

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 February 2012

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

MEMBER FOR RAMSAY

Ms Zoe Bettison, to whom the oath of allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took her seat in the house as member for the district of Ramsay, in place of Hon. M.D. Rann (resigned).

MEMBER FOR PORT ADELAIDE

Dr Susan Elizabeth Close, who made an affirmation of allegiance, took her seat in the house as member for the district of Port Adelaide, in place of Hon. K.O. Foley (resigned).

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 16 February 2012.)

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:06): In renewal developments planned for the CBD, highlighted by His Excellency the Governor, there is no intention by the Labor government to address the chronic shortage of public housing and ever-increasing waiting list. For example, I recently attended a forum with anxious residents who will be relocated as part of the Labor government's plan to demolish sections of Housing SA properties—Playford, Manitoba and the Box Factory in the CBD—to create high-rise apartments, most of which will privately sold.

The first 12 units to be demolished in Playford will then be replaced with a five to seven storey high-rise, but only up to 14 of the new units will be set aside for Housing SA clients. We are hardly addressing the public housing shortage when in such a large redevelopment such a small proportion is retained as public housing stock, while the rest of the asset is sold off. This is privatisation by stealth.

Manitoba, another Housing SA development within the city, contains 47 dwellings. It is proposed that these will be converted into 200 new dwellings. However, I understand that no commitment has yet been made for at least 47 of the new units to be retained as public housing stock, so another opportunity to provide affordable housing is wasted, but this government is neither listening nor serious about providing real and meaningful housing assistance to South Australians.

Let us look at the pensioner rebate available to pensioners to assist with their council rates. I recently responded to a letter from the Mayor of Prospect council, David O'Loughlin, seeking an increase in rebate relief available to pensioners for council rates. Ironically, mayor O'Loughlin has another role within Housing SA, particularly in the redevelopment of Housing SA properties in the CBD that I referred to earlier. I had to remind mayor O'Loughlin that the rebate rate is set by the ministers for families and communities and that the amount of the rebate available to pensioners has not increased during the tenure of this Labor government after 10 long years.

Pensioners have told me that they can no longer afford to live in the house they came to as a bride, in which they raised their children and in which many have become a widow. Some were even born in the house in which they still live. They can no longer afford to live within the community they know. I know pensioners who do not use heating or cooling for fear of what the electricity bill will be, and now we are forewarned that our electricity bills are set to rise by up to 40 per cent.

I urge the government to get real on these social issues. Come for a drive in my electorate—you will see all along Prospect Road several empty shops, a legacy of the state tax regime which makes it just too difficult for businesses to survive, let alone prosper. Melbourne Street traders have been struggling for years, with some premises averaging a new business occupant every year. You will see patchwork roads that are part of the \$200 million backlog in maintenance. You will meet school leavers who are part of our youth unemployment that is the highest in the nation. You will meet NGO workers who are opening up food cupboards to people

who have never before needed charity, going through each shelf offering cans, rice, flour—basic food staples. You will see the despair and shame many people feel in needing such help. You will meet older people—pensioners—many of whom have worked and paid taxes their whole adult life and who are losing hope that life can get better for them, that the struggle will end. I believe that the loss of hope is the greatest sadness and shame of all.

I received a letter just last week that I would like to read into *Hansard*, a letter typical of the responses I am receiving throughout my electorate. It states:

My wife and I have decided to move to a place that has its leaders plan and implement a positive future for their people and their region as a whole. Our new home will be in Dubai. It may be of some interest to you and a testimony to the extremely poor way the Labor government is running South Australia and Australia at this present time. I have been running a successful architectural practice for 26 of the past 28 years, surviving by referrals only! During the past two years the number of projects have reduced to 70 per cent over previous years. I have been through two recessions since 1983 and have never seen it so bad! Many of my peers, builders and suppliers are experiencing similar experiences. My clients of recent times have sought initial architectural advice only to have their projects put on 'hold' due to the uncertainty of the economic situation and the high cost of starting their projects.

Stifling taxes and levies imposed on developers (many small-time 'mum and dad' developers planning their retirement income in lieu of pensions) and the extraordinary high costs of running a business—it costs as much as 34 per cent more in taxes to start up a business in South Australia than in Queensland! has forced the very people that create jobs to pack up and move interstate or overseas (over 88,000 people left Australia for good in 2011!). I have attached a report on this for your information.

We will be located overseas for several years and won't be back to work in Australia unless the high tax and levy situations are brought back to an investor-friendly level.

Best wishes to you in future and we hope your party wins the next elections and implements a vision that supports the above-mentioned developers and people like us.

My only hope is for a Liberal government in just over two years so we can start setting things right and turn South Australia into the thriving, vibrant state it was before the Labor government's State Bank disaster and the last 10 hard years of Labor.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, I welcome the family and friends of our two new members today. It is lovely to see that they are able to draw such a crowd. I also draw attention to the presence in the gallery of our former premier Mike Rann—it is wonderful to see you back; also, former deputy premier Frank Blevins, my predecessor—it is good to see you here as well; and, also, a former member of our house and senator, Annette Hurley—it is good to see you still have your passion for politics.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate on motion for adoption resumed.

The SPEAKER: Members, I draw attention to the fact that the new member for Ramsay will be making her first speech and I ask members to extend the traditional courtesies to her. As is also traditional, the chair will give considerable latitude to the member's comments. I call the member for Ramsay.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:13): Thank you Madam Speaker. It is a privilege to give my first speech, and I thank His Excellency the Governor of South Australia for his speech at the opening of parliament. It is an honour to be here today representing the people of Ramsay and my party. I am grateful for the trust that they have placed in me. As the third member for Ramsay in the South Australian parliament, I have very big shoes to fill.

I stand in this place today as a fourth generation South Australian on both sides of my family. On my father's side, Moses Bettison arrived in South Australia in 1855 at the age of 18 from Cornwall, England. On my mother's side, the Reverend J.C. Kirby set sail for Australia from Buckingham, England, in 1854. The Reverend J.C. Kirby, my great-great-grandfather, was the head of the Port Adelaide Congregationalist Church. He was a well-known social reformer of his day and, in 1915, was a key instigator for the 6 o'clock closing of hotel bars. He wore the title of Port Dock Preacher with pride. Let me assure the house that we do not share the same views on temperance. In the Cheltenham Cemetery, his headstone is a clock tower permanently fixed to 6pm in commemoration of his achievements.

Along with his strong views on alcohol, he was also an advocate for the rights of women. In particular, he lobbied for the increase in the age of consent for women from 13 to 16 years, for women's suffrage and access to higher education. His wife, Marguerite Kirby, was the first woman

to vote in Port Adelaide on 25 April 1896 and, in 1890, his daughter Mary Kirby was one of the first group of female students to gain a bachelor of science at Adelaide University. He would view my election to parliament and achievements in higher education with pride.

I wish to congratulate the newly-elected member for Port Adelaide, and I am delighted that we are beginning our journey as members of parliament together. As we join the South Australian House of Assembly, I am still disappointed to see that women only make up 30 per cent of the members representing our great state. This is not good enough; we need more women in parliament. It is our right to be represented, and it is our duty to participate in all levels of society. Equal participation of women in politics is essential to building and sustaining democracy. We can do better.

In 1894 South Australia became the first state in Australia to grant women the right to vote and the first place in the world to grant women the right to stand for parliament. Our state set an important precedent that helped make Australia, in 1902, the first country in the world at a federal level where women had the dual right to vote and to stand for election. In recent times, we can celebrate that women have achieved the highest level of representation in the Australian political system. The Australian Prime Minister is a woman (still), and in this House of Assembly Madam Speaker is the first female speaker of the South Australian parliament. Also, the Leader of the Opposition is the first woman to take on this position.

We have succeeded, but there is more to be done. Merit in the selection of candidates is a topic of the past; we need to seek a new agenda that is focused on the encouragement and development of female talent. In order to be equally represented, there needs to be a wide pool of talented, articulate and educated women willing to put themselves forward to participate in all levels of political office. This is a challenge for all political parties—to nurture and guide women to achieve this goal.

I want to acknowledge a long-term supporter of mine, Annette Hurley. Annette is the former member for Napier and a former senator for South Australia. I first worked for Annette in the mid-nineties as an electorate officer, and then again from 2003 to 2004. Annette is a woman of substance. She is one of the most grounded individuals I know, and it has been an honour to have her mentor, guide and support me in my nearly 20 years of involvement in politics. For my part, as the member for Ramsay, I am committed to supporting young women in their journey as I was supported. I encourage any women interested in politics to contact me at the Ramsay electorate office.

In ancient times, Plato said, 'The direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life.' This is still true today. Education, training, skills and jobs; these are the key motivations for my involvement in politics today. Education and participation in the economy are the great equalisers in our society. It is my own experience that has made these areas so important to me. When I finished school in 1990 it was difficult to get a job; unemployment was high, and it was not unusual for more than 100 people to apply for the same position. I was fortunate to be raised in a loving home, where my parents always worked and education was valued. I can only imagine how difficult finding employment would be without such positive role models.

The government continues to focus on the importance of education, and the Governor's speech outlines particular attention paid to early childhood learning. Watching my son—who is nearly two years old—he has grown so quickly; he changes and grows before my eyes. The late Dr Fraser Mustard, a former Thinker in Residence in South Australia, led the research into the dramatic impact of brain development of the birth to five years age group. I was fortunate enough to hear him speak on how early experiences profoundly affect long-term learning, health and happiness. As Catherine Helen Spence once noted, 'There is nothing so costly to the state as a ruined life.' By partnering with parents we can support them in their most important role—raising the next generation.

Along with a focus on early childhood, I am passionate about lifelong learning and the people of South Australia developing confidence in their transferable skills. I am greatly encouraged by the recent announcement of the South Australian vocational education and training (VET) reform in partnership with the commonwealth. Not only are certificate I and II level courses on the subsidised training list fee free, but VET FEE-HELP is now available for students and approved providers studying at diploma level and above. Up-front fees will no longer be a barrier to entry for those seeking a vocational education. We need a larger skilled workforce, and this is a practical policy to deliver the skills and experience to enable all South Australians to participate in the modern economy.

I want the students in the northern suburb seat of Ramsay to feel as confident in their own options for life as any other South Australian. First, students must be encouraged to finish school. During the life of this government the school leaving age has been raised to 17. The evidence is clear that there is a direct correlation between the levels of schooling achieved and an income level of an individual. Second, I want people to be aware of their options. Whether it be vocational education, an apprenticeship, a traineeship or tertiary education, I want them to feel confident that they are in the driver's seat of their life.

What that means is that they have the ability to make choices about the level of education they achieve and how they achieve that, whether it is on or off-the-job training. Just because you did not enjoy school does not mean that you cannot get a good job. Learning, education and skill development do not stop at the school gate. You can upgrade your skills at any time, and the government will work with you to enable you to achieve the skills of development that you seek.

My parents are wonderful examples of this. My own father, who had not been a keen student, returned to studies at the age of 30, achieving his mechanic technician's certificate at the Whyalla Institute of Technology, which enabled him to change to a more interesting and responsible job at BHP. When I was three my mother was granted a scholarship for postgraduate studies in early childhood in Melbourne. Our family relocated for a year for her to achieve this goal.

We need all South Australians to participate in the economy to the best of their ability. On the horizon we have an economic opportunity of a lifetime. The Olympic Dam expansion has the potential to stimulate and engage the economy to new levels. It is imperative that the benefits are shared amongst all South Australians for generations to come.

When I was 12 my mother took my brother and me to the John Martin's department store at the Elizabeth City Centre to buy our first Holden jackets. Along with my spiral perm, plastic earrings and denim skirt, I was hip and happening in 1985. The Holden car manufacturing plant is at the heart of the northern economy. Today it employs 2,000 workers directly and is a stimulator of an estimated 16,000 indirect jobs. As South Australians we can be extremely proud that we are delivering a world's best practice product in a sophisticated technology arrangement.

I support the Australian and South Australian government's unwavering partnership with Holden to continue this powerhouse of advanced manufacturing for our state. But that is not the only area of growth in our state, and it is here that I wish to pay my deep respect to the former member for Ramsay and the former premier of South Australia. Mike Rann has left a lasting legacy to the people of South Australia, most importantly through the broadening out of our economy.

Whilst primary production and manufacturing are at the core of our industries, international education, mining and defence are now also intrinsic elements. South Australia's strong focus on renewable energy and its massive infrastructure program will remain unmatched for some time. In Ramsay we will very shortly experience for ourselves the benefits of this investment with the electrification of the Adelaide to Gawler train line.

We live in interesting times. Information and communication technology has transformed the way we communicate and increased global connectivity to never experienced levels. It has the ability to bring freedom of speech to parts of the world where it is suppressed. We are at the precipice of increased citizenship participation in political decision making.

The explosion of social networking and online media enables you, from the comfort of your own home, to express your opinion or participate in a poll or blog about any subject of your choice. This is a powerful tool that is given to the individual. Your voice can be heard across continents, cities and countries. We are only in the infancy of the impact this technology will have on our way of life and our decision-making. It is all very exciting.

However, nothing will ever replace the experience of meeting someone face to face. That is why I ran a grassroots campaign as the candidate for Ramsay. Doorknocking, shopping centre visits and street corner meetings may be old fashioned, but they are effective methods of community consultation. During the three-month campaign, I was able to invite the whole electorate to meet me at a series of Saturday morning street corner meetings. When the Premier joined me, more than 30 people took time out from their busy lives to meet with us. A status update on Facebook or a line on Twitter can never replace real-life conversations.

By going to meet people in their communities on their own terms, we can reach out to those who are disengaged from politics. We can help them become more engaged in the life of this community through this contact. This is essential in a community like Ramsay. When I was

doorknocking, not only could I talk with people one on one but I momentarily stood in their shoes to see where they lived, how they lived and the neighbourhood that surrounded them.

The seat of Ramsay, created in 1985, was named after Alexander Ramsay, a former general manager of the South Australian Housing Trust. Although the boundaries are amended after each state election, at the heart of the seat is the City of Salisbury. The surrounding suburbs included in Ramsay are Brahma Lodge, Salisbury Downs, Salisbury Plain, Salisbury South and parts of Salisbury North, Parafield Gardens, Paralowie and Parafield.

The people of Ramsay are the people at the core of the Australian story. Many of them are first-generation Australians who left Europe post the Second World War to give their families a better life. The electorate, like much of South Australia, has an increasing age level, and many people told me with great pride how much they love living in the area, which they have done for more than 30 or 40 years. They have raised their families there and often shared with me how well their children have done. Many still live in the area, but others have also moved further afield.

Sport is an important part of Salisbury. Whether it be soccer or Aussie Rules, pedal bikes or Little Athletics, I heard again and again how important sporting facilities were to the people of Ramsay. Local residents can be assured I have heard this message. I have already been asked to be the No. 1 ticket holder for the Salisbury Football Club, and I am delighted to accept the honour.

Not everyone is doing well. Those in the Ramsay electorate with fixed incomes on an aged, single parent or disability pension have increased challenges in budgeting for their daily needs. In particular, those who are renting privately feel that increasing costs make them vulnerable. Cost of living remains a concern for a number of South Australians and it is a key priority for this Labor government.

I am very excited to be joining a dynamic team, led by Premier Weatherill. I thank Premier Weatherill for coming to campaign with me in Ramsay. I was also fortunate to have the members for Enfield, Little Para, Croydon and Taylor, and Legislative Councillors the Hon. Russell Wortley and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars to assist me on the Ramsay campaign. I also want to mention Senator Don Farrell and the members for Playford and West Torrens for their nearly two decades of support. I have also received tremendous support from Amanda Rishworth, the federal member for Kingston, Tony Zappia, the federal member for Makin, and the members for Newland, Bright and Napier. I also wish to thank Peter Malinauskas, Sonia Romeo, Nimfa Farrell, John Camillo, Bob Donnelly, Ray Wyatt, Michael Brown, and Stephen Halliday.

It is at this time I wish to make mention of a dear friend of mine, Nick Champion, the federal member for Wakefield. Nick and I attended Kapunda High School together, and I doubt very much at that time that either of us would have believed we would have the honour of representing South Australians in parliament. Nick has provided both professional and personal support to me over many years, and I was privileged to have him lead my campaign team of Reggie Martin, Andrew Anson, Aemon Bourke, Josh Peake, Stephanie Gheller and Jessica Nitschke. None of this would have been possible without my hardworking campaign team.

There is an extra special thank you to the 120-plus volunteers who assisted on election day. My particular thanks to Young Labor who came out every Saturday to doorknock with me in all weather. To the Ramsay sub-branch, you have welcomed me with great warmth and I thank Chad Buchanan, Ann Wyatt, Phil and Erica Pinnegar, Brenda Walters, Alan Hesketh, Vicky and Allan Nelson, Barbara and Don Franks, Sonia Griesback, Rob, Irene and Graham Klose.

Finally, without the love and support of my family and dear friends, this would not have been possible. To Issaka Zangre, Kirby and Kate Bettison, Susie Barber, Jason Hall, Carla Leversedege, Annette Charlesworth, Lisa Bettison, Pam Bettison, Brigid Mahoney, Michael Gunner, Kirsten Andrews and Inger Ahaneku, I thank you for your many years of friendship.

However, without a doubt, the single most important influence on my life and the reason—not just because of the obvious—I stand here today are my parents, Max and Amie Bettison. They have always participated in the community in which we lived. From the Rotary Club to chairing the primary school committee, they have shown me how important it is to be involved. Like many South Australians, my parents moved to a regional area to achieve a better life. Newly married, they moved to Whyalla where my father, a fitter and turner by trade, worked for BHP, and my mother was a kindergarten teacher.

My brother and I were born in Whyalla and, after a brief stint in Melbourne while my mother completed her postgraduate qualifications, I started at Memorial Oval Primary School in 1978. As a

family, we moved several times, living at Evanston, Gawler and then Kapunda. I studied at Gawler East Primary School and, after a year at Gawler High School, I completed my studies at Kapunda High. I am a proud product of the public school system.

My father had an interesting change of career when he became a small business owner as the local funeral director. It is my experience as the daughter of a business owner that stimulated my interest in business and its importance to the economy of the state. In 1991, I had the great honour of representing South Australia as a Rotary exchange student to Penang, Malaysia. Georgetown, the capital of Penang, is a sister city of Adelaide. To be honest, I was not entirely sure where Malaysia was when I was told of my selection. Being a time well before Google or Wikipedia, I needed to search out the family atlas to confirm its location. As a 17-year-old country girl who had never travelled overseas before, this experience had a profound impact on my life.

In my working life my occupations have included weighbridge clerk, organiser, state secretary, adviser, director and government relations manager. However, the most important title I hold is 'mum'. To my son, Hugo, you are the light of our life. Your smile makes every day special—although a night of him sleeping through would also be lovely. When I get dressed in the morning, Hugo likes to be helpful and assist me. His particular strength is in the shoe department, and he likes to get them out for me. Our next step will be to get a matching pair.

Next year, I turn 40. Victor Hugo said, 'Forty is the old age of youth, 50 is the youth of old age.' Nearly half of my life is behind me, and as I stand before you as the new member for Ramsay I begin an exciting new chapter. I look forward to the future opportunities and challenges in representing the people of Ramsay.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Ramsay, and congratulations. It is good to have that Whyalla connection in here with me, and Memorial Oval School was a very good school to start off with. I now draw members' attention to the fact that this will be the member for Port Adelaide's first speech. I ask members again to extend the traditional courtesies to the member, and I also will give considerable latitude to the member's comments. I call on the member for Port Adelaide.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (11:36): Thank you. As I rise to give my first speech in this house, I do so with a consciousness that my campaign to be here may have been short but the road to prepare myself has been long. My earliest memories of a political awareness come from my parents' absolute adherence to the ideal of fairness and their rejection of the idea that social position should confer special entitlements. Their union is in itself a testament to the power of two people coming from quite different backgrounds meeting at university, my father from a private fee-paying boarding school where avoiding playing rugby was the main aim in life, and my mother from a small, English grammar school where she was celebrated as the smartest kid in the village— or at least that is the family story.

They chose to come to Australia to make their lives and raise their children in part because of the promise of fairness and equal opportunity that our culture has famously prized. That is the culture that my brother, Stephen, and I have been brought up to believe in and to cherish. It is not always played out in Australia, but it is always an ideal that the Australian people respond to.

I thank my parents for coming to Adelaide before I was born to allow me to grow up here. I thank them and my brother for their moral integrity, and I thank them for their unquestioning support for every path I have chosen. I was born in Glenelg, grew up first in Dover Gardens and then Coromandel Valley, which was convenient for my parents, who both worked at Flinders University. My education was a gravity-driven slide down Shepherds Hill, from the junior primary at Blackwood, down to the primary, the high school and finally landing near the bottom, at Flinders.

I have friends from those times who will remain tightly bound in my heart, and I thank them for their ongoing love and support: Vicki, Mick, Wendy and Liz in particular, I thank you. Flinders also gave me that most valuable thing: a general education. There I was fortunate to be turned loose to pick and choose subjects, and I was able to combine languages with biology and politics. If I may generalise from my particular experience, I would argue that an education in which one is taught to think and follow one's interests is invaluable, and a rush to force young adults to specialise early and to concentrate only on their earning potential should be tempered by the need to have young people who can criticise and challenge and construct new futures we can hardly imagine.

We must train people for the new economy—for advanced manufacturing, for mining, defence and technology-centred services, all of which require flexibility and creativity. We need to train people who will be capable of rising to the challenges this century will present us with.

The Governor's speech outlined an agenda for South Australia to prepare ourselves for those challenges through a set of priorities, and I was pleased to read that positioning our workforce to be part of the advanced manufacturing sector in the long term will be a high priority for this term of government and no doubt for many to come. Many people in the seat of Port Adelaide are dependent on the manufacturing sector for their employment, and they and their families deserve the security of knowing that this government will stand with them and increase our place in the advanced manufacturing our workers are so skilled in.

I have worked in the education sector. I was responsible for a set of services supporting university students in the late 1990s and the early 2000s and I know from that time, and from my own history, how transformative education and training is for individuals.

My grandmother, widely acknowledged to be the nicest member of my family, finished formal education at the end of primary school because her family could not afford for her to stay on. She was offered a scholarship, but this was insufficient as the family needed her to be earning. She did not leave her education at that, nor did she cease to value education. She and my grandfather gave all their support to my mother's school and university efforts, and she read widely in an ongoing journey of self-development.

Being a woman and marrying in the 1930s, my grandmother was also expected to leave the workplace to be a wife and mother. These two roles she relished but, as so many women did, and do, she channelled her considerable energy and generosity into working with charities and community groups. Her story may date from the last century, but it is widely replicated today. She may have been in England, but the same happens here.

Still too many people in our community are not able to receive the education and training they could benefit from, usually because they or their families do not have enough money. Coming from a low socioeconomic background is the technical terminology; not having enough money for housing, food and school is the reality. The Skills for All strategy is clearly aimed at giving all South Australians the opportunity to gain the skills they need to get meaningful and stable work, and it tackles disadvantage head on. I applaud its goals and will watch its success closely.

Having two young children of my own—along with my dear partner, Declan, the most important people in my life—I know what every parent comes to learn: that their futures are set by their experiences in these first years. It is not tolerable that children are excluded from a self-sufficient adulthood because their childhoods are overshadowed by poor housing, poor nutrition or poor education. Government must constantly battle disadvantage flowing from one generation to the next. That is the true meaning of progress.

As representatives of the community in this place, we must set as a test of our success the extent to which our interventions result in a society that allows children to grow up to fulfil all of their potential, regardless of what postcode they live in. The Governor's speech highlights a government priority to support the early years, when so much of our future path in life is decided. I am proud to have joined a government that recognises this as a priority and so clearly puts supporting family and children at the centre of its policy for the future.

I joined the Australian Labor Party in 1983, no doubt partly as a response to being 15 and wanting to get involved in something bigger than myself, but also because it reflected the values of fairness and progress that I hold dear. The Hawke government appeared to my teenage eyes not only to bring with it the end of the drought and the America's Cup win, but the possibility that Labor could be both popular over the long term and transformative. The Hawke-Keating governments introduced universal health care, dealt with the HIV epidemic in a no-nonsense, rational way, introduced far-ranging equal opportunity law and also won five elections.

At this point I wish to note that while Dean Jaensch and I have hardly ever managed to agree about anything in politics—and above all the merits of the Keating government—I have learned much from him. What I respect most in him is his fervent desire to enthuse people about politics—his view that a public that knows about politics and engages in it will demand better government.

In the Labor Party I met some of the brightest most sincere and principled young people in politics: Penny Wong, Mark Butler and Jay Weatherill. They have gone on to prove my early

admiration of them far-sighted. I volunteered on several campaigns, and two stand out because the candidates were simply so good at connecting with the people and so genuinely respected their electorates. Those candidates were Paul Caica and Steve Georganas.

I also learned the power of the union movement—its capacity to support workers in difficulty and to give a voice to those who have little power. The unions have waxed and waned in popularity in the Australian community. Membership has fallen as the labour market has changed both in the shift towards the service sector and in the increase in casual, temporary and short-term work. Their defence of workers' rights was, however, supported so powerfully in the 2007 election that any suggestion that Australians have left the 'fair go' ethos behind in favour of 'me first' holds no water.

I am a member of the left faction of the Labor Party. I want to acknowledge here today United Voice, the ASU, Dave Gray, Dave Di Troia, Katrine Hildyard, Cheyne Rich, Cameron Smith, Ellen McLoughlin, Joe Scales, Kyam Maher, Roger Zubrinich, Gail Gago, Ian Steel, Mel Bailey, Ian Hunter, Alex Overley and Lois Boswell for their support of me over the long term. I also want to thank the young people of our group who fill me with a hope for the future for politics in this state.

I was not, when a young person myself, content only with joining the Labor Party. As the late 1980s rolled in, I was swept up by a wave of concern about the destruction of nature and I was active in my 20s in the environment movement. It was there that I met people who remain close to me, who, despite not all being members of the Labor Party, came out and campaigned with me in these last months, and I thank them for their loyalty and their kindness: Steve, Mike, Alison, Annie and Claire.

My love for the natural environment, for the world David Attenborough showed us on television, and that my parents took me to on our early camping adventures, and that I studied at Flinders University, has not abated, but it has matured into an understanding that the question is not how to save the world from people but how we can all live within it. The challenge we face in fitting 7 billion, 8 billion or 9 billion people onto this planet, in a way that gives our children nothing less than we had, is not simply resolved. It is not fixed by wishing people away. Locking up areas and calling what is behind the fence 'nature' does not solve it. The challenge can only be addressed if our dependence on the environment is recognised in a way that the best farmers know to be true and that Aboriginal people have always known but we city dwellers sometimes fail to understand.

Reconciling ourselves to the demands of the Australian environment and accepting that that environment will never be as it was before we came is one of the great projects before us as a nation. Accepting the reality of fire, drought, flood and fragile productive soil and moderating our demands on the environment to acknowledge them is something we must do. The River Murray will go into drought again and we must insist that the river return to health in the good times and be managed for the long term when conditions become harsh again.

In accepting the limits of the environment, we must also acknowledge that the environment is the source of our food, fibre and wellbeing and it is legitimate for all of us to benefit from it. I believe we need to move beyond the 'use or conserve' model of land management to 'use and conserve'. The most successful farmers do this. Managers of public land are also increasingly running the land to benefit all of us, whether it be through tourism, recreation or as a reserve of healthy ecosystems. A blurring of public and private land, a blurring of conservation and production and a shift to seeing landscapes as interconnected sources of biodiversity, recreation and wealth generation is the emerging way of looking at the environment.

For the people living in the city, there is the additional requirement that our environment be clean. It seems a simple demand that we can breathe fresh, clean air, drink fresh water, not be driven mad with industrial noise all night and avoid poisons in our daily lives. For many, this cannot be taken for granted. Wherever industry and people come together—in the workplaces and where houses and heavy industry are neighbours—there is the potential for pollution. I support a strong EPA that regulates industry and how it affects people and works with South Australian industry to keep ahead of community expectations.

Many areas in the Port Adelaide electorate live with these challenges and the community has shown its capacity for activism and resilience in working through what is and is not acceptable. I will stand side by side with that community.

As our population increases in Adelaide, resolving conflicting land use, bringing green, linked space into the city and retaining working heritage buildings will maintain our reputation as

the most liveable city in Australia. The priorities articulated in the Governor's speech of a vibrant city, safe and active neighbourhoods and affordable living all speak to what kind of place we want to live in.

The Port of Adelaide must be an exemplar of how to make all these elements work. The William Faulkner quote, 'The past is never dead. It's not even past,' is never more true than of Port Adelaide. The deep history of the Aboriginal people, where the totem was the black swan, combines with the early European builders of our state, and with countless changes since, such as the departure of the big ships and wharves, the misstep of Newport Quays and the emergence of a vibrant arts community. The port is yet to fully emerge in its new guise as the artistic, tourism, maritime heritage centre of Adelaide but it must and it will. I will do everything I can to make that happen quickly.

Since leaving university, I have worked in the public sector in many roles and have accumulated experience and influences that have shaped my journey to this place. From my many colleagues who became and remain friends, some now working on the other side of the world, I learned professional discipline, the power of hard work and how to exercise a sense of humour when all else was lost.

To protect the innocent, I will not name the colleagues I owe such a debt to but, as an anonymous collective, I thank them. Their generous support of me when I failed, as much as when I succeeded, has taught me that we all blossom when in a community that recognises and cares for us and that we all struggle when alone. For me, this is at the heart of what government means, when government is done properly and well: it should be the expression of our community, of our collective will and our shared aspirations.

As I doorknocked my way around the Port Adelaide electorate, what struck me, from St Kilda, through Globe Derby Park, Paralowie, Parafield Gardens, Mawson Lakes and round into Ottoway, Rosewater, Port Adelaide and up Lefevre Peninsula, was that the electorate might be diverse, but more bound the people together than separated them. What I saw were communities in action—people volunteering to clean up the area, looking after their older neighbours, caring for each other's children, agitating for government to pay attention to their priorities, to their area, to their history and future. Not everything is perfect in those communities and not everyone is included or flourishing, but there is a drive and a generosity within the community to work towards the greatest good.

I mark myself as a social democrat, as being as far away as possible from Margaret Thatcher's view when she said that there was no such thing as society. I am not sure that there is much left without a community—without the support of our fellows, a collective action to improve our lot, and never finding it acceptable that anyone is left behind. Like the microcosm of the seat of Port Adelaide, what binds South Australians together is stronger than our differences. I look forward to my time as the member for Port Adelaide, working with and on behalf of the community that has sent me to this chamber as its representative.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Again, my congratulations to the member for Port Adelaide—that was a wonderful first speech—and also my congratulations to the member for Ramsay. We look forward to working with you. I call on the member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:53): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the Address in Reply, and I certainly join with everybody in the house to congratulate the Governor and Mrs Scarce on the outstanding manner in which they carry out their vice-regal duties and the manner in which they represent South Australia. I also congratulate the newly elected members for Port Adelaide and Ramsay. I trust that they will enjoy their time here in the parliament and that they will serve the South Australian community very well in public life.

I want to raise a couple of points, if I may, coming from the Governor's speech which, as we all know, was written by the Premier. The first point I want to talk about is the seven primary areas of focus for action the government has identified, and the first one I want to raise here in the house is that of affordable living. We all know that South Australia is the highest taxed state in the country. You only need to look at the facts. In statistics that we have from when Labor first came to power in 2002, CPI, the index for inflation, has increased 33.3 per cent over that almost 10-year period; 3.3 per cent is about where we understand inflation to be on an annual rate. CPI has increased 33.3 per cent over that almost 10-year period.

If we look at housing rents, there has been a 45.9 per cent increase in housing rents. Property charges have increased 72 per cent over the period that we have had this government in power. Gas bills have increased by 78.7 per cent. We are the highest taxed state in the country—there has been an 81 per cent increase in state taxes. Electricity bills have increased a staggering 106.4 per cent, and there has been a 178 per cent increase in water bills since this government has been in power.

We have heard a lot about the reasons for these increases. The government talks about affordable living in the speech given to the parliament by the Governor. If there is ever a conflict in what the government says and the reality of the situation, it is revealed in those statistics. The two highest increases are 178 per cent in water bills, a direct cost to everyday families in South Australia, and 106.4 per cent in electricity bills. Talk about affordable living!

We have massive increases in the cost of living affecting everyday families here in the state. We have huge pressure on the cost of living, and I want to know what this government is going to do about it. It talks about affordable living—what is it going to do about it? We ask questions here in parliament day in, day out. What do we get—more spin, more rhetoric, but no direct answers to our questions. It is time this government came clean with the South Australian community and explained to them how it is going to deal with the cost of living pressures.

The second issue that I want to raise from the Governor's speech is in relation to the mining boom and its benefits and advanced manufacturing. What has come to light over the past couple of weeks is the totally unacceptable situation that fourth-year apprentices, apprentices who have completed their skills training and all the requirements under their apprenticeship, have to wait, as in one example that I have highlighted, at least four months for their trade licence to be issued.

If there was ever an impediment on employment and the ability of people to earn the correct wage that they are entitled to, then the problems within the Office of Consumer and Business Services highlight that. For apprentices to have to wait at least four months for their trade licences to be issued is totally unacceptable. We have highlighted one example that was written up in *The Advertiser* yesterday. I certainly appreciate the work that the journalist, Lauren Novak, did in relation to that. I was happy to assist Lauren in publishing that article.

That is not the only example of the wait that apprentices have to endure in having their trade licence issued. I have made some other inquiries. I have spoken to the industry association. This particular example that I highlighted was to do with the plumbing industry. I have spoken to the Plumbing Industry Association and other plumbers I know. I have some close friends whose son has just finished his electrician's apprenticeship. They lodged their application in the Office of Consumer and Business Services at the beginning of January. It is being relayed to me that everybody who lodges their application and makes an inquiry about how long the application will take is told, 'Do not expect anything before three months.' That is totally unacceptable. These people are losing income. They are losing wages.

The difference between a fourth-year apprentice wage and that of a qualified, licensed tradesperson is at least \$300 a week. You do not need a doctorate in mathematics to work out that that is about \$1,200 a month and, in this particular example, close to \$5,000 over a four-month period that this person has lost in wages. As I said, it is totally unacceptable.

This problem within government of lengthy delays in issuing these licences I do not think sits at all well with the primary areas of advanced manufacturing, the mining boom and its benefits. If that is not an oxymoron, if that is not a complete contradiction of what the government is trying to promote in the speech it wrote for the Governor, then I do not know what is. The example I have highlighted of this apprentice is not the exception, it is the rule. The son of close friends of ours completed four years of being an apprentice electrician. They were told, when they lodged the application in the office in the city, that they could expect to wait up to three months. That is the rule, not the exception.

The Minister for Business Services and Consumers has direct responsibility for the performance of that agency. One of two things is happening here: either he is not aware of the problems within that agency—he is not being told or not making inquiries about the performance of that agency—or he is aware of it and he is not acting on it. Either way, either of those two things is totally unacceptable.

On Friday, I spoke to the minister and gave him the details of the apprentice who was highlighted in the paper yesterday. I understand he is making inquiries, but it should not have to

come to that—that you need a member of the opposition to feed information to the minister. He should be across these issues. He should be aware of the nonperformance of the agency. It should not have to come to an opposition member giving that information to the minister so that these problems can be fixed. It is the responsibility of the minister to get across issues in their agency and to act on them accordingly.

The third issue I raise is another matter highlighted in the Governor's speech in relation to the clean, green food industry. It goes to the very issue, in my electorate, that I have had an enormous amount to do with concerning the rezoning of the 1,300 hectares of highly productive agricultural/horticultural land at Mount Barker. Again, an article appeared in *The Advertiser* this morning in relation to that.

Again, I state the Liberal party's position—the party I represent—leading up to and including the last state election in relation to developing Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne, which I refer to as the tri-town district. Our position was crystal clear; that is, we did not support any expansion of the town boundaries until the services and infrastructure were in place to meet the current demands of those communities. Once that was achieved, then we would consider, in full consultation with the council and the community, some further growth—full stop. That was our position.

What we have seen is this heavy-handed government ride roughshod over the community up there in the Adelaide Hills, and it is my understanding that the minister at the time, Paul Holloway, wanted to make that decision before he announced his retirement. This was his last big hurrah. He completely ignored the concerns of the community, our position in relation to the matter and pretty much the concerns that the District Council of Mount Barker raised.

Mark Parnell in the other place has been successful in accessing some further information through FOI. My take on the information that has been revealed is that it really just confirms the beliefs and the understandings of the community, the councils and myself as to what had really taken place in relation to that decision of the minister for planning and urban development before he retired.

However, there is one important political point to make in relation to all this. The Greens try to paint themselves as the campaigners for fair, equitable and transparent dealings with the community, particularly in relation to the rezoning of this land in Mount Barker. Let us be very clear on this as well. The Greens' preferences at the last election helped re-elect this Labor government.

This has been raised publicly before and a number of letters have been written to the local papers saying that the Greens ran an open ticket in Kavel and Heysen and other seats—I think perhaps Schubert, Hammond, Finniss, in some of those Liberal-held seats—but the point that I want to make is that I have looked at the how-to-vote cards on the Electoral Commission's website, and in every key marginal seat the Greens published a how-to-vote card preferencing the Labor candidate over the Liberal candidate.

It is crystal clear that the Greens' preferences assisted the re-election of this Labor government and, as a consequence of that, the Labor minister for urban planning and development pushed ahead with a DPA to rezone that land in Mount Barker. The Greens cannot have it both ways. They cannot support the re-election of the Labor government, which then made this decision to rezone all that land and then after the event—after the fact that the government was re-elected and all the land was rezoned—start complaining about the decision.

It is unparliamentary to use the word 'hypocritical' and I will not use that word, but I am not sure what other description you can actually put on that. The Greens, through their preferences in the key marginal seats, assisted in the re-election of this Labor government and, as a consequence, the ministerial DPA to rezone that 1,300 hectares of prime agricultural/horticultural land in Mount Barker was made under this re-elected Labor government. You cannot have it both ways, and I want to make that crystal clear. That is something that I, as the local member, will be highlighting as we proceed.

The fourth issue I want to raise concerns how this government is operating. We have a centralist government in South Australia. It centralises a lot of the operations of government that historically had been maintained and conducted in the community. We have seen the centralisation of the health system and the very poor and bad policy relating to the building of the new hospital at the rail yards, which is an absolute black hole for the financial outcomes of South Australia.

This government has signed up future generations of this state to \$1.1 million a day for 30 years just to have the thing there, not to pay for the doctors, nurses, physicians, or anything like that, but just to have the building there and have it maintained. It is putting a financial noose around the neck of my children and, hopefully, my grandchildren—I do not hope that they are burdened with this financial constraint, but I do hope that I enjoy some grandchildren—and future generations of South Australians, and that is a very bad decision.

I have a bit of an inkling that some members on the government benches do not really like this policy direction of the government: the centralist agenda. That is my view. But they do not want to say anything and they do not want to break ranks, because we have witnessed history in the making over the past couple of weeks in the federal ALP scene where they have not only broken the ranks, they have smashed them to pieces. We have seen federal Labor tear itself to pieces over the leadership tussle between the Rudd faction and the Gillard faction. It is history in the making. Nobody I have spoken to, or who has relayed information to me or my colleagues, has ever witnessed such a state of affairs. We had the ballot yesterday and now we are all kissing and making up and making out that everything—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I just remind the member for Kavel that this is an Address in Reply to the Governor's speech. The last time I was aware the Governor spoke for the state not the federal scene. So, could you perhaps get back to the state.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It is my understanding that in Address in Reply members have—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Freedom; you are quite right.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —the freedom to talk about anything they want to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It should be at least closely relevant to the motion before us.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am using it as an example of how the Labor Party in South Australia compares with its federal colleagues. The tussle, the blood sport, if you like, that we witnessed in the federal ALP scene directly affects South Australia. It directly affects the confidence of this state. You only have to look at some of the transcripts from the Australian Retailers Association from last week that were pleading with federal Labor. They were saying, 'Get over this struggle. Sort your messes out. Sort your bitter internal divisions and arguments out for the benefit of consumers and for the benefit of businesses in South Australia, and right across the nation, because it is affecting consumer confidence.'

When political parties are going through issues, particularly in relation to the most senior public position in the country, being the prime minister's position, when you have the scenario that we witnessed last week, and in the months prior to that, that does have an unsettling affect on the country, and particularly South Australia, which we have responsibility for. So that is one of the reasons I am highlighting it. I hope that allays any concerns that you may have with me in raising those issues. You have to admit, Mr Deputy Speaker, it certainly has been history in the making, because I do not think anybody has witnessed such a level of venom, spite and pure nastiness—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —and, as the member for Bragg just said, the acidic nature of what we have witnessed. Let me proceed with more of my contribution, as the clock is starting to wind down. As I was saying, essentially, what we are witnessing is that this government is a centralist government. It is addicted to building the size of government and building a massive, bloated bureaucracy. South Australia has 85,000 public servants at the moment.

I have highlighted the issue in relation to health. We have a massive financial black hole being constructed down the other end of North Terrace. What are we going to see? I think we will see half a hospital, a mile apart (1.6 kilometres apart) at each end of North Terrace. We know that all the health services at the current site are not going to be transferred to the new site at the rail yards: there is some oncology; some women's health services; and most of the pathology.

The medical school is, obviously, just across the road on Frome Road. Some of the services that the hospital provides now to the South Australian community will stay at North Terrace east (if you like to call it that) and not be transferred to North Terrace west. We are going to have half a hospital a mile apart (1.6 kilometres apart) on either end of North Terrace.

If anyone apart from the Labor government were asked the question, 'Is that a good thing?' I think the answer would be a resounding no. However, purely for political reasons they do not want to break ranks, because they have seen clear evidence of what happens when people break ranks,

as I have just spoken about in the federal ALP scene; they do not want to talk about it. They hope the problem will go away, but I can tell you the problem will remain and it will remain for 30 years.

One of the reasons is that the government has been making very bad decisions, particularly about financial issues, and so we see the current state of the budget. I will not traverse that, because it not my particular area of responsibility on this side of the house. The member for Davenport, the shadow treasurer, the leader and other people are very skilled in that area and have the knowledge to deal with those issues.

Natural resource management (and we have the Minister for Environment with us, which is a good thing) is another prime example of a centralist government where you build massive, big, bloated bureaucracies and NRM boards. I heard a statistic the other day that 85 per cent of the funds that the NRM boards manage goes into administrative issues, if you like, and only 15 per cent of the money goes to projects in the community for the benefit of the environment. If ever there was a mismatch, it is clearly evident there.

We also have the current issue of half-day holidays in relation to shop trading hours. We have seen a really strong campaign mounted by the SA Business Coalition. Of course, members of the government and those close to the government are not going to say anything in opposition to this move. It was a deal brokered between the shop employees union (the shoppies) and Business SA. We have had members of the business community come out and criticise Business SA in relation to its role in this, but no-one is going to criticise the shoppies—and you know why?

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That's right, member for Unley—preselections. They are the unions who have the cash; they have the cash that they pour into pretty well every Labor member's campaign. When the house reconvenes after an election we hear Address in Reply speeches from the vast majority of ALP members saying how grateful they are for the generous support of uncle Don Farrell, Senator Farrell—in cash, that's what it means, for their campaign funds. So no-one in government, close to government, is going to criticise this decision about these half-day holidays and penalty rates that have to be paid for Christmas and New Year's Eve.

My time is winding down, but what we see—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Another thing I will quickly talk about is an issue raised in the Governor's speech, safe and active neighbourhoods. Safe neighbourhoods? Talk about law and order issues being to the fore, with bikies running around and shooting up the show, drive-by shootings. We are actually debating legislation now in the house concerning these issues because of the hash the previous attorney-general made of the legislation that he thought would address the law and order issues concerning organised crime and, as a fall out from that, the activity of outlaw motorcycle gangs.

Summing up, what we have here is a Labor government that is a mess. Those things I have spoken about over the last 29 minutes are all examples of the Labor government's mess that we have in South Australia. We have a bad government making bad decisions with bad outcomes for the community.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:22): First, I want to acknowledge and congratulate the two new members of this place, the member for Ramsay and the member for Port Adelaide, who were sworn in today. In my 22 years here I cannot recall a time when new members have made their maiden speech within an hour of being sworn in, and I commend them both; it is a very courageous thing to do. I think it is like when you go for a swim in the cold sea; race straight in and it will not be quite such a shock. I commend them both for that; they did well and spoke very well and it was very relevant. It was also great to see their families in here as well, particularly the Bettison family, who I have known for many years in the community of Kapunda. It was great to see Max and Mrs Bettison there, so proud—and why shouldn't they be?

I thank our Governor, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, for his address and for his opening of parliament, and I congratulate both him and Mrs Scarce on the fantastic job they are doing for the people of South Australia and for accepting an additional two-year term. We feel very relaxed in the Governor's company, and we very much respect the position he holds and the way he and Mrs Scarce relate to all the people of South Australia, and especially for the efforts he makes to get to the far-flung regions of our state. We very much appreciate that.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Hear, hear!

Mr VENNING: The member for Stuart would know about that. I rise to support the Address in Reply, and will use this opportunity to raise some very important and serious issues both to the state as a whole and specifically to my electorate of Schubert. First, I would like to talk about the importance of agriculture to our livelihoods, as highlighted in the Governor's speech as being one of the government's primary areas of focus: a clean, green food industry, to use the phrase in the Australian Year of the Farmer publication *Our Farmers. Our Future*. I will now quote from part of the Governor's speech as it is very relevant to what I want to say. The first page of his speech states:

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. We understand too that uncertainty and doubt can be the enemies of action. This is precisely why we need to act, and to embrace bold new approaches.

For these reasons, this Government has comprehensively reviewed where the State stands now, and made decisions about where its focus needs to be for the future. Its emphasis is not just on the next year, or the next decade, but on a future which will provide rich and worthwhile opportunities for our children, and for our children's children.

From this process, this Government has identified seven primary areas of focus for action. These can be summarised under the following headings...

There are six of them, the first being a 'clean, green food industry'. I find this rather amazing. Is this a genuine realisation, an honest about-face after the huge budgeting cuts we have seen for the Department of Primary Industries, SARDI and the ABB, especially after 123 years of service to the state?

In every budget we have seen cutbacks—and the previous minister is sitting here. Will we see a reversal of this? I certainly hope so. In my last speech of 2011, I highlighted that this is the Australian Year of the Farmer, which is aimed at increasing awareness of everyday Australians of the importance of our agriculture and food industry. I am pleased that, apparently, it did not fall on deaf ears, because this is a prominent part of the Governor's speech that he raised up-front.

I am confident we will see a change of heart, because I agree absolutely that this is the way to go—this is the future. We need to do this: food security is a huge issue. I first raised it in this place at least five years ago. I might as well have been whistling Dixie because nobody was listening, but now suddenly it has traction, it has fertile ground. It is a problem, and we need to address it urgently.

The Governor-General and Patron of the Australian Year of the Farmer, Quentin Bryce, puts it very well as follows, 'So many essentials of daily life are there for us because of the efforts of our farmers.' I could not agree more. However, it seems that all too often farmers are taken for granted, people assuming that their meat, milk and other food simply come from the supermarket, packaged and ready to eat straight out of the freezer.

It was reported recently in *The Advertiser* that the strong performance by the rural sector last year was behind the state achieving a record \$11.96 billion in annual merchandise trade. Wheat was up to 87.5 per cent to \$1.8 billion, meat was up 16.5 per cent to \$734.2 million, and wool increased by \$21.3 million to \$182.3 million. These are South Australian figures.

Labor's focus is on mining, but it is still the agricultural sector that is underpinning our economy. The Premier said in the *SA Business Journal* in early February, 'Our food industry is absolutely crucial for the future of the state.' I urge the Premier to keep this statement in mind, especially after the Governor's speech, when he is formulating this year's budget and not cut the agriculture budget further, as it has been every year under Labor because it has been very easy to do so, even though some ministers—particularly the minister sitting here—have been very diligent and tried hard for the sector, but it was a soft target and we were constantly trimmed. Let us hope it is reversed.

In the past two years, \$80 million was slashed from PIRSA last year, and this includes cuts to research and development (SARDI) and the rural services division; cuts to the biosecurity budget; and funding cuts to the Advisory Board of Agriculture after 123 years of service, with 179 positions to go. I ask: how exactly is this reflective of the government supporting the 'most crucial' industry in the state, to use the Premier's description? I am pleased that 2012 has been named the Year of the Farmer. I hope this campaign is successful in raising awareness of agriculture and the great contribution farmers make to our country.

Another very serious matter is the state government's proposal to legislate to protect the Barossa region against threats such as urban sprawl. The premise sounds good, and we all supported the concept, as did you, sir, to protect our agricultural areas from the threat of urban sprawl, so they are reserved for future generations, and to protect their unique environments.

What the first draft Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Bill 2011 actually contained was very different and divergent from the original discussion paper and the intent that we picked up from the public meetings. The interim Barossa Valley development plan amendment introduced by the minister on 28 September 2011 has basically placed a freeze on all development within the protection district and even development that is quite appropriate to the region—what you would call everyday, normal development.

Last Friday week, the minister put out a media release stating that he had listened to the concerns and a new bill had been drafted and a new DPA would be introduced to rectify the unintended consequences of the first DPA. He then said in this house:

I would like to advise the house, as I have advised all of them, that there will be new interim DPAs on foot, probably within a month. Those new interim DPAs will replace the existing DPAs and I believe considerably assist the local government authorities in the management of their development assessment processes.

He then went on to say:

I can also advise the parliament that as a result of these discussions there have been some very minor amendments to those two bills.

The minister believes he has listened to the community concerns, and I note the member for Mawson sitting here because he is also affected in McLaren Vale. However, once again, no-one outside the department has seen the draft bill, not even the affected councils, so how do we really know? The community and the affected councils need to see more detail before saying that all concerns have been addressed. The minister's reference to only 'minor amendments' being made is of concern. From my engagement with the affected councils about the contents of the first draft bill, it seems that more than minor amendments were needed.

I cautiously welcome the minister's announcement, because things could not get much worse than they have been under the current DPA. People have had to put their lives on hold, businesses have stagnated and people have been scared off proposing any sort of development, even that which we would consider as very appropriate to the area—everyday stuff such as sheds on farms, a new wine storage tank on an existing tank farm and a shearing shed on an existing farm. In one case, a \$1 million expansion of an existing 100-year-old business was put on hold.

It really does bite hard when a business that we would all know well rang this morning and contacted my office. He is a local shed builder and manufacturer, and he said that this DPA is hurting his business. People have had to apply for noncomplying development to build these sheds and are now not proceeding with it. He has put off workers already and will close his business within one year if we cannot solve this problem. To be told that a shearing shed on a farm is noncompliant and you have to go through this process which will take months, when the normal process would take two or three weeks, and there is no guarantee of success, is all too hard.

At this stage, we have not seen the proposed new DPA, but I hope that it corrects these issues, as the minister said it will. Also, all the affected councils' previous policies for developments in towns and rural areas will be reinstated, because there was nothing wrong with them. The minister said prior to the previous draft being introduced that townships would remain under the control of the local council. However, this has not been the case. The affected councils really should have been invited to meet with the minister before tabling a new bill and introducing a new DPA, and they should have had a chance to see the drafts, because this legislation is so unique. We are entering uncharted territory and it is important to get it right.

Yes, the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale are unique places and we need legislation to ensure we protect these areas for future generations, but you do not hamstring it and choke it in the meantime. That is what has happened. I do not think it was the intent of the minister, for whom I have personal regard, but this is what has happened and I am afraid the bureaucrats have lost control. I am grateful that the minister agreed to receive a delegation from the Barossa Council, last Thursday week, and I hope some meaningful dialogue resulted from that.

This issue is too important to play politics with. It is possibly the most serious legislation to affect the Barossa in at least a decade. I appreciate the liaison I have had with the member for

Mawson. We discussed this in early days and we will work through this. We all want a positive outcome, not politics.

The minister's media release suggested that the revised DPA appears to be only putting out fires started as a result of policy on the run and poor initial drafting of the bill. I urge the minister and his department to work collaboratively with the councils, and not impose their views upon people who understand their reasons better than those people based in Adelaide. For example, the original bill contained interim restrictions on common activities, and were not consistent with the agreed intent of the predicted legislation. Why? The minister needs to respond to that.

How and why were some of these regulations created? There were unnecessary and harsh restrictions on shops in shopping areas, sheds in rural areas, and industry that indicated to investors and the community that the Barossa was not open for business. Why were hobby farms and fast-food outlets included, but threats such as wind farms and mining not even mentioned? I sincerely hope that the new draft bill and DPA address the shortcomings and failures of the first drafts. Unnecessary complexity has surrounded what the government only now admits needs to be simple legislation that will not result in the removal or undermining of local decision-making.

My question is: is the government overreacting after the Mount Barker planning debacle? We heard about that again yesterday, about what happened; the minister lost control. They really did overdevelop that area, and the government lost control of that. I am just asking the government not to overreact with this. As the Barossa Council is the most affected by this bill—95 per cent of the council is affected—I have assisted council in seeking a formal dialogue with the minister, and I appreciate his efforts prior to the revised legislation and DPA being introduced, to ensure this time around that the council and its community can be engaged in a meaningful and strategic way.

So, I do watch this with much interest, and I am happy to talk to the minister, because we really need to be outcome-driven here, sir. And I note that this will affect you, Mr Deputy Speaker, because your electorate is on the fringe of this.

In addition, why are we not discussing the strategies for economic certainty to ensure that legislation does not result in the Barossa being an ageing museum piece that would have eventually been closed for business by the original bill and the DPA? As I have previously stated, the Barossa Council has been the most affected, 95 per cent. It has the most to lose and so it has to become more vocal. The Light Regional Council has about 10 per cent of land in this area, Onkaparinga has 30 per cent, and Adelaide Hills has approximately 1 per cent.

Past experience indicates that, as with the 30-Year Plan and the ResCode, we do not want to be left with policies that cut across our unique local character and cultural qualities. For example, the government's own 30-year plan created urban sprawl, not the council's development plan. The ResCode is also impacting on the Barossa by permitting densification of townships and, in particular, gutter-to-gutter housing. Where was the collaboration to create a code that was more suited to townships and rural areas? We do not want gutter-to-gutter housing in country towns.

Eventually, a lot of the character of our townships will be undermined by this metro-centric policy. Potentially, the bill should be looking at these overarching strategic elements in its framework, to ensure that it has a relevant effect. The sooner the government stops passing off fixing its own mistakes as consultation, and stops moving the target around, the sooner the community and councils can stop wasting time and resources chasing it, and focus on the real issues at hand. I only hope that the minister and his department have listened, and that the new bill reflects the affected councils' and communities' feedback. I await the details of the new bill and DPA with interest.

I hope that we are going to see this within a couple of weeks, because it is really starting to hurt, and I think the minister and everyone involved would understand what is happening. With everything in the Barossa, with every new development, we want to encourage people to spend. It is a bit tough out there in financial land, and when you know you have to go through all this hoo-ha—because that is what it is, a lot of bureaucratic red tape—people just lose interest. They will either not do it or they will move.

Also, as we do know, this is also going to become overarching legislation, and a model for many other communities. I know the Clare community is looking at this, so we have to get this right the first time, so that other communities can follow this, if they wish. So, it is all most important. I just want to use my last six minutes to discuss the—

An honourable member: Fourteen minutes.

Mr VENNING: It will take 14—problem we have today with grain levies, and how the ongoing dispute has been hurting our grain farmers at the moment. It is sad to see that we saw the minister last week having to take away the South Australian Farmers Federation controlling of the grain growers' levy funds—the Primary Industry Fund Scheme (PIFS). The minister has taken it back to herself; whereas, previously, the grain levies, which are paid by the farmers on every tonne of grain they grow and were administered by SAFF, will now be administered by the minister's office. Approximately half of it went to the South Australian Farmers Federation, which was mainly to be used for lobbying on behalf of farmers, and the other half went to the other grains body, SAGIT—an independent body which is into research and development, and it does a top job. It is totally independent of us—a great idea.

It was working well with SAFF, too. It was a great scheme, and I had full confidence that SAFF was doing it well until about four years ago when the dispute arose on the elected Grains Council. It was elected by the farmers. The dispute arose, which started with the same old story of the deregulation of the industry, and it caused a few feelings within that Grains Council. There was a lot of division within the Grains Council and then, in time, the SAFF board sacked that elected council and replaced it with a selected council that it chose itself.

The biggest mistake was that the board picked three people who were the chief troublemakers in the first place, and they put them back on the council they selected, and guess what happened? The arguments went on and on. We have always had this problem. We have had the deregulation. I say this, too, on the record that I believe that three or four of these people were actually on the payroll of Grain Traders. How can you represent farmers on a grains council of SAFF to lobby for farmers when you are being paid by a grain trader? To me that is a direct conflict of interest, and I am amazed that more has not been said or done about that.

I say that as reported to me. I have made some inquiries and, yes, there is some legal paperwork to say that that is the case. That was the first time I got cautious about what was happening here. I got very upset and cautious about that. Of course, as we go on further we find that there was disputation and there was some angst. During all this time, the Grains Council, members will understand, was spending the money gathered through the minister's office (by legislation of this place) and then administering it, mainly through lobbying for our industry, the grain industry of South Australia. They were doing that.

But then there were some disputes. The board itself, the South Australian Farmers Federation board, the overarching board, was watching, and it had to pay the cheques; it had to sign the bills. It became apparent that there was some dispute. I have sighted some invoices in recent days, and I can understand why they were concerned at these bills, because they were outlandish. They were not what the levies were all about. They were not about swanning around Adelaide; they were not about pub crawls. I can understand fully why the SAFF board was concerned to pay the bills and to bring into question what was happening.

Again, the council got sacked for the second time, and it goes on and on. Mr Peter Treloar is sitting here, and he was one of the so-called luminaries who was called in because he was a past chairman of that Grains Council, and a very good chairman, too, I might say. He only resigned that position when he became a candidate for this place. He is the one to give the independent advice. I have passed all this by him, and generally most of it he would hopefully agree with.

This became very personality minded. There were three or four people who were very involved and caused a lot of angst, and in all this time the membership of SAFF was crashing. I cancelled my membership because I was not about to be supporting the organisation. I think that, at the time, I probably blamed the wrong people. I blamed the hierarchy of SAFF, and I think it was wrong and I do publicly retract those comments. I should have been targeting these three or four people in these positions who, really, with this huge conflict of interest, were about to totally deregulate and open this up for the grain trade to infiltrate this area.

What happened was that they were sacked again, and then we saw efforts made by certain people. I will name John Lush (he was not one of the so-called troublemakers, nor was Peter White; I will put that on the record), and Mr Lush, through others, called a meeting of the luminaries—every chair, including Mr Treloar—to see what could be done about this terrible situation, because the membership of SAFF was almost bottoming out. Things were in a bad way. Board members were resigning. So, what to do about this situation?

They decided to have a meeting across the road in the Stamford Hotel lounge (which I attended), and they decided to set up a new body called Grain Growers SA. I supported that, but

with a strong proviso that it be within—the word 'within'—SAFF. In other words, this group of people, who are to be elected—I should go back because I missed that part earlier. With that first row four years ago with the selected board, I think the biggest mistake that SAFF made then was that, after the first sacking, it should have said, 'Within the next 12 months we will put an elected grains council in.' It did not do that. It still has not done that. That has been the single biggest mistake of SAFF, and it would admit that. It has been sad. SAFF never got around to it. When you select people, that is when you get trouble, and that is where SAFF has had trouble. I am saying that this is what they need to do: they need to reverse this trend.

Where we are today is that we have formed this group, Grain Producers SA, across the road, the document you have all heard about was signed, and now the President of SAFF has reneged. I support him not going ahead with it, because now Grain Producers SA are going to stand alone. We do not want two grain bodies. There is nothing worse than that. We do not want two grain bodies; we only want one.

I have been a very strong critic of SAFF, Mr Deputy Speaker, and in your time here you have criticised me for being a critic. Can I say that I have rejoined SAFF. I am back as a member and I am battling hard to make sure it succeeds. We want the SAFF that we used to have. We want to go back to fully-elected people who are responsible to the growers—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am glad you took my counsel.

Mr VENNING: Okay, sir. So, this is a critical issue. I will get to the minister's involvement in a second. We need to get back to an elected body here. This brings me back to the point. I agree with the SAFF people that the agreement that was signed did not happen, because it chose to take it outside.

Now, here we are today. I believe that a new Grains Council is going to be appointed, with a new chair to be announced, who I am told we are going to be very pleased with. I hope that is the case, and let us start again. I believe that we can and should forget all these personalities and who said what. It is not about the people, it is about the industry. Most importantly, it is about making it respectable so that our young people get involved. We need these younger people to get involved with these industries and to become part of this lobby process.

I have difficulty with the minister, who has established this PIF scheme. Section 10(5) of the Wheat Marketing Act says that the minister can take the funds and invest those funds. I do not believe investing means spending. I cannot see how a minister of the Crown can take over control of these moneys when most of that money is spent to lobby government. To me, that is a short circuit. I do not think it is sensible. I would refute that and I will be looking at the legal side of it. If you look at the definition of what an investment is, it is not about spending money for farmers, it is about putting their money somewhere where it can earn interest and grow in value. So, I would dispute the minister actually taking this on.

I can understand why the minister has done this. While this dispute rages around, minister Gago in the other place thought, 'Well, we need some breathing space here. We need to find a quiet spot,' so she has done this. Hopefully, while this is happening, the warring parties will get down to some common sense here.

Call it what you like, but I think the answer to this quite clearly is for us all to get off our high horses and eat humble pie—me included, and I have done that to you today, Mr Deputy Speaker. I apologised for my criticisms of SAFF in the past. I might have thought it was constructive at the time, but it was not. I probably targeted the wrong people, and I did, but I think we all have to move on.

I believe the final result should be that all levy payers—and we want people to pay levies because, as you understand, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is voluntary; you do not have to pay them. These voluntary levies are all part of the finances of the state. So, we want them to pay their levies, but these levy holders should then automatically be members of the Grains Council, Grain Producers SA—call it what you like; I do not care what the name is—or a body, which is elected by them; I say again 'elected'. Every levy payer should get to have a vote for that and should be under the umbrella of the South Australian Farmers Federation—within it.

Also, because those members are therefore automatically members of that council, they could be members of SAFF, with the payment of a subsidised membership fee. That would solve all our problems wouldn't it? It would help to get over this war. We would boost SAFF's membership and we would all be happy. The minister would know—and I have spoken to several

of the ministers, particularly the previous minister O'Brien—that you cannot go on unless you bring in new faces.

Three or four of these people have been in every fight we have had. It is time we woke up and moved on. It is not about me, it is not about anybody, it is about the organisation. We have people, and we have got to encourage them to come in. We have to draft in some of these younger people to do their term for their industry.

It has been a very difficult issue for me and for my family—because we all have different and diverse points of view—but I think the resolution that I have just spoken about is the way to go. I commend Mr John Lush for what he tried to do, but I am afraid that he has been hog-tied to some degree. Mr Treloar would probably back me in saying that it was with honest intent that I tried to fix it, but all I can say is that it has to happen.

Let us hope, come the annual general meeting of SAFF in August, that we have a new direction, and we need a lot of new faces. I am happy to put my back into it for the overall good of the industry, for the people and, indeed, for the parliament because it has been one of the single most difficult issues I have faced in this place. It has been going on for probably four to six years, and it is time we put a stop to it, time we all grew up, time we got on with it, and time we started representing the farmers of South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Schubert. I accept your apology. I look forward to reading your media statement where you acknowledge your guilt and how I was correct, because you did help to sow the seeds of discontent in that industry.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:51): As others have done, I would like to pass on my thanks and congratulations to the Governor on delivering the address to us two weeks ago. I also take the opportunity to congratulate the new member for Port Adelaide and the new member for Ramsay, who were sworn in this morning. I look forward to working with them over the years to come for the betterment and in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

It gives me great pleasure to start my Address in Reply today, particularly as I have the opportunity to comment on a number of issues relating to the portfolios on which the Leader of the Opposition has been kind enough to ask me to speak on behalf on the Liberal Party: the areas of families and communities, housing, disability and youth.

As we sit here in the parliament right now, South Australian police are searching for three young offenders who, last night, were amongst eight young offenders who escaped from the Cavan secure facility. This is an extraordinary situation that we find ourselves in. Cavan is a 36-bed facility for some of our most serious juvenile offenders; typically they are people who have committed more serious offences and are more dangerous young offenders than will be found at the Magill Training Centre which, as we know, is shockingly rundown, as it has been for many years, and that is why we are building a new one.

We are led to believe that apparently these dangerous young offenders escaped from the Cavan secure facility last night by cutting through a fence while there was some sort of commotion. I say 'apparently' because that is the only information the minister has provided at this stage to the people of South Australia about the circumstances surrounding that escape. We are talking about eight young offenders, and this is nearly a quarter of the maximum capacity of the Cavan secure facility if it was completely occupied at the time. It is an unbelievable situation that it has come to this.

Coming back to the Governor's speech, the Governor advised—and these are, of course, the Premier's words—that 'securing the safety of the people is the primary role of government', and that is from the speech two weeks ago. The community expects that securing their safety is going to be the primary role of government. It is the main reason that we are here. Last night's escape represented a clear breach of the trust that the public has put in the government to look after their safety.

We had eight young offenders on the run but, thanks to the dedicated and excellent work of South Australian police, five of them have now been apprehended and are back in care. I note that not all of them are back at Cavan because we still have not apparently fixed the situation that allowed for the escape in the first place, but we look to the minister to clarify those details. Some are back at Magill, where the Public Service Association has identified a concern about staffing levels.

We were told this morning that no extra staff have been put on at Magill to deal with these dangerous young offenders, as they have been described this morning. The other thing that we know about them is that two of them were apparently the ringleaders of last year's riot at the Magill Training Centre. At the time, we were told by the then minister, Ms Rankin, that it was just boisterous behaviour, as boys will do. This is a serious problem and the government has serious questions to answer. As yet, those questions remain unanswered.

The circumstance surrounding the escape of eight juvenile offenders is extraordinary. Questions that the minister might care to turn his attention to are: was the centre fully staffed at the time, and, if so, what level of staffing to offender does that relate to? Is the staffing level that is set at Cavan appropriate at the moment? Were any of the staff threatened in the process of the escape? Because we do not know about the circumstances, the community, I think, is very keen to know the answers to these questions.

Frankly, one question puts itself front and centre: how was that secure fence able to be breached by eight young people if the centre was fully staffed? There is also a question of how many people were in Cavan at the time. When I visited Cavan three years ago, it was then, and it is still, described on the departmental website as being a 36-bed secure facility. The minister this morning suggested that there were 42 people in the centre. That is an extraordinary situation if that is the case, but he was not able to say it for certain; it was, I believe, the 'vibe' that he had picked up. The numbers in the centre need to be clarified so that the South Australian public can be reassured that there is not overcrowding at the centre and that there is not, in fact, understaffing.

The government needs to clarify what events transpired between the escape, just after 7pm, and the police report that came out to the community at 8.58pm. It is the responsibility of government—this is a key responsibility. As the Governor stated, community safety is the primary responsibility of government and it is one that this government needs to deal with right here and now.

More broadly, the issues that I have the opportunity to deal with in parliament are of great interest to me and, in fact, stimulated much of my interest in public policy and going into politics. It was a long time before I came into parliament that I had an interest in juvenile justice and that led me to seek the opportunity to visit Cavan and Magill.

Some members may recall Chris Varney, who was a representative of the UN Youth Association and who wrote a report in 2009 on the young people he had visited at Magill. They were quite traumatic stories, and when he shared them with me I was deeply concerned. It is in my part of the world, it is within the Morialta electorate. We heard stories of offenders as young as 10. The Magill centre, as opposed to Cavan, deals with 10 to 18 year olds. It tends to be the shorter term issues, and also all our young female offenders are in Magill.

There were children as young as 10 sharing dormitories with older teenagers who were in Magill because they had committed sex offences. They were sharing bathrooms where the doors did not fit, where their bedroom doors were not secured. When I visited one of the dormitories we were able to walk through because occ health and safety was currently prohibiting the centre from occupying it at the time. Of course, all of our young female offenders are in Magill, and the terrible conditions there are the only ones available for those young female offenders, and it is a great concern.

The government has back flipped, and back flipped, and back flipped on Magill. We know that a new centre is currently being built to replace it, but this is something the Liberal government had in planning as early as 2000 and was cancelled by the Labor government on coming in; 10 years of failure in juvenile justice. As the Premier, Mr Weatherill, said on 9 August, we have a change of leader, we do not have a change of government. Let nobody think that this is any sort of new government. This is the same old Labor that has not been acting in the best interests of South Australia for 10 years. I seek leave to continue my remarks,

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, I draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of a group of students from Concordia College, years 11 and 12, who are guests of the member for Unley. Welcome and I hope you enjoy your time here today.

STRATHALBYN POLICE PRESENCE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 253 residents of Strathalbyn requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to increase the police presence in Strathalbyn to a 24-hour coverage.

COOBER PEDY ABORIGINAL AGED CARE FACILITY

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 80 residents of Coober Pedy and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to transfer the land on which the Coober Pedy Aboriginal aged care facility is located to the Umoona Aged Care Aboriginal Corporation and cease further negotiations of the lease with Country Health SA.

BUS CONTRACTS

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport): Presented a petition signed by 314 Adelaide metropolitan bus operators requesting the house to urge the government to ensure that future government tenders called for the Adelaide metropolitan bus contracts include a full and total transmission of business for all employees.

HOSPITAL PARKING

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport): Presented a petition signed by 37 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reverse its decision by removing car parking fees from public hospitals.

HOSPITAL PARKING

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport): Presented a petition signed by 60 residents of the northern suburbs requesting the house to urge the government to remove car parking fees from Modbury Hospital.

TONSLEY RAILWAY LINE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell): Presented a petition signed by 993 residents living along the Tonsley railway line and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action by reversing its original decision to ensure that the Tonsley railway line will remain open.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

THE CONSERVATORY

172 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (30 November 2010) (First Session). What is the tenure of the lease held by Department of Trade and Economic Development for its new offices at the Conservatory on Hindmarsh Square?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): I have been advised that DTED has a 10-year lease at The Conservatory from 1 December 2009 to 30 November 2019 with a 10-year right of renewal from 1 December 2019.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

206 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15 March 2011) (First Session). How many mobile telephones, credit cards and parking spaces, respectively, are paid for by the Department of Health?

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

At March 2011, the Department of Health paid for 10,042 mobile telephones, 101 credit cards and 83 parking spaces.

The Health workforce is highly mobile with most clinical staff not having a desk. Due to the 24-hour nature of service provision, a large number of staff are on call in support of our health system. On call staff are predominantly in clinical roles, but also include managerial, executive and infrastructure support such as biomedical engineering and ICT. In addition, Country Health SA has a significant number of staff that travel between population centres and for whom carriage of a mobile phone is required to ensure their occupational safety and welfare during travel.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

246 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (13 July 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 3, p124, Workforce Summary—

1. Why was there a reduction in staff in the Department of Premier and Cabinet?
2. Why will the 'net cost of providing services' increase by \$5.6 million in 2011-12, when the Department plans to employ about 56 less staff?
3. Will any Divisions be removed from the Department or transferred to another Department in 2011-12?
4. What are the functions of the 3 FTEs outlined in 'Administered Items for the Department of Premier and Cabinet'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development): I have been advised of the following:

The 2011-12 FTE Budget is 799.8 compared with the 2010 11 Estimated Result of 856.1. The reduction in FTEs of 56.3 is largely due to FTE savings reductions for 2011-12 approved through the 2010-11 Budget and the 2008-09 Mid-Year Budget Review.

The 2011-12 Estimated Result of \$246.7 million has a higher net cost of service when compared with the 2010-11 Estimated Result of \$241.1 million primarily due to the effect of carryovers associated with the Renewables SA initiative and new funding in 2011-12 associated with the future management of essential services in remote Aboriginal communities.

The staff numbers disclosed in the 2011-12 Budget Papers do not take into account the machinery of government changes announced on 21 October 2011.

The 3 FTEs reflected in the Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet are the Premier, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation and the Agent General.

WRONGS ACT

387 The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15 November 2011) (First Session).

1. Does the Supreme Court of South Australia deal with vicarious liability cases in common law and tort?
2. If the SA Wrongs Act 1936 is breached at Div 3, Sec 27C (1)(a)(b)(2)(3) and a person's injuries flow from the serious and wilful acts of misconduct of others, then are third parties vicariously liable for these injuries and does the case fall within the jurisdiction of either the District or Supreme Court?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): The Attorney-General has been advised that these questions will be answered by the Minister for Education and Child Development.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT GRANT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

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 the Small Business Development Grant (SBDG) was a \$5 million fund that provided support on a dollar for dollar basis for eligible expenditure to assist the creation of new jobs in innovative manufacturing and technology/services projects to enhance the economic growth of southern Adelaide, following the closure of Mitsubishi at Tonsley Park.

The government has established a new investment fund of \$1 million per year over 4 years from 2010-11 to provide assistance to Small and Medium Enterprises to generate and/or accelerate new capital investment in South Australia to assist innovation, diversification and competitiveness of growth enterprises.

The objective of the program is to support small to medium sized manufacturing businesses with turnover of less than \$10 million per year to introduce new technology, new products and services and/or to enter new markets.

The Small and Medium Enterprise Investment Development Program will build on the SBDG, however will not be limited to Adelaide's southern suburbs. It will be administered by Innovate SA on behalf of the Department of Trade and Economic Development.

SMALL BUSINESS WORKSHOPS

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

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 in 2009-10, DTED funded and organised several workshops including the 'Start Your Own Business', 'Better Business Series' and 'Business Manager Skills Development'. These workshops were presented through the BEC and RDA networks.

SMALL BUSINESS WORKSHOPS

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

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 that we will be working with our key partners and service providers to ensure small businesses are aware of, and have continued access to, the information they need to enhance their businesses.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

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 that Mr Worrall's appointment on an Executive Level E package is consistent with his previous appointment as the Chief Executive of the Public Sector Performance Commission and that the Executive Level E package is the standard for all Chief Executives. It is my understanding that Chief Executives are not employed on SAES contracts.

Appointments of the Chief Executives of government departments are the responsibility of the Premier, who made the appointment in this case.

THE CONSERVATORY

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

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 that DTED has a 10-year lease at The Conservatory from 1 December 2009 to 30 November 2019 with a 10-year right of renewal from 1 December 2019.

THINKERS IN RESIDENCE

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): I have been advised that Thinkers receive a stipend consisting of accommodation, flights and a payment (fees). Fees are negotiated on a case-by-case basis and are deemed commercial-in-confidence.

This confidentiality is critical so that competitive negotiations can take place at the beginning of each residency.

Private industry partners are contributing \$100,000 towards the cost of the 'Thinkers in Residence' program.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (8 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): The Treasurer has delegated his powers of referral to the IDC to the Minister for Industry and Trade.

There is no statutory obligation on me to refer matters to the IDC unless a guarantee is to be provided, either in relation to a liability or the repayment of a loan. I understand that no guarantees have been issued under the Industries Development Act 1941 since November 2005, when the Committee last met.

I feel the IDC provides a robust way of us having a bipartisan approach to certain industry development. I will be taking a more liberal view on referrals of these matters to the IDC.

SUBCONTRACTING WORK PAYMENTS

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee A).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development): I have been advised of the following:

The Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009 came into operation on 10 December 2011.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised:

Between 30 June 2010 and 30 June 2011 positions with a total employment cost of \$100,000 or more:

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department/Office of Consumer and Business Affairs	Manager, Consumer Affairs Branch	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department/Office of Consumer and Business Affairs	Commissioner for Consumer Affairs	\$288,922

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department/Office of Consumer and Business Affairs	Deputy Chief Executive (1)	\$300,000
Attorney-General's Department/Office of Consumer and Business Affairs	Deputy Commissioner	\$271,849

(1) Please note the position previously held by this incumbent remains vacant pending the finalisation of the restructure of OCBA and OLGC.

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department/Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner	Assistant Liquor & Gambling Commissioner	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department/Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner	Deputy Commissioner Gambling	\$143,818
Attorney-General's Department/Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner	Assistant Liquor & Gambling Commissioner	\$107,103

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department/Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner	Assistant Commissioner, Compliance	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department/Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner	Assistant Commissioner, Licensing	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department/Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner	General Manager, Business Services	\$107,103

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA OPERATING GRANT

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition)** (8 November 2011) (First Session).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development): I have been advised of the following:

The Anangu Pitjantjatjara operating grant for 2010-11 was \$1.329 million. The 2010-11 Auditor-General's statements incorrectly show this payment as a grant and subsidy to the Department of Health.

The \$465,000 represented in the 2010-11 statements as the Anangu Pitjantjatjara operating grant should have been shown as a grant and subsidy payment for the Wiltanendi project.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—District Council of Mallala Annual Report 2010-11

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

Public Advocate, Office of—Annual Report 2010-11

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements)—Urban Renewal Authority—General

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

Public Corporations—Land Management Corporation—Dissolution and Revocation

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

Regulations made under the following Act—

Food—Disclosure of Information

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

Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007—

Operation of—December 2011

Review of—December 2011

Regulations made under the following Act—

Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Grain Industry Fund—General

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2010-11

PARLIAMENTARY STANDARDS

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development)

(14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, on 1 November, in my first statement to the house in my capacity as Premier, I stated that our conduct in this place contributes to the poor perception that people have of us. The community expects more of us as members of parliament. They hope that we will come to this place to debate ideas and things that matter to them, and they are entitled to expect that of us. I doubt that that there is anyone who believes that, in our last week in this place, we lived up to those expectations. Therefore, today I foreshadow two changes to the procedures in this house. The government will move, at the commencement of parliament tomorrow morning, for these changes to be adopted as sessional orders and, if adopted, will seek that they be reviewed by the Standing Orders Committee during the winter break.

First, I propose that answers to questions without notice be limited to four minutes. This limit will apply in respect of answers both to government and opposition questions. Madam Speaker, under this proposed provision, you will have the discretion to extend that time if the minister is interrupted. This provision recognises that one of the matters that causes concern to the opposition is the length of time taken to answer questions. Time limits such as this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Time limits such as this have been adopted by a number of parliaments in Australia; introducing them here should reduce the unrest of those opposite.

Second, and to more directly address poor conduct, we will introduce an order giving you, Madam Speaker, the power to immediately exclude disorderly members from the house for up to one hour. The direction would not be open to debate or dissent. The direction would not, however, exclude the member from participating in a division. This, too, is a provision the nature of which has been introduced elsewhere.

During the last week of parliament, the member for Fisher gave notice of motion to introduce a similar provision into standing orders. He is a former Speaker in this place and has no doubt watched our conduct with some despair. We ought to take seriously his concern about these matters and his proposals for improvement.

The new provision will enable you, Madam Speaker, to better maintain discipline in this place by giving you an alternative to suspension. Suspension has serious consequences for the member concerned and for his or her party; it is a punishment and, because of its serious consequences, it is itself cumbersome and disruptive. The proposed provision is aimed at restoring order and defusing a situation speedily before it deteriorates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —rather than punishing the disorderly member.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Leader of the Opposition, be quiet.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I should make clear that, under this proposal, it would be open to you, Madam Speaker, to consider that frivolous points of order, clearly designed to interrupt the conduct of proceedings, may constitute disorderly conduct.

Finally, I seek to return to another matter I spoke of last November so that no-one is under any illusion. Serious questions which are seeking information should be answered seriously by ministers in this government; that may require context. The answer may not be the answer those opposite seek, but it should be an answer that responds to the substance of the question. However, questions designed not to elicit a serious response but which were asked for mere political pointscoring, will be given the treatment they deserve, and those opposite should not be heard to complain in those circumstances.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: The behaviour last week was disgraceful, and there will be an improvement this week. If there is a blatant disregard of standing orders, particularly standing order 137, there will be consequences.

CAVAN TRAINING CENTRE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): I only hope that the improved behaviour means answers to our questions. My question is to the Premier: will the Premier explain how it is possible for a facility which is being used to secure offenders who are considered dangerous to have such poor security that eight such offenders simply walk out?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:13): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is, of course, an important question. It is unacceptable that facilities that are there for the detention of offenders of any sort enable them to escape that detention. It is a fundamental principle of detention that it remain secure. We, of course, have the same questions, and that is why we have immediately commissioned an inquiry.

The Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion has requested that the Department for Correctional Services, which has expertise in relation to this area but which is not directly involved because the facility actually comes within the province of the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, should undertake a review of the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion's management of the incident.

The events leading up to the escape, the response to the escape and a review of the facility's security will form key aspects of the review. This investigation has already commenced and will be headed by Bill Kelsey, Manager, Intelligence and Investigation Unit of DCS, under an agreed terms of reference.

What I can say to assist members of this place is that fortunately seven of the eight escapees have been apprehended, and they have now been returned to detention; of course, there still remains one we are looking for. My message to members of the community who may have suspicions about a person who may be in this category is that they should not approach them, they should contact the police and the police will attend to the matter.

I do not want to say too much that could prejudice the investigation but I want to give the house the information that we have. It appears that there was an incident that occurred with one aspect of the unit which caused a number of staff at the unit to go to that area. During that period, a number of the young people who had already pre-prepared an escape route by using a cutting material through the fence, were able to pass through that fence. I do not have the complete details yet but that is my preliminary advice.

It is worth saying that the staffing levels at the unit were a full complement on that evening. It is also worth saying that the particular facility was not at full capacity so there should have been ample staff to be able to maintain, securely, those young people who were in that facility. We will, of course, carefully review the circumstances of this escape and act on any of the recommendations that flow from it.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about how the state government is assisting early childhood service providers?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:16): It is my great pleasure to answer a question from the member for Port Adelaide—asked in more dulcet tones than, perhaps, the former member for Port Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite will behave.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The member for Port Adelaide is very familiar with the question of early childhood because she is engaged in raising two young children herself, and I know this is a particular passion of hers.

There is a growing body of evidence that tells us that early experiences and influences in life have profound implications for the rest of a child's not only learning but their health trajectory and wellbeing. The quality of those early years and their experiences will not only shape their future but also the future of our state and our capacities here. In my view, it is not only an important issue in terms of the quality of those individuals, it is a great social justice issue that confronts us. We see so many broken lives where, if you look back at the experience of the early years, you can see precisely how the chain of events was put into place.

This is why we are putting in place structures and programs to position early childhood education and care at the centre of our thinking, with a new Department of Education and Child Development. It was one of the key seven priorities that we outlined in the Governor's speech. It is why we are building 10 new children's centres to bring together all of the elements that bear on the lives of children within the first period of their lives.

Today I am pleased to announce that Professor Carla Rinaldi, a world-leading expert in the Reggio Emilia approach and early childhood education, will be Adelaide's newest Thinker in Residence. The Reggio Emilia approach has long been heralded as one of the most influential approaches to early childhood education. Back in 1991, *Newsweek* recognised one of the Reggio Emilia schools (the Diana School in Reggio Emilia) as the best school in the world for its promotion of creativity in young children and one of the top 10 of those schools, but certainly the only preschool on the list.

The Reggio Emilia approach puts children at the centre of the development of how they learn. It recognises that children's experiences influence their learning. My vision for the education system is that I want the high school system to be more like the primary school system and I want the primary school system to be more like our preschool system, where we involve parents, where we have children and their inquiries at the centre of their learning. We have a fine tradition in this state in early childhood education. We certainly lead the nation. We have put—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We certainly put more resources into early childhood education than any other state, and I think the outcomes are there to look at. I think our society has been very favourably shaped by the quality of our early childhood education. What we enjoy in terms of the creativity of our citizens who succeed not only here but also around the world owes very much to the base that we put in place in this state in those early years.

This must be something that we can reach agreement about. You would have thought, if there is one thing that we could reach agreement about, it might be the importance of the early years.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right, motherhood. Could we reach agreement about—

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: That is four minutes, Madam Speaker. I thought the Premier might lead by example.

The SPEAKER: There is no standing order as yet, or sessional order. There is no point of order. Sit down. Premier.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Norwood, you are warned!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, I am more than happy to end now if the members don't want to hear any more.

CAVAN TRAINING CENTRE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is again to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the house if last night's escape from the Cavan secure youth facility was a result of overcrowding, understaffing and/or the transfer of too many young offenders from Magill in recent months?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:21): If the member had listened to my first answer, she would have had most of the substance of the question that she has just framed. I have just said that the maximum occupancy at Cavan Training Centre is 36 and the occupancy level at Cavan on the day of the incident was 29. There was an appropriate ratio of staff on duty at both the Cavan and Magill facilities last night, so the question of staffing I do not think lies at the heart of this, although that will be a matter for the investigation, and I do not want to pre-empt that.

What we had here is obviously a calculated attempt to prepare for the escape. I do not know whether the particular incident was a calculated distraction but that, no doubt, will emerge from the course of the investigations. All those things we will become aware of. If there are recommendations that flow in terms of staffing or processes, then no doubt we will consider them carefully.

We have been as open as we can as quickly as we can. The information that was provided to the police which permitted them to release names and identify the particular children, which is an exception to the general rule about protecting their identity, was done in the interests of public safety. This was a particular exception to that general principle. I understand that was an important factor in at least two of the escapees being detained. Seven of them are now back in custody and we are still searching for that last one. We will learn whatever the lessons are to be learnt from this escape.

CITY OF ADELAIDE PLANNING

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister inform the house about how the government is progressing with planning reforms in the City of Adelaide?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for her question, and it is lovely to have new faces in the parliament. Last year I spoke to the house—

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

Mrs REDMOND: How is the question not hypothetical?

The SPEAKER: I am not really sure what the Leader of the Opposition is on about. We are a bit confused up here. My knowledge of the question is 'inform the house about how the government is progressing with planned reforms in the City of Adelaide'. I do not see how that is hypothetical, so I do not uphold that point of order. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am reporting progress, I think; I think that is what I am doing. Yes. Last year I spoke to this house about how I had been concerned for some time about the need for the city council's policies to encourage and deliver appropriate and interesting development in the City of Adelaide.

I said that the city must lead in delivering the promise of the 30-year plan. I concluded my comments at that time by saying that I was pleased there was a positive partnering with the planning department and the Adelaide City Council to prepare a package of possible reforms by

the end of that year (that is, last year) that could include rezoning changes, activating public spaces and reinvigorating underused buildings.

Work has continued, and the government and the Adelaide City Council have been discussing what a reformed planning agenda for our capital city needs. I have been meeting with—and I continue to meet regularly with—representatives of the Adelaide City Council, including the Lord Mayor and members of the Capital City Committee, to keep them informed of progress. I was also pleased to attend the most recent Adelaide City Council meeting where I met with members to advise them of how work had progressed.

I was encouraged by the interest and general enthusiasm of the council members for their planning policies to be reviewed. As this work progresses, I look forward to returning to a future council meeting to discuss the time frames for this project and to seek council's endorsement for council staff to work with staff from the planning department to realise a new vision for the City of Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

CAVAN TRAINING CENTRE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is, again, to the Premier. Would the public have been better protected from dangerous criminals if Labor had not delayed the building of a new secure youth justice centre at Cavan by nine years? After coming to office in 2002, the government deferred the Liberal project to build the youth justice centre, which had been announced and budgeted since the year 2000.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: No budget!

Mrs REDMOND: It was budgeted. Labor then re-announced this project as part of the \$600 million new prisons PPP but then cancelled that again in 2009—at a cost of \$10 million—before committing to it for a third time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:27): I thank the member for her question. Can I just correct an answer that I gave earlier. Apparently there were 35 people in Cavan last night, which is still under the capacity of 36, but, apparently, the advice I received was wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think the question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, the question is internally inconsistent. You only need to consider the fact that the project is actually replacing Magill. That is the proposition. Cavan itself is a relatively young facility; it is nevertheless going to be replaced through the bringing together of the old Cavan and the old Magill sites to create a new site at Cavan.

So the Liberal proposition was to get rid of Magill. These detainees were at Cavan, so it would not have had an effect—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg! You are warned for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Liberal proposition would not have had an effect on Cavan. So there is a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, there is a lack of logic in the question. I just point that out. It does not follow that your proposals, which, incidentally—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The proposals of those opposite, which were incidentally unfunded—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I was looking after that portfolio. I couldn't find the money you had allocated to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I did. In fact, I did. It was commenced when I was minister. It was deferred and now it has been put back on track, and that is a good thing. So we now have a much bolder proposal, which is a new facility which will be built at Cavan. It simply does not follow that the so-called 'Liberal plans'—to the extent that they existed—would have had any effect on this at all. We are now in the position of building this facility. The decision that was taken to defer those earlier arrangements was taken for reasons—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —of maintaining the budget—

Ms Chapman: Yes, to keep building a film hub.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in good shape, and that was the reason for deferring it. We have now returned to those proposals, as is appropriate.

APPRENTICES AND TRAINEES

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister inform the house about apprentices and trainees starting and completing their training in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no interjections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:30): I thank the member for his question. I can advise the house that South Australia has record numbers of apprentices and trainees starting and completing their training. Yesterday the National Centre for Vocational Education Research released the 2011 September Quarter Apprentice and Trainee Report. This report indicates that South Australia had a record 23,800 apprentices and trainees starting training in the year ending 30 September 2011. That is an increase of 5.1 per cent, and higher than the 4.7 per cent national increase during the same period. Importantly, 6,600 of these apprentices and trainees commencing training were studying higher level qualifications, that is, certificate IV diplomas and advanced diplomas. This is the highest figure on record, and an increase of more than 30 per cent compared to the same period a year earlier.

This report also shows there were a record number of apprentices and trainees completing their qualifications, with a 5.6 per cent increase on the previous 12 months. Members may be interested to know that apprentice and trainee completions in South Australia also increased for women by 3.5 per cent and young people by 12.5 per cent compared to the previous 12 months to 30 September 2010.

Overall, we have 35,200 apprentices and trainees in training in South Australia. This is the second highest on record, a 5.8 per cent increase over the previous year and higher than the

national increase of 3.2 per cent. This includes the highest on record in-training figure of 8,800 for those studying a higher level qualification at certificate IV and above, and that is an increase of 28 per cent compared to a year earlier.

These figures are good news for the South Australian economy. They show steady growth since the September 2006 quarter. Importantly, the number of apprentices and trainees completing their training has been higher than the September 2006 quarter, and every quarter since then. That is a growth from 2,400 completions in the September 2006 quarter to 3,100 completions in the September 2011 quarter.

This shows just how far we have come since then. It shows this government's commitment to encouraging people to improve their skills. What this latest data demonstrates is that we have a robust training sector in this state, with more people than ever starting and completing training, and an increase in the number of South Australians in training.

I will let the facts speak for themselves. These results are good news for South Australians who are improving their skills levels required for jobs, now and in the future. It's good news also for employers and industry who need a highly trained and skilled workforce, and for the state's continued economic growth.

CAVAN TRAINING CENTRE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:33): My question is for the Premier. Given the budget constraints on the new Cavan facility, highlighted by minister Hunter in response to Auditor-General's questioning last year, will the Premier now ensure that security at the new facility will be better than the existing centre? The Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion told parliament on 10 November 2011 in relation to building cost blowouts of the new Cavan facility, and I quote:

The budget will stay the same and we will try to bring the project in on budget. That might mean looking at quotes and pushing them a little harder. There is always the potential for reviewing the scope of works and perhaps going for a different style of fencing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the Premier, there will be order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:33): Thank you, Madam Speaker. Of course, there are always imperatives about making sure that projects come in on budget, but nothing will be done that sacrifices the secure integrity of the new facility. We won't permit that to happen. Can I say that the question rather presumes that the cause of the escapes was some defect in the nature of the physical security arrangements. There are a range of explanations for the escape, and that is what will be investigated.

We need to understand the nature of the escape and the reasons for it before we can reach any conclusions about whether it was the nature of the facility that was to blame. In saying that, I don't seek to, in any way, point the finger at any of the staff who work at the facility. There are a range of hardworking staff who do their best to deal with some of the very difficult young people they have to care for.

ELIZABETH GP PLUS HEALTH CARE CENTRE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister inform the house how the Elizabeth GP Plus Health Care Centre is helping to create healthier neighbourhoods in the northern suburbs?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:35): I thank the member for Little Para for this question, and I acknowledge his strong interest in health matters and have visited the GP Plus Health Care Centre with him on a number of occasions. Elizabeth GP Plus is part of our new and growing network of GP Plus facilities, including GP Plus Super Clinics, that we are building around South Australia. It is part of our commitment to building healthy neighbourhoods.

The centres are a key part of a broader GP Plus strategy, which is helping to slow the growth of demand in our acute public hospital sector. In fact, the Department of Health and Ageing has estimated that 9,827 hospital stays were avoided in 2010-11 as a result of this strategy. That is

valued at approximately \$51.7 million. The avoided activity, as a result of these alternative places for patients to go, meant that we needed 122 fewer hospital beds. So, that is 122 beds that we did not have to invest in, which were available in our hospital system for other patients.

Demand for services at Elizabeth GP Plus is growing every month, which is a good thing, because we want the community to use the services as these services come online and as the public becomes aware of them. I am advised that, since services were phased in from November 2010, there have been 56,000 services provided, and that has included more than 11,000 GP appointments, more than 17,000 dental services and almost 13,000 breast screening services with the new digital mammography equipment.

GP services commenced in April 2011. In just under a year we have had 11,000 GP appointments, so we are running about 1,000 a month, which I think is pretty good, because that is 1,000 people who have been able to get access to a GP who otherwise may have gone to an emergency department. Clearly, people who have non-urgent matters now have a place they can go other than the emergency department, and that is a good thing.

A partnership with the Elizabeth police means people in the holding cells at the Elizabeth Police Station who have minor injuries and illnesses requiring treatment are now going to the GP Plus Centre rather than the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department, as they were in the past. So far, I am advised that about 30 people have been diverted through this process.

There has been a reduction, too, of outpatient appointments at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. For the period June 2011 to December 2011, 653 patients were transferred from the hospital to the Elizabeth GP Plus Centre. So, this is an alternative place where medical work can be conducted which does not need a hospital setting.

In dental I am advised that the current waiting time of around six months for Elizabeth GP Plus is less than the state average of 16.4 months and about 10 months less than it was in November 2010. There are about 2,000 fewer people on the waiting list for the outer northern metropolitan area than there were in November 2010 when the clinic opened.

The one-stop services are also helping northern suburbs residents to better manage their health conditions. For example, I have been told of a man with newly diagnosed diabetes who was seen by one of the GPs in the centre and was then referred to a diabetes nurse educator and a podiatrist in the same centre for management of his diabetes. During his appointment he mentioned he would like to quit smoking and, as a result, he was referred to the respiratory nurse at the GP Plus for support with quitting and asthma management. So, that is a really good example of the integration of services that we are able to provide through the GP Plus service. I am advised that 150,000 services have been delivered from the GP Plus Super—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kavel, you're warned! You have had a running commentary. Be quiet!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That is about the only running that the member for Kavel could do, Madam Speaker.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You are warned for the second time, member for Kavel!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised that 150,000 services have been delivered from the GP Plus Centres and Super Clinics, and this figure will continue to grow as we expand the services.

TRADING HOURS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is again to the Premier. How does the Premier justify his statement that the government would move from 'announce and defend' to 'debate and decide', given that his government failed to consult key stakeholders—including the Motor Trade Association, the Australian Hotels Association, the aged care sector and Restaurant and Catering South Australia—on the proposed new public holidays before announcing them?

The SPEAKER: There is a lot of supposition in that question; I could almost disallow it. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:40): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for getting with the lingo. It is good that she has adopted the announce and defend, debate and decide sort of analysis of the world. Given that it is my language, perhaps I will explain what it means, because it might help. The truth is that that language is not a recipe for making no decisions. What it is about is ensuring that there is a mature public debate about public policy issues before you actually make decisions. If anyone here is telling me that there has not been a mature public debate about the question of shop trading hours—which has gone on, and on, and on—with the respective—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The question was not about trading hours. The question was about public holidays, and the Premier is not answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, deputy leader. The Premier will continue his answer. I do not uphold that.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am happy to make the connection for those opposite but, if they are going to use my language back to me, they are going to have to accept that I might have to explain it to them. The nature of this public debate has been, on the one hand, the Liberal Party 'let it rip' total deregulation. On the other hand, we have had a very restricted view of shop trading hours—

Mr Williams: So have I.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, it is your policy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They have shifted their position now. It has always been their policy, out there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —with Business SA—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. This is why we have a standing order not allowing debate when answering questions. The minister is supposedly saying what the Liberal Party policy is, and it is clearly wrong. He does not know what the Liberal Party policy is.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, deputy leader. You can have an opportunity to give a personal explanation after question time if you feel you have been wronged. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: For those opposite, if they want to use the word 'debate' and ask a question about debate, it is incumbent on me to describe the debate. The debate has existed on two sides: the debate between those who are with the deregulations—let it rip—and, on the other hand, Business SA. Let us use Business SA. Do you accept that Business SA has had a policy of total deregulation? Incontrovertible. So, Business SA has had a policy of total deregulation of shop trading hours. On the other hand, we have the interests of people, working people, who want to keep those public holidays for their families. It has always been a matter that we have defended, but what has happened here is that those two sides that have been the lead protagonists in those debates have decided to compromise: on the one hand, Business SA, and, on the other hand, representatives of workers in those industries coming together.

The debate is a broader one than shop trading hours. It is also a debate around recognising that working people in this state are entitled to have some family time on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve. When they have been deprived of that family time—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —to spend time with family and friends, preparing for New Year's Eve or, indeed, Christmas Day, the next day—they should get higher rates of pay. I would have thought that that is a fairly self-evident proposition. It is a social norm that we, on this side of

the house, support. We are seeking to bring those things together in a piece of legislation which will, for all time, settle the shop trading hours issue. It does another very important thing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It will. It will lock this away forever, and those opposite know, and that is why they are resisting it. What we have here in this state is something that would be the envy of other states: an independent small retail sector—30 per cent of our retailers are independent. If you are in the food industry and you want to get something on a shelf here in South Australia, you have got an even chance of getting it on there, because we have an independent retail sector that is capable of supporting South Australian small food producers. Many of them get their chance and their start in the small retail sector. It is as low as 10 per cent in some of the Eastern States—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Can I say this: Woolworths and Coles don't like this arrangement because they want a deregulated environment where they have the whole of the market, let's be absolutely clear, and let's be clear about what that would do to the whole range of suppliers who are trying to sell their produce into the retail sector. This is a sensible arrangement, and I urge all those who believe in a strong independent retail sector, who believe in fair remuneration for working people when the rest of us are enjoying ourselves and who want a vibrant city, to stand with us.

Ms Chapman: Where's the bill? If it's so important, where's the bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg, you are warned for the third and last time. The next time, you will leave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:45): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer tell the house about steps he has taken to improve access to government information?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:45): I would like to thank the member for Torrens—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —for her question. As some members may be aware, the Australian Bureau of Statistics regularly releases data on several economic indicators, such as overseas goods exports, building approvals and labour force numbers. The data is used by each state government to see how they compare to the rest of the country, and a state-specific briefing paper is normally produced.

In South Australia, the Department of Treasury and Finance analyses several key economic indicators and, as a result, produces briefing papers on the following topics: building approvals, consumer price index, gross domestic product and state final demand, gross state product, labour force numbers, mineral and petroleum exploration, overseas goods exports, population estimates, private new capital expenditure and retail trade.

I am pleased to inform the house that I have asked my department to make all of this information available online from tomorrow. Those who follow monthly statistics, including the opposition who like to cherry-pick statistics to try to talk down our state economy, will now be able to go straight—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —to www.treasury.sa.gov.au to download the Department of Treasury and Finance's economic briefings. This news may be of particular—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, can you just hold for a moment? There is too much noise coming from my left and I can't hear what you are saying.

An honourable member: You're lucky.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This news may be of particular interest to the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place. Mr Lucas has a habit of submitting monthly freedom of information requests to my department for their internal economic briefings rather than doing his own work and sourcing his own information directly from the ABS. I hope that by—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —publishing DTF's economic briefs online it will relieve some of the burden that Mr Lucas has placed on the hardworking public servants of the Department of Treasury and Finance, who spend considerable time and precious taxpayer resources—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond and the member for Chaffey will behave. You are both warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They spend considerable time and precious taxpayer resources to process his requests for information he could just as easily gain directly from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The publication of South Australian-specific information and analysis on the DTF website is just one example of how the state government is working—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —to increase transparency and make government information available online to the wider South Australian community.

The SPEAKER: The member for Norwood.

BUSINESS INNOVATION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:48): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I hope you notice I have been on my very best behaviour today.

The SPEAKER: Good.

Mr MARSHALL: My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Will the minister explain why he claimed in a recent media statement, 'Despite pulling funding for the body,' Innovate SA, 'the government's support for innovation remains undiminished' whilst he simultaneously cut the only program specifically aimed at stimulating business innovation in this state? Will the minister explain which agencies will be taking over Innovate SA's programs and services? On 23 February this year, the minister stated, 'Innovate SA has offered a range of services...and a significant number of these will continue to be available through other agencies.'

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Trade.

Mr Marshall: Serious question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:49): I thought you were on your best behaviour. I thank the member for Norwood for his question, and I refer him to our new department called the Department for—wait for it—Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy. We made this decision two years ago. This new department, which our new Premier has brought into being, will be focusing on innovation. We put manufacturing and innovation in the name to specifically focus the department. We have also established—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government also recently launched Invest in South Australia, which will play a key role in securing investment which will build on existing prosperity. The government is committed to the redevelopment of Tonsley. This new focus in this new department will set the scene for things such as Innovate SA. I will say this, Madam Speaker: the opposition was so horrified with the budget cuts, they voted for them.

An honourable member: No, we didn't.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, you did.

Mr Marshall: What are you talking about? Is that your answer?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Taylor.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:51): Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Can the Minister for Multicultural Affairs inform the house about how the state government is supporting new arrivals to feel safe, to thrive and to contribute to South Australia's prosperity?

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) (14:52): I thank the member for Taylor for her question, and I thank her for her considerable support as parliamentary secretary and for the very many multicultural functions she attends. Can I take this opportunity—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Can I also take the opportunity to welcome the member for Ramsay and the member for Port Adelaide to this chamber. It is wonderful to see two more women on this side of the house.

I was delighted last Tuesday to attend the 2011 Governor's Multicultural Awards. The Chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission was there with many commission members, as was the Leader of the Opposition. Those awards were a testament to the many innovations, inclusive programs and outstanding personal effort which have made a positive and significant impact in improving the life of migrants and new arrivals, as well as a greater understanding across all sections of our community.

Both as Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Police, I was especially proud of the Eastern Adelaide Crime Prevention Section of South Australia Police. The section took out the award for outstanding service to recognise cultural diversity by a government agency or team. It won despite very strong competition from other very impressive finalists, including SAPOL's Limestone Coast Local Service Area Crime Prevention Branch. The officers were recognised for their work with new arrivals, including a number of African refugees, whose past experiences made them distrustful of authority. Many people who have lived in war-torn countries, where they witnessed acts of terrorism and genocide, can understandably be wary and distrustful of authority figures in uniform, and this can be very challenging for our police, and that is what makes this accolade so commendable.

This group of officers have gone the extra mile to break down barriers and connect with this community, particularly young people, so that they see the police in the same way we do: as approachable figures, people who can be trusted, who can help them, who they can learn from and perhaps even aspire to be like. It is also an excellent example of our police working closely with the

community to build understanding and a sense of safety in our community. I applaud the Eastern Adelaide Service Area, led by Superintendent Anthony Fioravanti, and especially the local crime prevention team: Senior Sergeant Ken Jaensch, Sergeant Kym Foster, Constable Jane Tan and Mr Juma Abuji.

I also want to make mention of other outstanding recipients of these awards. The Outstanding Individual Achievement Award went to Ms Eugenia Tsoulis OAM, the Arts and Culture Award went to the Adelaide Festival Centre's OzAsia Festival, and the Community Sector Award for Individuals joint winners were Baldev Dhaliwal and Mr Nicholas Niarchos.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: When you get everything right in your speeches—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —then you can criticise others.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The Community Sector Award went to the Asthma Foundation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They have been credited with saving lives, in fact, with their work. The Media Award Individual went to Anelia Blackie from *The Border Watch*, Mount Gambier, the Media Award Organisation to the Messenger News *Weekly Times*, the Private Sector Award to the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre, the Volunteer Award to Mr Hussain Razaiat, the Youth Award Individual to Ramla Giirre and the Youth Award Organisation to the University of South Australia's Global Experience program. They have all done outstanding work and deserve congratulations.

Mr Pisoni: Thirty seconds over.

The SPEAKER: Order!

THE CONSERVATORY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Will the minister explain why the government funded a fit-out of his department's offices to the tune of \$5 million at the same time as cutting future funding for Innovate SA of \$3 million? What does this say about his Labor government's priorities?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:56): Madam Speaker, I will have to take that on notice, because I am not quite sure what he is talking about. If he is saying that we have recently spent \$5 million on a refit of the department at The Conservatory—is that what you are talking about?

Mr Marshall: Absolutely.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will get a detailed answer for the member and bring it back to the house.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: Madam Speaker, the substance of the question was not to do with the quantum of \$5 million. It was pointed at what the priorities were for the government when they cut funding of \$3 million to Innovate SA—

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Norwood. However, I think the minister is interpreting that it is based on that \$5 million versus \$3 million. He will come back with an answer, he said. I am quite satisfied with his explanation.

LOWER LIMESTONE COAST WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Water and the River Murray. Can the minister inform the house of any progress in the sustainable management of water resources in the South-East?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:57): The passage of the Natural Resources Management (Commercial Forests) Amendment Act 2011 was a significant step forward in the sustainable management of water resources in our state, particularly as the impacts of forestry on this resource can be significant. South Australia prides itself as being at the forefront of water management in Australia, and this legislation is another demonstration of our commitment to retain this position.

Since the passage of this act, the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan government task force and the stakeholder reference group—which comprises representatives from forestry, viticulture, dairy, potato and dryland farming industries as well as the South Australian Farmers Federation and the Conservation Council of South Australia—have completed a set of policy principles. These policy principles underwent a four-week public consultation period and will guide the preparation of the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan by the South-East Natural Resources Management Board. These principles state that forest water licences should be applied in the Lower Limestone Coast Water Allocation Plan.

Yesterday I had the privilege of travelling to the South-East and had the opportunity to meet with the outstanding member for Mount Gambier and, of course, the South-East Natural Resources Management Board. We discussed the policy principles and my expectation that the board will continue the excellent work that has been undertaken as they work with the community. Importantly, they worked with the community to prepare the water allocation plan during the course of 2012.

The South-East is home to a number of our state's most important primary production and forestry industries, as well as the world-renowned Ramsar wetlands and other unique environments. Water is vital to this region in a social, economic and environmental sense; it has, however, become scarce as a result of changes to land use. The recent extended drought illustrated the issue, when several areas had significant declines in their watertable. This government is committed to sustainable management of this region's precious water resources, and the NRM board's policy principles are a step to best managing our environment and water resources to ensure they are sustainable and support the clean and green reputation of our state's produce.

While in Mount Gambier, I was pleased to represent the Premier at the wonderful ceremony—again, along with the member for Mount Gambier—that celebrated the handover by the Indigenous Land Corporation to the Burrendies Aboriginal Corporation of a significant piece of land at White Avenue. Burrendies will use the land for the establishment of a community training facility which will develop the knowledge and skills of community members and improve employment outcomes.

I want to congratulate the local Aboriginal community for their dedication to achieving this milestone and, in doing so, I urge the ILC to support—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Trivialising important issues, aren't you? Yes, you are.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: This is an important point, even though the member for Unley might not think so. I urge the Indigenous Land Corporation to support similar initiatives of other Aboriginal communities around and in South Australia.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TRAVEL CENTRE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): My question is to the Treasurer. What is the total cost to government of the new tourism visitor centre, including the cost of alterations for disabled access, cancelling the Holidays of Australia contract, and re-taking control of the tourism centre?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:01): I haven't got the figures in front of me, but the decision to transfer the running of the tourism centre over to a private body was part of a savings exercise undertaken by the Tourism Commission—a decision, if I am correct, of the Tourism Commission board to adopt that as a way of achieving their savings targets that were placed on them as part of the 2010 budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm more than happy to come back with an answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about how the state government is working with schools to encourage parents to get involved in the education of their children?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:02): I thank the member for Florey for this important question. We know that parents play a pivotal role in their children's education and, together with teachers and principals, they do hold the key to a better future for their children in work and their community life. Parents are a child's first teacher, and it is important that mums, dads and carers are encouraged and supported to be partners in the ongoing education of their children.

For some years now, the state government has supported local school initiatives to involve parents in their schools. For example, last week I was pleased to announce the new Early Literacy Learning Strategy which is designed to encourage parents of young children to work with teachers to improve literacy skills in those important early years; in fact, our Premier spoke about it earlier.

This important program, which involves ongoing funding of \$12 million a year, will include providing parents with information about the importance of reading at an early age and support them to read at home with their children. In addition, the strategy supports children in the classroom with 260 specially trained reading support teachers who will work with classroom teachers to improve reading skills and encourage parents to take part in their children's learning.

The government also strongly supports and encourages parents to become more involved in their school community by providing a number of grants to help connect parents and schools. Grants of up to \$2,500 are being provided to 56 public schools and 15 Catholic schools across our state. The grants are modest, but they do provide important support that fosters real connections and participation by parents in their school.

This can include anything from assisting Vietnamese parents at Adelaide High to run their local school parent group, to a program that supports parents at the Elizabeth O'Grady Kindergarten to help preschoolers have a better start with developing their maths and numeracy skills. This builds on South Australia's long history of parent participation and engagement in our schools, and it also supports the evidence and practical experience of teachers and parents that we should be investing in and engaging early.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TRAVEL CENTRE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Business Services and Consumers. Did the government provide accurate information to the tenderers for the tourism visitor centre contract that was won by Holidays of Australia, including the number of tourism inquiries and bookings?

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart, will you repeat that question? I missed the first bit.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Certainly, Madam Speaker. Did the government provide accurate information to the tenderers for the tourism visitor centre contract that was won by Holidays of Australia, including the number of tourism inquiries and bookings?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:05): I think the minister responsible for this is, in fact, the Minister for Tourism, not me—

Mr Pisoni: You signed the deal.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —I didn't sign anything—and I think she has already answered the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister inform the house how mines, such as the recently opened Kanmantoo copper mine, contribute to the people of South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:06): I want to thank the member for his question and his keen interest in all things mining. Last Wednesday, I had the pleasure of attending the opening of the Kanmantoo copper mine, opened by our Premier at his first mine opening. Of course, also in attendance were the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the local member of parliament, the member for Kavel.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You're correcting everyone today, aren't you; you're very good at that. Kanmantoo is just one of the many exciting mineral resources projects coming on line that demonstrate this state's rich resources wealth and the potential it provides for South Australia to continue to grow as a world class mining jurisdiction.

The renaissance of the Kanmantoo mine is expected to yield 21,000 tonnes of copper each year and provide significant and positive effects to the local community. Kanmantoo will create over 150 direct jobs, with up to 300 flow-on jobs to be created. Operations will contribute to an already vibrant copper mining sector that has seen South Australia produce two million tonnes of copper valued at \$12 billion in the past 10 years. South Australia's copper mining projects are world class, with this state producing about one-third of Australia's 952,000 tonnes of copper in 2010-11. This state is a leading player in both copper exploration and production.

Madam Speaker, when you consider the average home requires 200 kilograms of copper, South Australia's production in the financial year 2010-11 was enough output to provide electrical wiring, plumbing, roofing, brass fittings and appliances to over 1.5 million homes. Projects such as Kanmantoo demonstrate the state's rich diversity of mineral resources projects, from large-scale operations such as Olympic Dam and Prominent Hill to smaller scale projects operating alongside regional communities.

Something all these projects have in common is their contribution to this state and the people of South Australia. This government knows that there is a direct link between the prosperity generated by our mines and the standard of living in our suburbs. Indeed, these sentiments were echoed by Mr Philip Lowe, Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia, who last week highlighted the links between the effects of Australia's mineral boom and its positive spillover effects to our towns and communities. The wealth these resource projects create powers our economy and flows through to the wages of their workers, the dividends of their shareholders and the profits of the service industries they support.

Further, it goes into the cash registers of mum and dad businesses in our regional communities and here in Adelaide. It supports superannuation savings through the share market to provide for retirement incomes; it provides revenue to the government to support the schools, hospitals, teachers and nurses we need for a growing population; and it leaves a legacy of infrastructure—rail, ports, roads and powerlines—for future generations of South Australians to enjoy.

The mining and service industry it supports provides high wages and advanced skills that, in turn, attract people to South Australia, growing our regional centres and contributing to a more vibrant Adelaide. That is why this government remains steadfastly committed to the resources sector and capturing its benefits for all South Australians—and the best thing the member for Unley can do is look at his stop watch.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. I think you were trying to outdo the member for Morphett there with the speed of that answer. The member for Kavel.

OCCUPATIONAL LICENCES

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Business Services and Consumers. Now that I have personally provided the minister with the details of the apprentice plumber who has waited over four months for his plumbing licence to be issued (which I highlighted in a question to the minister last sitting week), can the minister explain to the house the reasons for this lengthy delay, and is the minister concerned about reports of tradespeople doing work they are not licensed for?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:10): Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the honourable member very much for his question. Can I say that, of course, any responsible regulator would be concerned about people who do not hold appropriate qualifications performing work for which they are not qualified. Can I also say that the honourable member did raise a question with me here in the parliament in the last sitting week.

Unlike a number of his colleagues, the honourable member chose, rather than to pop around and see me, or to ring me up, or to do any other form of approach, which works perfectly well for a number of your colleagues—I invite you to talk to them about this, they have never found me difficult to speak to—

Mr Goldsworthy: What was the delay? What was the reason for the delay?

The SPEAKER: Member for Kavel, behave! You asked the question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Just let me finish answering the question. The honourable member decided that, instead of doing that—and if in the end there was no satisfactory approach to bring the matter into the parliament—he chose to bring it into the parliament without contacting me about it, which, of course, he is entitled to do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and I do not have a problem about that if that is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Do you want me to finish answering the question or not?

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, behave!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If you approach, however, the issue the way in which the honourable member did, you put me in a position where I have to ask you for further information so that I can get back to you and provide you with an answer. And, Madam Speaker, the thing that the honourable member has not mentioned and the thing that I think the rest of the people sitting in the chamber might find interesting is the fact that my staff attempted from that day until Friday of last week to get any information at all from the member for Kavel and his office, and we got—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: And you know why?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —wait a minute—and we got nothing.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Tell why?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'll get there. We got absolutely nothing.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We got nothing. On Friday at about 11.30 I spoke to the honourable member on the telephone.

Mr Goldsworthy: That's right. You weren't in the office on Thursday.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kavel, you have asked the question; you will listen the answer or you will leave!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Look, if you just let me finish I will; if you interrupt me again I will stop. The point I am trying to explain is that I was given particulars of this matter for the first time on Friday of last week at approximately 11.30am in a telephone conversation I had with the honourable member. I took down notes of that conversation and I have asked to be provided with material about it. I gather now that the reason I was not given that material until then was because there was an article about to pop up in *The Advertiser* and it would not do for me to be in a position to be able to explain what the story was.

I was told also—this is significant—that the honourable member was prepared to ask the question of me in the parliament knowing full well that he had been told by the complainant not to give me any details at the time because the complainant was worried about his job being placed in jeopardy if any details were given to me. That is not what I understood it to be, a legitimate question offered by the honourable member last week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

THE CONSERVATORY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:14): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, before you commence: we will have quiet from my left or you will leave the chamber. Thank you. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As a result of a question from the member for Norwood, I have done some research and found out what the hell he was talking about. He was talking about the move from Terrace Towers to The Conservatory. I understand that the department moved from Terrace Towers to The Conservatory to save money. The lease was up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I am advised, and I have given this answer before in estimates, I think, as well, so it is an old question. It would have cost \$1.6 million more over a 15-year term, and that present value of moving to The Conservatory was \$1.6 million less than the option of refurbishing DTED's Terrace Towers and Pirie Street offices. That is why we spent \$5 million. This question was answered in 2010, and it wasn't even your question.

CAVAN TRAINING CENTRE

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) (15:16): I lay on the table a ministerial statement made in another place.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

CAVAN TRAINING CENTRE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:16): Last night, eight young offenders escaped from the Cavan high security juvenile training centre, and subsequently there was an overnight manhunt. We are glad that South Australian police have done an excellent job in apprehending seven of those eight young offenders; one remains at large. The government's response has been disappointing to say the very least. It has been unable or unwilling to provide clarity to the South Australian public about the circumstances relating to the escape last night.

I note that the Minister for Police has just tabled a ministerial statement made in another place. I assume that it is the one made part way through question time in the Legislative Council by minister Hunter, in which he laid on the table some of the incident's details, but by no means all of them. It certainly would have been helpful for that material to have been provided before question time, perhaps, given that the Premier answered four questions on the issue.

It certainly would have been helpful to the Premier, given that some of the answers that he provided were weak and confused to say the least. For example, the first question that arose out of this situation was the issue of whether or not there has been overcrowding at Cavan. This has been confusing all day for the government. We heard minister Hunter say on the radio this morning that capacity at Cavan is about 42. These are the most secure cells for young offenders in South Australia.

These are the people who commit serious youth offences, and the minister thinks there are about 42. There are actually 36, which did come out at one stage during the Premier's answer but, as to the number of people actually in the cells last night when the breakout happened, first we heard 29, then there was a suggestion this morning that it might have been 25, and, finally, the Premier came back halfway through question time and said, 'Oh, it turns out it's 35.'

So, we know that there were 35 of the 36 beds taken; if maybe not over-capacity, we are certainly looking at a very full Cavan, and that is part of the reason that the juvenile justice system is seeing many people transferred from Magill to Cavan—because Magill is straining at its edges. This has been a long story, of course, because in 2000 the Liberal Party announced that Magill would be replaced with a new facility at Cavan.

The Premier did two things: first, he suggested that this had nothing to do with the breakout last night, but to do that suggests that there is absolutely no connection between juvenile justice policy, the offenders at Magill and the offenders at Cavan. We are talking about one body of offenders, and they move the ones requiring the most secure facility from Magill to Cavan. We know, for example, from the very limited information that the Premier and the minister have been able to release, that two of the offenders who broke out last night at Cavan were involved in the riot at Magill last year, so there are two who were moved from Magill to Cavan because security and the system at Magill were not up to scratch.

If the government had proceeded with the Liberal plan that was in the 2002 budget papers until it was knocked off by this government, we would have better secure care facilities at Cavan for both the new facility and the old facility, and we would not be in such trouble. The Premier went on to say that the Liberal government had never budgeted for this matter. As a former minister for families and communities, he should know better.

I draw to his attention the Capital Works Statement of the 1999-2000 budget, page 27, that talks about, look, the replacement of Magill and the redevelopment of Cavan Training Centre, construction of a new facility to replace the outdated and inefficient Magill Training Centre and works to extend the capacity and infrastructure of the Cavan Training Centre. There are media releases from Dean Brown, there are *Advertiser* stories at the time suggesting it will cost \$19 million, and there is money allocated in that budget paper to get the work underway.

Further, at the time, in *The Advertiser* article of 4 September 2000, Salisbury mayor, Tony Zappia, who is, I believe, now a Labor member of the federal parliament, said the government had agreed to pay the council \$350,000 to spend building Goldsborough Road, and that would enable the construction of the centre to take place.

The Labor government is dreadfully confused on this issue, and it is a very important issue. As the Governor said in his speech to open the parliament, public safety—community safety—is a primary responsibility and a primary duty of government. Last night's escape of the eight detainees is a fundamental failure by the government to commit that duty of care to the South Australian public. It is a severe community safety problem.

We have had no reasonable explanation of the details and the facts from the government. That has been lacking. They need to come clean and they need to answer the questions that are being put to them. They need to explain clearly how on earth it is possible that eight young inmates were able to escape, and we are told by the Minister for Social Inclusion that it was by cutting a way through the fence.

Time expired.

AUSTRALIA DAY

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:21): On 26 January each year we celebrate Australia Day. We celebrate what being Australian means to each and everyone of us. For some of us, it is sharing time with family and friends or enjoying a beer at the cricket. For others, it is a celebration of a new beginning, of freedom from oppression and the opportunity to start a new life and find a new home. It is also an opportunity to remember and respect the traditional owners of this land, to remember the wars that we have fought and the sons and daughters we have lost, and to remember the many migrants who have come to our shores over the years from far and wide, who have helped our nation to prosper.

I was privileged this year to participate in a number of Australia Day events both in my electorate of Mitchell and farther afield. On Australia Day eve I dropped by the local Woolworths to support a great community initiative the supermarket had organised. To get into the Aussie spirit staff dressed up in their favourite Aussie clothing and put on the very first sausage sizzle fund raiser for the local Salvation Army.

The Salvos do amazing work in and around the southern suburbs, including offering financial and general counselling, as well as emergency relief for people who are doing it tough. That evening I attended a citizenship ceremony and an Australia Day awards ceremony held by the Marion council. I find that citizenship ceremonies held around Australia Day are always inspiring for everybody to participate in. The pledge of commitment to uphold our laws and pledge loyalty to our democracy, our rights and our liberty, is especially heart warming when it is a part of Australia Day celebrations.

I would like to offer my warm congratulations to the Citizen of the Year, Patricia Wade, for her tireless work as President of Riding for the Disabled for the past 15 years, also to Mr Michael Payne of Sheidow Park, who was awarded Young Citizen of the Year for the enormous amount of volunteer work he undertakes, including teaching seniors how to become techno-savvy and serving food for the homeless at Westcare. Congratulations also to the wonderful folk at the Marion Historic Village Project, for their hard work organising the Light Square Lantern Parade, which won Community Event of the Year.

I attended the lantern parade with my children, and I have to agree it is one of the most spectacular community events that I have ever had the privilege to participate in. On Australia Day itself I attended a citizenship and Australia Day awards ceremony hosted by the Onkaparinga council. I would also like to congratulate the Australia Day Citizen of the year, Mr Bernard Smart, who has been stalwart of the Kangarilla community for more than 60 years.

Congratulations also to Mr Lance Fakes, Young Citizen of the Year, for his work in creating opportunities for southern youth to explore theatre and dance, and also to the Southern Football League for its 125th year event, which earned the Community Event of the Year Award.

I then attended the Australia Day parade in Adelaide, one of the largest in the country, featuring more than 3,500 participants from more than 100 community groups and cultural organisations. It was an honour to mingle among the many groups from all around the globe celebrating their cultures and heritage. From Japan to India, from Somalia to Fiji, from Brazil to Papua New Guinea, from China to Ethiopia, it felt like every country in the world was represented there.

The national costumes, the colours and the music were just incredible. It is a reminder of how lucky we are to be part of such a diverse and vibrant community and how lucky we are to be able to bring together people from all over the world to live in this great country that offers freedom, democracy and opportunity.

It also made me think about what it really means to be Australian. It can be many things but, most of all, I think it is about this: loving the country that we live in, respecting ourselves and each other, promoting the fair go, recognising that there is prosperity enough to share with all who call this land home, and enjoying celebrating Australia Day with good friends and family and having good food and good times. That is what being Australian is to me on Australia Day.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:26): I rise to talk on health budget matters and to draw to the house's attention the sad news of recent days: that the blowout in the health budget appears now to have increased from the \$99 million figure that the Minister for Health revealed to parliament on 16 February to a figure more attuned to \$114.3 million. The reason for that is that

there has been a mishandling of the Burnside mental health facility project, with the result that a remediation expense estimated to be around \$1 million has become an expense of around \$25 million.

I note that the minister claims that, as a result of offsets or changes in design and scope to the project, he may be able to ameliorate that figure down to something in the order of \$15.3 million. That overrun will clearly be an overrun that comes from the health capital works budget that goes on to the figure which is the overspent amount within health.

For the health budget to be overspent by \$114.3 million, or thereabouts, in this financial year (2011-12) at this point in the cycle is concerning in itself. I just want to remind the house of some of the issues before the Minister for Health. First of all, he has not tabled an annual report. Second, he did not provide his financials to the Auditor-General or to the parliament in time for a proper audit to occur, resulting in the Auditor-General making damning comments in regard to the minister's portfolio management in his report. As he indicated, he would have to bring in a special report, which we await and which may even be arriving in the parliament this week or the next week of sitting.

To a large degree, this has been caused by the minister's decision to implement a new IT financial management system in his portfolio under the auspices of Oracle. The Auditor-General pointed out that, when he took that submission to cabinet, he did not present a business case and he misadvised cabinet about what the cost of that project would be by many millions of dollars. These are facts reported by the Auditor-General. It is now a mess. Bills have been double-paid, accounts cannot be reconciled, and a \$10 million emergency group has been put together to try to sort out the mess.

As well as that, we have nurses protesting outside the Mount Gambier Hospital, the Renmark Paringa hospital and here in Adelaide, about safety concerns linked to under-staffing in our hospitals. We have had emergency department elective surgery figures that leave much to be desired and we have come in last of all the states in regard to the four-hour rule in our emergency departments. There are problems right across the country health system and, of course, issues at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the rail yards.

It is a mess, to be frank. I am intrigued that more has not been made of it and I will be ensuring that more is made of it because this is 30 per cent of government outlays. It is \$5 billion, 30,000 people, and it is important money that needs to be spent well.

I want to turn my attention to the last of the points I observed in regard to the Royal Adelaide rail yards hospital because I want to draw to the attention of the house concerns raised before Christmas about contaminated groundwater and the need for asphalt membranes and vents so as to remove noxious gases that could be a risk to health workers. I want to draw to members' attention that, on 2 February, concerns were raised about the removal of fill from the site that was supposed to be deemed clean fill but was later found to be contaminated. It was reported in *The Advertiser*.

Of course, last Thursday, there was the stunning revelation that 11,000 tonnes, which was the expected highly-contaminated waste component, had become 30,000 tonnes. Somehow or other, the minister had missed the fact that the amount of highly-contaminated waste was three times the size he initially estimated. All this was supposed to be removed at \$250 a tonne and I really want to know whether each tonne that has been removed at that cost has been properly treated. I want to know where that treated, highly-contaminated waste is located. I want an assurance that it has been treated in accordance with EPA protocols and that we know where it is.

Clearly, there is something going terribly wrong down at the Royal Adelaide site in regard to the removal and remediation of highly-contaminated waste. We have had the so-called independent auditor removed and replaced with someone else. There are concerns about the EPA's management. All these amount to an overspend in health and concerns for the integrity of the health budget that the house should note with concern.

CHILD AND ADOLESCENT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:31): Last Friday, I attended the launch of a booklet *Walking on eggshells: child and adolescent violence in the family*, a South Australian information and advice booklet for parents and carers. I was aware that child violence in the family was becoming a more difficult problem in society. It was raised at a domestic violence forum that I attended way back in 2001, I think it was, but I had no idea of the extent and nature of this problem

until I heard the excellent addresses at this launch. The little information card that was also launched says:

You are not alone—this behaviour is happening in many other families too.

It is estimated that between 10 and 15% of young people behave violently and abusively towards other family members. However the real figure may be far higher because of the silence surrounding the problem.

Parents have said:

We are unable to relax...we are walking on eggshells 24/7.

The Flinders University law department became aware of the problems through research that they were doing, particularly a report 'Exposing the dark side of parenting: a report on parents' experiences of family violence'. As a result of this, they organised \$10,000 through the Southern Knowledge Transfer Partnership and worked with Relationships Australia, Southern Junction Community Services, Woodcroft Morphett Vale Neighbourhood Centre, CAMHS, Southern Domestic Violence Service, Cove Youth and Reconnect, among others, to put together some practical advice for parents.

They have produced a very attractive and easy to read booklet. In fact, I think it is one of the most useful booklets I have ever seen, despite having written some myself. The table of contents reads:

Introduction

What is it?

But...isn't the occasional abusive outburst common in young people?

What you might be experiencing

Other possible effects

Why is it happening?

Parenting Practices

Taking action

Take a stand!

Consequences

Setting consequences

Sometimes things will get harder first

Reflecting on your responses and beliefs

A safety plan

What if I call the police?

More about police involvement

How friends can help

Looking towards a better future

Seeking support

What support is available?

Contact numbers for young people

Further information

Emergency contact numbers

Among the things I learnt was that, contrary to my expectation that this was likely to be a problem more for mothers, it is, in fact, a problem for both mothers and fathers. I would imagine that fathers would feel particularly humiliated at times to find that their child is abusing them physically as well as with language. It seems from the case studies presented that it is very difficult for parents to work out when the child stops just being a bit of a naughty child and starts becoming abusive and violent. It is also very difficult for them to work out what is normal teenage behaviour, because we all know that teenagers are not always entirely rational, and when the line is crossed so that abuse and violence take over.

There was a wide range of agencies at the gathering, including the police, who have been involved in this project, and there was also an indication that, fortunately, help is available from a number of services. The excellent working party is also in the final stages of putting together a seminar for service providers, which will distribute more widely the information they have gained through this research project and collaboration with service providers.

Last night, I attended the excellent O'Sullivan Beach Primary School governing council meeting. I took a copy of the booklet along with me to let them know about it because it was suggested that this behaviour can start from the age of 10. They all knew about the problem, and they were very pleased that there are some answers.

PEST ANIMALS AND WEEDS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:37): Let me initially put on the record my congratulations to the new member for Ramsay and also the new member for Port Adelaide: congratulations to them both at a personal level on their recent election win.

I would like to use the time I have available to me today to talk about invasive pests and weeds. An enormous amount of work goes into this. As members of this house would know, the natural resources standing committee of parliament has recently done an enormous amount of work and written a report in relation to this, and landholders all over South Australia put in an enormous amount of effort in this area. NRM boards, local government councils, volunteer groups and all sorts of people do their very best, but we are not on top of this problem.

I would particularly like to focus on pest animals, in particular, foxes. There are many examples of pest animals. In the feral category are mice, foxes, cats, goats, pigs, carp, pearl oysters, cane toads, and there are many others affecting South Australia. We also have overly-abundant native species which fall into the pest animal category, and they include corellas, Australian plague locusts, seemingly New Zealand fur seals, and dingoes below the dog fence. This is a very big issue. Their impact on the environment and recreation—the use of the land, rivers, lakes and sea which we all enjoy—and, very importantly, on primary producers, cannot be underestimated.

As I said before, I really would like to concentrate on foxes in the small amount of time I have available to me today. Foxes do an enormous amount of damage, particularly to our native animals. I would say that cats and foxes probably do more damage than any other ferals to native animals and foxes to our primary producers. Anybody who has had the misfortune to come across lambs with their tongue ripped out, which is what foxes do when they get into a paddock of lambs—and there are plenty of them around—will know that they do not bother about eating the whole lamb; they just go and eat a tongue, move to the next one, eat a tongue, move to the next one, which, of course, is devastating for the lambs, to the ewes, to the flock and to the grazier.

With regard to foxes, I commend the Eyre Peninsula program that is taking place at the moment. It seems that nearly the entire Eyre Peninsula has got together to do a baiting program, with the support of the local NRM and other organisations. I think that is fantastic. I would encourage the rest of the regional areas of South Australia to consider something very similar. I can tell you from first-hand experience, and also from information brought to me from constituents, that in the electorate of Stuart fox numbers are growing at an alarming rate.

Just one example that I can give you is a local person who told me that in one night in the Bundaleer Forest he saw 50 foxes. He is a kangaroo shooter, so an experienced person who is out and about with a spotlight; this is information and evidence to be given genuine credit. I encourage all of regional South Australia to get together and utilise a baiting program such as they are doing on the Eyre Peninsula at the moment.

When combating this sort of problem the very first step is to work with your local Natural Resource Management Board. They have the tools, they have the skills, they have the research and they have the funding to help you with this sort of program. Whatever your area of interest is, of course, I suppose there is never quite enough funding, but I encourage everybody to work with their NRM boards and participate in whatever programs they put together in their local communities.

If those programs do not work, then I would like the government, the NRM boards, PIRSA, and Biosecurity SA to very seriously consider the reintroduction of a bounty for foxes. Members of this house will know that I raised this issue with regard to dingoes below the dog fence several months ago. It is not something that you would enter into lightly and I make it very clear that in my

mind any sort of bounty should only be collectable by landowners, so that it does not encourage people to sneak onto land to go shooting without permission to collect foxes, whether it be tails, ears, noses, scalps, or whatever is required. It can only be collected by landowners, land managers or pastoralists, for foxes shot on their property, and those landowners must already be participating in another NRM program of some sort to eradicate foxes on their property.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Stuart. I am sure, like me, that you have noticed the increase in the number of foxes dead on the side of the road in the last 12 months. The member for Torrens.

WORLD YOUTH INTERNATIONAL

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:42): My grievance today follows on from those of the 15th and 16th of this month, when I was talking about World Youth International. I had just begun talking about Matt and Amelia. Matt is a schoolteacher. He had 60 pupils in his class, but only had 20 textbooks to share amongst them. The syllabus he had to teach was strictly controlled, following the textbook rigidly.

Lessons are conducted in English, even though many of the children do not have English even as a second language, which has obvious difficulties. Students are tested on the syllabus regularly and if they fail cannot progress up through the grades. This means, of course, that if they fall behind at any stage through sickness or if for some other family reason they cannot attend school, it is very hard for them to catch up.

Senior students cannot access university, even if they pass their exams, unless they are computer literate, but there are only two computers in the whole community of Mutumbu and no local person was qualified to teach them at that stage. Matt also spent much of his free time teaching computer skills to four boys who wanted to go to university. He also took time to teach two of the community leaders so they could sustain the program after he left. It makes my tummy turn a bit, but in return they taught him how to kill chickens and skin and spit roasted goat, which I did not want them to go into more detail about.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Delicious!

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, I am sure the member for Stuart would be much better at it than me. He also bought the community two more computers out of his fundraising money. In their final months in Mutumbu, responding to a need identified by the community, Matt and Amelia refurbished an old building, making it into a community library. They cemented the floor and walls, painted and built bookshelves, bought books and painted a mural of a map of the world on one of the walls, as the people in that community have little concept of their place in Africa, let alone in the world. The community was quite thrilled with their building. When they left the children were still getting used to all the books, but because they were so enthusiastic they really appreciated the effort.

World Youth International is a well-organised, not-for-profit, non-religious group offering amazing opportunities for young Australians to change the lives of whole communities in poverty—particularly poverty-stricken areas—and at the same time for those young people who attend to change their own lives forever. As South Australians we should be very proud of these young people. Kate, Matt and Amelia—I know all three—are amazing young people. Kate is now back from her second trip. She returned on Saturday and starts university on Tuesday. She is the most amazing young woman. These young people are really and truly global citizens.

We need to value the new skills learnt, the experiences and the maturity that they now offer Australia. I commend the work of this generation Y group to the house. Many times we, perhaps, are not all that complimentary about them, but the value of having these three young people go to Africa to share their skills and experience is a wonderful thing. I encourage more young people, if they have the opportunity, to take that step because they will also learn a great deal from it and they will contribute a whole lot more.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:46): I move:

That Ms Bettison be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Odenwalder.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector)
(15:46): I move:

That Ms Bettison be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Sibbons.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:47): It is with pleasure that I resume the remarks I was making before lunch. Of course, we have time-travelled and things have changed. The government has come forward with some explanation that it was unable to make prior to then, but it is still insubstantial. I note that the Premier, in his responses to questions about the breakout at Cavan, made a few strange statements.

The first thing to say is that minister Hunter has made a ministerial statement in which he has explained that the events leading to the escape, the responses to the escape and a review of the facility's security will form key aspects of a review of the juvenile justice facility at Cavan that will be conducted by the Department for Correctional Services, which does not say a great deal for the minister's confidence, which is unfortunate because these staff work so hard and they have undertaken a severe trauma in many ways.

The other thing the minister has done is confirm that it was a case of youths detained in two separate units working in collaboration to 'detract' staff—I assume the minister meant distract staff—to facilitate their escape. They escaped through a hole cut in the courtyard fencing of each unit. While the staff were attending at one distraction, the others were escaping and vice versa, and that led us to the situation we are in.

The point I make in raising my concerns in parliament about the Cavan breakout is that the public of South Australia has seen the situation where last night these eight serious juvenile offenders were on the loose. It is a serious concern to public safety. One of them is still on the loose. Two more have been captured since the last remarks I made in my Address in Reply.

The government, I believe, has a responsibility to ensure that the full facts are known to the people of South Australia. In the other place and during question time, the responsible minister refused to release details about the offences that had been committed by these young people, even though this morning some of that material was released. We know that they are not murderers, and we know that they had committed violent offences or were charged with violent offences, but the minister refuses to provide any further information, even of the nature of the offences we are talking about. The public demands to know more.

Then the Premier comes into the house and, having said in his initial answer to the Leader of the Opposition that the offenders escaped by cutting a hole in the fence, when I pointed out that minister Hunter had suggested on 10 November 2011 that the new training centre being built at Cavan might potentially have some cheaper style of fencing put in, the minister came back and said there is a range of explanations for the escape and that is what will be investigated.

The point that I make—and this is the last time I talk about it in this speech because there are other issues that I want to traverse—is that, when the Premier and the minister obfuscate the answers to these very serious questions that the public has a right to know the answers to, it does not do anything for public trust in the pronouncements that they make. It demonstrates, yet again, that this government continues—as it has for 10 years, and will continue, I imagine, for the next two, given every indication we have had from this Premier—not to be the government of openness and transparency and to obfuscate as a first course of action in response to any issue that comes up. It is far from the government that we were promised by that fresh-faced minister for education who criticised his predecessor for being the premier who would announce and then defend. All we have seen since he has taken the reins is a continuation of that policy, and it is very disappointing.

So we have had 10 years of Labor. On 9 February 2002, I turned 23 years old and we had an election. The 10th anniversary of that is just up, and very soon we will reach the exact 10-year date of when Peter Lewis crossed the floor and announced his support for the Labor Party. What has the Labor Party achieved in 10 years, and I am particularly concerned about the areas that I have responsibility for—families and communities, housing, disability and youth?

I think of the issues, and they are certainly ones of severe concern to me, in terms of the community sector. We know that this year is 18 months since Kevin Foley (the former member for Port Adelaide) announced in his budget, with the support of the then minister for families and communities, Jennifer Rankine, that the financial counsellors supported by the government (this is about 44 positions) would no longer be available for the community to have access to. These financial counsellors fulfil a very important role. The Sustainable Budget Commission—the former treasurer's favourite excuse—suggested that if they were cut the security sector could take on this work.

Of course, any member of parliament in this place I am sure has had representations from UnitingCare Wesley, Anglicare, the Salvation Army or other community sector care agencies that offer financial counselling in South Australia and would be fully aware that these agencies were already stretched to capacity before the government made its cuts. These financial counsellors do a very important job. It is an early intervention that does terrific work in ensuring that before people get completely sucked into a poverty trap they can put in place some systems that will ensure that they are not in need of acute government support later. By getting issues sorted out when they are in the bud, by helping people put in place systems to pay their bills, stop gambling on escape from poverty, the government ends up saving itself money down the track.

When the government abolished these 44 positions, it identified that there would be funding for 3½ new positions that could be taken up by the community sector. I applaud the community sector for seeing that offer for what it was, which was a complete nonsense. Three and a half positions to replace the work of 44 will have almost no effect at all.

I applaud the community centre for continuing to fight this budget cut. It is now upon the government to respond in kind. I particularly note a report from SACOSS that came out quite recently demonstrating the effects that these staff cuts have had on the community sector. Anglicare, for example, since this budget cut came into place, has reported an overwhelming 373 per cent increase in requests for assistance; UnitingCare Wesley has seen requests for assistance increase by 34 per cent between November 2010 and November 2011; and the Salvation Army's requests have increased by 69 per cent.

I know that most members of parliament here have dealt with people who have been beneficiaries of this sort of financial counselling. I imagine that the member for Ashford, who is a former minister in this area, probably met with many people during her time as a minister in that area, and I commend her for her longstanding interest in it. It must appal her, as it appals me and members on this side, that the government continues to say that this is unnecessary, that these are not needed to be funded.

In answering a question from me in this place two weeks ago, the Premier suggested that this is the sort of tough decision that governments have to make. It is not a tough decision to rip away the sort of support that is going to help people stay away from having to need government services and acute support later on. It is just pinching pennies from Peter to pay Paul. It is just a short-term budget savings measure that is going to lead to longer-term financial problems and longer-term pressures on the budget for that matter.

I urge the government to reconsider this, and I hope that members present on the government side will consider talking to minister Hunter, the Premier and the Treasurer in the lead-up to this year's budget to ensure that some sort of resolution to this very, very concerning situation with the financial counsellors can be reached, because individuals in the community sector who work as financial counsellors report to me that their waiting times to get their service have blown out from potentially getting a first appointment within a matter of a week or two to now being several months.

The figures we saw before of the incredible increase in demand on their services do not even take into account the number of people who are now turned off and do not seek their services any more, because being able to get an appointment in three months' time is hardly likely to be followed up as being able to get an appointment next week. It is only recently, and certainly since my election, that UnitingCare Adelaide East opened up a new office around the corner from my electorate office where we are very fortunate to have a part-time financial counsellor. My office has, on a number of occasions, taken the opportunity to refer constituents to that financial counsellor offered by UnitingCare. She does an absolutely fantastic job, but she and other people in her situation are finding it impossible to cope with the massive increases in demand imposed on them by this government's cut, and it is not going to do the government any good in the long term.

In the area of disability, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to be spokesman for the Liberal Party on the issue of disability at a time that is very exciting, hopefully, for the disability sector. Currently on the agenda in the disability sector we have at a federal level the National Disability Insurance Scheme (which I will get to in a moment), and at the state level one of the last acts of former premier Rann was to launch Monsignor Cappelletti's Strong Voices report, which identified some 34 recommendations for improvements to disability services, including a number of urgent measures that needed to be taken.

First and foremost in those urgent measures was dealing with the unmet need category 1 waiting list for supported accommodation. I can inform the house that category 1 in this area deals with people in urgent need of assistance—they are at urgent risk of harm to themselves or others or urgent risk of homelessness. The Strong Voices report in November last year identified that there were 907 people on that critical category 1 waiting list. This is a real concern. This is an extraordinary increase of approaching 200 per cent since the term of this government. It is a sign that, in this area, for people with the most difficult conditions in need of the most urgent support, things are getting worse.

I have had the opportunity to meet with over 60 stakeholders in this sector since I was appointed as shadow minister, and I am not going to get any of these bodies into trouble by naming people who have said specific things because all of them are dependent on having good relationships with the government. One of the things that keeps coming back in all these conversations is that the government is continually dealing with a crisis situation and, when the government continually deals with a crisis situation, it is very difficult to plan for the long term and to make the sorts of commitments that are necessary. Going into the last election, the opposition committed to dealing with the unmet need waiting list as a top priority, removing that unmet need and auditing everyone who was in need of those services so that they could be dealt with.

It behoves the government to deal with this issue in this year's budget. The Strong Voices report, which the government announced its response to in December, deserves budgetary support in this year's budget. The sector expects no less. The sector has been promised as much by the Premier and the Minister for Disabilities when they announced the government's response in December. The government's response involved things like agreeing to those recommendations that had no cost, putting links on websites, promising to consider issues relating to disability when government decisions were made in other areas. Those things that had no dollar value were, of course, agreed to immediately. The government then made some vague commitments to consider some things in light of the budget, and a whole series of those 30-odd recommendations had no response at all.

One of the significant issues the government put on the agenda to be dealt with was that those people with disability who attract at least six hours a week from disability services will have confirmed the details of how they will be able to manage the funds themselves—as of this year's budget, I assume. Again, this is an issue that the Liberal Party took as policy to the last election. It is something that the Hon. Robert Lawson QC, former minister for disability, announced that we would be looking at in 1999. It is nice to know that after 13 years the Labor Party has finally come on board with this. We know they are doing it because the National Disability Insurance Scheme is going to mean that this will be a far more individualised sector in relation to funding, and this is the sort of work that South Australia needs to do in preparation for the National Disability Insurance Scheme coming into place.

I note that the National Disability Insurance Scheme was supported by the Liberal Party and the National Party federal conventions, and Tony Abbott has said it is one of the highest aspirations of a Liberal government federally, once the budget has been returned to surplus, which I believe Wayne Swan has said is going to be next year, so that will be nice. The National Disability Insurance Scheme is yet to be funded by the federal Labor Party despite the fact that everyone backing Julia Gillard announced it as one of their achievements over the last week and a half. It was an extraordinary spectacle. They claimed credit for introducing something that is still unfunded by \$6.5 billion a year.

When we go into this negotiation for a National Disability Insurance Scheme, one of the issues that COAG and all the other governments will have to face is that some states commit more to disability support than others. I regret to inform the house that South Australia is not amongst those that are pulling their weight in this area. The Productivity Commission report in January showed that government expenditure on services for people with disability in South Australia is

\$234.90 per capita. The national average is \$275.90. We are streets behind Victoria and New South Wales—we are streets behind Tasmania, for goodness sake.

The commission criticised government support across Australia for people with disability as 'underfunded, unfair, fragmented and inefficient, and that it gives people with a disability little choice and no certainty of access to appropriate support'. That is the whole of Australia, and we are well below the national average. The issue that the government will have to confront going into this COAG round is that we are currently not pulling our weight. How do you think the governments of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and the commonwealth are going to respond if we go cap in hand to them and say, 'We'd like the commonwealth to bail us out because we have not been providing the necessary support.' We would be laughed out of town as we should be.

It is incumbent on the government to right this wrong. They made these promises to people with disability in South Australia in December in response to the Strong Voices report. In this year's budget, they have a serious responsibility to finally deliver, and they will be judged by how they respond to Strong Voices. They will be judged by the level of real support on the ground that we see in this year's budget.

It is disappointing that they did not take the opportunity to announce their measures of support in the Mid-Year-Budget Review in December. The Mid-Year-Budget Review came out on a Friday. They waited until the following Monday, and I can only assume that that is because they did not want to be judged by the fact that there was not one cent for disability in that Mid-Year-Budget Review.

The area of housing is one that got some attention in the Governor's speech. It is often repeated by members and ministers in this house that Labor is apparently the party of support for the poor in our society and those in need of social housing. Yet, it is the Labor Party that has sold off over 10,000 properties from Housing SA. We have seen the figures go from over 50,000—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: I'm sorry, minister, but we were told by the Premier that ministers—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pengilly): Order!

Mr GARDNER: —were going to be respectful of other members of parliament, and I hope that will be the case.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: I'm sorry; I look forward to the Premier's words being listened to by his own ministers. Public housing has seen a significant loss in the last 10 years of Labor. The Housing Trust of South Australia, of course, was a proud Liberal initiative set up 75 years ago this year—its 75th birthday, and we have seen that in public housing we have lost over 10,000 houses.

In December, we heard the Treasurer, Jack Snelling, on radio saying that public housing in South Australia is very expensive because people cannot get rent assistance, and South Australia has far more people in public housing per capita than any other state in Australia. When asked by Leon Byner how many South Australians that meant we should potentially have in public housing, the Treasurer identified a figure of 30,000—30,000, so that is another 10,000 that apparently are to go.

This is going to place an extraordinary burden on the community sector. The community housing sector actually does things pretty well. I have every confidence in Anglicare, UnitingCare, and all those other housing providers to do a good job, but they need to have some sort of support if the government is planning on completely palming off onto them all this work that they currently do.

The other issue that we have here is that we are expecting that a number of people who have traditionally gone into public housing will go into the private rental market. There are some issues with this, too. The cost of living burdens that have been placed upon South Australians outstrips anywhere else in Australia, and this is particularly tied to 10 years of Labor because it is in 10 years of Labor that we have seen water bills go up nearly 200 per cent, with more rises coming. Electricity bills go up, state taxes go up, and state fees and charges go up constantly. With the cost of living going up so extraordinarily, people who used buy their own house are now in the rental market.

At the other end of the spectrum, people who used to be in public housing are now going to be forced into the rental market. Those South Australians who are in this situation are really struggling, and I am especially thinking of young South Australians who are at the bottom end of the food chain, it seems, when it comes to this government's support. Consequently, we see instances of couch surfing and people staying in inappropriate accommodation. These people are not counted in the homeless figures, yet they do not have a safe roof over their head where they can be confident that they are going to be able to stay in two or three weeks' time.

The pressures being put on the community sector are extreme. I would urge all members of parliament to look at some of the community sector's programs that are going on at the moment because some terrific work is being done. The cost of living for all South Australians is particularly affecting these people. I put the blame for that at the feet of the Labor government, which over the last 10 years has seen those extraordinary increases go up and up and up—10 years of economic mismanagement, 10 years of Labor waste.

We heard from the member for Mitchell during the last sitting week in the Address in Reply that he is quite proud of the level of debt that the government is at because it is heading towards only \$8 billion. The effect, of course, is that the state government has interest payments of \$2 million a day, and that is money that cannot be spent on the things that we should be doing to provide a social support safety net for the people of South Australia who need our help. Ten years of Labor waste, 10 years of Labor mess. I really look forward to 15 March 2014 so that the people of South Australia will have the opportunity to deliver us from this mess.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:10): I would like to join with my colleagues and congratulate the new members for Port Adelaide and Ramsay on joining us in this place. It is not yet two years since I came to this place, so I understand your excitement and apprehension. Congratulations to you both and well done on delivering your maiden speech today.

I would also like to thank the Governor for his speech and congratulate him on the way in which he carries out his duties. I understand that he has been appointed to that role for another two years. I also understand that he recently took part in the Adelaide to Port Lincoln Yacht Race. I trust that he and the crew with whom he was involved enjoyed the trip and the hospitality of Port Lincoln. It would be of some comfort to the crew, I am sure, to know that they had a rear admiral on board; he would certainly know the ropes. However, I understand that it was not an easy trip. The weather was not great; it was pretty rough for about 20 hours. There was much seasickness and then the weather calmed. All the yachts eventually made it in, including the governor's, and I know that he enjoyed the evening in Port Lincoln.

The Governor, of course, delivers the speech, but it is actually the government's speech. I would like to pick up on a few of the themes from the speech, and, of course, the emphasis was on themes. There was plenty of rhetoric but not a lot of detail.

What I would like to talk about initially is affordable living. It is a term that was used in the Governor's speech. It is a theme that was mentioned today during the new members' maiden speeches. I find the term to be a very interesting bit of spin. The Governor's speech mentioned affordable living as a broad theme of this government, and we must be clear that the real issue is, in fact, the cost of living.

To highlight the cost of living in South Australia, I point out that electricity charges have doubled under 10 years of Labor, gas charges are up nearly 80 per cent and Adelaide now has the highest capital city water charges in the country. The recent analysis of a well-known political commentator's own water bill indicated that just 15 per cent of the total bill was for the cost of water. The remaining 85 per cent was made up of administration fees and charges. That is extraordinary. Nobody minds paying for water, but when 85 per cent of an account is made up of government fees and charges, it is just extraordinary.

I would like to highlight a letter which appeared in the most recent *Sunday Mail*—in fact, it was printed as the letter of the week—entitled 'Spiralling costs leave pensioners powerless'. I will quote from that letter:

We used exactly the same amount of electricity this quarter as we did for the same time last year, but owe \$140 more due to the 30 per cent increase in electricity in the past eight months.

We're frugal with electricity and have done all of the advised, cost-saving recommendations. We can no longer use the washing machine, as it's 15 years old and we now hand wash. We've turned our electric hot-water service off and will do without hot water for bathing.

We've restricted ourselves to just two to four hours of air-conditioning a day when the temperature is above 34C, but will no longer be able to afford even that small luxury. We don't ever use heating in the winter.

This is a letter from somebody who lives in Adelaide. It really hits the nail on the head and demonstrates the human element that is perhaps ignored in this place on occasion. The people who are suffering most are the people who can least afford the rising utility costs. This is a first-world country. We have to ask: what on earth is going on?

The cost of living pressures are also hurting country people—people who live in Flinders. Cost of living pressures—mostly the cost of utilities but also licence fees and vehicle registration fees—have all increased dramatically under Labor. Does the government realised that the cost of registering a B-double truck, for example, is now \$18,000 a year? It costs \$18,000 to register a truck. This nation relies on transport for business to function, yet the industry is being forced to operate under an impractical compliance regime—I will say it again: it is an impractical compliance regime—and, at the same time, is being bled dry.

I have picked out the transport industry but, of course, it is not the only industry that is suffering under regulation and red tape. Regulation and red tape is stifling small business in this state. It is simply not good enough for South Australia to have fewer start-up businesses than other states or, worse, for business to be heading interstate where there are more favourable tax regimes and conditions for doing business.

Once again, does the government not understand that we operate in a global economy and to be successful we must be internationally competitive? The regime that this government has imposed on businesses in this state is counter to this whole notion. It is no wonder we are struggling.

I would like to talk about exports. Exports are fundamental to this state's economy; they are fundamental to the regional economy. It is unfathomable that export levels are only just recovering to the point where they were under the previous Liberal government, 10 years ago, and it is no thanks to the government, even though they are fond of taking the credit for the efforts of our farmers, our fishers and our miners. Any manufacturing business that is still managing to stay in business in this state should be congratulated because they have managed to do so despite the best efforts of government to make it nearly impossible.

One area I would like to particularly highlight today is the government's lack of commitment to research and development. I noted the member for Mawson, in his address in reply, highlighted his fear of multinational corporations. I have to say, to my mind, the best way to ensure cost-effective development and timely uptake of technology, particularly in areas of primary production, is through public investment into R&D—research and development—but, even more particularly, through extension. Unfortunately, departments such as PIRSA are just a shadow of their former selves. For 150 years, South Australia led the world in the development, adoption and promotion of dryland agricultural practice.

The list of accomplishments from the South Australian agricultural industry is well known but it does not hurt to revisit them from time to time just to highlight and demonstrate the ingenuity and initiative that the agricultural industry has shown over such a long time:

- the stripper: Ridley invented the stripper and developed the stripper here in South Australia in the 1840s;
- the addition of superphosphate to nutrient-deficient soils;
- lay farming; and
- the green revolution.

South Australia was at the forefront of all of these developments. My concern is that we have already started to see the demise of that key role that we once had in world agriculture, simply because our state government cannot afford or cannot be bothered to provide the support and extension required.

It is going to be more critical at this point in our history than ever before. As the dynamics of world population and agricultural production change, as we face the realities of a carbon tax, the initiatives that agriculture will need to be able to demonstrate and develop need appropriate support, appropriate research and development and appropriate extension.

What I have decided, in fact, is that this government is more interested in telling landowners what they can and cannot do with their property and what they can and cannot grow in their own paddocks. This smacks of old-fashioned socialism. It is a dangerous shift to the left by government members who do not understand how the world works, do not understand how things tick and have their respective heads buried in some quaint notion that, somehow, they know best and are best able to tell citizens what is best for them.

I might just touch for a moment on the issue of food security. It is a topic that comes up often; in fact, it has already come up today in this house, in a contribution from the member for Schubert. I have noticed that it is on the tip of everyone's tongue, and it is particularly raised often by the local radio shock jocks, who manage to whip people into a frenzy about food security and issues that might arise should we not address it.

The reality is that our ability to produce food has risen at a faster rate than the world's population and will continue to do so—it will continue to do so with the advent, introduction and adoption of technologies. Another reality is that food in this country is actually so cheap that we can afford to throw it away. That does not really demonstrate to me that there is a food security issue. There is certainly a food distribution problem, but it is not about the supply itself. Certainly, there are people in the world—up to one billion, possibly—who are hungry; some are starving. The problem is that they are hungry not because there is not enough food but because they are poor. We need to take a step back, a deep breath and address food security seriously and understand the fundamentals that are contributing to the debate at the moment.

We are the highest taxed state in the nation. It is an indictment of this government's financial management. It is putting pressure on households and businesses, and that pressure is being felt in regional, rural and remote South Australia, as well as in metropolitan Adelaide. What do we see for our taxes? Not much. We certainly see some poor roads. One road in my electorate that I have highlighted a number of times—and I will continue to highlight and lobby for funding—is the Tod Highway, which extends through the centre of Eyre Peninsula. I am going to talk particularly about a length of that road of probably 150 kilometres from Karkoo to Kyancutta. It is a highway, and it is so narrow that it is dangerous.

About three million tonnes of grain is grown on Eyre Peninsula in any given year, and a good portion of that is transported by road down that Tod Highway. When two road trains come head to head and attempt to pass each other on the Tod Highway, it is dangerous. I commend the skill of the drivers for managing that situation. I have heard of instances where mirrors have been knocked off. Touch wood, no serious accidents have occurred, although there have been some incidents. It would not cost much to seal the shoulders of that particular road.

Water and power infrastructure is no longer able to cope with the demands placed on it, and we have a government that, despite its tax regime, does not seem to want—or cannot afford—to invest in basic infrastructure. Once again, we have to wonder what on earth is going on.

Back in 2010, the government made a commitment to create an extra 100,000 jobs over six years. First of all, I have to say that I am always very cynical of governments claiming to have created jobs. The reality is that businesses create jobs, although I must say that the government has been very good at building the Public Service in this state. If we do analyse this claim of an extra 100,000 jobs, I would be very interested to hear about any progress the government has had in reaching that target because, month on month, time after time, we are seeing ABS jobs data that tells a very different story about South Australia.

Of particular concern is the youth unemployment rate in this state. My wife and I have four teenagers; many of our friends have children of the same age. We are concerned, obviously, about their future. According to ABS statistics released in January, South Australia's youth unemployment rate was 30.5 per cent (the December figure), an extraordinary figure which suggests that almost one in three of our youth has no work. This is the second highest of all the states and well above the national rate of 26½ per cent and, quite rightly, it is concerning for regional communities right across this state. The government has made commitments around jobs and training places, but quite clearly something is wrong when we have the second highest youth unemployment rate of all the states.

I would like to talk briefly about health. Country health in particular is a topic dear to my heart, as is the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. Time and time again we have raised this as an issue in this parliament, time and time again we have had correspondence with the Department of Health and the minister, and time and time again we find constituents having difficulty either

accessing or getting relief from the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. It comes to be an equity issue.

We have had a wonderful hospital development at Ceduna, and we are about to have a wonderful hospital development in Port Lincoln. They will be major and very good regional hospitals, but I need to highlight again the importance of the smaller country town hospitals which are so vital to the communities they service. There is a sense of ownership by country people of their local hospital. The reason those hospitals are there in the first instance is that the people of the communities and the towns built them. They built them, they owned them, they operated them. In recent years, we have seen a change in the way they function, and it has been a retrograde step, in my opinion.

Recently, Senator Fawcett and Dr Andrew Laming from the federal parliament visited the electorate of Flinders. One of the reasons for their visit was to talk to doctors and the broader community about some of the challenges that we were facing in the country, in regional, remote and rural Australia, with regard to health services. Along with Rowan Ramsay, the member for Grey, I was fortunate enough to be part of that visit. We met with some local doctors one particular evening, and they highlighted the challenge of attracting and retaining doctors to country areas—not only doctors but allied health professionals as well—and they put up a few options. I think the government certainly needs to show some imagination in this. There are schemes that could work, and they certainly need to be considered.

We have concerns also about the financial implications of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the actual costs compared to what the public was told prior to the 2010 election in terms of costings. It goes to the very credibility of the government. We were told throughout the election campaign in 2010 that the new RAH was a \$1.7 billion project: the reality is that this looks like being a \$12 billion project. That is an extraordinary blowout.

If we examine the financial implications of the Adelaide desal plant, coming in at \$1.8 billion, and the \$535 million contribution to the Adelaide Oval project—which, of course, during the election campaign was \$450 million 'and not a penny more'—it is clear to see that this government cannot deliver a project without subjecting taxpayers to significant cost blowouts. Sadly, we will be paying for this extravagance for decades to come.

I would also like to touch on the mining boom and its benefits. Once again, it is government spin and rhetoric that came to light under Mike Rann but has continued under the new Premier. The former premier would often trumpet the 16 new mines during his reign as premier. The reality was that it was an indictment on the government, not a badge of honour. Exploration activity on Eyre Peninsula, and indeed across the state, is exciting, but I have to say that we have a long way to go in terms of seeing the benefits of the mining boom like those we have seen in other states.

We want to see those real benefits flow through regional South Australia in the coming years. We have seen this government try to grab headlines without backing it up with results. The challenge, of course, will be to achieve a balance when mining development does take place. We need to find a balance, particularly as mining extends into the agricultural areas. That balance will need to be between farming, or existing land uses, the environment, and the mining industry itself. It will not be easy to find that balance particularly, as I said, in regard to existing agricultural industries.

With regard to mining on Eyre Peninsula, the associated infrastructure will be crucial. The government, in fact, is going nowhere near infrastructure development. They have stepped right back and right away from it. There is no intention whatsoever to spend money on much-needed infrastructure, so much so that mining companies are now looking at the viability of constructing their own railways and building their own ports.

Port infrastructure is going to be crucial to this mining development and it is baffling to me that the government is not investing in critical infrastructure for the mining industry such as ports, power supplies, roads and rail. As I mentioned, one of the mining companies on Eyre Peninsula, should it get up and running, is considering quite seriously building its own railway line to transport goods to port.

The infrastructure priorities of this government seem to be very city-centric. The Northern Expressway has been a priority of this government. This is the only place in the world that I have come across which has stoplights on a freeway. In other places in the world you drive onto a freeway and you drive off again with no stopping. Unfortunately, in this state, we seem to have a need to put stoplights on a freeway.

Water remains one of the most important issues for the people and businesses in Flinders, if not the most important issue. The health of the Murray-Darling Basin, the Lower Lakes and the Murray Mouth all remain high priorities. However, I would like to see greater priority given to the area of water in my region. I am very pleased that, as of now, the Natural Resources Committee of parliament will conduct an inquiry into water supply and resources on Eyre Peninsula. I am pleased that they will take submissions from all interested parties and that they will identify any gaps in our knowledge and any gaps in the science that might be highlighted. It will also give the opportunity for the air to be cleared around a lot of the issues that have built up over the last few years with regard to the water situation on the Eyre Peninsula.

The state's dire budgetary position keeps coming up time and time again and every single contribution from this side has highlighted it. It seems like almost every day there is some new economic data or business survey that supports the argument that this Labor government has a terrible record on managing the economy and the state's finances. The figure I highlight is that we have a current debt of \$11 billion and growing, which means that each and every single day this state is paying \$2 million in interest.

In relation to police numbers, much like the government's commitment to creating an extra 100,000 jobs, we have seen the police recruitment target pushed out and, essentially, their election promise broken. Up to 200 fewer police officers will be delivered over the next two years than the number promised at the 2010 election. The Police Association President, Mark Carroll, recently outlined his position in the *Police Journal*. Mr Carroll was adamant that the government's 'pledge to recruit 313 police over and above attrition by 2014' had been broken by the Weatherill government or, in his words, the government had stepped away from its pledge and pushed the date for the recruitment out to 2016.

The government has tried to explain away this broken promise by saying it is part of the budget savings target. The disappointing part is that, 'Mr Weatherill's government undertook no consultation with either SAPOL or the Police Association,' according to Mark Carroll. This comes as no surprise to the opposition. The government has a significant credibility problem here.

A recent article in *The Advertiser* reported that local renewable energy companies are facing tougher competition for commonwealth funding following cuts to the Renewable Energy Fund last year by Premier Jay Weatherill. It is a massive hit to Renewables SA, which was set up by former premier Mike Rann, and it brings into question the Premier's commitment to invest in local renewable energy companies, and research and development. There is that lack of investment into R&D, once again.

As recently as today, an article appeared in *The Advertiser* regarding Innovate SA, and that came up in question time today in this house. Innovate SA is coming to an end because of budget cuts by this government. Its priorities are all wrong. Innovate SA provided a really valuable service to South Australian businesses in terms of improving technical practices in advanced manufacturing. So, as our shadow minister for industry (the member for Norwood) has highlighted, the closure of Innovate SA does not match federal and state Labor's rhetoric when it comes to the importance of innovation and advanced manufacturing.

I will come back to one topic that I have touched on briefly already, that is, food and agriculture and the government's commitment to a clean, green food industry. It is an admirable notion but it is a bolt from the blue, I would suggest, after a decade. This is paying lip service to the food industries of this state without backing it up with any meaningful investment from the government. In fact, it is an insult.

What we saw in the speech delivered at the opening of this session of this parliament paid lip service, unfortunately, to just about everything. It is easy to say, but I have not seen any indication from this government that it can deliver on any of its aspirations, and a real risk for the government is that it becomes self-centred and more concerned about itself than others. Sadly, after 10 years of Labor, that is exactly where we are now.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:36): This is my first go at being tail-end Charlie in my contribution to this debate, so I have had the opportunity of listening to everyone else speak and it is rather interesting to hear the contexts that are put into it. I, as have others today, acknowledge the election of the members for Ramsay and Port Adelaide and welcome them to this chamber. I enjoy listening to the reflections of other people upon their lives and the reason they sought to come here, what gave them the opportunities to come into this place and who has supported them.

Indeed, I note that they are both very keen and enthusiastic. I was, also, six years ago. I must admit, as time goes by, you change a little bit, but we have a great honour being a member of parliament. I know when I am in my community, as I am sure they do, you respect that every day. It is a great responsibility, also, to always ensure that you are the voice of the people, so never lose that attitude to the role.

I am a person who loves to be inspired by speeches. I must admit that I had just about given up on the fact that the word could make us believe again until, in my case, I listened to some of Barack Obama's campaign speeches and the 'Yes We Can' message. I am not sure what it meant, but it made people believe again. I enjoy listening to good, well-crafted speeches that deliver a very sound message that makes us think that, indeed, we can. While I was not disappointed with the Governor himself and the speech, because I respect Governor Scarce immensely, and his wife—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: The honourable member for Croydon will probably criticise this, and for me it is detail. I have read through the speech again today hoping to see the detail of how these visionary statements are going to be delivered, and that is what I am disappointed by because, if they were there, I would acknowledge it because that is the sort of person I am. But I cannot see that detail. That is the question that I raise, and I know others have raised also. It puts a lot of responsibility upon the government and, indeed, us in opposition to ensure that we hold the government to account and that the visionary statements it has projected are delivered. The seven key areas were identified and comment was made on all of them. There was a general point of view in discussion about it but none of the key aspects that, to me, will deliver it.

I want to take an opportunity during today's contribution to talk about some key things that are also affecting the people in the regions that I have the opportunity to serve in parliament. The first is marine parks. It has gone relatively quiet. I will acknowledge that. One of the first actions of the new Premier, in conjunction with the minister, was to call a bit of a halt to the proceedings, to go out and re-engage with the community and consult on it.

I have been telling the people who have contacted me about it—and it is still a steady stream of people who speak to me about marine parks—that this has not gone away; and you need to be alert to the fact that, yes, all sides of the political spectrum support the principle of marine parks but there is a very different approach, in our case, to my concerns in relation to the sanctuary zones and the impact that they are going to have.

I am pleased that the minister has given me an undertaking that, as soon as the draft management plans are in a position to be released, and therefore the information from the economic and social impact studies (which have formed part of the consideration of those management plans), a briefing will be provided to me, because for me that has always been a key point. In my correspondence with the minister and my contact with him personally, I have tried to impress upon him that fishing in a professional and a recreational form is an enormous driver of the economy of the region of Goyder—the Yorke Peninsula and Adelaide Plains areas.

Equally so, the economic impact study needed to consider—and disregard to some degree—agriculture and other existing industries and only consider what the impact of marine parks and sanctuary zones would have upon the local communities in those coastal towns. I hope that has been taken into consideration when it comes to the draft management plans coming out and some form of declaration of the sanctuary zones and the size of those zones, because if they are too large it will devastate communities.

I know that many other members in this chamber have spoken about it. The member for Finnis was actually the very first person to raise this concern with me, and I will always acknowledge that. He was concerned about it. It has taken a while for some of us to come on board, but we do acknowledge it now and we do so on behalf of our communities. These people have continued to come to me, wondering about what is going on and asking, 'When are the draft management plans coming out? Is there still an opportunity to have a voice on this?'

They were pleased that the select committee was travelling around regional South Australia inviting comment from people about it, but we all hope that what comes out soon is a manageable process that allows the marine environment to be protected, and to have some surety about that, and that it takes into account the different types of depths of water, and rocky and weedy and sandy bottoms, and all those things that want to be included in it, but does not take away the opportunity for my communities to have an economic future.

Another issue I want to talk about briefly is shared services. In previous roles, some time ago I held some level of shadow portfolio responsibility for this, and concern has always been expressed about what the target set on savings was and what it was actually going to deliver. The Auditor-General's Report has continued to highlight that projected savings were not going to be met. I have a recollection of a figure of, I think, \$103 million a few years ago being a target about which concerns were being raised.

From a community point of view there have been a lot of worries about duplication of payments, or delays in wages being paid, and things like that. I do not disrespect the fact that the people involved in the shared services program are good, well-intentioned staff members who have been put under a lot of pressure. I have always had concerns about the fact that withdrawing people from regional communities and putting them into a centralised facility for these sorts of transactions to be conducted would have a real negative impact upon regions.

I am comforted to some degree by the fact that some of the in-scope people (and that was a term that the minister at the time used to identify the number of people who might be affected by it) has dropped compared to what it was originally intended to be. However, there are still people known to me personally who have lost position opportunities because of shared services. I know that the Leader of the Opposition continually expresses concerns about the effectiveness of shared services. Other responsible shadow ministers have also done that, but it is important that we get the processes right.

At the time of the shared services proposal even coming out, it was well known that Western Australia was not working. They had tried that. It had not met their financial savings targets and there was a problem with the delivery of the services, too. We have to get that right. I do want to talk about a very current issue, which is the wind farm development plan amendment. There has been a series of public meetings held around regional South Australia. I was grateful that the minister, on the basis of another council (I think it was a Port Lincoln one), was prepared to hold one at Port Wakefield.

Because of the wind farm project proposal that exists for Yorke Peninsula, it has been an emotional issue, and I know because I attended the Port Wakefield meeting. There were probably about 30 people there and eight or nine people spoke. The continued theme that came from that was the concern that their democratic right was being removed by their inability—if in fact this DPA had a long-term implementation—to lodge appeals against decisions that were made.

As I understand it, there has been a reference to a select committee being established and, no doubt, a lot of input will come in from that. But in the submissions I read—and I believe that there were over 100—that were generated by the people who live in the Goyder electorate, there was a common theme of concern. Yes, they want to see a level of economic development occur—some people are supportive of wind farms, some are ambivalent towards them, some are openly objecting to it—but they want to ensure that the process is right. That is where there was a real concern that this DPA could affect the process, whereby their ability to express an opinion, and for that opinion to be heard and considered, was going to be removed.

So, I would urge Mr Mario Barone—who I think is the chair of the committee that advises the minister on planning issues—and his committee, in the summation of the public meetings that have been held, that the report they provide to the minister reflects—and I am very confident that it will—the concerns put by the community and the positive support that came from it, too, because there have been a lot of questions asked. I know that in the meeting I attended, Mr Peter Blacker, the former member for Flinders, and the current chair of the Regional Communities Consultative Committee raised about six questions—and I must admit that I had a personal conversation with him about it—that opened up people's eyes to the fact that, 'Oh, there are issues here that we need to consider.'

There is no doubt that wind farms are with us. In my own electorate, there is a 55-turbine farm. There is a proposal for another wind farm of 176 turbines, with each of these turbines from the ground to the tip of the blade at its maximum extension being 152 metres. I have heard people say to me that it will be a veritable forest of them, occupying a 40-kilometre-long by 20-kilometre-wide area of Yorke Peninsula. While there is a willingness for technology to become an opportunity in regional areas, there is great concern being put to me about the impact upon traditional agriculture, and on agricultural management practices, and on the ability to feed people for the future, so there is an important need here to ensure that negotiation occurs.

I respect the fact that the Suzlon people and the series wind farm project people have lodged an application and a major project status declaration, that will ensure that the 25 or 26 independent reports that they prepare are independently assessed, and are reviewed by government with a recommendation going through on how to proceed.

I have told people continually that it is not just a blanket case of approval being granted, because I am aware of other major projects that have been denied, but this is going to be a tricky one. It is a \$1.3 billion project. It is an 18-month construction period. It will involve hundreds of people during construction and, probably, as I understand it, some 50 people in long-term job opportunities in the maintenance of these things. But there is a strong groundswell of emotional argument being put against them with a lot of concerns about firefighting capacities, aerial spraying for weed and control, and the impact that that is going to have, so the company will have a challenging time trying to negotiate that with the community.

I have supported the company because they have held two community information forums. I commend them on that. They have stood up and provided the best answer they have available on any question posed to them. They have not tried to run away from any issue proposed to them. They are working through it as best they can, but that is where the process has to ensure that the community still has the opportunity, and that is where I come back to the fact that this wind farm DPA will take that right away. So, I hope the minister, Mr Rau, recognises that, and considers a future on it very closely.

Other members in the chamber have spoken about the Year of the Farmer, and I know the member for Schubert is quite passionate about this. Coming from an agricultural community—even though I am not a farmer, my mother's family are farmers, and my wife's family are farmers, so I have always been around it to some degree, without having been a practitioner like many others in this chamber have been—it is important that we respect agriculture.

The member for Hammond, as the shadow minister for agriculture, food and fisheries continually tells me, and many other people, indeed, that PIRSA has lost 400 jobs and \$80 million in recurrent investment in its support of agriculture, and I think that is a great shame. All of us want to see agriculture prosper, and all of us want to see an investment in technology and the ability for us to grow and improve our productivity. It takes dollars to do that. Government has a responsibility to be involved in that, but the withdrawal of that level of funding really does give me a lot of fears about where the long-term support for agriculture is going to be.

Agriculture itself faces some challenges within its agripolitical spectrum at the moment. Some members will have followed Grain Producers SA and the South Australian Farmers Federation about what is proposed for the levy and the withdrawal, as I understand it, from the agreement that was originally put in place, and the minister has come out now with what she intends to do with the 5¢ levy. Apparently, it is a half a million dollars per year. That is really important for the industry, but it has to get it right.

Agriculture itself has to understand that it is time for good, young managers to stand up and be involved, not just in what they do within their own fence lines but in what they do within their industry. I do know some great, young farmers who have followed the genes given to them by their fathers and mothers by becoming involved in research, higher bodies and grain research development councils, and they have invested an enormous amount of their own time to ensure that their industry is successful.

We have become a bit more of a society that looks after itself more than those around us sometimes. I think agriculture has suffered from that a bit too. Like everybody, agriculture needs to invest in itself, but I am hopeful that the realisation is with agriculture now, and I hope a big transition occurs in the next 15 years of good, young managers who, yes, want the lifestyle opportunity it provides but are also driven by what they can produce and what their profit margin will be, because that is where the balance needs to be.

A lot of people have spoken about cost of living pressures. Indeed, I listened to the letter that the member for Flinders recounted to the chamber. Sadly, it reflects a lot of people across our communities. In my regional towns, with an older age demographic, I am faced many times with people in similar financially challenging circumstances who are very proud. They were brought up in hard times when, if you had a bill, you paid it and you did not buy anything until you could afford it. So, their quality of life is being reduced substantially to ensure that they meet their financial obligations.

All politicians, no matter what their political persuasion, have a responsibility to ensure that they work diligently towards future opportunities for the state and that they also care for the people who are with us now, and that is across all age spectrums. I have often been frustrated by the fact that, seemingly, our younger aged cohort do not respect our older people, who have done a tremendous amount of work in their lives, in the way they should. The focus of expenditure seems to be on the 18 to 60 age bracket, but we have to get this right.

It is challenging—I do not deny that. It costs so much more money now to ensure that that infrastructure opportunity is there. It is very expensive to employ people, it is expensive to have the materials required for large projects. It does cost an enormous amount of money, but we can never get to a situation where we tax ourselves out of existence.

The higher level of taxation in this state is commonly related. It is a fact of life because of our smaller population and the large distances that we cover that we need a revenue source to fund what we do, but you have to find the balance between it. Unless we get it right, we do not create an environment in which South Australia is a place to invest and live, with a lifestyle that people can enjoy. We have to make sure that we provide an opportunity for older people so that their quality of life is not reduced to such a deplorable standard that we get more of the sort of letters to the editor that the member for Flinders recounted to the chamber just 10 or 15 minutes ago.

Another issue is the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale development plan amendment 2. While I no longer hold any shadow portfolio responsibility, I have been contacted over the last six months by people concerned about the fact that the community development vision statements that their local government and community have developed have been taken away and overriding principles of control have been put in place by the minister. They feel that they cannot do a thing in their communities anymore.

The minister mentioned to me in a briefing that there is an opportunity for a noncompliant development application to be lodged and considered on its merits. I know that because I understand how the planning process works, but many people are now fearful of losing investments they have made previously, with the intention of doing something. That opportunity has been taken away because of the development principles put in place, seemingly not with a lot of consultation. The Barossa Council has been quite outspoken. I have spoken to individual elected members who are very concerned about the impact of that.

I urge the minister to ensure that the review being undertaken reflects the need, yes, to control rampant development, because they are attractive places for people to live, but also to give people the opportunity for development. It is not an easy challenge to find a balance in between, but it has to be achieved, otherwise there will be such an artificial stifling of those communities that they will suffer terribly, and none of us wants to see that happen.

I also wish to talk about the country road network and country hospitals. As a member who drives probably 60,000 kilometres per year, I know that there are good roads, challenging roads and poor roads. I note that in his formal role as the minister for transport, the Acting Speaker invested in my community once. I will be eternally grateful for the Ardrossan to Port Wakefield Road investment that you, Mr Acting Speaker, made as the minister.

People are frustrated by the quality of the road network. In a recent decision, the Minister for Road Safety decided to reduce speed limits. I know that the minister will continually refer to the fact that it is hoped that it will result in lower road fatalities and accidents. I completely agree with the principle of wanting to reduce those terrible fatalities, but the message being provided to me by my community is that speeding creates accidents, not speed limits. There is a difference.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I know. If you obey the speed limits, the risk of being involved in an accident is far less than it might otherwise be if you are 10, 15, 20 or 50 kilometres over a speed limit. A responsible driving habit is required amongst people, especially those who are driving on unfamiliar roads. So, if we obey the law, things will be a lot better.

The member for Flinders just reflected on country hospitals. Having lived in towns with fewer than 1,000 people all my life, too, I know how important our hospitals are. It is very true indeed that the communities built them. They own them. They invested in them. I think the absolute majority of them were transferred under the state government public hospital system in the late sixties or seventies. However, now we have the situation where people are fearful of it.

I held a public meeting in my own small town of Maitland, where the member for Bragg spoke wonderfully well. It was mentioned then that, over a 20-year period, \$2 million had been raised by the community to go into that hospital. That was after it was in the public system. It was an investment by that community to keep it at its absolute best.

I am fearful of what has happened—the country health mark 1 stuff of, I think, June or July 2007 or 2008. There has been a going away from that because people now seem to think that there is a board of management in place and the health advisory councils are there, but the government sets the budget. We are not able to have any influence on what that budget allocation will be, so we do not do as much. However, there are still really strong desires.

There is a health centre in Maitland with an independent board. It is attached to the hospital. It wants to invest in more consulting rooms for visiting specialists, and it recognises the fact that it will have to raise money. The community will support this, but you have to bring your community along with you, and I do not think that that has occurred in recent years. So, we have to go back to that local engagement, local involvement and local desire to actually invest in a hospital system, otherwise it will become just a public system that we use but do not respect or support, and that would be very sad.

Others have reflected upon challenges to manufacturing. In some of my previous shadow portfolio roles, I have met with various manufacturers who have told me how big their business was in the fifties and sixties, what it is down to now, where their competition comes from and the world economy in which we now operate, and they are very fearful. Quite often they are third-generation. They have gone through difficult transfers, they have reduced their operating costs as much as they can, they have become as efficient as they can, they have invested in technology to ensure that their productivity is very high, but still they are challenged to actually be viable in the long term.

I am concerned, as are other members. The member for Norwood talked about Innovate SA and the rather flippant response that was given by the minister today during question time. These matters are important. I consider Innovate SA to be similar to regional development association groups, who will have their funding withdrawn in a couple of years. Business enterprise centres had their funding withdrawn as of July last year. It is all part of investing in our future. Yes, the challenges are enormous—to actually get the balance of where the financial spread occurs—but, if you take away from those basic opportunities to grow our economy and to employ people and not invest, it will be a sad decision that will come back and bite us in the future.

The Governor's speech talks about skills, education and training. I totally agree with that. We can only have a vibrant future if we have a workforce that is upskilled to ensure it remains competitive. It relies on the fact that all of us, no matter what we do or what age we are, continue to invest time in educating ourselves. There will be a lot of opportunities. With the projected number of baby boomers who are going to retire over the next 10 or so years, opportunities will abound for our kids if we have a good economic climate to operate in. These kids will need skills, so they need to work hard at school, go to TAFE, go to university and continue to involve themselves in workplace training, too, to get the real opportunities.

A speech with a lot of words certainly captured the imagination of the members of parliament while we sat and listened intently to the Governor. The challenge will be for the government to deliver upon it. The speech talked about mining opportunities. Yes, they are out there. South Australia is seen around the world as a place in which mining is an opportunity. The Governor's speech also referred to the Copper Triangle (now known as the Copper Coast, which is Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta) which has a very strong mining history, going back some 152 years.

Yorke Peninsula, my own community, continues to be explored. There is a great proposal by Rex Minerals, but there again the challenge will be to get the balance right between that next level of economic development and traditional agriculture because farmland needs to be dug up for mines to occur. I commend Rex Minerals for their community engagement principles. They are very strongly focused on ensuring that the community is fully aware of what they are doing all the time, that they have a consultation group and that they bring that group and the community along with them.

We will see if the exploration work they are doing—which, I understand, will be completed at the end of this year—results in a full-blown application for a mining tenement to be declared to the area. If it does, I am attracted by the fact that, from what Rex Minerals tells me, they will be taking out material to the value of some \$800 million per year.

It is just mind-blowing to think that suddenly we will have 500 or 600 jobs in the area. We will not get people to live there all the time but, if it does happen, I hope that a good number of them decide that they want their families to be raised where they work and not be commuter employees who come in ferries or light planes across from Adelaide. Again, it is a challenge for a community, but it is part of the challenge that South Australia has to face up to.

The Premier is quoted as saying that the decisions of the next decade will be the most important faced by this state. I think history reflects that every year represents great challenges when really important decisions have to be made. It relies upon people in public office, such as us, who have this opportunity to ensure that we make the right decision all the time—not just a politically expedient decision or what might get us out of trouble in the shortest possible term, but the decision that is the right one for our state. If we do not make the right decision at that right time, in many ways I think we should forfeit our opportunity to be in here because we have done a disservice to those who have supported us to get into the chamber.

I commend the Governor for his speech. I look forward to future contributions from the member for Ramsay and the member for Port Adelaide in this place and congratulate them on their election. Like all others on this side of the chamber, I challenge the government to deliver upon its words and to ensure that words that are meant to inspire us actually deliver for us.

Going back to Barack Obama, 'Yes, we can' sounds fantastic. President Obama faced an enormous challenge with the global financial crisis not long after he was elected. Equally so, we in this state—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Didn't do as well as Kevin Rudd.

Mr GRIFFITHS: —yes, true—face enormous financial challenges with a high level of debt and liability and a challenge for a community to actually pay the level of taxation that is put in front of it. These are challenging times, but the opportunity is there for the right people. I hope that the right people stand up.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 16 February 2012.)

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I just say, Mr Chairman, that, if you and other members will allow me to do so, it would be useful, probably, for me to put a bit of context on the record at the beginning and, after that, that means I will not have to repeat the context in respect of each amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. M.J. Wright): If you wish.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the context is probably useful, otherwise we might get repetitive around each particular provision, and I do not think that is a good way for us to proceed.

First of all, the legislation was originally contemplated to deal with two problems. The first problem was quite a particular issue which related, as you might recall, sir, to a tragic incident where a young man was stabbed in the city some years ago, and he was stabbed by another person who, at the time, was a juvenile.

The circumstances of that event are, broadly, that the person who was the assailant had gone into a shop, and he purchased a knife. Apparently, as I understand the story, he then realised that the knife he had purchased perhaps was not adequate for purpose. He went back in—I am not sure whether it was a *Crocodile Dundee* sort of thing, but he said, 'This is not an adequate knife,' and he got a bigger one. Then he left and went out into the street—into Grenfell Street, I believe—and some sort of melee occurred and another young man was stabbed and died.

So, that was the first general area of concern when the preparation of this bill was being undertaken, and that is the access that minors have to knives. So, there is a more or less discrete part of the legislation that deals with minors having access to knives, and I think that, to some extent, that stands alone as a topic within the bill.

In addition to that, the balance of the bill is to do, really, with an array of different weapons. I think I should indicate to members that legislation evolves in the Attorney-General's Department by reference to topics or subject matter, and teams of people work on those topics and produce

legislation. In some respects that is unfortunate, because you do not always appreciate the interlocking nature of one piece of legislation with another.

The situation we are dealing with presently is that we have two bills in the parliament which were introduced the other day in relation specifically to serious and organised crime. We have a number of other bills which were introduced in the last parliament and are at varying stages of passage through this place or the other place, and this is one of them. Those other pieces of legislation, when taken in conjunction with the two recently introduced pieces, form a whole which needs to be considered as a whole, not just by taking a bit out and looking at it all by itself and analysing it on its own terms.

The other pieces of legislation, aside from the two organised crime provisions, which were introduced last week and which I am not sure when we will be debating, but I notice the—

Ms Chapman: Tomorrow.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Tomorrow? You are ready for tomorrow? Fine. That's good. Excellent. Those pieces of legislation were quite targeted. I am not going to waste a lot of time on these, because we are dealing with it tomorrow, but just to put on the record—

Ms Chapman: You are not allowed to.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not going to debate them. I am just identifying what they are. One was what we call the SOCCA repair legislation and the other was the SOCA or the organised crime offences legislation. They are complemented first of all by the guilty pleas legislation that we put in a while ago, which sought in part to regulate the courts so that their time was fully occupied with cases which were going to actually run to trial, as opposed to those which were going to be pulled out of the list at the last minute by reason of a plea of guilty.

That legislation contained a number of things which were intended to change the culture of the legal profession and the courts, to move forward the point in time at which they give active consideration to whether a plea of guilty should be entered or not from the last minute, which is the situation now, to a much earlier time. The decision can be made earlier so that the trial list can have removed from it the cases that are not actually going to run, so that the ones that are in the list do get a judge and do run when they are supposed to run. The witnesses are not inconvenienced, the victims are not inconvenienced and so forth, and prosecutors and defence counsel get to focus on the work that is actually necessary as opposed to work that will never result in a trial.

Part of that legislation included, importantly, provisions which said that, if a person who cooperates with the police in a material fashion by giving information or giving evidence or whatever pleads guilty, they can get a much higher concession. The reason for that is we are trying to encourage people to talk. We are trying to put incentives in the system which say, 'You, as a criminal who knows about other people's criminal activities, it is in your interests to speak about it and help us prosecute other criminals.'

Likewise we put in legislation about declared drug traffickers, which was intended to take the incentive out of those people being involved in drug trafficking because of the serious penalties and consequences, namely a loss of their assets. Even then, that legislation has a provision in it which says that, even though you are convicted of one of these things, you can still get out from one of these forfeiture provisions if you cooperate with the authorities. That is a way to get out. So you have to be doubly stupid. You have to be a serious drug offender and you have to refuse to cooperate with the police before you get into the bad aspects of that legislation.

Then we had legislation regarding criminal intelligence. Criminal intelligence is important because these very serious criminal elements like nothing better than to be involved in licensed premises, gaming, firearms and the so-called security industry, bouncers in the common parlance.

What we sought to do was make the legislation in each of those areas secure from constitutional attack on the basis that it offended a constitutional principle, because we have one piece of criminal intelligence legislation in the Liquor Licensing Act which we know is okay because the High Court says it is okay. We simply wanted to replicate that in the other bits. I want to make it clear that all those form a package with this legislation. This is the last element of it that I want to mention.

What does this basically do? What it does, aside from the business about young people getting access to knives that I have already dealt with, is say that there are some people in the

community who are such a menace that the police can at present apply under the Firearms Act 1977 to have a firearms prohibition notice put on them. We know from recent discussions here and elsewhere that 50-odd people out of the whole 1.5 million in South Australia have had that process undertaken in their case.

These are people the police think are such a risk to the community that the mere possession by these people of a firearm is of itself an offence and they can be searched in order to ascertain whether they have a firearm. It is a way of upping the ante. I am not going to name anybody because that would be foolish, but if you imagine a serious heavy criminal with a known criminal record for violence, if that person gets one of these orders on them it means that they cannot be out there with a firearm. I do not think anyone seriously thinks that is a big problem.

What we seek to do here is acknowledge that a person—that same person you would not give a firearm to in a fit—may nevertheless have other weapons like nunchakus, Samurai swords, machetes, knuckledusters, star knives, crossbows and a whole range of other things that you would not want that person to have. You would not want them to have those things. What we are trying to do here is broaden out the number of restrictions we can put on this limited number of people to have the right to carry what are basically offensive weapons. That is what it is about. It fits in with all the other aspects I have tried to briefly articulate about as to the measures designed to make it difficult for this very, very small number of very, very dangerous and ruthless criminal individuals.

I believe, although I am not sure, that this legislation has achieved a record of sorts in that it is the most amended legislation in living memory, if not parliamentary history. I am frankly puzzled as to why it has attracted quite so much attention because I do not think anything I have said about the objectives of the legislation should be confronting to people.

I know that underpinning some of the amendments here is what you might call a philosophical debate about regulations versus legislation. As I understand that debate, it goes something like this. My view was that because these characters are pretty nimble on their feet, and because what they are doing will change from day to day, week to week, month to month or year to year—and we know legislation is a reasonably slow-moving beast—to keep track of them legislation is okay in terms of the big picture, but in terms of detail it might have trouble catching up with them as quickly as we would like.

So we opted for a model which had a legislative framework but lots of scope for regulations to be made which would fill in the detail, and that would make the legislation reasonably nimble so that we could change regulations as and when the need required.

As we all know, the parliament has scrutiny of regulations and regulations cannot be made without being set aside in the event of the parliament not agreeing to them. So, the parliament still has scrutiny of regulations but the process is a much simpler, less cumbersome process than the passage of legislation. I guess, from that philosophical point of view, there are places in the original bill where we designed it in such a way that there would be the main architecture in the bill and the detail filled in by regulation.

I think, early on in the piece, we provided the member for Bragg with a copy not only of the bill but also early draft regulations. Can I say that, inasmuch as the debate is about where that tipping point is between regulation and legislation, we have the view that it is a more nimble arrangement in terms of law enforcement to have the regulations where we had originally put them than it would be to cast that in stone, so to speak, through legislative measures.

That said, if what the opposition wished to do is to have a discussion not so much about the balance between legislation and regulation but the content of the regulation and, more particularly, if the member for Bragg's concerns are that the regulations were not as detailed or perhaps not as sophisticated as she would have liked, then I have made it clear, and I make it clear now on the record, that we would be prepared to engage in a discussion about that, and it might well be we can resolve many issues about details of exactly what the regulations might say in particular instances. I guess I am making that offer to the honourable member and, through her, to the opposition.

If we do not get too hung up on this business about moving everything out of the regulations and into the act and we just work on the basis of, 'Let's, at least, talk about the original balance of those two things but, in so doing, recognise that there might be more work to be done on the detail of the regulations,' which we would be happy to do in discussion with the opposition,

then I think that would be a sensible way forward, and I offer that as an attempt to break out of what appears, unfortunately, to be destined to be a deadlock. I just make that point.

That is really the big philosophical point of difference, I think, which results in so many of the amendments here. They are not only moving things from regulations into the act but they are also tweaking with the detail of those things as well in many instances. My concern actually is also that, because of the way in which these amendments have evolved in the upper house, there is a disconnect between amendment on top of amendment on top of amendment, which only reinforces my point, really, about legislation being the less preferable way of resolving those details: because, once we lock things into the legislative compartment, then the finetuning that might be required to make an amendment, say, by Mr Wade resonate with an amendment by Ms Bressington and resonate with an amendment by Family First, or whoever, becomes more difficult when they are in the legislation, as opposed to being left to regulation.

What I am worried about is that we will wind up with a piece of legislation which is internally contradictory, has no clear theme or message to it, and which becomes in practical terms useless to the police. I think that would be the ultimate failure for us as a parliament—to deliver something to the police which was basically just a piece of paper they could throw on their desk and have a look at and put their coffee on. Just imagine this in a few years' time. I see this now: it is my crystal ball thing. If this were to pass as it is now, there would be coffee rings all over it in some policeman's office, because I doubt it would ever be used, and it would not be responsive to the times, either.

That is really the big philosophical issue which underpins a lot of these amendments. I am happy to descend into the particular if that would be of assistance, because, let's face it, there is quite a bit of the particular to descend into. In fact, you could be listening to this for sometime as we descend into the particular.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, I have tried to give the overview.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. Do you want to do an overview now?

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. M.J. Wright): The member for Bragg has three questions (and for that matter any other member), and she can speak for up to 15 minutes. I am prepared to give her some latitude because, obviously, I gave the minister some latitude.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I perhaps just indicate that, in due course, I think that the Attorney will want to put a specific position of the government on the record on amendment No. 1 (the criminal intelligence definition). I think that, with some informal discussion with the Attorney, we have agreed—if it is agreeable to you, sir—that I will address in general, as he has. He may then wish to make some brief comment about amendment No. 1, the criminal intelligence definition, and then I will attempt to do that briefly in response. I agree with the Attorney that we will be able to deal with a number of these amendments, I think, in groups because they relate to five or six general aspects. I am sure that we will both try to assist you to get through in that manner.

I will say first that it comes as no surprise to the opposition that the government has rejected these amendments, not because it regularly does so. From time to time it does accept amendments from another place and wise consideration of how it might assist in the ultimate application of legislation. However, the reality is that, notwithstanding the Attorney's indication that this is a bill within a suite of bills to deal with serious and organised crime in South Australia, nothing actually could be further from the truth.

The government, in fact, introduced this legislation post some events in 2008 (and I will address those shortly), but it is the government—although the Attorney on its behalf is suggesting today the importance of this being part of, as I say, a suite of legislation to deal with a very important social issue—in reality that has literally been sitting on its hands on this legislation. Let me just briefly recap.

This bill was originally introduced on 15 September 2010, and, for the benefit of the record, I advise that it was introduced by this Attorney not his predecessor, and I have often made some adverse comment about what contribution he has made in legislation, which this Attorney has had to pick up the end of. However, in this instance, it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the current Attorney-General entity. It was introduced on 15 September 2010 and promptly passed with the

support of the second reading of the opposition on 11 November 2010. It was considered in the Legislative Council in early 2011, which completed the committee stage on 21 June 2011. That is nine months ago.

The government proceeded to let it lie dormant for another six months until it finally brought it to the third reading vote on 8 November 2011. It then returned to this place where it sat until the prorogation. The government has suddenly renewed its interest in the legislation in the midst of a storm of violent outbreaks over the post-Christmas period, which are well known to all members in this place and which the opposition would suggest have grown in this state as a result of the failure to deal with organised and serious crime.

The government is now trying to somewhat opportunistically claim that this recent violence—and we have seen it all over the newspapers, one dead young man and his father riddled with bullets—somehow justifies the provisions contained in the bill. The government has also made a dismal attempt at rewriting history to present this as the measure for fighting organised crime rather than addressing street crime.

Let me remind the house of this: the genesis of this legislation lies in the tragic and fatal stabbing of Daniel Awak in the Grenfell Street brawl that occurred back in 2008. Members who were here then will remember that the then attorney-general instigated a review in respect of knife laws generally and outlined the concern arising out of the death of this young man. Alongside that, another 14-year-old boy was prosecuted, convicted of murder, given a nonparole period, I think, of six years, and there were questions of appeal—in any event, a long, sad story—and that was running alongside the development of legislation out of this tragic incident.

I think it is fair to say that that incident, having gone through its legal process, has no connection whatsoever to organised crime. In fact, for those who follow these matters, when they look at the government's contribution on the debate of this legislation—back on 15 September 2010 in particular—when the attorney-general presented a second reading contribution outlining the basis of this legislation, there was not one word by the attorney-general or any other speakers that raised the issue of organised crime in that debate—not one word. In fact, the very specific purposes outlined in the contribution by the attorney at that stage, included:

The bill fulfils the government's election commitment to introduce laws to prohibit the sales of knives of minors, authorise police to use hand-held metal detectors to find knives and other weapons, authorise the issue of weapon prohibition orders, and allow general weapons amnesties to be conducted in relation to dangerous articles and offensive and prohibited weapons.

To be fair, post the 2008 incident, post the review on 2009, we had the election in March 2010, and the then premier launched his policy on law and order, including serious crime. In the published document about what he was going to do to deal with serious and organised crime, there was not one mention about the weapons prohibition orders. However, there was a reference to that aspect of this bill in a second document on community safety, titled 'Safer Streets—Community Safety'.

In that policy document is outlined the government's intention, if re-elected, to introduce weapon prohibition orders to make our streets safer for those in them. There was not one mention of serious and organised crime. Quite clearly, even up until the election, preceding this legislation, the previous attorney-general and the premier had not linked this legislation with serious and organised crime. So, to come into this house today and try to present to us that this is a package to deal with a serious problem in the community—namely, serious and organised crime—is quite fallacious and we reject it entirely.

I also note that this legislation, when introduced, predated 1½ years the serious and organised crime legislation that was introduced, which ultimately ended up in the High Court and which, hopefully, we will be remedying in some way in the legislation we are about to deal with after we deal with this legislation. This bill fools no-one as being a part of that anti-serious crime legislation.

Quite clearly, the knife crime under Labor has been rampant—and I am going to refer to some statistics in a moment—during the lifetime of this government. So, it is not as though because it was bill that, in fact, had no genesis in serious and crime debates it didn't mean that it wasn't a serious issue to be dealt with, and the fact that we had a culmination of a street fight in Grenfell Street in which a 14 year old boy murders another child was serious enough.

So, safety in our streets is an important issue, particularly as, between 2000 and 2009, there were 10,448 victim reported offences involving a knife or machete. In latter years, knife crime has become even worse. In the year 2000 there were 1,043 reports; in 2009 there were 1,290. One

of the main elements of this bill, emphasised by the government, has been the proposed restrictions on minors accessing knives. The incident I have referred to, tragic as it was, is clearly the basis for that.

Between 2000 and 2009 there were 1,414 charges against persons under the age of 18. That is a pretty sobering statistic. So, as zealous as the government have been to reduce the availability of knives through the bill, the government proposed to make it a criminal offence to sell a minor a knife, under any circumstance. The government's bill, however, was so broad that it captured even minors receiving a plastic knife and fork at a barbecue. No consideration has been given to the fact that it would criminalise one of the most basic community activities.

The Attorney-General has previously referred to this bill as the 'pig marketing bill' following amendments made in another place—something about the snout and the tail as being the only thing left, as I recall.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: No, that was not this one. That was—

Ms CHAPMAN: That was another one on confiscation of assets, but—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: This is a long pen; this one's like a stretch limo. It's got so much in the middle now, it's not funny.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Australian Labor Party might like to abolish the other place—I think that is still their policy. I remember we had lots of promises from the previous premier about getting rid of it, and all sorts of promises prior to the 2006 or 2010 election. They came up with some limp alternative about having a review, I think, ultimately. In any event, whilst they are obviously keen under their policy to get rid of the other place, the members there were elected by the voters and provide an important house of review, a chance to fix up the torrent of this government's mistakes and improve the legislation.

There were other ridiculous provisions such as those that required a person to visit every person at their residence, including neighbours in an apartment block, to ask if they had any weapons. Imagine the scene when a person, who has drawn the attention of police enough to have been given a weapons prohibition order, turns up at your doorstep asking you to declare if you have any weapons in accordance with the provisions of this bill. Is the person really meant to comply with the spirit of the section and say, 'Sure, sure, I've got a whole stash of them right here for you'? Absolutely absurd.

The legislation was defective, it clearly was not going to be effective, and it was going to place an absurd level of obligation which, in fact, would make it sit on any one's desk, let alone police officer's, with coffee stains all over it because it would be simply ineffectual, in its previous form.

The opposition, together with members in another place, took out a number of these provisions which would otherwise put the public at risk; yet such amendments are effectively treated with contempt by the Attorney-General, who thinks that any changes are simply either delay tactics or some kind of philosophical difference. These are very serious amendments, which I will refer to in very general terms shortly. We are not just talking about whether we prescribe the list of weapons that might be covered in some particular legislation.

The Attorney-General is quite right when he says that sometimes, when we have lists that tend to be exhaustive, we could miss something out, and it is appropriate to have a prescriptive power by the Attorney or some other minister to actually have the capacity to add to the list as more modern weapons become effective. But to simply have this prescription power to fill in what is otherwise a skeleton bill is not acceptable to us. We want the list there. If we miss something and it is too difficult to come back to the parliament, we can look at how quickly that can be dealt with.

When it comes to prescriptive lists of weapons, for example, where are we going to fit scissors, screwdrivers and all the other things that can clearly kill people? Pens. We have all heard the Amanda Vanstone answer to the federal initiative in, I think, the 2010 election—it might even have been before that—when she said how ridiculous it is when all she had to do was get on a flight. Of course, if she got on a plane, she would get real cutlery, because first class always has real cutlery. If you are in the back blocks, you get plastic cutlery. As Amanda Vanstone said, 'taking a knife away from me is not going to stop me if I am so possessed to stab the person sitting in the seat next to me. I just have to pull out my fountain pen or my ballpoint and stab them in the neck'.

So, the reality is that we have deficiencies in being able to deal realistically with the question of protecting everybody—minors and vulnerable people in particular—from those who might want to cause them injury by what we generally know as weapons that have no other domestic use.

Let us get real here. People can be stabbed with all sorts of things. In fact, subsequent to the legislation being introduced, there was one case out at Tea Tree Plaza that was covered in the local media, where a young man was stabbed. The prosecution evidence was that the four defendants who were charged at the time—and this is back in November 2010, around the time we were debating this in the first instance—may have stabbed the victim with a pen and not a knife. Presumably, during the course of the case, they were able to identify what the weapon ultimately was.

In that case, for example, the stabbing weapon—which was believed to be a pen—caused serious injury to the victim, who was also beaten up. However, the reality is that being prescriptive on a number of weapons does not protect the world—particularly in domestic circumstances, let alone in street circumstances—against being stabbed by something that will cause an injury or a fatality.

As to any question of the opposition being responsible in any way for the delay of the passage of this bill, I just want to place clearly on the record that this bill passed within months when it was debated in late 2010. In fact, it passed this place in less than a month and, when it got to the other place, it was dealt with within several months, even with all the amendments. Before the government even came back to pass the third reading, it took another six months, and it has been another nine months before it has been brought back on for debate here. So, I do not accept that for one moment; nor should this house, nor should anyone out there who listens to this debate or peruses it at a later time be in any way under any illusion that the delaying, in this instance, is the responsibility of anyone but the Attorney-General.

In summary, the amendments proposed in the other place and moved by the opposition included making it an offence to take offensive weapons into schools. We think that is pretty important. We still think it is important and we are puzzled as to why the government would not accept such an important addition to the effectiveness of the legislation.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No, I am just making my general comments. Other amendments included ensuring that community barbecues are not inadvertently criminalising volunteers every time they give plastic knives and forks to minors.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: We can exempt that in the regulations.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Attorney calls out what he is promising to do in the regulations but let us just have it here in the legislation. Other amendments included introducing medical reporting provisions so that police have the information to target crime hotspots, amending provisions to ensure that searches are legally robust and do not put those assisting police at risk of litigation and people being searched at risk of abuse, and correcting the drafting problems that would have meant that police would be committing an offence each time they enforced weapons prohibition orders, if they did so carrying their standard equipment.

That has been very important for the opposition. We did not want police to be placed in a position where they would be liable to prosecution or exposed to potential prosecution when they were carrying out their normal duties with their usual equipment. As we know, police officers carry weapons for the purposes of guaranteeing their duty, whether they are batons, spray or the like, and they need to in order to properly carry out their role.

Instead, the government, having rejected the amendments in the other place, as we experienced with the prescribed drug offender bill, would rather reintroduce the legislation to repeat the same debate without any consideration of the views expressed in the other place during the previous debate. This is clearly a product of the government's failure to negotiate.

Whilst I hear today the Attorney-General extending an olive leaf for the purposes of a productive discussion on what we put in the regulations, that is really not good enough, Attorney. We will be having some discussions, I have no doubt, and they will be in a deadlock conference but, nevertheless, they will be about the act. Be under no illusion, we want minors and vulnerable people protected in streets and their homes and elsewhere. We will see whether this is cranked up

to be useful in serious crime, but it has to be done properly so that it is effective and we protect our police.

We confirm that the government should accept the amendments to the bill and bring these laws in to address the crime that the bill was intended to address and that the amendments of the other place enhance the bill's ability to address crime involving knives and prohibited weapons. I say government members only have themselves to blame for the delay to crime laws. They are the ones who let it sit unattended for six months. They are the ones who failed to consult, who failed to see the unintended consequences the bill would cause and, worse still, failed to recognise the faults that have been appropriately highlighted in the other place.

Let us be clear. In putting the motion that this house reject the amendments of the Legislative Council without any non-government amendment, the government is continuing its position of disengagement—a loudhailer at 20 paces. If the government is serious about getting good law on the books as soon as possible, it will stop grandstanding and start negotiating on the act or sensibly accept some of these amendments.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As always, I feel myself chastised after a contribution from the honourable member. If I can just summon a few words in my own defence, the original bill went for 19 pages. The new version that has come back to us, freshly minted from another place, runs to 45 pages. I have a version here with track changes on it, and I am looking at it and I am struggling to find any bits of the original bill left in it.

As I have said, there is a philosophical thing here about moving things out of regulations and so on that I am happy to have a conversation about. However, there are some points of fundamental disagreement and, more particularly, can I say, and I put this on the record, there have been many layers of amendment in the other place—we have amendment No. 30, which, I am advised, because it takes out certain provisions and then inserts a new one which is different, creates unintended consequences, and I will go into that in some detail at another point. In particular, I draw the committee's attention to Nos 30, 46 and 53. These are ones where, it seems to me, we have got ourselves in a bit of a pickle by layer upon layer of amendment where the original purpose of the original thing is lost because it is removed and then other bits are put in. In fact, we have amendments on amendments, which cause some complexity.

It would be my suggestion, through you, sir, that the sensible way for us to proceed with this matter would be for us to proceed to a deadlock conference because the intricacies involved in going through all of this are such that they are going to occupy this parliament for a very long time. There is no reason why a committee of the parliament cannot go off and try to come to some sensible point of agreement on it where we can.

Can I say to the honourable member that it is not my view that every single proposition that was advanced in the upper house is silly; it is not my view that everything they have said or done should be dismissed out of hand. It is my view that the extent of the amendment to the original bill—that is, taking it from 16 to 45 pages—necessarily means that we have a fundamentally different beast from the one we had before and that we need to actually talk through what the detail of that will mean. I am happy to enter, in good faith, into discussions with the honourable member, and I guess we are obligated to have people from another place in the room as well, to try to see whether we cannot come to some point of consensus at least on a number of things. I think that would be good. I would very much like to have the legislation passed in a functional form.

As for the amount of time that this has taken, quite frankly, the sheer volume of amendments, and the layering effect of these amendments, has been something that has taken a bit of time to work through and to come to views about. Nevertheless, all of that said, it would be my suggestion, sir, that the most productive way of this matter proceeding further would be for us to recognise that the degree of detail is something that a committee of the parliament should look at rather than our laboriously going through each provision in here. I am not quite sure how I can make that suggestion in an orderly fashion.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. M.J. Wright): Attorney, what I would suggest, if that is what you want to occur, is that you move that all amendments be disagreed to.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Acting Chairman. With those words, and on the understanding that the member for Bragg at least comprehends that I am not moving that they all be disagreed to because there is no room for us to have a conversation about any of them, I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

Ms CHAPMAN: I agree with the course of action outlined by the Attorney. I notice, though, in his contribution he indicated that amendments 30, 46 and 53 which, on my understanding, relate to the imposition of a duty on orders to notify police, the incorporation and annual reporting for search area declarations and annual reporting on searches and discoveries respectively, are all matters which in some way are unworkable and have ended up being in some way legislatively corrupted by the debate and amendment process in another place. If that is the case, and there may be some legal aspect of that, then I invite him to forward to the opposition the particulars of that after the adjournment of this bill into deadlock conference, and we will have a look at that. If there is some result that was unintended by the other place as to the effectiveness of those, then we will obviously have a look at that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I just say that there are two elements there. One is the unintended consequence thing, which I think we can deal with. I will ask departmental officers to be able to brief the honourable member; that is probably the best way to deal with that issue. Whether we agree as a matter of policy in the end if that is sorted out, is a matter for me to deal with in deadlock.

Motion carried.

At 17:57 the house adjourned until Wednesday 29 February 2012 at 11:00.