily available, and the waiting time for category 1 clients is far too long in this state. We must also make sure that enough money is made available to maintain our present public housing in a timely manner. Housing affordability is also going to be challenged if the Work Health and Safety Bill is passed, not only from stamp duty but also the ever-increasing costs of power and water.

Regarding early childhood, I concur that we must invest in our youngest children, but we must continue that right through to adulthood. We must have an environment in which our children can learn to their fullest potential. Along with knowing what their rights are, they must also know what their roles and behavioural responsibilities are. We must also have in place good resources to assist our young people when they are having difficulties dealing with life. The safety of our vulnerable children is of paramount importance.

I would further like to say that we must reform our public sector. Our public servants do a tremendous job, but it is now costing us far too much to administer our state. We must set priorities and slowly wind back the costs of administration, and not just simply wind back those people at the coalface.

Little was mentioned in the opening speech about our health services, yet these services are the most important to our people and have the largest impact on our finances. We have to be very smart about how we manage health services into the future. The demand for health services is ever increasing as people live longer and we improve technology.

The decisions that we make in this next decade will be extremely important to the future of our state. We must learn from past follies and build on our assets, rather than sell them for short-term gain. We must live within our means and set priorities that are in the best interests of all people who live in our great state.

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (17:33):** I would like to firstly congratulate and thank the Governor, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, for his wonderful speech opening this session of parliament, and congratulate him on the extension to his term as Governor. I also congratulate him and his wife for the fine execution of their duties in the office of Governor.

The Governor's speech is, according to members of the opposition and our Premier, a break in tradition. For some reason, the opposition see that as a negative thing. I think it is an appropriate change because, whilst the opposition have considered it inappropriate, it is an opportunity for this new government to outline its vision and values for the balance of this term and beyond.

What is the vision, and what are these values? The Governor has identified the following seven primary areas of focus for action. The list is not exclusive and does not diminish in any way those areas which are not mentioned; rather it identifies those areas that can be leveraged to maximise the benefit to the community.

I would like to go on to some of these key areas. As to the clean, green food industry, the importance of food production is recognised by this government, and our recent moves for protection zones is an example of us recognising the importance of primary production in this state. The state government's legislation to introduce a small business commissioner is also very important, because one of the industry codes of practice which will come under this act would be one for the farming sector.

It is also interesting to note that the small business commissioner legislation and also the code which will come from it—which came from the farm machinery inquiry by the Economic and Finance Committee of parliament—were two initiatives opposed by the Liberal Party. As we can see, their rhetoric does not match their actions.

The mining boom will benefit this state in two ways. Firstly, there will be the royalties and, secondly, the service industries and employment—apart from the direct employment—that will create. My electorate is one of those which will benefit. The employment lands in my area are set to grow enormously as a result of the mining industry, and many companies are already manufacturing goods and services for the mining sector.

In relation to advanced manufacturing, the government is prepared to invest in manufacturing, in particular in the north and north-western suburbs of this state—and my electorate will benefit from that. The government is prepared to give an undertaking which is both mature and strategic in the response to the challenges facing General-Motors Holden's, and not only General-Motors Holden's but also those other companies and small businesses in the area that provide products and services for General-Motors.

Contrast that with the responses—and I do say the 'responses'—from the Liberal Party. It is very difficult to know what its response is because there are so many of them. It is appropriate at this point to highlight a developing theme in the opposition's responses or actions on a range of areas. While it is appropriate for an opposition to hold a government to account, it is not appropriate for an opposition to do it in a way which undermines our state. This opposition has no shame at the collateral damage from its actions. I will explain why. It does not care about the damage it does to the economy or the community in its endeavour to attack the government. This is no clearer than in the example of a lack of bipartisanship in ensuring support for the manufacturing in this state.

There are more examples. In the two focus areas of safe and active neighbourhoods and early childhood, the Liberals' attack on volunteering and schools is unforgiveable. I will explain why. In their attempt to make a cheap (but inaccurate) political point, the Liberal Party has undermined both volunteers and schools. The Liberal Party issued a statement this week which stated that parents on school councils now risk their home. While pretending to support greater local school autonomy and greater parental involvement, the Liberal Party's statement seeks to scare both parents and volunteers from actively participating in their school communities.

So the Liberal Party does not care about the collateral damage from their actions. Another example is the recent surfing festival—excuse me if I do not have the right name for it—on Kangaroo Island. Their actions there have been so opportunistic that even their own member, the member for Finnis, had to rebuke his own side today in his speech in this place. When you look through what he said, it is quite clear that it was quite a veiled attack on his own members who have attacked the government's investment in this event. It is quite unusual for a member to attack their own side, so one has to grasp how bad this opposition is.

What is the collateral damage here, and this is a theme which is quite clear through the whole response by this opposition? They do not care about the collateral damage they are doing to both the economy and to the community. The collateral damage is to tourism and small business on the Fleurieu Peninsula and KI, and closer to my own home.

While the government is working to make living more affordable in my own electorate by improving public transport, and in particular the town of Gawler, what have the Liberals done? Over the last few months they have issued a number of statements attacking the new public transport system to the extent that they seek to undermine it. This service has in its first six months made 20,000 passenger trips, yet they call it 'not viable', they call it 'unnecessary', etc.

Why would the Liberal Party attack a new service? Why would they not encourage people to use it? Why would they actually issue statements attacking it? When you look through the paperwork and the Liberal Party's policy for public transport in my town of Gawler at the last election, their response for public transport was to introduce a community bus. That was the extent of it. One line in a document about public transport was that the Liberal Party will investigate a community bus. That was their response to a growing community of 20,000 people.

Embarrassed by that lack of policy response, what do they do? They attack our initiative, which is a full metro public transport service for the town—the first in the town's history. What do they do? They try to undermine it, again. They have no shame in the collateral damage they seek to impose on both the economy and on the community. When you carefully read those media statements put out by the local Liberals, and more recently the member for Bragg in her role as opposition spokesperson for transport, it is quite clear that a reasonable conclusion to reach from their statements put together is that, if they win government in 2014, they will axe it.

They will axe the new transport service to the town, one which has taken heavy lobbying from the community to get going. They will axe the service when it is most needed, when the town is growing, and they do it without shame. There is no pretence of trying to make sure it works well, no pretence of trying to get people to use it and actively support it, encourage it and promote it. What do they do? They criticise it, undermine it and they do not care about the collateral damage.

What are they trying to do, in effect? They are trying to undermine the \$2.6 billion investment by this government in public transport—the biggest investment in public transport for many a decade. As I have shown, this opposition will say anything, do anything and damage anything (the economy and the community) to get their message across, and why would an opposition do that? As I said, it is legitimate for an opposition to hold a government to account. It is not legitimate for an opposition to undermine the state in trying to do that.

Simply, the Liberal opposition has no policy responses to the various challenges facing this state. One just has to listen to question time and the nature of their questions. One has to listen to their addresses in reply, especially the Address in Reply by the leader and the lack of policy response. The Governor's speech outlines a vision for this state, which I said was appropriate.

It is interesting to note that, while the Governor outlined a vision for this state through his speech, the member for Norwood earlier today criticised the speech because it did not look at the past, there was not enough of the past in his speech. While the Governor's speech focused on the future, as it should, the Liberal Party is focused on the past. In closing, I just would like to say that this government is quite rightly focused on the future and not the past, because when you look at the past all you find is a Liberal opposition.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:46):** I rise today to give my Address in Reply speech and will use the opportunity to remind the government of the real state of our state and, specifically, of the electorate of Adelaide. First, I will touch upon some issues raised by His Excellency Governor Scarce in his speech. His Excellency mentioned the need to supply food for an increasing world population. A secure and efficient food supply is vital not just globally but for our own domestic needs. However, the Labor government has needlessly compromised Adelaide's future food production by rezoning productive land in Mount Barker and Buckland Park for residential development. Hectares of food bowl land will be turned into 500 square metre lots. This decision was made, even though over 500 submissions were received appealing to the government not to rezone for housing high quality 'low food miles' primary production land at Mount Barker, while many residents pleaded for the retention of prime agricultural land for food production.

Public transport problems plague the Adelaide electorate. The suburb of Prospect, only a few kilometres north of the city, is supposedly part of the 15 minute 'go zones', yet my office regularly receives calls from constituents waiting for up to an hour for a bus, many giving up and starting to walk home to be passed by three of their buses in convoy, and deciding it is easier to take their car. A safe, reliable, affordable and on-time public transport system is an integral part of city planning and infrastructure. Our public transport system is used only by a small percentage of our city workers, yet we have half-empty buses running. City workers choose to drive to the city rather than use public transport because the public transport service is unreliable.

I was very pleased to hear His Excellency's desire for change in the City of Adelaide. His Excellency suggested that our capital city centre should be a vibrant place that expresses our state's confidence and vitality. I agree completely with His Excellency's statement. However,

vibrancy and vitality are just buzz words without the actions to help them become applicable. To this end I brought my first bill before parliament to amend the shop trading hours to allow for Rundle Mall to operate as a tourist precinct, which would allow it to trade on non-religious public holidays. Unfortunately, but perhaps not surprisingly, my bill was unanimously opposed by the Labor government.

Now we find the government introducing legislation that allows for Rundle Mall to open for trade every day of the year, except Good Friday and Christmas Day. But this comes at a very significant cost in wage penalties to small businesses across the state. In an effort to create vitality in Rundle Mall, the government has dealt a serious blow to small businesses by the creation of two new half-day public holidays for workers across the state. So, a restaurant on Churchill Road, a petrol station on Prospect Road or a nursing home on Main North Road will now pay public holiday rates to staff on both 24 and 31 December between 5 p.m. and midnight as a pay-off to the SDA for opening Rundle Mall.

This decision appears to have been made without consultation with small businesses. I have received, as I am sure many members have, correspondence from many, many small businesses adversely affected by this bad deal. I am also sure all members have heard from the newly formed collaboration between the Australian Hoteliers Association, Restaurant and Catering SA, the Motor Transport Association and the Aged Care Association of SA, all united in their view that this is a pig of a deal. To quote from their correspondence:

While we strongly endorse the additional shop trading capacity of the CBD, we object that the cost is being carried by every other small and medium business across the state.

Not a single business constituent with whom I have spoken has said that the government knocked on their door and asked them if they thought it was a good idea to create two half-day public holidays. In fact, the only union even involved in this discussion was the SDA, the same people who gave Rann the tap on the shoulder to inform him his time was up.

I ask: who is running this state? This deal is counterproductive and further reduces our state's competitiveness. I do not believe any other state has implemented either of the half-day public holiday rates. I am not aware if Fair Work Australia has been consulted on this move and I would like the government to be transparent about who it consulted and who supported the decision. Surely, more than just the SDA and Business SA were involved in this decision.

Another very important issue for families within my electorate is the need for affordable and accessible education. Last evening after parliament rose, I attended the Adelaide High School governing council meeting. It occurred to me last night that it has been nearly two years since the 2010 election when the Labor government promised to expand Adelaide High School to allow for up to 250 extra students. The government promised to expand the zone to include Prospect and Walkerville and to expand without encroaching on the Parklands.

Although being the school that needed the expansion the most, the other three schools mentioned in the government's press release are building or at end-stage planning now. It is two years on, yet Adelaide High School has no confirmation, no direction and no plan. So far, the governing council's second option was selected, as their first option was deemed too expensive. Thus, the second option, which encroaches almost entirely on the Parklands and will now require a new service road around the building that is entirely on the Parklands, has been chosen.

There is no possible way of meeting the 2013 promised finish date, so families of Adelaide will suffer. Families living in Prospect with children now in years 6 or 7, who took the government at their word in 2010 and thought their children would have a chance to go to the closest state high school, are left in despair knowing they are going to struggle to afford a private college yet are left with no other choice.

South Australia is already the highest taxing state and among the least competitive. The SDA is just another blow for small business with their deal. This will mean that either the business owners will have to be the sole staff on the days the public holidays have been added or businesses will not open, as the new penalty rates will make it unaffordable. There is a real risk that Adelaide's hospitality businesses will be closed next Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve, turning Adelaide into a ghost town, hardly promoting Adelaide as a vibrant city.

Compounding this, the government seems to think it is good practice to repeatedly award contracts and tenders to interstate businesses which bring with them interstate workers who take their earnings and spend them out of the state. I have been contacted by firms which believe they



were competitive in both price and service delivery yet have been overlooked for tenders or repeat contracts with our government.

There are so many SA businesses that are snubbed by this government awarding contracts interstate such as stationery provider Penfolds, who provided quality stationery products to various government departments only to lose to a multinational company. To my understanding, there was no fiscal saving to be found for the government in this decision and now stationery supplies are sent to Adelaide from Sydney. Business profits, again, are going out of this state.

Then we have the new hospital under construction. Two South Australian plumbing businesses tendered for the contract. They were competitive in price and they were confident of service delivery. They did not win the tender because the government thought the best decision they could make was to send the tender interstate. I was contacted by the mother of one of the young plumbers who was laid off because a tender was rejected. She said to me:

He has gone interstate, already got a job. We have lost a good young tradesman and someone who loves South Australia, but he realised there is nothing here for him and he won't be back.

We need these young men and women tradespeople. We need them to build up our state. But this young man, and thousands of other young tradespeople and professionals, are packing their bags. Our government's priorities are distorted. There is big money for big screen TVs out of the bloated budget at Adelaide Oval, yet there is no money for vital regional health services such as the Keith hospital or for the Adelaide Aquatic Centre to remain the place for young athletes in sports such as water polo, canoe polo and underwater hockey to keep training in Adelaide.

Selling the forests in Mount Gambier, which currently brings in \$40 million per year, and selling the Lotteries Commission, which brings in around \$80 million per year, is like selling the goose that lays the golden egg. Selling the forward rotations of the forests is, in effect, privatisation. We are paying \$5 million to Marathon Resources after the government first granted an exploration licence and then further renewed the licence. After renewing the licence, they decided to stop mining in Arkaroola and thus taxpayers are left with a \$5 million compensation payout. Then there was a \$10 million payout to get out of a contract to build a new prison as we could no longer afford it.

With the pending by-election in Port Adelaide, the government decided to finally listen to the community and stop the Newport Quays development. Of course, this was cancelled just 10 days after renewing the contract, thus \$10 million in compensation will now have to be paid. I cannot believe the stupidity and financial mismanagement that this government has got away with for 10 years.

In His Excellency's opening speech to parliament, references were made to the increased cost of living in our state. His Excellency made references to the renewal of public housing and the concessions to ease the burden of the increasing cost of living. It is astounding that according to the review of Mercer's 2011 Cost of Living Survey Adelaide is ranked as the 46<sup>th</sup> most expensive city in the world. In 2010 we were ranked 90<sup>th</sup>. I do not believe that this is a contest where we want to move up the ranks.

Cost of living is a very real issue that presents itself daily in my electorate, and I would like to take this opportunity to present the story of a constituent who came to my office last week desperate for help. This constituent is a single woman in her late 50s. She has had personal and health issues throughout her life and has managed to survive in private rental despite a meagre disability support pension being her only income.

Several years ago my constituent took her name off the Housing SA waiting list after being told there was essentially no chance that she would ever get public housing. As in many inner suburban areas, rents in my electorate have increased, and my constituent was recently issued with a notice that the rent of a very modest unit was going up to \$255 per week, an increase of \$105 per week since she moved in five years ago.

Academics would say that my constituent is in housing stress, and I can absolutely agree with them. She has no money left once the essentials of rent and electricity are paid. When basic food becomes a luxury item for some people, we are in serious trouble as a society. I would think that each member of this chamber would have such constituent issues. The great shame is that there is no solution available. There is nowhere that can really help as there are no resources to help. There are emergency food hampers, small amounts of money to help with prescriptions and maybe a free Multitrip from an NGO, but the reality is that there is little more.

My constituent has met with Housing SA and she has told me that essentially there is nothing that can be done. There is very little private rental housing under \$240 per week within 15 kilometres of the CBD and no assistance to move should you find anything. Bond assistance is limited and only partial. So what is someone like my constituent to do? Pray for a miracle? There is little else one can do. The threat of this constituent becoming homeless is very real.

The lack of resources is compounded by the Labor government's commitment to selling off public housing stock. Since 2002, there has been a systematic sell-off of Housing Trust homes in Adelaide, electorate suburbs and particularly in the Adelaide CBD, with a decline of approximately 14 per cent of Housing Trust and Aboriginal housing stock combined. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 5, page 3, line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1), definition of *criminal intelligence*]—

After 'suspected' insert: serious and organised

No. 2. Clause 5, page 3, line 26 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1), definition of *dangerous article*]—Delete 'regulation' and substitute:

Schedule 2 Part 2

No. 3. Clause 5, page 3, after line 32 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1)]—After the definition of *knife* insert:

*lawful excuse*—see section 21E;

No. 4. Clause 5, page 4, after line 12 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1)]—After the definition of *offensive weapon* insert:

*official ceremony* means a ceremony conducted—

- (a) by the Crown in right of the State or the Commonwealth; or
- (b) by or under the auspices of—
  - (i) the Government of the State or the Commonwealth; or
  - (ii) South Australia Police; or
  - (iii) the armed forces;

No. 5. Clause 5, page 4, line 13 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1), definition of *prohibited weapon*]—Delete 'regulation' and substitute:

Schedule 2 Part 3

No. 6. Clause 5, page 4, after line 15 [clause 5, inserted section 21A(1)]—After the definition of *school* insert:

*serious and organised criminal activity* means criminal activity involving 2 or more persons who are reasonably suspected of associating for the purpose of organising, planning, facilitating, supporting or engaging in serious criminal activity (within the meaning of the *Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008*);

No. 7. Clause 5, page 4, after line 23—After section 21A insert:

21AB—Expiry of criminal intelligence provisions

Information may not be classified as criminal intelligence for the purposes of this Part after the day on which the *Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008* expires in accordance with section 39 of that Act.

No. 8. Clause 5, page 5, lines 13 to 16 [clause 5, inserted section 21C(3)]—Delete subsection (3) and substitute:

- (3) A person who, without lawful excuse, carries an offensive weapon or dangerous article at night while in, or while apparently attempting to enter or leave—
  - (a) licensed premises; or
  - (b) a carparking area specifically or primarily provided for the use of patrons of the licensed premises,
 is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

No. 9. Clause 5, page 5, after line 35 [clause 5, inserted section 21C]—After subsection (6) insert:

- (7) A person who, without lawful excuse, has possession of an offensive weapon in a school is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty:

- (a) for a first offence—\$2,500 or imprisonment for 6 months;  
 (b) for a subsequent offence—\$5,000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

- (8) A person who, without lawful excuse—

- (a) uses an offensive weapon; or  
 (b) carries an offensive weapon that is visible,

in the presence of any person in a school or public place in a manner that would be likely to cause a person of reasonable firmness present at the scene to fear for his or her personal safety, is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

- (9) For the purposes of an offence against subsection (8), no person of reasonable firmness need actually be, or be likely to be, present at the scene.

- (10) If on the trial of a person for an offence against subsection (7) or (8), the court is not satisfied that the person is guilty of the offence charged, but is satisfied that the person is guilty of an offence against subsection (1)(a), the court may find the person guilty of the offence against subsection (1)(a).

No. 10. Clause 5, page 5, after line 39 [clause 5, inserted section 21D]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) Subsection (1) does not apply in relation to the sale of a knife if it is reasonable to infer that the knife was made for the consumption of food.

No. 11. Clause 5, page 6, after line 19 [clause 5, inserted section 21D]—After subsection (4) insert:

- (4a) No offence is committed under subsection (4) if a person markets a knife solely in a way that indicates or suggests that the knife is suitable for use in a lawful form of entertainment or a lawful and recognised form of recreation or sport.

No. 12. Clause 5, page 6, lines 32 to 38 and page 7, lines 1 to 11 [clause 5, inserted section 21E]—Delete section 21E and substitute:

21E—Lawful excuse

- (1) Nothing in this section limits the circumstances in which a person will, or will not, be taken to have a lawful excuse for the purposes of this Part.
- (2) It will be a lawful excuse for a police officer to use, carry or possess an offensive weapon or an implement or article if the use, carrying or possession occurs in the course of the officer's duties as a police officer.
- (3) It will be a lawful excuse for a person to use, carry or possess an offensive weapon if the use, carrying or possession is reasonably required in the course of conducting his or her business or for the purpose or in the course of his or her employment.
- (4) It will be a lawful excuse for a person to use, carry or possess an offensive weapon if the use, carrying or possession is reasonably required in connection with—
- (a) a lawful form of entertainment; or
- (b) a lawful and recognised form of recreation or sport; or
- (c) an official ceremony; or
- (d) an official uniform; or
- (e) in the case of a knife—
- (i) the exhibition of knives for retail or other trade purposes; or
- (ii) an organised exhibition by knife collectors; or
- (iii) the preparation or consumption of food.
- (5) It will be a lawful excuse for a person to carry or possess an offensive weapon if the carrying or possession is reasonably required in connection with a museum or art gallery.

- (6) The regulations may, however, despite a provision of this section, prescribe circumstances in which certain convicted persons will not be taken to have a lawful excuse for the purposes of this Part.

No. 13. Clause 5, page 7, line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(2)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

- (a) Schedule 2 Part 4; or

No. 14. Clause 5, page 7, line 22 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(2)(b)]—Delete 'Commissioner' and substitute:

Minister

No. 15. Clause 5, page 7, lines 25 to 27 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(3)]—Delete subsection (3)

No. 16. Clause 5, page 7, line 28 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(4)]—Delete 'Commissioner' and substitute:

Minister

No. 17. Clause 5, page 7, line 31 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(4)(b)]—Delete 'Commissioner's' and substitute:

Minister's

No. 18. Clause 5, page 7, line 35 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(5)]—Delete 'Commissioner' and substitute:

Minister

No. 19. Clause 5, page 7, line 37 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(6)]—Delete 'Commissioner' and substitute:

Minister

No. 20. Clause 5, page 7, line 38 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(6)(a)]—Delete 'Commissioner' and substitute:

Minister

No. 21. Clause 5, page 7, after line 39 [clause 5, inserted section 21F]—After subsection (6) insert:

- (6a) The Minister must not make a decision on an application for a declaration unless he or she has consulted with the Commissioner.

No. 22. Clause 5, page 8, line 1 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(7)]—Delete 'Commissioner' and substitute:

Minister

No. 23. Clause 5, page 8, after line 3 [clause 5, inserted section 21F]—After subsection (7) insert:

- (7a) The Minister may delegate his or her powers under this section to any person or body.  
(7b) A delegation under subsection (7a)—  
(a) must be in writing; and  
(b) may be conditional or unconditional; and  
(c) does not derogate from the Minister's ability to exercise the power under this section; and  
(d) is revocable at will by the Minister.

No. 24. Clause 5, page 8, lines 4 and 5 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(8)]—Delete 'Commissioner' wherever occurring and substitute in each case:

Minister

No. 25. Clause 5, page 8, lines 27 to 30 [clause 5, inserted section 21F(12)]—Delete subsection (12) and substitute:

- (12) A person who is entitled to use or possess a prohibited weapon in accordance with this section—  
(a) must not use or possess the weapon unless he or she does so in a safe and secure manner; and  
(b) must take all reasonable steps to prevent access to the weapon by persons who are not entitled to such use or possession.

Maximum penalty: \$1 250 or imprisonment for 3 months.

No. 26. Clause 5, page 8, after line 30—After section 21F insert:

## 21FA—Information relating to weapons related injuries

- (1) If a medical practitioner or a registered or enrolled nurse has reasonable cause to suspect in relation to a person who he or she has seen in his or her professional capacity that the person is suffering from a wound inflicted by a weapon or article of a kind referred to in this Part, the medical practitioner or nurse must, within 1 month after forming the suspicion, make a report to the Department (within the meaning of the Public and Environmental Health Act 1987) containing—
  - (a) details of the wound; and
  - (b) any information provided to the practitioner or nurse about the circumstances leading to the infliction of the wound (other than information tending to identify the person).
- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply if, in the opinion of the medical practitioner or the nurse, the injuries are not serious and the medical practitioner or nurse believes on reasonable grounds that the injuries were accidental.
- (3) A person incurs no civil or criminal liability in taking action in good faith in compliance, or purported compliance, with this section.
- (4) In this section—
 

*enrolled nurse* means a person registered under the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law*—

  - (a) to practise in the nursing and midwifery profession as a nurse (other than as a student); and
  - (b) in the enrolled nurses division of that profession;

*medical practitioner* means a person registered under the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law* to practise in the medical profession (other than as a student);

*registered nurse* means a person registered under the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law*—

  - (a) to practise in the nursing and midwifery profession as a nurse (other than as a student); and
  - (b) in the registered nurses division of that profession.

No. 27. Clause 5, page 9, lines 18 to 20 [clause 5, inserted section 21G(4)]—Delete subsection (4) and substitute:

- (4) A weapons prohibition order served on a person must be accompanied by a notice—
  - (a) setting out the Commissioner's reasons for issuing the order; and
  - (b) setting out the terms and the effect of the order; and
  - (c) stating that the person may, within 28 days, appeal to the District Court against the order.

No. 28. Clause 5, page 9, line 26 [clause 5, inserted section 21G(6)]—Delete '5 years' and substitute:

3 years

No. 29. Clause 5, page 10, after line 23 [clause 5, inserted section 21H]—After subsection (4) insert:

- (4a) It is a defence to prosecution for an offence against subsection (4)(a) to prove that the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the place was a place of a kind referred to in that paragraph.

No. 30. Clause 5, page 10, lines 29 to 41 [clause 5, inserted section 21H(6) to (8)]—Delete subsections (6) to (8) inclusive and substitute:

- (6) A person to whom a weapons prohibition order applies must—
  - (a) immediately on becoming aware of the presence of a prohibited weapon on premises at which the person resides, notify the Commissioner of that fact; and
  - (b) comply with—
    - (i) a direction of the Commissioner, given in response to that notification, that the person must not reside at the premises; or
    - (ii) any other direction of the Commissioner, given in response to that notification, in relation to the weapon.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

No. 31. Clause 5, page 11, lines 5 to 13 [clause 5, inserted section 21H(10) and (11)]—Delete subsections (10) and (11)

No. 32. Clause 5, page 11, line 15 [clause 5, inserted section 21H(12)]—Delete ', (10) or (11)'

No. 33. Clause 5, page 11, lines 18 to 25 [clause 5, inserted section 21H(13)]—Delete subsection (13) and substitute:

(13) For the purposes of this section, if a person to whom a weapons prohibition order applies is on or in premises or a vehicle, vessel or aircraft (other than any premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft to which the public are admitted) when a prohibited weapon is found on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft, the person will be taken to possess the weapon unless it is proved that—

(a) the person has notified the Commissioner of the presence of the weapon in accordance with subsection (6); or

(b) the person did not know, and could not reasonably be expected to have known, that the weapon was on or in the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft.

No. 34. Clause 5, page 11, after line 29 [clause 5, inserted section 21H]—After subsection (14) insert:

(15) The Commissioner may, by notice in the Gazette—

(a) exempt a class of persons, unconditionally or subject to conditions specified in the notice, from a specified provision of this section; and

(b) vary or revoke such an exemption.

No. 35. Clause 5, page 11, lines 31 to 33 [clause 5, inserted section 21I(1)]—Delete subsection (1) and substitute:

(1) A person aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner—

(a) to issue a weapons prohibition order under section 21G; or

(b) to vary or revoke an exemption under section 21H(14),

may appeal against the decision to the District Court.

No. 36. Clause 5, page 12, after line 13—After section 21I insert:

21IA—Reports relating to weapons prohibition orders

The following information must be included in the annual report of the Commissioner under section 75 of the *Police Act 1998* (other than in the year in which this section comes into operation):

(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 21I and the outcome of each appeal that has been completed or finally determined;

(d) any other information requested by the Minister.

No. 37. Clause 5, page 12, lines 26 and 27 [clause 5, inserted section 21J(2)(a)]—Delete 'who a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds is a person'

No. 38. Clause 5, page 13, lines 28 to 30 [clause 5, inserted section 21M(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

(a) provide that this Part or specified provisions of this Part do not apply to a specified class of persons; and

No. 39. Clause 7, page 14, line 4 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(1)]—Delete 'A police' and substitute:

Subject to this section, a police

No. 40. Clause 7, page 14, line 5 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(1)]—Delete 'metal detector'

No. 41. Clause 7, page 14, after line 9 [clause 7, inserted section 72A]—After subsection (1) insert:

(1a) A search referred to in subsection (1) in relation to a person or property must be carried out as follows:

(a) the search must, in the first instance, be a metal detector search and must not proceed to a further search unless the metal detector search indicates the presence or likely presence of metal;

(b) if the metal detector search indicates the presence or likely presence of metal, a police officer may—

- (i) require the person to produce the item detected by the metal detector; and
- (ii) if the person refuses or fails to produce such item—conduct a search of the person for the purpose of identifying the item as if it were a search of a person who is reasonably suspected of having, on or about his or her person—
  - (A) stolen goods; or
  - (B) an object, possession of which constitutes an offence; or
  - (C) evidence of the commission of an indictable offence;
- (c) a search will not be taken to be lawfully carried out under this section unless it is carried out in accordance with procedures set out in the regulations (being procedures that seek to minimise, as far as reasonably practicable, any undue delay, inconvenience or embarrassment to persons being subjected to a search under this section).

No. 42. Clause 7, page 14, line 11 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(2)(a)]—Delete 'and the vicinity of licensed premises'

No. 43. Clause 7, page 14, after line 16 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(2)]—After paragraph (b) insert:

- (c) a car parking area specifically or primarily provided for the use of patrons of an area referred to in paragraph (a) or (b).

No. 44. Clause 7, page 14, lines 29 and 30 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(5)]—Delete 'metal detector'

No. 45. Clause 7, page 14, lines 33 to 35 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(6)]—Delete subsection (6)

No. 46. Clause 7, page 14, lines 36 to 41 and page 15, lines 1 to 12 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(7) and (8)]—

Section 72A(7) and (8)—delete the subsections and substitute:

- (7) The following information must be included in the annual report of the Commissioner under section 75 of the *Police Act 1998* (other than in the year in which this section comes into operation):
  - (a) the number of declarations made under subsection (3);
  - (b) the following details about each declaration made under subsection (3):
    - (i) the name and date of the event;
    - (ii) the location of the public place;
  - (c) the number of metal detector searches, and the number of searches other than metal detector searches, carried out under this section;
  - (d) the locations at which those searches were carried out (for example, licensed premises, a public place holding an event or elsewhere);
  - (e) in the case of a search carried out at a public place holding an event—the event and period specified in the relevant declaration and the date on which the notice of the declaration was published in the Gazette;
  - (f) the number of occasions on which a metal detector search indicated the presence, or likely presence, of any metal;
  - (g) the number of occasions on which weapons or articles of a kind referred to in Part 3A were detected in the course of such searches and the types of weapons or articles so detected;
  - (h) the number of occasions on which other kinds of weapons or articles constituting evidence, or possible evidence, of the commission of an offence were detected in the course of such searches and the types of weapons or articles so detected;
    - (i) any other information requested by the Minister.

No. 47. Clause 7, page 15, after line 12 [clause 7, inserted section 72A]—After subsection (8) insert:

- (8a) This section will expire 3 years after it comes into operation.

No. 48. Clause 7, page 15, lines 30 to 34 [clause 7, inserted section 72A(9), definition of *metal detector search*]—

Delete the definition of *metal detector search*

No. 49. Clause 7, page 15, line 36 [clause 7, inserted section 72B(1)]—Delete 'A police' and substitute:

Subject to this section, a police

No. 50. Clause 7, page 16, after line 1 [clause 7, inserted section 72B]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) A search referred to in subsection (1) in relation to a person or property must be carried out as follows:
- (a) the search must, in the first instance, be a metal detector search and must not proceed to a further search unless the metal detector search indicates the presence or likely presence of metal;
  - (b) if the metal detector search indicates the presence or likely presence of metal, a police officer may—
    - (i) require the person to produce the item detected by the metal detector; and
    - (ii) if the person refuses or fails to produce such item—conduct a search of the person for the purpose of identifying the item as if it were a search of a person who is reasonably suspected of having, on or about his or her person—
      - (A) stolen goods; or
      - (B) an object, possession of which constitutes an offence; or
      - (C) evidence of the commission of an indictable offence;
  - (c) a search will not be taken to be lawfully carried out under this section unless it is carried out in accordance with procedures set out in the regulations (being procedures that seek to minimise, as far as reasonably practicable, any undue delay, inconvenience or embarrassment to persons being subjected to a search under this section).

No. 51. Clause 7, page 16, lines 11 to 13 [clause 7, inserted section 72B(4)]—Delete subsection (4)

No. 52. Clause 7, page 16, line 17 [clause 7, inserted section 72B(5)(b)]—After 'relates' insert:

(which must not be larger than is reasonably necessary for the purposes of the authorisation)

No. 53. Clause 7, page 17, lines 4 to 23 [clause 7, inserted section 72B(10) and (11)]—

Section 72B(10) and (11)—delete the subsections and substitute:

- (10) The following information must be included in the annual report of the Commissioner under section 75 of the *Police Act 1998* (other than in the year in which this section comes into operation):
- (a) the number of authorisations granted under subsection (3) and the nature of the incidents in relation to which such authorisations were granted;
  - (b) the number of metal detector searches, and the number of searches other than metal detector searches, carried out under this section, and information identifying the authorisation pursuant to which those searches were carried out;
  - (c) the number of occasions on which a metal detector search indicated the presence, or likely presence, of any metal;
  - (d) the number of occasions on which weapons or articles of a kind referred to in Part 3A were detected in the course of such searches and the types of weapons or articles so detected;
  - (e) the number of occasions on which other kinds of weapons or articles constituting evidence, or possible evidence, of the commission of an offence were detected in the course of such searches and the types of weapons or articles so detected;
  - (f) the number of occasions on which the Commissioner gave consent under subsection (9);
  - (g) any other information requested by the Minister.

No. 54. Clause 7, page 17, after line 25 [clause 7, inserted section 72C]—Before subsection (1) insert:

- (a1) A metal detector search carried out under section 72A or 72B must be conducted—
- (a) using only a metal detector of a kind approved by the Commissioner; and
  - (b) in accordance with any directions issued by the Commissioner.

No. 55. Clause 7, page 17, lines 28 to 32 [clause 7, inserted section 72C(2)]—Delete subsection (2)



No. 56. Clause 7, page 17, after line 32 [clause 7, inserted section 72C]—After subsection (2) insert:

- (2a) A police officer must ensure that any exercise of powers under section 72A or 72B does not unreasonably interfere with a person's right to participate in lawful advocacy, protest, dissent or industrial action.

No. 57. Clause 7, page 17, lines 33 to 35 [clause 7, inserted section 72C(3)]—Delete subsection (3)

No. 58. Clause 7, page 18, lines 9 and 10 [clause 7, inserted section 72C(6)(a)]—Delete ', or a person accompanying a police officer,'

No. 59. Clause 7, page 18, line 36 [clause 9(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) Section 85(2)(a) and (b)—delete paragraphs (a) and (b) and substitute:
- (a) vary the provisions of Schedule 2 (other than clauses 5 to 7 inclusive and 19 to 25 inclusive) by including provisions in, or deleting provisions from, the Schedule;

No. 60. New clause, page 19, after line 3—After clause 9 insert:

10—Insertion of Schedule 2

After Schedule 1 insert:

Schedule 2—Weapons etc

Part 1—Interpretation

1—Interpretation

- (1) In this Schedule, unless the contrary intention appears—
- catapult* includes a shanghai and a slingshot;
- designed* includes adapted;
- extendable baton of a prescribed kind* means an extendable baton that can only be extended by means of gravity or centrifugal force;
- number*, in relation to the identification of a weapon, means an identifying mark comprised of either numbers or letters or a combination of both numbers and letters;
- official ceremony* means a ceremony conducted—
- (a) by the Crown in right of the State or the Commonwealth; or
- (b) by or under the auspices of—
- (i) the Government of the State or the Commonwealth; or
- (ii) South Australia Police; or
- (iii) the armed forces;
- prescribed masonic organisation* means—
- (a) the Antient, Free And Accepted Masons Of South Australia and the Northern Territory Incorporated; or
- (b) a Lodge or Order of Freemasons warranted and recognised by the association referred to in paragraph (a); or
- (c) the Lodge of Freemasons named 'The Duke of Leinster Lodge';
- prescribed services organisation* means—
- (a) The Returned and Services League of Australia (SA Branch) Incorporated or any of its sub-branches; or
- (b) an association or other body (whether or not incorporated) that is a member of the Consultative Council of Ex-Service Organisations (SA).
- (2) For the purposes of this Schedule—
- (b) a reference to a particular class of dangerous article is a reference to the class of dangerous article as declared and described in Part 2; and
- (c) a reference to a particular class of prohibited weapon is a reference to the class of prohibited weapon as declared and described in Part 3; and

- (d) if an article could, but for this paragraph, be declared by this Schedule to be both a dangerous article and a prohibited weapon, it will be taken, unless the contrary intention appears, to be declared to be a prohibited weapon and not a dangerous article.

#### Part 2—Dangerous articles

##### 2—Dangerous articles

Each of the following is declared to be a dangerous article for the purposes of Part 3A of this Act:

- (a) *anti-theft case*—a case, satchel or similar article designed to administer an electric shock to a person who handles or interferes with the case, satchel or article or its contents;
- (b) *bayonet*—a stabbing weapon designed to be attached to or at the muzzle of a rifle;
- (c) *blow gun*—a blow-pipe or similar device or instrument designed to propel an arrow, dart or similar projectile by air expelled from the mouth;
- (d) *cross-bow*—a cross-bow, other than a pistol cross-bow as described in Part 3 clause 3(s) of this Schedule;
- (e) *dart projector*—a device (for example, a Darchery Dart Slinger) designed to propel a dart by means of elastic material;
- (f) *gas injector device*—a device (for example, a Farallon Shark Dart or a WASP Injector Knife) designed to kill or injure an animal by injecting a gas or other substance into the body of the animal;
- (g) *plain catapult*—a catapult made for commercial distribution, other than a brace catapult as described in Part 3 clause 3(b) of this Schedule;
- (h) *self-protecting spray*—a device or instrument designed to temporarily or permanently immobilise, incapacitate or injure a person by the emission or discharge of an offensive, noxious or irritant liquid, powder, gas or chemical;
- (i) *self-protection device*—a hand held device or instrument designed to temporarily or permanently immobilise, incapacitate or injure a person by the emission or discharge of an electric current, sound waves or electromagnetic energy.

#### Part 3—Prohibited weapons

##### 3—Prohibited weapons

Each of the following is declared to be a prohibited weapon for the purposes of Part 3A of this Act:

- (a) *ballistic knife*—a device or instrument (other than a dart projector) designed to fire or discharge a knife, dagger or similar instrument by mechanical, percussive or explosive means;
- (b) *brace catapult*—a catapult (for example, a Saunders Falcon Hunting Sling) that includes or is designed to be used with a brace fitted or resting on the forearm or another part of the body in order to support the forearm or wrist when the catapult is activated;
- (c) *butterfly knife*—a knife comprised of a blade or spike and a handle, in respect of which—
- (i) the handle is in 2 sections that fold so as to wholly or partially cover the blade or spike when the knife is not in use; and
- (ii) the blade or spike can be exposed by gravity or centrifugal force;
- (d) *chloroacetophenone*—chloroacetophenone (known as CN) in all its forms;
- (e) *concealed weapon*—an article that appears to be harmless but that conceals a knife, spike or other weapon;

- (f) dagger—a sharp, pointed stabbing weapon (other than a bayonet or sword), ordinarily capable of being concealed on the person and having—
- (i) a flat blade with cutting edges on both sides; or
  - (ii) a needle-like blade that has a round or elliptical cross section or that has 3 or more sides;
- (g) dirk or sgian dhu—a ceremonial weapon associated with traditional Scottish culture;
- (h) *dypenylaminechloroarsone*—*dypenylaminechloroarsone* (known as DM or adamsite) in all its forms;
- (i) *extendable baton*—a baton designed for use as a weapon that can be extended in length by gravity or centrifugal force or by a release button or other device;
  - (j) fighting knife—a knife (other than a bayonet or sword) designed for hand to hand fighting, for example, a butterfly knife, dagger, flick knife, push knife or trench knife;
- (k) *flick-knife*—a knife in respect of which—
- (i) the blade is concealed when folded or recessed into the handle and springs or is released into the extended position by the operation of a button or other device on the handle; or
  - (ii) the blade is wholly or partially concealed by a sheath that can be withdrawn into the handle of the knife by gravity, centrifugal force or by the operation of a button or other device;
- (l) *hand or foot claw*—an article designed as a weapon consisting of prongs or other projections worn on the hands or feet (for example, the martial arts weapons known as ninja hand claws, ninja foot claws or ninja claws);
- (m) *knife belt*—a belt or similar article (for example, a Bowen Knife Belt) designed to hold a knife, dagger or similar instrument so that the presence of the knife, dagger or instrument is concealed or disguised when the belt or article is worn;
- (n) knuckle duster—a device or instrument designed to be worn across the knuckles of a hand so as to—
- (i) increase the force or impact of a punch or blow when striking another with the hand; and
  - (ii) protect the knuckles from injury,
- including a weighted or studded glove, but not including a boxing glove;
- (o) laser pointer—a hand held device, commonly known as a laser pointer, designed to emit a laser beam with an accessible emission level of greater than 1 milliwatt;
- (p) *morning star*—an article designed as a weapon consisting of a weight (whether or not with spikes or blades) attached to a chain, rope or a length of other flexible material;
- (q) *nunchakus*—a device comprised of 2 or more bars joined by a chain, rope or other flexible material so that the bars can swing independently of each other;
- (r) *ortho-chlorobenzal-malononitrile*—ortho-chlorobenzal-malononitrile (known as CS) in all its forms;
- (s) pistol cross-bow—a cross bow designed for aiming and discharging an arrow, dart, bolt or similar projectile when held in one hand;
- (t) poniard—a ceremonial weapon associated with the traditions of a prescribed masonic organisation;
- (u) *push knife*—a knife (for example, an Urban Pal Knife) comprised of a blade or spike with a transverse handle that is designed—

- (i) to be held between the fingers or the forefinger and thumb with the handle supported by the palm of the hand; and
- (ii) to inflict injury by a punching or pushing movement;
- (v) *star knife*—a device comprised of a number of points, blades or spikes pointing outwardly from a central axis and designed to spin around that axis, and capable of causing serious injury, when thrown;
- (w) *throwing knife*—a knife that is designed to cause serious injury when thrown;
- (x) *trench knife*—a knife comprised of a blade or spike attached to one end of a handle that is designed to be held in the closed fist with the fingers through the handle which serves as a knuckle duster;
- (y) undetectable knife—a knife that—
  - (i) is made wholly or partly of a material that prevents the knife from being detected, or being detected as a knife, by either a metal detector or by a method using X-rays; and
  - (ii) is capable of causing serious injury or death.

#### Part 4—Exempt persons—prohibited weapons

##### 4—Application of Part

- (2) If—
  - (a) in this Part, a person is expressed to be an exempt person for the purposes of 1 or more offences against section 21F(1) of this Act in relation to a particular class of prohibited weapon; and
  - (b) the weapon is included in 1 or more of the other classes of prohibited weapon,

the person is an exempt person in relation to that weapon for the purposes of the offences even though he or she is not an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon of the other class or classes referred to in paragraph (b).
- (3) The provisions of this Part (other than clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8) do not apply to a person who has, whether before or after the commencement of this Part, been found guilty by a court of—
  - (a) an offence involving violence for which the maximum term of imprisonment is 5 years or more; or
  - (b) an equivalent offence involving violence under the law of another State or Territory of the Commonwealth or of another country.
- (4) If a person is an exempt person in relation to a weapon under a clause in this Part other than under clauses 5, 6, 7 or 8) and a court finds the person guilty of using the weapon to threaten or injure another person, he or she ceases to be an exempt person in relation to that or any other weapon under that clause and can never again become an exempt person under that clause.
- (5) A person who, prior to the commencement of this Part, ceased, in accordance with regulation 7(4) of the *Summary Offences (Dangerous Articles and Prohibited Weapons) Regulations 2000*, to be an exempt person under a particular regulation is taken not to be exempt under any corresponding provision of this Part.

##### 5—Police officers

A police officer is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the officer uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose or in the course of his or her duties as a police officer.

##### 6—Delivery to police

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose of delivering it as soon as reasonably practicable to a police officer.

##### 7—Emergencies

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purpose, and in

the course, of dealing with an emergency (whether as a volunteer or in the course of paid employment), provided that the person does not use the weapon to threaten or injure another person.

#### 8—Executors etc

- (1) A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person has possession of a prohibited weapon in the course of his or her duties—
- (a) as the executor, administrator or other representative of—
    - (i) the estate of a deceased person or a bankrupt; or
    - (ii) a person who is legally incompetent; or
  - (b) as receiver or liquidator of a body corporate.
- (2) A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of sale or supply of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(a) of this Act, if the person sells or supplies a prohibited weapon in the course of his or her duties—
- (a) as the executor, administrator or other representative of—
    - (i) the estate of a deceased person or a bankrupt; or
    - (ii) a person who is legally incompetent; or
  - (b) as receiver or liquidator of a body corporate,
- provided that the sale or supply is to a person who is entitled to possession of the weapon under section 21F of this Act.

#### 9—Heirlooms

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person has possession of a prohibited weapon that is of sentimental value to him or her as an heirloom and that was previously in the possession of 1 or more of his or her relatives provided that the person keeps the weapon in a safe and secure manner at his or her place of residence and does not remove it except for the purpose of—

- (a) display by a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it for that purpose; or
- (b) repair or restoration by a person who carries on a business that includes the repair or restoration of articles of that kind; or
- (c) valuation by a person who carries on a business that includes the valuing of articles of that kind; or
- (d) secure storage by a person who carries on the business of storing valuable property on behalf of other persons; or
- (e) permanently transferring possession of the weapon to another person (being a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it).

#### 10—Collectors

- (1) A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person has possession of a prohibited weapon as part of a collection of weapons or other artefacts or memorabilia (comprised of at least 3 weapons, whether or not prohibited weapons) that has a particular theme, or that the person maintains for its historical interest or as an investment, provided that—
- (a) the person keeps the following records in a legible manner in a bound book at his or her place of residence for a period that expires at the end of 5 years after he or she ceases to be in possession of the collection:
    - (i) a record describing and identifying the weapon;
    - (ii) a record of the date of each occasion on which he or she obtains or re-obtains possession of the weapon and the identity and address of the person from whom he or she obtains or re-obtains possession;

- (iii) the date of each occasion on which he or she parts with possession of the weapon to another person and the identity and address of that person; and
  - (b) the person keeps the weapon in a safe and secure manner at his or her place of residence and does not remove it except for the purpose of—
    - (i) display by a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it for that purpose; or
    - (ii) repair or restoration by a person who carries on a business that includes the repair or restoration of articles of that kind; or
    - (iii) valuation by a person who carries on a business that includes the valuing of articles of that kind; or
    - (iv) repair, restoration or valuation—
      - (A) by another collector who is, under this clause, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon; or
      - (B) by a person who is, under clause 13, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon; or
    - (v) secure storage by a person who carries on the business of storing valuable property on behalf of other persons; or
    - (vi) storage by another collector who is, under this clause, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon; or
    - (vii) returning it to—
      - (A) another collector who is, under this clause, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon; or
      - (B) a prescribed services organisation that is, under clause 11, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon,
        - on whose behalf he or she has repaired, restored, valued or stored the weapon; or
    - (viii) taking it to a meeting but only if the majority of persons at the meeting are collectors who are, under this clause, exempt persons in relation to prohibited weapons; or
    - (ix) its sale or supply to another person in accordance with subclause (2); and
  - (c) the person permits a police officer at any reasonable time to enter his or her residential premises to inspect the collection and the records kept under paragraph (a).
- (2) A person who is an exempt person under subclause (1) will also be an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of sale or supply of such a weapon under section 21F(1)(a) of this Act if the person sells or supplies the weapon in the normal course of maintaining the collection, to a person who is entitled to possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F of this Act.
- (3) A reference in subclause (1) to the place of residence of a person will be taken, in the case of a body corporate, to be a reference to the registered office of the body corporate.

#### 11—Prescribed services organisations (RSL etc)

- (1) A prescribed services organisation is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if it has possession of a prohibited weapon of a kind acquired or used by one of its members (or by a person that it represents) while on active war service as a member of Australia's armed forces, provided that—
  - (a) the organisation keeps the following records in a legible manner in a bound book at its premises for a period that expires at the end of 5 years after it last ceased to be in possession of the weapon:
    - (i) a record describing and identifying the weapon;

- (ii) a record of the date of each occasion on which the organisation obtains or re-obtains possession of the weapon and the identity and address of the person from whom the organisation obtains or re-obtains possession;
  - (iii) the date of each occasion on which the organisation parts with possession of the weapon to another person and the identity and address of that person; and
- (b) the organisation keeps the weapon in a safe and secure manner at its premises and does not remove the weapon except for the purpose of—
- (i) display by a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it for that purpose; or
  - (ii) repair or restoration by a person who carries on a business that includes the repair or restoration of articles of that kind; or
  - (iii) valuation by a person who carries on a business that includes the valuing of articles of that kind; or
  - (iv) repair, restoration or valuation—
    - (A) by a collector who is, under clause 10, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon; or
    - (B) by a person who is, under clause 13, an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon; or
  - (v) secure storage by a person who carries on the business of storing valuable property on behalf of other persons; or
  - (vi) its sale or supply to another person in accordance with subclause (2); and
- (c) the organisation permits a police officer at any reasonable time to enter the premises of the organisation to inspect the weapon and the records kept under paragraph (a).
- (2) A person who is an exempt person in relation to a prohibited weapon under subclause (1) will also be an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of sale or supply of such a weapon under section 21F(1)(a) of this Act if the person sells or supplies the weapon in the normal course of maintaining the collection, to a person who is entitled to possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F of this Act.

#### 12—Possession by collector on behalf of prescribed services organisation or another collector

A person who is, under clause 10, an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act (the *first collector*) will also be an exempt person for the purposes of such an offence in relation to a prohibited weapon that is owned by another collector or a prescribed services organisation if—

- (a) possession of the weapon by the first collector is solely for the purpose of repairing, restoring, valuing or storing it on behalf of the prescribed services organisation or the other collector; and
- (b) the other collector is, under clause 10, or the prescribed services organisation is, under clause 11, an exempt person in relation to the weapon; and
- (c) while the weapon is in the possession of the first collector, the first collector complies with the conditions in clause 10(1)(a) to (c) in relation to the weapon as though it were part of the first collector's collection.

#### 13—Manufacturers etc

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of manufacture, sale, distribution, supply of, or other dealing in, possession or use of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1) of this Act if—

- (a) the person—
  - (i) has not been found guilty by a court of an offence involving the use, or the threat of using, a weapon; and

- (ii) has notified the Commissioner in writing that he or she is, or intends, manufacturing, selling, distributing, supplying or otherwise dealing in prohibited weapons and of—
  - (A) the person's full name; and
  - (B) the address of the place or places at which the person is, or intends, conducting those activities; and
  - (C) the person's residential address; and
  - (D) in the case of a body corporate—the full name and residential address of each of its directors; and
- (iii) the possession and use is, or is to be, only to the extent reasonably necessary for the purpose of manufacturing, selling, distributing, supplying or otherwise dealing in the weapons (as the case requires); and
- (b) the weapons are kept in a safe and secure manner; and
- (c) in the case of the sale, distribution or supply of, or other dealing in, a prohibited weapon—the weapon is not sold, distributed or supplied to, or dealt in with, a person who is under the age of 18 years; and
- (d) a prohibited weapon is not marketed (within the meaning of section 21D of this Act) by the person in a way that—
  - (i) indicates, or suggests, that the weapon is suitable for combat; or
  - (ii) is otherwise likely to stimulate or encourage violent behaviour involving the use of the knife as a weapon; and
- (e) in the case of the manufacture of prohibited weapons, each weapon manufactured is marked with an identifying brand and number in a manner that ensures that the brand and number cannot be removed easily and will not wear off in the normal course of use of the weapon; and
- (f) the person keeps the following records in a legible manner (and in a form that is reasonably accessible to a police officer inspecting the records under paragraph (i)) at his or her business premises for a period of at least 5 years:
  - (i) a description of each prohibited weapon that is, or has been, in his or her possession;
  - (ii) the identifying brand and number (if any) that is marked on each of those weapons;
  - (iii) the name and address of the person to whom he or she sells, distributes, supplies, or with whom he or she otherwise deals in, each of those weapons;
  - (iv) the date of each transaction; and
- (g) the person permits a police officer at any reasonable time to enter his or her premises or a vehicle in which prohibited weapons are carried to inspect the premises or vehicle, the weapons on the premises or in the vehicle or records kept by the exempt person under paragraph (f); and
- (h) the person notifies the Commissioner in writing of a change in any of the information referred to in paragraph (a)(i) and (ii) within 7 days after the change occurs.

14—Possession by manufacturer etc on behalf of prescribed services organisation or another collector

A person who is, under clause 13, an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act (the *manufacturer*) will also be an exempt person for the purposes of such an offence in relation to a prohibited weapon that is owned by a collector or a prescribed services organisation if—

- (a) possession of the weapon by the manufacturer is solely for the purpose of repairing or restoring the weapon or valuing or storing it on behalf of the collector or prescribed services organisation; and



- (b) the collector is, under clause 10, or the prescribed services organisation is, under clause 11, an exempt person in relation to the weapon.

15—Extendable batons—security agents

- (1) A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the use or possession of an extendable baton of a prescribed kind if—
  - (a) the person is—
    - (i) authorised by a licence granted under the *Security and Investigation Agents Act 1995* to carry on the business of protecting or guarding property as a security agent; and
    - (ii) the holder of a firearms licence under the *Firearms Act 1977* authorising the possession and use of a handgun in the course of carrying on the business of guarding property; and
  - (b) the baton is kept in a safe and secure manner at the person's business premises when not being used; and
  - (c) the baton is marked with a number for identification and with the name of the person in a manner that ensures that the number and name cannot be removed easily and will not wear off in the normal course of use of the baton; and
  - (d) the baton is not issued to another person unless the other person is—
    - (i) an employee in the business; and
    - (ii) an exempt person under subclause (2); and
  - (e) the person keeps the following records in a legible manner (and in a form that is reasonably accessible to a police officer inspecting the records under paragraph (f)) at his or her business premises for a period of at least 5 years:
    - (i) the make and model of the baton and the identifying number marked on the baton under paragraph (c);
    - (ii) the date and time of every issue of the baton to an employee, the identification number of the baton, the identity of the employee to whom the baton is issued and the date and time when the baton is returned by the employee;
    - (iii) the date or dates (if any) on which a person to whom the baton has been issued uses the baton (as opposed to carrying the baton) in the course of his or her duties and the reason for that use of the baton; and
  - (f) the person permits a police officer at any reasonable time to enter his or her business premises to inspect the baton, the manner in which the baton is kept and the records kept under paragraph (e); and
  - (g) in the case of a natural person—
    - (i) the person has completed a course of instruction approved by the Commissioner in the proper use of extendable batons and has been awarded a certificate of competency by the person conducting the course; and
    - (ii) the person does not carry the baton while engaged in crowd control.
- (2) A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the use or possession of an extendable baton of a prescribed kind if the person—
  - (a) is employed to protect or guard property by a person who carries on the business of protecting or guarding property; and

- (b) is authorised by a licence granted under the *Security and Investigation Agents Act 1995* to protect or guard property as a security agent; and
- (c) is the holder of a firearms licence under the *Firearms Act 1977* authorising the possession and use of a handgun in the course of employment by a person who carries on the business of guarding property; and
- (d) reasonably requires the possession of an extendable baton for the purposes of carrying out the duties of his or her employment; and
- (e) has completed a course of instruction approved by the Commissioner of Police in the proper use of extendable batons and has been awarded a certificate of competency by the person conducting the course; and
- (f) has not been found guilty by a court of an offence involving the illegal possession or use of an extendable baton, a firearm or any other weapon; and
- (g) does not carry the baton while engaged in crowd control; and
- (h) as soon as reasonably practicable after using the baton in the course of his or her duties, provides his or her employer with a written report setting out the date on which, and the circumstances in which, he or she used the baton.

#### 16—Dirks and sgian dhus—members of Scottish associations

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the possession of a dirk or sgian dhu (alternative spelling 'skean dhu') if—

- (a) —
  - (i) the person is a member of an incorporated association that has as its sole or a principal purpose the fostering and preservation of Scottish culture or the playing or singing of Scottish music; or
  - (ii) the person is a member of a society, body or other group (whether or not incorporated) that is affiliated with an incorporated association and both the society, body or group and the incorporated association with which it is affiliated have as their sole or a principal purpose the fostering and preservation of Scottish culture or the playing or singing of Scottish music; and
- (b) the person has possession of all of the clothes and other accoutrements traditionally worn with the dirk or sgian dhu (or, if the dirk or sgian dhu is traditionally worn with different clothes on different occasions, he or she has possession of the clothes and accoutrements for at least 1 of those occasions); and
- (c) the person has possession of the dirk or sgian dhu solely for the purpose of wearing it with that clothing and, in the case of a dirk, for the purpose of using it in traditional Scottish ceremonies; and
- (d) in the case of a dirk—the person only uses the dirk for the purposes of traditional Scottish ceremonies; and
- (e) the person keeps the dirk or sgian dhu in a safe and secure manner at his or her place of residence and does not remove it except—
  - (i) for the purpose of wearing it with that clothing; or
  - (ii) for the purpose of lending it to a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it; or
  - (iii) for the purpose of permanently transferring possession of the dirk or sgian dhu to another person (being a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it).

#### 17—Poniards—lodges of Freemasons etc

A prescribed masonic organisation is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the use or possession of a poniard if—

- (a) the poniard is kept at the premises of the association, Lodge or Order concerned in a safe and secure manner and is not removed from the premises except for the purpose of—
  - (i) repair or restoration by a person who carries on a business that includes the repair or restoration of articles of that kind; or
  - (ii) valuation by a person who carries on a business that includes valuing articles of that kind; or
  - (iii) permanently transferring possession of the poniard to another person (being a person who is entitled under section 21F of this Act to have possession of it); and
- (b) the poniard is only used at the premises of the association, Lodge or Order concerned for traditional ceremonial purposes.

#### 18—Laser pointers for astronomical use

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the use or possession of a laser pointer if—

- (a) the person is using or has possession of the laser pointer for the purpose or in the course of participating in astronomy; and
- (b) the person—
  - (i) is a member of—
    - (A) the Astronomical Society of South Australia Incorporated; or
    - (B) the Mars Society Australia Incorporated; or
  - (ii) participates in astronomy under the supervision of a member of a body referred to in subparagraph (i); or
  - (iii) participates in astronomy at an observatory; or
  - (iv) participates in astronomy as part of a course of study conducted by an educational institution.

#### 19—Undetectable knives used in food preparation

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the use or possession of an undetectable knife if the use or possession is solely for the preparation of food or drink for human consumption.

#### 20—Business purposes

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon in the course of conducting his or her business or in the course of his or her employment, provided that—

- (a) the use or possession of the weapon is reasonably required for that purpose; and
- (b) the use or possession of the weapon is not in the course or for the purpose of manufacturing, selling, distributing, supplying or otherwise dealing in the weapon.

#### 21—Religious purposes

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act in relation to the possession of a knife (other than a butterfly knife, flick knife, push knife or trench knife) or dagger if—

- (a) the person is a member of a religious group; and
- (b) the person possesses, wears or carries the knife or dagger for the purpose of complying with the requirements of that religion.

#### 22—Entertainment

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon in the course of providing a lawful and recognised form of entertainment of other persons that reasonably requires the use or possession of the weapon.

#### 23—Sport and recreation

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon in the course of participating in a lawful and recognised form of recreation or sport that reasonably requires the use or possession of the weapon.

#### 24—Ceremonies

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon in the course of an official ceremony that reasonably requires the use or possession of the weapon.

#### 25—Museums and art galleries

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purposes of a museum or art gallery.

No. 61. Schedule 1, page 19, line 29 [Schedule 1, clause 4]—Delete 'Commissioner of Police' and substitute:

Minister

### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 14, page 6, line 21 [clause 14(2), inserted subsection (4)(b)]—After 'suspected' insert:

on reasonable grounds

No. 2. Clause 22, page 10, line 32 [clause 22, inserted section 35A(3)(a)]—Delete 'who represents the prisoner' and substitute:

acting in his or her professional capacity

No. 3. Clause 40, page 15, lines 6 and 7 [clause 40, inserted paragraph (aa)]—Delete '(the prisoner having been released on parole following application by the prisoner to the Board)'

No. 4. Clause 40, page 15, after line 7—After its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

(2) Section 66(2)—after paragraph (ac) insert:

(ad) a prisoner who has been returned to prison under section 74 for breach of a parole condition; or

No. 5. Clause 41, page 15, after line 13—After subclause (2) insert:

(3) Section 67—after subsection (7) insert:

(7a) The Governor must, not more than 30 days after refusing to order that a prisoner be released from prison on parole, notify the prisoner in writing of—

(a) the refusal; and

(b) the reasons for the refusal; and

(c) any matters that might assist the prisoner in making any further application for parole.

(7b) Despite subsection (7a)(b) and (c), the Governor is not required to disclose to the prisoner any reason or matter if any such disclosure is likely to give rise to a significant risk to public safety.

No. 6. Clause 49, page 19, line 1 to page 20, line 5 [clause 49, inserted sections 76A and 76B]—Delete sections 76A and 76B and substitute:

76A—Apprehension etc of parolees on application of CE or police officer

- (1) If the CE or a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that a person who has been released on parole may have breached a condition of parole, the CE or police officer may apply to—
  - (a) the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Board; or
  - (b) if, after making reasonable efforts to contact the presiding member and deputy presiding member, neither is available—to a magistrate,for the issue of a warrant for the arrest of the person.
- (2) A warrant issued under this section authorises the detention of the person in custody pending appearance before the Board.
- (3) A magistrate must, on application under this section, issue a warrant for the arrest of a person or for the arrest and return to prison of a person (as the case may require) unless it is apparent, on the face of the application, that no reasonable grounds exist for the issue of the warrant.
- (4) If a warrant is issued by a magistrate under this section—
  - (a) the CE or police officer (as the case requires) must, within 1 working day of the warrant being issued, provide the Board with a written report on the matter; and
  - (b) the warrant will expire at the end of the period of 2 working days after the day on which the report is provided to the Board; and
  - (c) the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Board must consider the report within 2 working days after receipt and—
    - (i) issue a fresh warrant for the continued detention of the person pending appearance before the Board; or
    - (ii) cancel the warrant, order that the person be released from custody and, if appearance before the Board is required, issue a summons for the person to appear before the Board.
- (5) If a warrant expires under subsection (4)(b) or a fresh warrant is not issued under subsection (4)(c)(i), the person must be released from detention.
- (6) The Board may, if it thinks there is good reason to do so, by order, cancel a warrant issued under this section that has not been executed.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Tuesday 28 February 2012 at 11:00.