

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 September 2012

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW IMPLEMENTATION) BILL

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (11:01): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (TAFE SA CONSEQUENTIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (11:02): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GRAIN HANDLING INDUSTRY

Mr BROCK (Frome) (11:03): I bring up the final report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

Mr BROCK: I move:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

The select committee reiterates the recommendations made in the interim report, which was tabled on 14 September 2011. In this report, the committee's final report, the select committee strongly recommends, first:

That the Federal Government initiate a review of the Wheat Export Marketing Amendment Bill 2012 that is currently before the Federal Parliament, with the objective of developing policies and legislation that will ensure the benefits of deregulation are fully realised within a competitive and innovative framework that provides the basis for a viable and successful industry.

The committee finds that the existing regulatory arrangements imposed on the grain storage and handling systems in South Australia are failing to provide a vigorous and competitive marketplace for grain growers. There is a clear case for a review of the system. It is a system that is overly complicated and difficult to negotiate. Legislation and regulations at commonwealth and state government level are not consistent with the objectives of deregulation. There needs to be an alignment of the relevant legislation at both levels of government.

This access regime requires the approval of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC). The ACCC has recently endorsed an auction system developed by Viterra to allocate shipping slots. The whole of the grain supply chain that delivers grain to the ports is not subject to access regulation. Regulation is only applied at the ports.

ESCOSA recommended in its 2007 Ports Pricing and Access Review that the South Australian government undertake a broader review of the South Australian grain supply chain. The recommendation was also included in the recommendations of the draft report of its 2012 review. The committee believes it is time to act on this recommendation, particularly in the context of federal government legislation to deregulate wheat export marketing.

What becomes obvious is that a wider review of legislation that governs access to ports and also rail services is needed to fully realise the benefits of deregulation of the wheat export markets. The emergence of new traders indicates that there is competition and farmers now have a choice for marketing grain. The difficulties in the industry are around the control that is able to be exercised by the dominant owner of storage and handling infrastructure in South Australia and the ownership of rail and port services by companies that own all of the facilities.

The point to be made is that, in order to export grain, the competitors must go through Viterra because it is Viterra that controls the port loading facilities. Market parameters in the South Australian grain industry do not provide the basis for a vigorous and competitive marketplace for

grain growers. Despite deregulation of wheat export markets, the fact remains that South Australian farmers will not be able to fully exploit the opportunities that deregulation should provide.

The committee has considered all of the arguments in favour of the current structure but still comes back to the fact that the effective monopoly in South Australia does not sit well with the principles of deregulation. The imposition of access regimes only adds to the costs that are then passed on to farmers without providing any productivity gains that reduce costs and increase competition. There is a clear case for a comprehensive review of the current legislative and regulatory systems that govern the wheat export market and grain handling services in South Australia. Recommendation 2 states:

That the Federal Government establish an independent body to oversee the classification of grain. The independent body would develop and implement classification policies and procedures, set grain standards, accredit grain classifiers and their training, undertake audits to ensure compliance with mandated procedures and generally ensure the reputation of Australian grain.

The body is to be funded from existing levies paid by the industry. In its interim report, the committee made two recommendations that dealt with the issue of grain classification, namely:

1. That GTA be required to mandate that, in the case of a disputed grain classification, an objective measurement is made available to the farmer at the sampling point.
2. That the relevant Commonwealth and State Ministers be requested to provide direction to the industry on the implementation and enforcement of a dispute resolution process that mandates the use of objective tests.

Neither of these recommendations have been acted on. The committee's view is that the absence of sound and reliable practices for the classification of wheat puts the Australian industry at risk of becoming a second-class producer. The state government has set as one of its objectives for the state the development of a reputation for producing premium food from a clean environment. Classification of grain and the maintenance of standards must come into consideration if this objective is to be achieved for the grain industry. However, there is still no mandatory legislative requirement for an objective test to be available on request and, given their response to the committee's interim report recommendations, little enthusiasm by authorities to go down that path appears likely.

The committee has received submissions from industry participants who believe that Australia risks gaining a reputation for providing grain that does not meet world standards. The committee is not convinced that the industry has an appropriate structure that will allow market forces to manage the classification and grading of grains. The dominance of one company in South Australia which, under current procedures, has the power to determine classifications and is responsible for turnout of grains that are not to specification calls for oversight by an independent body.

For this reason, the committee is advocating an examination of the arrangements that apply in Canada and the United States. Canada deals with these issues through the Canadian Grain Commission and, in the United States, the relevant body is the Federal Grain Inspection Service.

The committee is also recommending that the principles underpinning the Australian Wool Testing Authority (AWTA) should be examined for their relevance to the grain industry. There was no reference to these models in the Productivity Commission's 2010 inquiry report. The responsibility is on all participants in the industry to come to an arrangement that ensures Australian grain can be such that the market has complete confidence in the standard and quality of the product. Recommendation 3 states:

That the State Government review the costs and benefits of establishing an agreement with the Government of Western Australia for participation in the Australian Export Grains Innovation Centre.

Together, South Australia and Western Australia account for 75 per cent of Australian wheat exports, and there are similarities between the two states on issues such as road transport, access to port facilities and rail transport.

The deregulation of wheat export markets has greater relevance to Western Australia and South Australia because of the volume of grain exported. An investigation into the areas of common interest and opportunities for cooperation should be undertaken to establish a formal arrangement that will provide access to expertise that has the potential to improve the industry in South Australia. Recommendation 4 states:

That the State Government establish formal arrangements for consulting with the grains industry and local councils on planning for each harvest, rationalisation of grain receival centres (strategic sites) and, designation of access routes (rail and road) to port. This arrangement would extend to providing annual reports to the Parliament through an appropriate Standing Committee.

In its interim report the committee made recommendations that dealt with annual management plans. The interim report included extensive coverage of this issue and facilities in general. The general view was that facilities and operating hours were less than satisfactory. The objective is to establish a forum that allows the grain handling companies to work with the state government and local councils to share information and to work towards common goals that will support the industry. Recommendation 5 states:

That the State Government authorise ESCOSA to undertake a review of the entire grain supply chain with the objective of establishing arrangements that provide the basis for pricing of and access to grain storage and bulk handling facilities (including up-country services) that are consistent with the requirements of a competitive and deregulated wheat export market.

The committee has undertaken an active interest in the role of ESCOSA in administering ports, pricing and access arrangements in South Australia.

The committee made two submissions to the commission: on 15 March and 18 July 2012. The imposition of two levels of regulation in a system that should ideally be treated as a single system appears to be unnecessarily complicated and expensive. In its 2007 Review of Ports Pricing and Access, ESCOSA made two recommendations that have not been acted upon by the South Australian government. The draft report of June 2012 includes similar recommendations.

The committee believes it is time the government took action on the recommendations, particularly of the recommendation that there should be a broad review of the entire grain supply chain in South Australia. The need to establish a legislative system that sets the base for competitive and viable port services is important for the future of the grains industry in South Australia. The issue requires leadership from both levels of government. Recommendation 6 states:

That the State Government undertake a review of the Maritime Services (Access) Act 2000 to determine the effectiveness of the legislation in providing the basis for competitive services and investment in port facilities. The proposed review would also clarify the interaction between Commonwealth and State regulations to eliminate possible duplication and simplify the procedures that are imposed on industry participants.

Recommendation 7 states:

That the State Government in consultation with Local Councils, transport operators and appropriate grain industry representatives establish a project group to:

- identify a coherent network of local government roads which provide direct and appropriate access for heavy vehicles between main roads, storage sites, railheads and ports in all council areas;
- produce an agreed single policy document for the operation of heavy vehicles on access roads across all Councils;
- provide a forum for local councils, transport operators and industry to work collaboratively to identify priority needs thus maximising the benefits of road infrastructure funding;
- provide a single voice for local councils to present a logical and consistent argument to the State and Federal Government for road infrastructure planning and funding of heavy vehicle access routes; and
- seek to rationalise and reduce duplication of the network;

The committee heard evidence from local councils that indicates there are problems in the way the heavy vehicles are regulated. Given the commercial arrangement between Viterro and Genesee Wyoming Australia for the supply of rail transport and the cost to use the service as reported in the committee's interim report, the importance of good heavy vehicle access routes cannot be overstated.

This is an important aspect of the grain industry and it is the committee's view that management of road infrastructure would benefit from an open public process that ensures that all parties have access to information and can be involved in determining policies and priorities. There appears to be a problem in communicating these processes through various levels of government and the industry.

A central problem for provision of road infrastructure is the lack of capacity of local councils, local government, to meet the cost. This is a constant theme raised by councils across all

rural areas. The cost of regulating heavy vehicle movements and maintaining roads to a suitable standard places an onerous responsibility on the councils.

The whole question of managing road infrastructure for the grain industry should be seen as part of developing the industry and not managed in isolation from the objective of establishing the basis for an industry that is very important to the whole of the South Australian economy. Development of the grain industry is part of the government's stated objective of producing premium food from a clean environment. Recommendation 8 states:

That the services offered by the Small Business Commissioner be made known to farmers throughout the relevant groups representing the interests of farmers in South Australia and that the Small Business Commissioner, in preparing the current code of practice on farming, notes the recommendations from the committee.

The Small Business Commissioner will ensure South Australia's small business have a fair and competitive environment in which to grow and expand by providing low-cost mediation services to business to business, and business to state and local government disputes.

The Minister for small business may also wish to give consideration to direct the commissioner to investigate market practices in the grain industry that may adversely affect farmers. Farmers are small businesses that rely on a service provided by a dominant company that holds an effective monopoly over the classification, storage and handling of grain in South Australia. Recommendation 9 states:

That the South Australian Parliament establishes a Standing Committee on Primary Industries with the following objectives:

- to ensure that Primary Industries continue to be a vital part of state's growth and economic successes;
- to assist in developing policies and practices that promote the State as a producer of Premium Food from a clean environment.

The grain industry and other industries that can be classified as forming the primary production industry have always been mainstays of South Australia's economy. The work of the Select Committee on the Grain Handling Industry once again highlights the importance of primary production to South Australia.

Issues raised in the evidence to the committee are not confined to the grain industry but are generic to all forms of primary production. The provision of infrastructure to support these industries is a major challenge that will require coordination and planning across all levels of government, and the allocation of finance to implement the required changes. Many of the changes will require new legislation and revision of existing legislation. The appointment of a standing committee on primary industries would provide a forum to monitor and to keep the parliament informed of developments and issues.

Such a committee, with appropriate terms of reference relating to primary industries, will ensure parliament is kept aware and will enhance a policy and legislative framework that is supportive of primary industries in South Australia. The appointment of a standing committee would also complement the objectives of the government to promote South Australia as a provider of premium food and wine from a clean environment. Recommendation 10 states:

That the State Government establishes a formal working arrangement with Glencore International to ensure that the transition from Viterra to Glencore avoids disruptions to the grain industry and sets the basis of cooperation in introducing measures to improve efficiency.

In closing I would like to sincerely thank the committee members Mr Adrian Pederick, Mr Leon Bignell, Mr Tony Piccolo and Mr Tim Whetstone. The committee also worked tirelessly and the final report was unanimous. I would also like to thank Parliamentary Officer, David Pegram; Ms Rachel Stone, who was Assistant Parliamentary Officer; and John Parkinson, Research Officer for their tireless work. I also thank *Hansard* for their commitment for the duration.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:18): I rise briefly to thank all those people throughout South Australia who came out to give evidence to our committee as we travelled around the state. It was heartfelt evidence that they gave to the committee, and I hope that we have been able to capture that in this report. I will not go into all the details of the report, as the member for Frome, our chair, has just done that.

I would also like to thank the companies like Viterra who opened up their facilities for us to go on tour and have a look first-hand at the operations, and the many other companies around state. Also, the Western Australia government and the industry over there when we visited were

very open in letting us know what their experiences were; and the Canadian officials that we met with were very informative as well.

We hope that this report addresses many of the concerns that all of us were hearing through the harvest of 2010-11. What we were hearing then was very disturbing, that local farmers were not getting the money they should have been getting and that money was leaving the regions and therefore leaving our state. We all know that these farmers are the backbone of our economy, and without a profitable and successful grain industry the whole state suffers. Hopefully, what we have done with this report is lay out some things that can be improved in the future, and hopefully things have already been improved because of the work we have done.

I would also like to thank my fellow members, the member for Frome, the member for Hammond, the member for Chaffey and you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I think it was a great sign of how we can all work together, Liberal Party, Labor Party and an Independent. There was not a cross word heard in 18 months, and that is the way parliament should work.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:20): I rise, too, to support the motion on the grain handling industry committee. I would like to commend the members on the committee: the Chairman, the member for Frome, Geoff Brock; Leon Bignell, the member for Mawson; Tim Whetstone, the member for Chaffey; and Tony Piccolo, the member for Light. We did have a very collaborative approach to this issue.

I would also like to commend the former minister for agriculture, Michael O'Brien. When I nominated in this house for this committee to take place, I negotiated with him fruitfully and we managed to get unanimous support in this house. I was very grateful for that because it was very much needed to get this committee up. I would also like to acknowledge the valuable work of David Pegram, Rachel Stone, and John Parkinson, our tireless research officer, for putting this report together around us.

This committee came about because of what happened in the 2010-11 harvest. There was a real issue with classification, where farmers were not allowed access to falling numbers machines to get an objective measurement of this grain. I mentioned in my previous speech, when we tabled the interim report, that we had constant discussions over that harvest with Paul Tierney from Viterra, and I applaud Paul for keeping up that dialogue. I think he was listening, but I think he was under the pressure of the company policy that they were not going to allow objective measurement through that harvest.

Thankfully, through the pressure of this committee, 78 falling numbers machines were purchased by Viterra and used for classification during this last season, 2011-12. One of our recommendations is that the federal government set up an independent body to oversee a classification in this country. With deregulation and overseas companies buying in, I think we do need that body to look at how we classify that grain, similar to what they do in Canada and the United States and, I note, in deregulated environments, just to make sure that we can uphold the quality of South Australian grain.

I would like to talk about some of the things that the select committee did, apart from our fruitful travels around the state and to Western Australia, and some of us went to Canada. I think the Canadian trip was vital, just to see how Viterra operates over there and why things were not working here in South Australia. Certainly, in regard to the report, it is obvious that in Canada, with the proposed takeover by Glencore of Viterra, a lot of sweeteners were put in the deal and they were still put in the deal later on—hundreds of millions of dollars of sweeteners, in fact billions of dollars of sweeteners, because the original bill of \$6.5 billion dollars was diluted to something like \$3.1 billion.

None of this happened in Australia, which disappoints me. The committee actually asked the ACCC and the Foreign Investment Review Board to see if we could get divestment of port assets or other divestments in this state but, no, the ACCC said there would be no lessening of competition. Well, work that out: we take one player out of the mix and there would not be an effect on competition. I am sorry; I cannot work it out.

The member for Frome has done a good job in going over the recommendations, and I expect many people will be looking over those recommendations. I think the committee has done very valuable work so that we make sure that we do not lose the perceived hundreds of millions of dollars that we think we have lost out of the rural industries in the 2010-11 harvest due to poor classification guidelines given to the classifiers. I am certainly not blaming the classifiers here: they were under the pump.

I would like to say a lot more but, due to the constraints of time, I would like to make one last comment. I am concerned about the intransigence of Viterra in communicating with anyone on the problems with the Outer Harbor ship loader. This ship loader is vital to exports out of this state, yet we are getting nothing out of them. I approached both Viterra and Glencore at the Cleve field days and I got told to just look at the website. I do not think that is good enough, and that is why we need committees like this. I applaud the fact that we have also recommended that we should have a standing committee on the very vital industry of primary industries in this state.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:26): I reiterate what the members for Frome, Hammond and Mawson have said. It has been a delight to sit on a select committee with those members. I also congratulate David Pegram, Rachel Stone and, of course, John Parkinson, the senior consultant throughout the course of the committee.

I would like to begin by emphasising the importance of the grain industry to this state. It is the largest single contributor to the state's food sector. The crop produced in 2010, before the committee was established, was worth around \$3 billion, and wheat is the biggest item on our export figure. Producing grain is something that South Australians have done since the colony was founded, and it is ironic that the first wheat crops grown in this state were on North Terrace where we are today. Again, we produce some of the best quality wheat in the world. Our malting barley is recognised as the world's best. I emphasise the importance of the industry to demonstrate that when it is having problems it is vital we act to address them.

I think the select committee should be commended for the work it did. We went out and travelled many miles, and consulted with many people, growers and organisations. We listened to their concerns. We brought up those concerns with industry and, in many cases, industry addressed some of those concerns. The lack of transparency is quite alarming in an industry that so important not only to this state but also to the national economy.

In 2010, after many years of drought, the grain growers across South Australia finally thought they were going to have a truly bumper season but, unfortunately, the rain fell and everyone found themselves with quality issues, particularly sprouted grain. Normally that would not be a problem, but it was compounded by what I considered a lack of preparedness by the dominant grain storage and handling operator here in South Australia, Viterra.

It did not take long for all the growers to come to all the MPs' offices and the alarm bells were ringing loudly that there was a lack of communication and a lack of streamlining in the logistics. There was concern about classification, and that lack of classification could quite easily have taken many hundreds of millions of dollars off the state's economy.

In our initial meetings right across the state, the alarm bells that rang were primarily about classification. The classification, in essence, was dealt with: it was a seasonal factor. However, the issues of road infrastructure, port access, and the lack of an information chain were highlights, and it is an ongoing process that needs to be addressed.

Again, I thank the committee. I think it was very much a worthwhile committee. The feedback I have had from the growers and industry has been that it was a success, and I think this final report will highlight the success. I commend the member for Hammond for being the instigator of the select committee. For me, being my first select committee, it was an eye-opener in respect of probably one of the state's biggest economic drivers; and, again, there must be more come out of this along the way. I know that we are time constrained, and I will sit down. I commend the Select Committee on the Grain Handling Industry.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WHYALLA SPECIAL SCHOOL NEW SCHOOL

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:30): I move:

That the 452nd report of the committee, entitled Whyalla Special School New School, be noted.

The committee has received the proposal to develop a new Whyalla Special School adjacent to the Nicolson Avenue primary and junior primary school site at an estimated cost of \$7.2 million (excluding GST). The new school will accommodate a total of 64 students. This equates to a maximum of 16 students for reception to year 7 and 48 students for years 8 to 12. The scope of the redevelopment is as follows:

- two single-storey buildings comprising six general learning areas with secure play zones, four withdrawal areas, an independent living unit, storage, student toilets, administration, library resource and activity hall;
- relocated dual metal transportable building comprising two general learning areas, withdrawal spaces and student toilets;
- individual outdoor open space and play areas;
- new covered outdoor learning area;
- a new flat-grassed playing area;
- increased staff and visitor car parking with improved safety; and
- improved staff and student circulation.

The project is expected to be completed by October 2013, and, given this and pursuant to the act, the committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:31): The opposition supports the project and is keen to see it go ahead.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:31): I acknowledge the strong support of the government for improving facilities for children who have particular disabilities, and I would make the general point that there are still many parents who will not avail themselves of these facilities believing that they want their children to be, to use the current term, 'mainstreamed'.

These special schools have specially-trained staff. They are well equipped and have appropriate resources and facilities. I note in recent times people talking about creating a special school for children with autism. We had one once at Glen Osmond. It did not survive because the cost of running it was so high that it was pretty hard for parents to sustain it.

One of the great costs involved with special education is that the department (DECD) provides transport to those schools for children who have particular disabilities. It is a very significant commitment by the state government, reflected not only in the upgrading of this special school at Whyalla but also many around the state, and I acknowledge its ongoing commitment to providing transport arrangements for children who have disabilities and for the actual physical infrastructure itself.

I would ask parents to reflect carefully on any decision to deny their child with special needs the opportunity to be in one of these schools on the false premise, I think, that they are better being mainstreamed. These schools can provide the help and assistance that those children need. I commend the government for its ongoing commitment and the Public Works Committee for its support of this project.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BRIGHTON SECONDARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:34): I move:

That the 453rd report of the committee, entitled Brighton Secondary School Redevelopment, be noted.

The project involves the new build of a new facility and refurbishment of some existing facilities at an estimated cost of \$17.875 million (excluding GST). It will be designed to accommodate an additional 250 students. It will deliver the following: construction of a new learning facility, incorporating a canteen, student amenities, student services, a new library (replacing the existing library), maths and English departments, science, staff amenities and staffroom; a new 400 seat extension to the existing music recital hall, providing a total 734 seat facility with associated boulevard and landscaping; refurbishment of existing facilities; OHSW compliance to refurbished buildings; modification to car park to accommodate additional staff members; and demolition of existing buildings in poor condition to make way for the new build. This project is expected to be completed by November 2013. Given this and pursuant to the act, the committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:35): I have a few words to say on this. We found the project of some interest. We asked a series of questions of members opposite about the capacity of schools nearby to pick up the slack rather than pour it all into the one school at Brighton. That is not taking anything away from that school but there are other schools that we felt could have met

the needs. This would appear to be a political decision to prop up Brighton in the seat of Bright. With those few words, I endorse the report.

The Hon. C.C. Fox: That is an outrageous thing to say and you cast a slur upon the entire school when you do that. You are shameful.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member for Little Para will have a chance to rebut in closing the debate. The member for Finniss might wish to be careful about what he says as well.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The next person who interjects will be taking a walk. The member for Fisher.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:36): This is one of our many fine state high schools. Some of the young people in my electorate go there because it is a specialist high school, as well as a general secondary school. I would urge those in the community who are not positive towards state schools to have a look at what happens in many of our primary and secondary schools in the state school system. We have fantastic state schools in general. Ultimately, it comes down to the quality of the principal and the staff. I think it is great to see some money being spent on state schools. Many other schools need more money spent on them to bring them up to what is modern day standards in terms of infrastructure, but this is one of the very good schools in the DECD system. I do not accept what the member for Finniss says. I think money spent on any of our state schools is money well spent.

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (11:38): It is a very sad day that because of his own desperation, because of his own collapsing career, because of his own obsession and dislike of me, that the member for Finniss will come in here when we are discussing a secondary school redevelopment and say the things that he says. I look forward—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you will have a chance to speak if you wish to avail yourself of that. Stop interjecting.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: —to his wrongful attribution of political motive to be retracted. I would like to put on the record my deep respect for this particular school, which is one of the state's outstanding schools. Brighton High has a famous music program, a famous volleyball program and an exceptional principal, who is lauded far and wide for her ability within education. I was recently at that school where I spoke to a number of students who were on their way to a global engineering competition. They had been selected for a national team in Dubai. To use his own personal animus towards me or those in my electorate—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: this is blatantly ridiculous.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Minister, continue.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I will wind up my remarks there. This is what I say as a final remark: the member for Finniss has a record of saying, frankly, inappropriate and hurtful things, and I will be speaking to the—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: this is impugning improper motives and it is absolutely out of order and ridiculous.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HOPE VALLEY AND HAPPY VALLEY WTP CRYPTOSPORIDIUM MANAGEMENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:41): I trust this one will be a little less controversial. I move:

That the 454th report of the committee, entitled Hope Valley and Happy Valley WTP Cryptosporidium Management, be noted.

The South Australian Water Corporation (SA Water) proposes to upgrade the existing water treatment facilities at the Hope Valley and Happy Valley water treatment plants, at an estimated cost of up to \$23.125 million, excluding GST. I will not go into all the technical aspects, but the key aims of the project are to ensure that metropolitan Adelaide's drinking water continues to meet the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines, to improve the management of pathogens such as

cryptosporidium and improve capability of the WTPs to provide good-quality drinking water in terms of its aesthetic quality. The project is expected to be completed by June 2013. Given this, and pursuant to the act, the committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:42): One of these plants is in my electorate. It is interesting to note that the northern plant is in Hope Valley and the southern one is in Happy Valley, so you have a choice between hope and happiness.

This is a very important project. Happy Valley reservoir, which is now over 100 years old, is linked to Mount Bold by an underground tunnel, which was dug at great human cost many years ago. It has a bypass drain around it, which people think is for stormwater, but it was put there to divert tailings from the silver mine at Aberfoyle Park around the reservoir. It is the holding basin initially for the desalination plant and it is very important that water quality is maintained, which this plant will help achieve.

I commend SA Water and the government for this project in my electorate, because I think about 55 per cent of Adelaide's drinking water comes from the Happy Valley reservoir. As I said, the water is ultimately sourced from Mount Bold and the River Murray, and now from the new desalination plant. This is a very important project to ensure that this particular nasty bug is kept out of the system and that Adelaide can maintain its high standard of quality drinking water.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:44): The opposition found both this project and the next one very interesting. We had two water treatment plant projects. Cryptosporidium is an issue that needs to be dealt with. We were most happy to discuss this matter in the hearing. We asked some additional questions. I am not quite sure where this cryptosporidium and other issues are going to end up, but we support the report and are happy to get on with it.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:45): I move:

That the 73rd report of the committee, entitled Eyre Peninsula Water Supply Interim Report: Under the Lens, be noted.

In October 2011, the Natural Resources Committee was approached by the member for Flinders, Mr Peter Treloar, to consider an inquiry into the Eyre Peninsula water supply. Water resources and supply have been major issues for the peninsula since European settlement, and certainly since 1900. In the member's own words, 'There is no other issue that creates the interest and passion on the Eyre Peninsula.'

After hearing the member's concerns and speaking with other interested parties, the committee determined to inquire into the matter and put the issues 'under the lens'. Problems with water management on Eyre Peninsula are compounded by the region's remoteness. The closer you get to Western Australia, the more residents seem to feel they have been forgotten by a state capital more focused on events in suburban Adelaide.

Our call for submissions elicited a huge response and a high number of submissions—in fact, 59 so far—and more than 25 requests to present in person to the committee. To put this into perspective, this was a greater response than our recent call for submissions for the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

The water resources of the peninsula—which the members heard was, in fact, better described as a cape, in morphological terms—are unique in South Australia. Nearly all naturally occurring water is found in fragile limestone lenses resting atop ancient bedrock. The lenses fill following major winter rainfall events like large contiguous underground storage tanks. Groundwater flows in a southerly direction, contributing to a network of wetlands, soaks and springs that support local ecosystems.

Much of this water—up to 10,700 megalitres per annum—is extracted for distribution to major population centres, including Port Lincoln, via South Australia's pipe network. A percentage of the available water is extracted by landholders for stock and domestic use. Some of the water eventually discharges directly from the aquifers to the sea.

The committee heard that extractions from previous decades have resulted in a number of aquifers becoming degraded thus compromising their ability to provide secure water supplies into

the future. As one would expect, the past extraction levels are considered unsustainable and significant efforts in expenditure on water resource planning have been undertaken. However, despite these efforts, many in the community remained convinced that future management of the resource looks set to be ineffective and are openly questioning the commitment of the government agencies to sustainable water resource management.

In addition to the concerns regarding levels of extraction, the committee also heard that mineral exploration and mining proposals threaten the integrity of the remaining intact aquifer systems, including Uley South lens—the main water supply aquifer to Port Lincoln. The committee was alarmed at the depth of divisions in the community regarding water resource management.

Historically, a number of water sources for Eyre Peninsula have been investigated. SA Water considered building desalination plants at Sleaford Bay and the Tod Reservoir and then opted to extend the Morgan Whyalla pipeline instead, further entrenching dependency on an already stretched Murray-Darling Basin.

Local councils, including Ceduna and Streaky Bay, have investigated and developed waste water and stormwater recycling and created suggestions for improving water resource management, including developing small-scale desalination plants and dams and tanks to capture surface water run-off. There has also been discussion of harvesting fresh water as it is discharged into the marine environment. This technology is untested in Australia but appears to warrant further investigation as the volumes of water lost in this way are potentially available for capture and use; these are significant.

While there is disagreement, there are also points of agreement. Most of the feedback, for example, the committee has received from stakeholders suggests a consensus that less water needs to be extracted from the limestone lenses to ensure their sustainability. The committee has made one recommendation in this interim report; that is, that the parliament fund the committee to engage an expert to provide valuable independent technical advice on the Eyre Peninsula water supply.

The committee looks forward to bringing to bear additional resources to facilitate a detailed analysis of the complex issues at play, including the considerable evidence already collected to ensure a thorough investigation. All up, we anticipate this inquiry will run for about 12 months. The committee's final fact-finding visit to Eyre Peninsula is scheduled for early November 2012. We look forward to receiving further evidence from interested parties and viewing a number of sites to enhance our understanding of these issues.

I commend the members of the committee: Mr Geoff Brock MP, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, Mrs Robyn Geraghty MP, Mr Lee Odenwalder MP, Mr Don Pegler MP, Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan MP, and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC, for their contributions. Finally, I would particularly like to commend the parliamentary staff for their assistance and note the fabulous work that has been done by David Trebilcock, our research officer, along with our executive officer, Patrick Dupont. I must say that one of the people who we have adopted on our committee is the member for Flinders, Mr Peter Treloar, who is also seen as part of our team. I commend this report to the house.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:52): I, too, commend the Natural Resources Committee and its members. I would particularly like to thank the Chair, the member for Ashford, for her work and dedication and her ability to manage this committee and the enthusiasm with which the committee has undertaken this inquiry. It is an issue that is very dear to my heart. It is an issue that is very dear to the hearts of many residents of Eyre Peninsula, and that has been highlighted today.

As the member for Ashford indicated, the committee has received more submissions on this particular topic than they did on the Murray-Darling Basin plan. I think that highlights the interest and enthusiasm of the residents of Eyre Peninsula with regard to this. I congratulate the committee on their interim report—it is a substantial report with some 60 pages in total, I believe—and also the dot-pointed executive summary and one recommendation.

The executive summary highlights the technical nature of some of the evidence that has been submitted and also the disparity and lack of agreement between some of the evidence that has been received. For that reason, I would absolutely endorse the recommendation of the committee to the parliament here in South Australia that we provide sufficient funding to allow the committee to engage a technical expert to provide independent advice on the Eyre Peninsula water supply.

I endorse wholeheartedly the recommendation. I encourage the parliament to see fit to support it. The reason is that the evidence is of a very technical nature. In fact, technical support would be valuable in finding a way through all of the evidence that has been presented, all of the disparity, and all of the knowledge gaps that have been highlighted by the various submissions, the most notable being the lack of understanding as to the interaction or otherwise of the underground lenses. I really believe that technical support would be available and of much value.

There will be no silver bullet. There will be no one solution to Eyre Peninsula's water resource issues but there is no doubt that demand will increase as population increases, industry expands and new industries come on board. We need to be prepared for that, we need to put ourselves into a position as a regional community that is relatively isolated from the rest of the state where we can go into the coming decades with some confidence. Once again, I absolutely endorse the interim report and recommendation. I also thank the committee for inviting me to be involved, as I have been along the way, and also for them taking the time to visit Eyre Peninsula and make site visits as well.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:55): I thank the committee for this report on the Eyre Peninsula water supply, which, as many members would remember, Liz Penfold was very passionate about, and our current member, Mr Treloar, is equally passionate about the need for water security on Eyre Peninsula. I will add one thing. Recently, I visited Eyre Peninsula and had some meetings with representatives from Centrex who are investigating the viability of their development for an iron ore deposit and the building of Spencer Port and so on. All of that is hopefully something that will be successful for the state. As part of the proposal they will look at a desalination plant. When I inquired as to whether there was any interest from SA Water in acquiring extra water that they may be able to produce, the answer was no, there was no interest.

SA Water has a privileged position in the state of being currently the monopoly regulator and operator. We have had legislation which allows new parties to come in and that has been referred to in your report and, hopefully, they will be able to get going. Over the years, a number of different infrastructure projects have come across my desk which I think have a future, but it is very disappointing as the shadow minister for infrastructure to find in a state, particularly in the driest part of a region which has a future particularly in mining, that we have the single biggest monopoly regulator saying 'No, we are not interested in any other water you can produce.'

I understand that there is a bit of variation in the science as to whether there needs to be new supplies discovered or developed before 2015, or whether it is more pressing. All I know is that every time I visit Eyre Peninsula it is a major issue. I thank the member for Flinders for raising this issue and the committee for considering it, but it seems to me that there is a monumental difference between what is required and what SA Water is prepared to alert themselves to in a priority list of what needs to be done. I urge the committee to continue to push this issue and ensure that that is followed through, and that SA Water understands the seriousness of this and does not keep putting its head in the sand.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bragg, when did you go to Eyre Peninsula?

Ms CHAPMAN: When?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, when?

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not know if I did say, but it was about two months ago.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You might want to get an update because the committee was out there last week and we were advised differently about Centrex and SA Water discussions.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, there you go. Hopefully it has advanced.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:58): I would like to thank the committee again for their input and also the staff. I take on board what the member for Flinders said. The member for Bragg might like to know that we also had the former member for Flinders as a witness to our committee and we also had contributions from the former member for Stuart, so this is an issue that has been around for a long time and our committee is quite dedicated to making sure that we come up with a sensible and technically correct and independent report.

Motion carried.

SURVEILLANCE DEVICES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 September 2012.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:00): I rise to speak on the Surveillance Devices Bill 2012, which was tabled by the Attorney-General just recently on 5 September. I will say that I am concerned at the expectation of the deliberation and passage of this bill by the government in listing it this week. If it were simply to review or add on to some of the legislation to support the COAG 2002 meetings on terrorism and multijurisdictional crime, of which there is one particular aspect, namely cross-border recognition of surveillance device warrants, then I would probably not have any great degree of criticism.

What is clear is that this bill is much more extensive. Indeed, the second reading explanation discloses that, while the bill amends the Listening and Surveillance Devices Act 1972 (and it has been more than 10 years since it has been revisited), significant developments in the electronic surveillance arena and the methods of intruding into privacy have occurred since then and so there needs to be some significant review of that. A much more comprehensive review has been undertaken with the follow-up of other issues that are quite independent, even though claimed to be consistent with the original intent of dealing with terrorism and multijurisdictional crime.

It concerns me that the government seems to take the view that this appears to be of no moment to them, that they want to press through these types of reviews without any significant consultation, and certainly to deprive the opposition and other members of this parliament of an opportunity to investigate the matter. Only yesterday, we were dealing with a bill that was drafted two years ago. When asked, 'Why did you drag the chain?' they say, 'Well, we want to give you an opportunity to consider these matters.'

Now, they have something drafted up, throw it to us and expect us to be able to deal with the matter in such a short time. In addition, the government chose to table the bill during the leave of the relevant policy officer and to have the briefing ultimately provided last Friday, when the police were not involved in the briefing and were not available, although they are the most significant agency that has been consulted and had apparently—according to the second reading explanation—sought the addition of a number of aspects for our consideration. It is brought on, we have no information really available from the single biggest contributor to the review, and we are expected to consider these matters in a vacuum, presumably with some expectation of support. Some of these may have some quite meritorious aspects. Let me identify, though, where that line is drawn.

In terms of the cross-border recognition of the surveillance device warrants, we already have law in this state recognising the use of surveillance device warrants, and this essentially is to give that recognition interstate. It is obviously up to other Australian jurisdictions to pass laws recognising our warrants for the purposes of the law in their state and this is nationally regarded as important. I do not think there will be any issue from the opposition on that: it is part of the National Organised Crime Response Plan.

However, that is where the line in the sand is drawn, for us. We then have, as disclosed in the second reading speech, a review of the act in consultation with the South Australian police and, as a result of that consultation, apparently, there are a number of other amendments. One is the power for urgent warrants to be issued. Under current law, an urgent warrant application is done by telephone or fax application to a Supreme Court judge at any time of the day or night. The Attorney in his second reading says, 'In practice, the Supreme Court rosters judges for this purpose,' and he says, 'No doubt, it is a nuisance for everyone.' The police have indicated this is a process that can take two hours, during which they claim nothing can be done.

In the absence of not one example of where there has been a prejudice to the proper investigation or prosecution of a particular case, nothing has been brought to us to justify the transfer of this responsibility, or the access to the warrants being issued by a senior police officer. Not one single example has been brought to us to satisfy us of that. No submission has been presented to us from the judiciary who say, 'This is no longer convenient to us.'

The Attorney suggests that it is a nuisance to everyone. Well, we have not heard from anyone who suggests it is a nuisance. In fact, we have Supreme Court judges who are paid to do a job and they are in a position independent of this parliament. They are not prosecuting or investigating parties—they are the judges—and they make decisions about whether a warrant issues. The issue of civil liberty, and the issue of protection of civil rights, is paramount. It is obviously why we have a separation of powers.

Yet, it puzzles me: I cannot understand why the Attorney-General should be so intent on bringing in a completely new regime of allowing senior police officers to issue urgent warrants when we have had no complaint from the judiciary who undertake this role. There is no suggestion that it is a nuisance to them. I do not know how often they are asked in the middle of the night to get out of bed in their pyjamas and go to the fax machine or pick up their iPhone, which I assume would be the immediate call from their associates to apprise them of the situation.

I just cannot understand how the government, the Attorney-General in this state, can come in, throw in a bill to tidy up some machinery matters and then go into a thorough examination of the Listening and Surveillance Devices Act 1972 and suggest that it now needs to have major areas of reform and we do not have any consultation. It is just bizarre, absolutely bizarre.

It is not the first time the government has tried to do it. We have had this under the guise of parole reform, where it seems that there is this great urgency for members of the police department to have this new role. So, we would want to be satisfied of a number of things before we consider that that would be an appropriate development.

Then we have the surveillance device (tracking) warrant. I do not know much about this. I have read what is in the second reading contribution. It may well be that we need to be able to provide for a new process with emergency authorisations for serious drug offences that need to be realigned with technology. Again, we do not have any other information on this. We then have restricting the circumstances when a listening device can be used to record a private conversation. I mean, where did that come from? Out of left field.

What about clarifying the impact of the bill on the ability of the private citizen to hold public authorities to account in being able to record conversations? We have a pretty clear law. It is a 1972 piece of legislation. It was reviewed 10 years ago. If the government were worried about legislation that is old, look at the Education Act 1972. There is a piece of 40-year-old legislation which government after government have promised to review and update and they still have not done it.

It is just extraordinary to me that suddenly there is an urgency that we need to be able to restrict the circumstances in which listening devices can be used. Let us have some examples, Mr Attorney, as to why it is necessary that we do this, what safeguards are in place and who on earth out there in the community has actually been asked about this as to the relevant stakeholders that I would have thought have a very significant involvement and want to have an involvement in this legislation.

Then, of course, we have remote applications. They, again, may be able to deal with instances where physical remoteness means that it is impractical to make a warrant application in person. We have had common-sense approaches to that type of difficulty for decades. I do not understand what the new problem is. In fact, with all the new technology we have, I cannot see why that cannot be improved. It may be that it is something that is being proposed in the bill that is adequate, but, again, we seem to have this whole process supplemented by regulation again, which we have not been privy to as to what should be happening.

These are not things that we just add in because it is convenient for someone or it is easier for different agencies. There has to be some justification that is presented to us here in the parliament as to why this should occur.

Then we have the specified persons warrant. This bill is to allow for a warrant to be brought for the surveillance of a specific person where he or she may be, instead of the usual warrant, allowing the surveillance of a particular place. Now, I note that the Attorney's second reading explanation refers to the judges of the Supreme Court having interpreted the current act so that all people authorised to exercise powers under the warrant are specified in the warrant.

Again, SA Police argues that the specification of SA Police personnel in the warrant poses potential security risks—risks of retribution from targets of the warrants—because of the intrusive nature of the work they perform. There has been extensive consultation with the previous chief justice on this issue. He agreed that an amendment to provide for a degree of anonymity was acceptable using a code on the warrant instead. The code name 'scheme' is in the bill. The holder of the key is not specific in the bill. It will be up to the court to determine how it will deal with the matter.

In one minute the Attorney seems to be quite happy for the court to be able to have some control over these issues and recognises—as the former chief justice had—that there may be a

level of anonymity that would be important in the specific person warrants, but we need to have some particulars about where this has come from and why it is necessary to suddenly tack this onto this area of reform.

Then we have this bill allowing for the use of surveillance material beyond criminal investigations to civil legislative remedies, that is, the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act. I do not remember any of this issue being raised in that legislation when we have reviewed it several times. Again, we just rely, I think, on one paragraph from the second reading explanation on that, which gives us no real understanding about why this is necessary.

Then, for the specific users the bill is to provide for a degree of anonymity on specified users of the warrants through the use of a code, and that is really a follow-on from the comments I just made about the former chief justice's apparent contribution in advising the Attorney on what should be done in that regard.

I repeat at this point that it is impossible for the opposition or any member of this house to be fully apprised of what the consequences are, even inadvertent, of presenting legislation as comprehensive as this, which is far beyond what the opening statement of the second reading explanation suggests, namely, to fit in with the expectations that were determined at the original COAG meeting back in 2002.

To follow on from that, this is a major review of a piece of legislation which impinges on the direct civil liabilities of people in South Australia. To try to sneak in the transfer of issue of urgent warrants from judges to police officers, I think, is reprehensible. The government cannot keep coming in here expecting us to jump into line without the police department being available to give us a briefing on the urgency or the need for these reforms. They are far reaching and we are entitled to investigate these matters. Even the second reading explanation suggests to us that, apart from the police and a conversation with a former chief justice, there appears to have been absolutely no consultation with anybody on these amendments.

I find it extraordinary that we are expected to debate this bill without the government even having debated it, let alone having an opportunity to consider these matters. So, at this point, we cannot consent to the bill. Obviously, it is going to go through the house but the indecent haste and the government's expectation of us to fall into line is concerning. Let me make this point: in the penultimate paragraph of the second reading explanation the Attorney-General states:

The Bill also incorporates necessary provisions to take into account the needs of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption.

Hello; we do not even have one yet. What are they? If they are legitimate and important aspects of whatever occurs with the ultimate appointment of an Independent Commissioner Against Corruption then we will look at them to accommodate that, of course we will, because members on this side of the house are very keen for the establishment of an ICAC, but it is still progressing through the parliament and whatever form is ultimately determined we will need to work with the government on any consequential amendments that are needed.

To expect us to line up with a bill suggesting that this is also to incorporate provisions to support the ICAC when we do not even have one, and there is no detail, even in this second reading explanation, as to what that is necessary for, is just extraordinary. That we are expected to both debate this bill and have any capacity to acquiesce, other than, as I say, the cross-border recognition, which probably should have happened some time ago, is something that I am not even sure has been advanced through other jurisdictions around the country. If it is to work it is one of those across-border recognition pieces of legislation which means that each of the jurisdictions need to come into the plan otherwise it is of little effect, but obviously that mutual recognition is important.

With those few words, I indicate that the opposition is still in the dark. We want to be able to have a briefing as soon as practicable with those who the government have relied on. The advice, particularly of SA Police, is the only one disclosed so far. We are happy to meet with the former chief justice, if he is available. He has given advice, apparently, on this matter. We would like the opportunity to consider other people with vested interests in this and their views as soon as we can and we will do that in between the houses.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:19): I always try to get excited about legislation before the house. I had difficulty getting excited with this one, until such time as I got down to recommendation No. 7, but I will get there in a minute. This bill was introduced to this house on

5 September by the Attorney-General, who is here. The bill addresses a range of issues, and we do not have a problem with a lot of this, except for the lack of detail. The first issue is the cross-border recognition of surveillance device warrants, which needs to be spelt out in a little bit more detail. I do not know whether that is deliberately lacking in detail or whether there might be a security reason for the minister to put a bland comment like that there.

Urgent warrant applications—I think a briefing may be the way to solve some of these issues. If the minister feels there is any breach of security by revealing information on the public record, just say so. Currently, urgent warrant applications need prior approval of a Supreme Court judge. The bill proposes that authorisation by a senior police officer be confirmed within two business days (up to four calendar days). I think that is okay, but should the rank of that senior police officer not be stated? Does that mean senior sergeant, or does it mean a commissioned officer? It does not say. You expect us to pass legislation that really is lacking in detail.

More information is required on surveillance device (tracking) warrants. 'Restricting the circumstances when a listening device can be used to record a private conversation,' yes, that is a big call. I am neither for nor against that, but I do want the detail. I am concerned, though, to clarify the impact of the bill on the ability of a private citizen to hold public authorities to account. I think 'remote applications' is a positive, and I have no difficulty with that because I have a reasonable idea of what it means.

As to 'specified person warrants', the bill allows for a warrant to be brought for the surveillance of a specific person, wherever he or she may be, instead of the usual warrant allowing the surveillance of a particular place. I sort of understand that but, again, I would like to have a briefing where that is discussed.

Recommendation No. 7 really got me excited and it is why I am standing in my place. It says 'allowing use of surveillance material beyond criminal investigations', and that is what we thought it was all for and 'to civil legislative remedies (e.g. criminal assets confiscation)'. That really is an off-target activity and I think it is taking it into an area that is outside the content of this bill. If that is necessary, the Attorney-General needs to tell us why because I think that is fraught with danger.

Recommendation No. 8 relates to 'other specified users'. The bill provides for a degree of anonymity on specifying users of warrants through the use of a code. I have no problem with that. I also understand from discussions I had briefly with the member for Bragg and the shadow attorney-general that the law bodies have not provided their reviews as yet. Can the Attorney-General tell us what is the hurry with this? We do not even have an opinion here. I am not a lawyer: I am the opposite end of this and looking at it from a layperson's point of view. I am staggered as to how we can deal with this when we do not have an opinion from the law officers.

We note this bill, and I absolutely agree with the member for Bragg that we cannot agree with the government at this time. We want more detail and certainly a briefing to fill in these gaps that are there. I do not think I have seen a position paper—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: While they have their discussion, I will finish mine. We certainly have some reaction, which is good. It is all good. We can fill in these gaps. I urge the government to postpone this legislation and bring it back. I cannot see any reason that we could not agree with this when all these queries are explained, maybe even with a minor amendment or two. I certainly support the member for Bragg and our position.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:24): I would just like to make a couple of remarks about this. We today have had a repetition of the usual conduct of the opposition. It is actually almost down pat now for every single bill. It starts off with a complaint about what happened at some moment in history. Sometimes it is a moment in the last century, sometimes we can be going back to Louis XV or something. That is usually the beginning and then we move on.

Mr Venning: John.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Hang on, I am just giving you the set pattern. It is sort of fill in the blanks. The next bit is to say, 'It snuck up on us. We did not know anything about it.' The next thing is to say, 'It is terrible,' but with no particularisation as to what is terrible. Some of these are

optional—add A or B or C, we did not get a briefing. What they do not add is they did not ask for a briefing because that might be a problem.

Ms Chapman: Excuse me?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Where were you last Friday?

Ms Chapman: We had a briefing on Friday from the police.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, you weren't there.

Ms Chapman: Stephen Wade was there. I wasn't available.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So, are you complaining now that you weren't available and that's our problem?

Ms Chapman: Well, it's so late; of course.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Oh, for God's sake—so late! Oh, it's so late! It's at the eleventh hour!

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I plead guilty—

Ms Chapman: Sneaky, underhanded—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I plead guilty to the following offences relating to time: first of all, I introduced this bill on 5 September which, by my reckoning—what is today? Is it the 19th?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The 19th. Would that be about six weeks ago? I plead guilty to having given them six weeks to read this. I plead guilty.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, two weeks. It doesn't matter. I plead guilty to two weeks. Secondly, we have not refused briefings to anybody: in fact, we offered them. As I understand it, Mr Wade and somebody else, not being the member for Bragg, received a briefing last week on Friday. If the member for Bragg could not be there, that is disappointing but never mind.

Anyway, I got distracted a bit. The interesting business about this is they then say that there are a lot of things wrong with this bill or, today, they have said, 'There are things wrong with it, but we do not know what they are,' which conjures up this sort of *X-Files* conspiracy theory, and, 'Between the houses, we will come up with some way of amending the legislation.'

Of course, this is what happens every single time. There is lots of huffing and puffing here. There are no amendments tabled in this house so that we can actually look at them and comment on them—never—because that would deny the savant in the other place an opportunity to be able to spring it on us at the last minute.

So, now we just have to sit back and wait. We do not know what their issues are—we have not got a clue. We just sit back and wait until, at a moment of his choosing, it is dropped in and, I can tell you, the moment of his choosing is usually just before the relevant matter is to come on. This thing has been on the agenda for the parliament. Nobody has been taken by surprise by this. That is a general sort of discussion about this. We do have a second reading speech which, hopefully, has been very informative.

Ms Chapman: Useless—absolutely useless.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you.

Ms Chapman: One-and-a-half pages—about as illuminating as a dead candle.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Schubert said that he would like a briefing. I do not recall the member for Schubert actually asking for a briefing but, if he did want one, I am happy to accommodate the member for Schubert. He can have a briefing. I am not sure if we can

accommodate you whilst you are painting the bridge. You might have to come down and come to a different place, but we can manage you.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Actually, the member for Torrens raises a good point. I am not accusing the member for Schubert of any improper purpose in his remarks here, but I am informed that there is a chance that, if he were to paint the bridge, that might be a criminal offence. It might be; I do not know because I am not a policeman. It might be that his concern about this bill gets back to the fact that there may be a device on the bridge which records his conduct; I do not know. Anyway, we will wait and see.

Let me deal with the things specifically that have been raised, because there have been very few, but the member for Schubert, to give him his dues, did raise specific issues. Can I just explain cross-border stuff in general terms. South Australia Police, Victoria Police and New South Wales Police, and so on, have people of mutual interest, and these people do not just stay here in Adelaide, or stay in Sydney, or stay in Mildura.

Now, here is the issue. What happens if the police in Mildura are watching some bloke who was doing the wrong thing—he is growing dope, or he is doing something else—and they want to work out what he is doing, and they put some surveillance device on his vehicle, or whatever? He then drives across to Renmark or he goes across to Wentworth. What is the standing of that tracking device in my hypothetical example? Does it mean that the recording of his movements in Wentworth, for instance, are illegal because the device was not obtained by reference to a New South Wales similar piece of legislation?

The cross-border issue is to basically say that if the New South Wales police have validly got an order to track some person and that person crosses the South Australian state border, we as the South Australian authorities say, 'Well, because you're going to recognise our orders when they cross into your state, we'll recognise your orders when they cross into ours.' All that means is that the police across borders have an opportunity to track these characters when they move around—simple as that. So, you can sleep at night; that is not a problem.

As for the rest of this, I do not think anybody in this room would be surprised to hear that communications and electronic equipment have changed substantially over recent years. It is not unreasonable in those circumstances for us to be looking at a piece of legislation, which is basically all around the regulation of electronic surveillance equipment, and to say that this legislation needs to be reviewed. There needs to be some consideration of whether it is contemporary. There needs to be some consideration as to whether the legislation actually, because of changes in technology, enables police and law enforcement officers to do, in a practical sense, what they have to do, or whether it is rooted in technology which is now obsolete.

Ms Bedford: Grounded.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Exactly; I beg your pardon—grounded in technology. There is nothing sinister or mysterious about this. This is an attempt to bring this legislation into contemporary times.

Ms Chapman: What's that got to do with urgent warrants? Explain the urgent warrants.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have been invited to explain urgent warrants. Urgent warrants—here's the thing. There are circumstances where police may be advised that a particular series of events is about to occur at some place, which involves criminal people, and they require, for operational reasons, to be able to get out there quickly and do what they have to do. If you want chapter and verse on this I think it is better it is not done in here, to be quite frank.

Ms Chapman: Well, give us the briefing with the police; that's what we've asked for.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Where were you last Friday, by the way?

Ms Chapman: They weren't there, they are not available.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Nor were you. Let us get back to it. Keep with me, it will be worth it in the end. For operational reasons, they require to be able to make a very quick decision about some sort of tracking of an individual. As I recall, and I am happy to be corrected (and I will be spoken to by wise counsel if I get this wrong), but my recollection is this: that even in those circumstances there is a provision for subsequent review by a court, and so the question is not whether a judge

gets to have a look at the application for the warrant, the question is whether that review of the application occurs ahead of the installation of the device.

The safeguard for the public is this: if, when the judge hears it, and there has been one of these emergency device placements, the judge says that it should not have happened, the material that is obtained from that device is not admissible because it is not granted the protection of the act because it was not obtained under the protection of the act. As to the word 'admissible', note that I am not an expert on admissibility in criminal cases, but it is certainly not protected information by reason of having complied with the scheme of the act—more or less.

I think it is important for people in the room to get the idea about who some of these characters are we are dealing with. SAPOL has relatively limited resources. They have better things to do than follow the member for Schubert around on the off chance he might start painting a bridge one day. They are not interested in that, unfortunately. That is not what they are focused on. Believe it or not, SAPOL think people involved—

Mr Venning: Can I quote you?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, you can. I am prepared to say that to the best of my knowledge you are not public enemy number one as far as SAPOL is concerned. I do not think that the commissioner has called a meeting of all his senior staff to make sure that you are apprehended when you approach that bridge. I do not believe that, but I do not know; I am not a confidante of the commissioner.

I think that the Commissioner of Police is looking for people who are causing serious trouble in our community—people who are dealing in drugs, people who are involved in organised crime, whether they have big beards or not, and people who do all sorts of things which really damage our community—that is what the commissioner is interested in. He is not interested in ordinary citizens going about their business lawfully. He does not have the time or the inclination or the interest. We could get very carried away about all these theoretical problems that come from this, but it has to be seen in the context of reality.

Between the houses—that magical, mystical place—we will arrange for the member for Bragg, the member for Schubert and any others of the merry band who wish to participate in the event to have a briefing. If you want SAPOL to be present at the briefing—

Ms Chapman: They are the only ones you talk to, apparently.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, they are the ones who do it. That is their job, so of course we talk to them.

Ms Chapman: You didn't consult with anyone else.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Who do you suggest I speak to about it—Don Corleone, so I can get the other point of view? Anyway, we are happy to talk to you folks, and I will do whatever I can to arrange for the police to be available and I am happy to allow you to discuss whatever you want to discuss with them and ask them whatever question you like. I am completely relaxed about it. Satisfy yourself as to what they are doing and ask them any question you like. I can tell you that officers of my department and SAPOL have been in discussions on this for 18 months at least, so there has been a great deal of time and effort spent in nutting out the detail of this legislation. It has not all been a matter of SAPOL sending us a wish list and we just tick yes, yes, yes. There has been a lot of discussion about this and a lot of effort put into it. Can I say in particular the effort of Matthew Goode in this has been extraordinary. He has been presented with a number of frustrations and difficulties, all of which he has overcome with great good humour.

I would urge people to have a good look at this. We will arrange appropriate briefings, but the member for Bragg throws up questions like, 'Who else have you talked to?' Well, the criminal community is going to find this unpleasant; I do not need to talk to them to work that out.

Ms Chapman: Why not?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can you give me their names and addresses and we will go and talk to them?

Ms Chapman: Try the Law Society—have you forgotten that they exist? Try the Bar Association. Try the civil liberties organisations.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Actually, what we have discovered is—

Ms Chapman: Try the judiciary.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The interesting thing is—and this is not what happened here; this is not why we are doing this, but it is an interesting thing. This is almost like an experiment. In this case, we have not sought extensive consultation with the Law Society or the Bar Association.

Ms Chapman: Or anybody.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I accept that. No doubt they will make comment about this, and that is fine. We will listen to them. We thought this time, 'Wouldn't it be novel for the opposition to come up with their own view about this?' What they normally do is outsource their view to the Law Society—except if the Law Society agrees with us, in which case they disagree with them. If the Law Society disagrees with us, then that becomes the opposition's point of view.

I understand the opposition's point of view. I do not have any fear of them conversing with the police about this—or anybody else for that matter. I think this legislation has received a great deal of attention. It modernises the situation in respect of a very mobile area of technological advancement and also dovetails very well into a national scheme. Let us not forget that.

This is one instance where the idea of the national scheme does have an important role to play, because, let's face it, policing around Australia should be as integrated as possible. A lot of the driver for this comes from attempts by police at a national level to create harmonious arrangements between jurisdictions, which is obviously in the interests of all of us. With those few words, I will conclude my remarks.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:43): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GRAFFITI CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's message.

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

That the disagreement to amendments Nos 2, 3, 5 to 7, 10 and 12 be insisted on and the alternative amendments to amendments Nos 1 and 4 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:46): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that a conference be granted to this house respecting certain amendments from the Legislative Council in the bill and that the Legislative Council be informed that, in the event of a conference being agreed to, this house will be represented at such conference by five managers and that the members for Torrens, Mitchell, Bragg and Morialta and the mover be managers of the conference on the part of the House of Assembly.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12:47 to 14:00]

NATIONAL HEALTH FUNDING POOL ADMINISTRATION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PROSPECT HOUSING DENSITY

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide): Presented a petition signed by 539 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to overturn any plans to create higher density living in the City of Prospect and oppose any rezoning for such development.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, I draw your attention to the Speaker's Gallery. There are three guests who were members of the Youth Parliament and who are guests of the member for Finniss. It is nice to see you back here, and you can see how we really operate.

Also, we have a group of students from Victor Harbor Primary School (years 3 to 7) who are also guests of the member for Finniss. He has had a busy day today. There are also some guests here from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, who are guests of the Attorney-General. It is lovely to see you hear today. I am sure they will all be extremely well behaved for you today.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Government Boards and Committees Information—Annual Report June 2012

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:04): I bring up the 14th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:05): I bring up the 460th report of the committee, entitled Queensbury Wastewater Pump Station Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr ODENWALDER: I bring up the 461st report of the committee, entitled Paralowie, Bolivar Road, Salisbury—Wastewater Trunk Main Rehabilitation.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

WORKCOVER

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Why did the government tell parliament, in 2008, in relation to the WorkCover scheme, that reducing workers' entitlements will enable a reduction in the unfunded liability and an improvement in return-to-work outcomes when the unfunded liability has now blown out to \$1.2 billion and return-to-work outcomes have not improved?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:06): The fact is we have seen an improvement in the underlying performance of WorkCover. The reasons for the deterioration—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, can you sit down. Thank you. Some order. We need to be able to hear the Treasurer. Thank you, Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The reasons for the deterioration in the unfunded liability are twofold. One is reduce earnings on assets which are affecting many funds, including the funds the state government is holding for unfunded superannuation liability. We have seen the effect of reduced earning on assets on that. It is also because of the reduction in the discount rate, which causes significant deterioration in these sorts of funds and their actuarial calculations. If you look behind the numbers and at the actual performance of WorkCover—the scheme—there has been an improvement in the scheme.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. What action is the government taking to support the construction sector?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:07): I thank the honourable member for her question. Yesterday, I was pleased to meet with a cross-section of representatives from the construction industry, including builders, contractors, unions, representatives from local government, together with my ministerial colleagues the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Housing, to discuss ways in which we could tackle the challenges the construction industry is currently facing. Dwelling approvals are currently at the lowest level in over a decade and we have also seen a substantial slump in construction starts.

The government has already taken action (in the last budget) to stimulate demand in the construction sector, including extending the first home owners boost for another year and granting stamp duty relief to purchasers of off-the-plan apartments in the city, Bowden and Park Terrace at Gilberton. We have also taken steps outside of the budget process to stimulate demand in this sector, reforming outdated city planning rules. I acknowledge the fine work of the Deputy Premier in piloting through probably one of the most significant changes in the planning regime in the City of Adelaide that we have seen. We have about \$1 billion of committed expenditure.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: 1.2.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: \$1.2 billion, indeed, off the back of those changes. We recently brought forward some much needed maintenance work in schools. We decided to shift some funding from the capital program into the maintenance program and bring it forward so that we could generate activity in the building trades. There is no doubt that there is more to be done, so yesterday, as I said, myself and my colleagues announced, together with the planning agencies, that we would put in place low-risk residential planning decisions that would have availability for private certification, speeding up application times and saving money. This is a move that has been long called for by much of the industry and, indeed, was called for in the lead-up to the round table by industry participants.

The changes will see private operators able to certify developments that comply with the residential code similar to the way private certifiers currently certify compliance with the building code requirements. While many jurisdictions have introduced private certification for other sorts of approvals, South Australia will lead the nation in providing private certification for planning applications.

Following the roundtable discussion, the government will consider a range of other measures to help stimulate demand in the building and construction sector. We will continue to consult with industry and the community about how we shape those reforms, and we will be working to provide the support the industry needs to meet its present challenges. All of those participants at the round table participated in a constructive fashion. They, unlike those opposite, understand the financial imperatives—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Stuart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Ninety-eight: the question was very specifically about the government's action, and straying from that should be considered debate.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Stuart. I am sure the Premier will return to the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I would be assisted by those opposite ceasing their interjections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —leader keeps chirping about stamp duty. The truth is that at the meeting there was a general understanding of the financial constraints that were facing the government. They understood that they needed to work within the existing fiscal envelope that the government provides, and that is what we were doing together. We were doing the hard work of actually working on detailed policy prescriptions, something that those opposite would be a stranger to. That is what we are trying to do: come up with real policies that advance a real issue, which is the present circumstances of the residential, in particular, construction industry in South Australia.

WORKCOVER

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is again to the Premier. Is it the case that WorkCover spends more on rehabilitation services than the Victorian scheme, which is three times the size, and yet achieves here worse return-to-work outcomes?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:12): We are addressing these issues, particularly with the change and the recent announcement that we made with regard to a WorkCover board, made with regard to the change in claims management, moving from one to two providers. We have also changed the nature of those contracts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have changed the nature of those contracts to put into those contracts the incentives and the drivers that we need in order to drive improved outcomes, particularly return-to-work—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —outcomes in the WorkCover scheme. It is not rocket science that you need to have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —best return-to-work outcomes. The best way to get a good outcome for an injured worker is to get them back to work as soon as possible. We are going about the business of making the reforms that we need to build on the reforms that were made in 2008. Reforms went through the parliament—it was either earlier this year or late last year—to change the employer payments scheme—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —to put the incentives in place to get better outcomes and to build the incentives in there for employers. We are making all of those reforms to make further improvements to the way our WorkCover scheme operates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy leader and the Leader of the Opposition, order!

ENERGY PROVIDERS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about what the government is doing to give South Australian households greater confidence when choosing an energy provider?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:14): Embarrassed laughs from those opposite as we take further measures to repair the devastation caused by the privatisation of ETSA.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, can you sit down until we get some quiet?

Mr Pederick: Just say, 'Thank you, Mitch.'

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, if I hear you again, you go out. Order! Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Energy prices are, of course, affecting many South Australian households and families, and they need to be given every advantage possible in managing their power bills and maintaining a competitive advantage in this newly competitive electricity and gas market. Consumers shouldn't feel as though they are being harassed in their own homes when trying to make important decisions about purchasing essential services such as gas or electricity. I have actually experienced this myself where, quite late at night, some young woman comes to the door and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: You might think it's funny, but I actually thought it was quite tragic. It was a rainy night and she came to the door and warned me that, unless we signed up to some arrangement, it would soon be cancelled. I thought, 'What on earth is this young girl doing out at this time of night doing door-to-door sales? What on earth are they doing warning people?'

It was designed, of course, to frighten people into making decisions, and some pensioners and people from non-English-speaking backgrounds often find themselves pressured into signing because they think that something bad will happen if, in fact, they don't sign up. I actually thought it was disturbing and I thought that she should be home and that it was not funny at all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, we are doing something about it. We are actually acting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We are acting rather than—

Mr Pisoni: Did you report it to the Employee Ombudsman?

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Rather than, like those opposite, making cheap stunts on the eve of an announcement they get some advanced notice we are making, we are doing something about it.

Consumers shouldn't feel pressured into this. In the last 12 months to July, the South Australian Energy Industry Ombudsman investigated more than 14,400 complaints—an increase of 42 per cent. Of these complaints, 17.3 per cent related to sales and marketing issues. In light of these statistics, we are going to act to ensure that consumers have the right amount of choice and that retailers and salespeople adhere to standards which will be nation-leading standards.

The government will be implementing reforms that will see the development of an industry code of practice that ensures that salespeople are adequately trained, accredited and supervised, and operators will either be forced to lift their standards or risk being fined or deregistered. We will also look at the prohibition of exit fees and the introduction of a mandatory offering of at least one exit fee contract.

The performance of the South Australian energy retail market 2010-11 report notes that there is a significant increase in customer switching between retailers but, with respect to exit fees, consumers have to pay exit fees to be released from an energy contract and, of course, that locks them in. It is something that we think consumers should have an adequate choice about.

We will be engaging with the industry. We believe that this code should be mandatory. We believe that there should be penalties, but we will be consulting with industry to ensure that they

give us their feedback. I understand the opposition, from this morning, are supportive of these initiatives, so we look forward to their support when we promote them in the parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will stop talking to each other across the chamber. The member for Unley.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:18): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I certainly hope the Premier is reporting the conduct of that electrical retailer to consumer and business affairs.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, this is not an opportunity to make a comment.

Mr PISONI: My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Why has South Australia for the second year running failed to meet the national average of NAPLAN scores in all 20 testing categories?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:19): I am very happy to answer this question and report that the vast majority of South Australian students continue to achieve at or above the minimum standards in all areas, with over 90 per cent of students achieving at or above this benchmark. In fact, this year's NAPLAN results have shown significant improvements in years 3 and 5 spelling and year 7 grammar and punctuation, while our years 7 and 9 means are much closer to the national mean, which indicates a catch-up effect in our later years' results. In fact, our results for this year demonstrate that we have stayed the same or made improvements in 12 out of 20 categories. Can we stop for a moment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —to contemplate the prospect of future NAPLAN testing with 25,000 fewer public sector workers?

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (14:21): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer tell the house about the latest Liberal submission to the GST Distribution Review?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:21): The four Liberal states of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia have lodged a joint submission with the GST Distribution Review Panel that proposes a new method to distribute GST grants and a change to the definition of horizontal fiscal equalisation. The Liberal submission recommends a—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Very well. I think we'll find that the panel is receptive to the arguments which I have put to them. The Liberals' submission recommends a population—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: the Treasurer is debating a hypothetical issue.

The SPEAKER: I must admit I had some concerns about that question. I do not think he is debating it. However, I will listen to the Treasurer for a few more minutes, and then I will decide if it is not appropriate.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Liberal submission recommends a population-based distribution system for GST grants with a long-term goal of equal per capita distribution. No wonder those opposite do not want—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: I raise it again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I can't hear you; just a moment.

Mr PENGILLY: The Treasurer is clearly debating something that is in the federal realm and has got absolutely nothing to do with this state parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Of course, it is GST revenue that we depend on in this in state, so I think it is relevant.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I think it might have a little bit to do with the state, Madam Speaker, despite those opposite being in denial. The position of the big four Liberal governments is that the commonwealth would take responsibility for funding the additional financial assistance required for states like South Australia that have lower fiscal capacity. The equalising amount above equal per capita in 2012-13 GST distribution is around \$4 billion. In the long run, this would see the four larger Liberal states better off by \$4 billion, while at the same time, under the Liberals' proposal, the commonwealth would be required to provide significant additional funding to smaller states like South Australia. This is unlikely to occur, and even if it did there would be a significant risk that the funding would not be maintained over time. The Liberal proposal undermines horizontal fiscal equalisation.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: for the third time, the Treasurer is debating the issue. This is the party that did not want the GST.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not sure how you can say he is debating it. I was concerned about the wording of the question; however, Treasurer, I ask you to wind up.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Liberal proposal undermines horizontal fiscal equalisation, and South Australia will not support it. To undermine HFE is to begin to unravel the federation of Australian states as we know it today. Any proposal to increase commonwealth funding to the states should be consistent with the current equalisation framework, and Liberal governments should not be seeking to undermine it.

The SPEAKER: Thank you Treasurer, I think you have made your point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will discuss that question with you afterwards.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Why have South Australian NAPLAN results gone backwards in half of all NAPLAN categories since the first NAPLAN test in 2008?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:25): Well, I simply don't accept the premise of the question, because—

Mr Pisoni: Is it wrong? Are you saying it's wrong?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I simply don't accept the premise of the question. What—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Well, you do have a history of getting it wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order, the Treasurer!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: And I reiterate that our results for this year in fact demonstrated that in 12 out of the 20 categories we stayed the same—our results are stable—or

we improved. But I would like to add this, and it is a quote from Mr Gonski's report, which I think puts NAPLAN in an appropriate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Thank you Madam Speaker. This is what Mr Gonski says:

While the quality of a schooling system—

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr PISONI: My question was clearly asking why we fell behind in 10 out of 20 categories—

The SPEAKER: Thank you. We know what your question was.

Mr PISONI: —since the first NAPLAN results in 2008.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr PISONI: It has nothing to do with David Gonski.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The minister can answer the question as she chooses and if she considers that that is relevant to the question then we will listen and see what she has to say.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: This is what Mr Gonski says:

While the quality of a schooling system is often measured by outcomes and standardised assessments, things like PISA, TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) and NAPLAN, or by senior secondary school completion rates, the panel recognises that education is about much more than this. In Australia, schools aim to promote the intellectual, physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual, aesthetic and wellbeing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —of young people as well as ensure the nation's ongoing economic prosperity and social cohesion. Many parents consider that, while providing outstanding education must be the key focus of schools, the ability of a school to foster these broader outcomes is also important.

We are absolutely committed to ensuring that every—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Standing order 98: whilst this is all very interesting on what Professor Gonski has said, it has nothing to do with the question, which was asking for an explanation why our NAPLAN results have been going consistently backwards ever since NAPLAN was introduced.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold that point of order. Minister.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: It goes directly to the heart of what we are doing in schools. We aspire for every student in every school in our community, and let us remember that NAPLAN is a measure for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —the entire three sectors.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: We aspire for every student in our community to be the very best that they can be. That is why I have asked my agency months ago—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! If your point of order is relevance again.

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, Madam Speaker, we are asking about outcomes that are actually happening. We are not asking about the minister's aspirations. The minister is full of aspirations—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr WILLIAMS: —but she is very short on achieving outcomes.

The SPEAKER: We don't need a speech from you, member for MacKillop. Minister, I would ask you to wind your answer up.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DISABLED STUDENTS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:29): Supplementary, Madam Speaker. The minister preferred in her answer to talk about how Professor Gonski was supporting the idea of support for every school and every student in every school. My question is—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: My point of order is that if the member seeks to explain a question he should seek the leave of the chamber, not launch into a speech on his question.

Mr GARDNER: This is supplementary to the answer just given, and I'd finished that. My question is—

The SPEAKER: But you do that after the question, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: My question is: can the minister explain why the Gonski review criticised—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GARDNER: —the South Australian government for coming dead last in support for students with a disability.

The SPEAKER: That is a separate question. Minister, do you want to answer that question?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:30): In fact, we are very proud in South Australia that our definition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Our definition of what we consider to be disability is incredibly broad, so broad that it actually brings in many more students than other states do, but the notion of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: This notion of supporting students with disabilities is something that goes to the very heart of the Gonski reforms and we support this. In South Australia, as I said, our definition of supporting students with disabilities is much broader than most other states, which means that we support—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —we support many more students, and we are very proud of that—not to mention our efforts in the NDIS, something we are very proud of.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Can the minister inform the house about a new discussion paper designed to seek feedback on ideas to improve motorcycle safety?

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) (14:30): Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I thank the member for Mitchell for his question and I acknowledge his commitment to improving road safety. In fact, he was one of a few members of parliament who provided feedback on the recent graduated licensing scheme discussion paper and involved many people in his electorate in formulating his submission to us.

Today I am releasing another new discussion paper and this one outlines six proposed licensing changes for motorbike riders that, if introduced, will, I believe, have a positive impact on road safety and help reduce trauma on our roads. Copies are being sent to over 50 key organisations here in South Australia and I am keen to receive their advice on the proposals that have been developed before we take the next step of regulatory and legislative change. The proposals out for discussion include:

- whether a car licence should be held for at least 12 months before a person is eligible to apply for a motorcycle learner's permit. This gives a novice motorcycle rider the opportunity to have practical on-road experience, experience in varied traffic and road conditions in the relative safety of an enclosed vehicle, before hitting our roads on a motorcycle;
- the introduction of a compulsory six-month period between the basic and advanced rider safe motorcycle training courses;
- requiring all licence holders endorsed with R-date to have zero blood alcohol concentration while riding a motorcycle, which would bring them in line with L and P-plate drivers in South Australia;
- introducing specific licensing and training requirements for riders of mopeds; currently anyone with a driver's licence can hop on a scooter and drive on our roads;
- banning riders with a class R-date licence endorsement (including riders of mopeds or scooters) from carrying a pillion passenger. Riding a motorbike is risky enough without having someone on the back of your bike when you lack experience. From 2007 to 2011, nine pillion passengers on average have been killed or seriously injured each year on our roads; and
- exploring options for a motorcycle safety fund dedicated to motorcycling safety initiatives to address the high and disproportionate risks they face.

The Motorcycle Riders Association of South Australia has publicly welcomed the opportunity for its members to have input into these proposals and the director of the Centre for Automotive Safety Research backed the proposals, saying they were supported by research, experience in other states, and expert opinion. I stress, however, that these are only proposals at this stage. Considerable weight will be given to the feedback we receive before any reforms to be introduced to parliament are finalised.

With 174 motorbike riders killed and 1,649 seriously injured in the last decade, it is clear we have a real challenge in reducing these unacceptable figures. Last year alone, 21 motorcyclists died from a road toll of 103 people. In fact, the risk of a motorbike rider being killed in a crash is almost 30 times higher than for a car driver. It is imperative that we take action and I would encourage anyone with an interest to provide their feedback during the next eight-week period.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:34): My question is for the Minister for Education and Child Development. Why have NAPLAN results for year 9 students, who will next year start the new SACE, gone backwards in reading, writing and spelling since the first NAPLAN test for year 9 students in 2008?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:35): When I say that I aspire for our students to be the very best, I am acknowledging that there is room for improvement. There is absolutely—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: No, our results are steady.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Our results are steady, and I—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kavel, order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: But I have asked my department, a number of months ago, to come back to me with a revised comprehensive plan for literacy and numeracy in our schools. NAPLAN is one of the tools in our tool kit. I think that plan is a very good idea because it has focused not only South Australia but all the states, all the territories and the commonwealth on our literacy and numeracy efforts in our schools, and I think this is a very good thing.

I am not going to use NAPLAN to bag our teachers, to have a go at the outstanding work that our principals and teachers do—and they do outstanding work. I am going to use NAPLAN—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I am going to use NAPLAN to assist our students to do better, and that is a very good thing.

PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister inform the house about the performance of South Australian athletes at the 2012 London Paralympic Games?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:37): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge the outstanding efforts of our South Australian athletes at the 2012 London Paralympic Games. The world has just witnessed possibly the most successful ever Paralympic Games in London, and they are to be congratulated on that. I think they were just about sold out.

This success is not only in terms of athlete performances but also the enhanced profile and exposure of the games themselves and the inspirational stories of triumph and achievement by the athletes. The media exposure and public awareness-raising, notably here in Australia, and certainly in Great Britain, has provided great impetus and support for people with a disability, as well as increased understanding and respect from the broader community. It really was a privilege to witness this transformation of the Paralympic Games into one of the largest sporting events in the world.

Out of a total of 161 athletes in the Australian Paralympic team, South Australia had 14 representatives across six sports. Australia placed equal fourth with Ukraine on the gold medal count, with 32 gold, and we were fifth on the overall medal tally, with a total of 85 medals won: including the 32 gold, there were 23 silver and 30 bronze medals. South Australian athletes contributed 11 of those medals to the tally—seven gold, two silver and two bronze—and they were achieved across 11 events.

South Australia's most successful competitor at the London Paralympics was the phenomenal Matthew Cowdrey, winning a total of eight medals—five gold, two silver and one bronze. Matthew's performances in London also saw him become Australia's greatest-ever Paralympian, surpassing Tim Sullivan's 10 athletics gold medals. By the end of the competition, he had extended this lead by winning his 13th gold medal out of 23 career Paralympic medals (more than 50 per cent of the medals he wins are gold).

Matthew made further Paralympic history during his 200-metre individual medley triumph, becoming the first Australian athlete to win the same event at three consecutive Paralympic Games (Athens, Beijing and London), and he also broke the world record in the men's 50-metre freestyle, set a Paralympic record in the men's 4 x 100 metre freestyle relay and an Oceania record in the men's 100-metre breast stroke.

As at the Olympics, the velodrome was once again a venue to witness South Australian success, with Kieran Modra winning a gold medal and setting a world record in the men's tandem individual pursuit with pilot Scott McPhee. London was Kieran's seventh games, having competed in three different sports (athletics, swimming and cycling) during his Paralympic career. However, to make the London Paralympic Games, let alone win gold, is an amazing achievement, having come back from a severe accident late in 2011 that resulted in three broken vertebrae.

There was further South Australian success in track cycling with Felicity Johnson and pilot Stephanie Morton winning gold in the women's individual one kilometre tandem time trial, and setting a new Paralympic record in the process. Paralympic debutant wheelchair athlete Nathan Arkley won a bronze medal in the men's 4 x 400 relay (T53-54). He also competed in the men's marathon finishing 17th out of 32 athletes. These are great results for the 17 year old who must be considered a great prospect for Rio.

Gabriel Cole, Katy Parrish and Michael Roeger in athletics, Grace Bowman in equestrian, swimmers Jay Dohnt and Esther Overton, and goalball team member Rachel Henderson all performed admirably on the world stage in London.

I would also like to make special mention of shooter Libby Kosmala who retired from Paralympic competition in London having represented Australia and South Australia at an amazing 11 Paralympic Games. The oldest Australian team member at 70, Libby made the final of the women's 10 metre air rifle standing event to finish eighth overall and placed 24th overall in the mixed 10 metre air rifle prone event. It was a great privilege when I was younger to be instructed in shooting by Libby Kosmala.

The assistance provided by the South Australian Sports Institute and relevant sporting organisations, as well as the family, friends and supporters who helped these athletes reach their goals and fulfil their dreams, is also acknowledged and appreciated. South Australians can be proud of the performances of all 14 of our athletes and coaches representing Australia at the 2012 London Paralympic Games, and we look forward to welcoming them home on 26 September (next Wednesday) at the Welcome Home Civic Reception.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Why did South Australia perform worse in all the states in the following NAPLAN categories: year 3 persuasive writing, year 3 grammar and punctuation, year 3 numeracy, year 5 grammar and punctuation, and year 5 numeracy?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:41): I thank the member for this question, but I ask the member: what is their plan? Where does this get us?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Where does this get us?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order. If the minister can't do the job, she can stand aside.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. There is no point of order. Sit down. Minister, I refer you back to the question.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Because, in addition to the answers that I gave earlier, at the very heart of my aspirations for every student in our state are the Gonski reforms. Key to lifting our performance in our NAPLAN results is Mr Gonski and what he proposes: lifting teacher quality, more power for principals, more information for parents.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: It was me last week who reported that I had said to my department that I want us to relook very fundamentally at our literacy and numeracy strategy, not just because of NAPLAN but because literacy and numeracy are so important—they are such foundation skills—in addition to the many other fantastic things that go on in our schools. But it is me who said at least a day before the opposition spokesperson got off the blocks that I want our students to do better, and we will because it is not our intention to cut 25,000 public sector jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ashford.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:43): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Minister, how are South Australian hospital emergency departments performing?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:44): I thank the member for her question. I am very pleased to report that collectively South Australia's public hospitals have improved in all areas of emergency department performance between 2010-11 and 2011-12.

At the last election we committed \$111 million to be spent over four years to improve performance in our emergency departments to make sure that every patient was able to get care as quickly as possible. I am pleased to advise the house that the growth in emergency department presentations was only 0.3 per cent between 2010-11 and 2011-12 and there has been an average of only 2 per cent growth between 2006-07 and 2010-11, which is the lowest growth rate in the nation.

When you take into account that we have the oldest population, people should understand that that is a huge achievement. Before our state Health Care Plan was introduced we were tracking at about 5 per cent per annum growth in the emergency department. So, by putting extra resources into the community and having extra systems in place we have been able to reduce the growth.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am pleased that the member for Bragg is interjecting. I assume that is in anticipation of taking over again as the shadow health minister once changes are made at the other end of the front bench. Despite this small amount of extra activity, the median waiting time in our emergency departments is now 15 minutes. That is down from 20 minutes in 2010-11. So, 50 per cent of patients are seen within 15 minutes. As we have hundreds of thousands of patients who go to our emergency departments that is a great tribute to the people who work in those departments. In fact, waiting times have steadily fallen since 2007-08, when national performance across the board has stayed relatively constant.

Seventy-six per cent of patients were seen on time by a doctor and nurse in 2011-12. That is five percentage points better than the previous year. In relation to our four-hour target—that is, the target to have 90 per cent of patients seen, treated and admitted or discharged within four hours—we are at 66 per cent as of June of this year for the calendar year 2012. We are well on our way to achieving the national target of 67 per cent by the end of 2012. We announced this target during the last election campaign. Subsequent to that, the commonwealth—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: She never stops, Madam Speaker; she just never stops.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I know she would like to get up on her feet to ask questions about health, and I would invite her to do so.

Mr PISONI: I rise on a point of order. Members are to be addressed by their constituencies.

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear what the minister said, but there is no point of order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member for Unley is so quick to take offence. I say that the member for Bragg would love to be asking questions on health. It was cruelly taken away from her

and one hopes that in the future she may get it back. I did enjoy having the member for Bragg as the shadow minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have enjoyed all five shadow ministers I have faced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I refer you back to the question, please.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Indeed, Madam Speaker, if they did not interject I would not be distracted.

The SPEAKER: That is it. If you go across interjections you will get a response.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order. Was the minister then just arguing with you?

The SPEAKER: No, he was not. Thank you. Sit down.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: One could forgive the deputy leader for not understanding what an argument sounds like, but that was not an argument. Can I say that we embraced this target at the last state election. Subsequently, the commonwealth and all of the states have embraced it, so we have now adapted our target to be the same as the national one. We are well on our way to achieving 90 per cent of patients being seen, treated and admitted or discharged within four hours by the end of 2015. These results reflect the performance of our emergency departments 365 days of the year, as opposed to the gimmicky survey of last week which was conducted at 10 o'clock on Monday 3 September, where the results from our state were lumped in with the results of that of the Northern Territory and the ACT.

It is interesting to point out that the person who was responsible for the survey actually works in the emergency department, or is associated with the emergency department, of the ACT, which is a poorly performing hospital compared to our hospitals. Nonetheless, he lumped his results in with ours and then made some claims about our system based on one survey taken at 10 o'clock on a Monday morning. It is like taking the temperature in all of our cities, including Canberra, Darwin and Adelaide, and then making judgements about the weather here compared to the rest of Australia. Some of our improvements across the 2011-12 year have been assisted by the inclusion of country hospitals, which brings our reporting into line with other states and territories.

The SPEAKER: Minister, your time has well and truly expired.

MOUNT LOFTY RANGES RESERVOIRS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Water and the River Murray. Why were water levels in the Mount Lofty Ranges reservoirs deliberately lowered during the year, and is it the case that reservoir levels have been kept deliberately low to justify the use of the desalination plant? SA Water figures show that the 10 reservoirs have been consistently holding approximately 20 per cent less water than at corresponding times during the previous year, despite heavier winter rains than in that previous year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That question was somewhat out of order because it had imputations in it but, minister, I think you should respond to it.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:50): The answer is no and no.

TEACHERS' CONFERENCE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Education—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader, order!

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Environment, order, or you will go too; you will both go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, order! Member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about the forthcoming inaugural South Australian teachers' conference in Adelaide and how this will assist teachers in their day-to-day classroom teaching practice?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:50): I would like to thank the member for Florey for this very important question. The intention to directly involve teachers in helping to shape this important conference was flagged by an education policy discussion paper that was made available—and released, in fact—last year by the now Premier. In that discussion paper there were a number of matters raised; a number of practical ways that we as an entire community might better recognise, respect and value the role of our teachers. Those aspirations are important, because the research tells all of us that it is quality of teaching that is the biggest single factor that determines how well a student does.

I am delighted to report that around 400 of our teachers from across the state will take part in this conference on Monday to share their ideas and practical experiences. I am very pleased to report that the discussions will focus on a professional development resource for teachers called the TfEL program, that is the Teaching for Effective Learning framework. It is this sort of support of professional development that assists our teachers—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: This is an internationally-recognised program that is being ridiculed by members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: That's why we must respect and support our teachers to do their work, as opposed to having them live in fear of losing their jobs—kind of New South Wales and Queensland style. In fact—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Gee, I wonder why. It was the New South Wales government, that those opposite would have us emulate, that just recently announced a cut of \$1.7 billion to their budget, and we now know that those opposite intend to do exactly the same thing.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: the question was very clearly asking the minister to inform the house about the conference and nothing else, so the minister is debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the minister is talking about the general subject matter then it is relevant.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: In closing, I am very pleased to report that this conference is a fantastic opportunity for our teachers to work together to examine the fundamentals of effective teaching, because that is key here, and the way teachers can inspire and spark creativity and innovation in the classroom. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many teachers, leaders, researchers and student support officers who day in and day out do a fantastic job in supporting our students.

OAKLANDS PARK RAIL OVERPASS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. I am going to reassure: I am not leaving you, Patrick. Will plans to upgrade the

Oaklands Park rail crossing receive the same fate as the government's upgrade plans for the Britannia roundabout, the South Road/Port Road intersection, the South Road/Grange Road intersection and the South Road/Sturt Road intersection, all of which have been announced by Labor and cancelled?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:54): With great pleasure I will talk about those matters, because we are proud of this—

Mr Williams: Of the cancellations.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That's the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the man that takes points of order all the time—a stickler for standing orders—who can't stop interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I'm fond of him. I am fond of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I don't want to get too fond.

The SPEAKER: Minister, back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They tend to die in your arms.

The SPEAKER: Minister, will you answer the question?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We are extremely proud of our infrastructure program—the greatest infrastructure program in this state since World War II. Already spent on the north-south corridor—the very subject matter raised—has been, of course, the outstanding Gallipoli Underpass, the lifting of the tramline over South Road down there and, currently, the construction of the most expensive construction project in this state's history in the South Road superway. What we have done is committed to creating—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, that's on South Road as well, I inform the member for Unley, who has broken off his communications with the Scientologists to make a point.

The SPEAKER: Order, minister!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Thank you, member for Unley. We hope he is not getting any more emails from them.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you will get back to the question or you will leave the chamber!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sorry, Madam Speaker, for responding to those terribly rude interjections.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr PISONI: I think the transport minister needs to clean his ear out. I have been sitting here not saying a word.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr PISONI: I've been listening to what he has to say.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, there is no point of order there.

Mr PISONI: I think he's past it.

The SPEAKER: Sit down.

Mr PISONI: He's past it.

The SPEAKER: Sit down. Minister.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The truth is that, as to what is purported by the member for Bragg to have been cancelled on the South Road, we in fact put, for the first time, the north-south corridor on the agenda and we funded it. What we did—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, we remember the projects they did in opposition, as they interject again. We remember that Laurie Brereton gave them \$100 million to build a tunnel and they had a black-tie party inside it, because it's the only thing they built—apart from, of course, a one-way expressway which, of course, we are fixing too.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: The minister is debating the issue: he is not answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! He is responding to interjections that are coming across the floor. Minister, back to the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I apologise. What occurred is we put the north-south corridor on the agenda. We committed funding to it and, as a result, we shamed John Howard into committing funding to it and, when he lost, we got funding from the federal government. From that, we took \$70 million to do the most comprehensive planning study on that road and, as a result of that planning study, moved to a project of \$800 million—much bigger than the one she refers to and which, I point out, is responsible for maintaining a great level of employment in the construction industry in South Australia.

It is true that we cancelled the Britannia roundabout; that is because I sent an engineer out with a camera to photograph the trees. I visited them myself and I believed that it was an unnecessary wreckage of our Parklands and our boulevard into the city. I stand by it and, if I had to do it again, I would do it again because those trees were magnificent. I invite anyone who is interested to go and have a look at them. They should never have been cut down. We remain—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We remain committed to looking for a program on Britannia roundabout that addresses the issues there, but it won't be at the expense of this magnificent corridor of trees in the Parklands.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What about the trees? That is the thing: they don't know the difference. We are planting more trees than the arborists employed by the council have suggested—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —we take away. We are planting more trees.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is this a point of order?

Mr WILLIAMS: Thankfully, Madam Speaker, four minutes has expired.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The minister's time has expired, exactly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I don't know what it is about you, Minister for Transport, but the noise you create in this chamber is incredible. I hope you don't have the same problem with your children. The member for Taylor.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister inform the house whether the state government intends to reduce the number of South Australian police officers serving our community?

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) (15:00): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. I think it is a fair question to ask. I can be very clear that my answer is: absolutely not. Not only do I not have any intention of cutting police numbers, but—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order?

Mr WILLIAMS: I think the minister has answered the question. She can now sit down.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for MacKillop. Minister, I am sure you have more to add.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I do, Madam Speaker, I do.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Last Wednesday, I joined our new commissioner and the member for Morphett to welcome 27 new probationary constables to SAPOL. This government has committed to providing 313 additional sworn police officers to the ranks of our South Australian police force by 2015-16, and this is on top of the 700 extra police already working our streets and 200 additional civilian staff who provide important support. South Australia has had the highest rate of operational police of any state for five years in a row and, as I have said, their ranks are continuing to grow. It was a fair question the member for Taylor asked for a couple of reasons. When the Liberals were elected in 1993 police numbers went down and crime skyrocketed by about 1,000 offences per week—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister is now clearly debating the answer to the question. As I said, she answered the question with a no, the first word she gave, and the rest is irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. We don't need a speech from you. Minister, continue with your answer.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Speaker—200 more victims of crime every week, 200 more victims traumatised than is the case now. We increased police numbers, and despite our population growth of about 8 per cent, victim-reported crime has plummeted by 37 per cent to the end of 2010-11. I expect that to continue, and I know our community wants that to continue, but it is clear that our state Liberals are studying the play books of their colleagues in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister is clearly—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Minister, point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister is clearly debating. She was asked a very simple question: did the government intend to cut police numbers?

The SPEAKER: Thank you; we know the question. We have heard it three times now. Minister, I would ask you to wind up your answer.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: If those states really are the trial sites for mass reductions here in South Australia, Campbell Newman's slashing of public servants is likely to be a case of just—

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —dipping their toes in the water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We don't need another point of order. I have asked the minister to finish her answer. The member for Bragg.

OAKLANDS PARK RAIL OVERPASS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:03): My question again is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. I thank him for his previous answer and commitment to the Oaklands road-rail project. What part of the unfunded \$100 million Oaklands rail crossing upgrade will be for the station, to replace the \$6.8 million station that you will have to knock down, and to replace the electrification infrastructure that you will have to tear down to do it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:03): It is very interesting. I note the explanation to the question, where I have committed to do this, apparently. Well, for the benefit of the member for Bragg, what was—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Oh, so you're still here? I thought we did a condolence motion for you. The story in the paper, the comments that have been made today, even the member for Bragg's own explanation, was that it is a piece of planning that is unfunded at present. As it is unfunded, therefore—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: When you're done; I've got plenty of time. The member for Bragg knows full well that what has been released is the—

Ms Chapman: Aspiration.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, if the member for Bragg knows the answer, which I'm sure she does, because she knows the answer to everything—she is certainly a Renaissance member, a polymath of the highest order. She certainly knows everything about every subject—

The SPEAKER: Minister!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —I don't know why she bothers with the question.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you will answer the question, not give personal reference to the member for Bragg.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Norwood has woken up too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Nothing reassures me more about our future than knowing he's the future of them.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, ma'am: relevance.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Minister have you finished your answer? Could you wind it up quickly please.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The simple fact is that it is the engineer's plans for the proper solution—unfunded at present—for that intersection, so it is very hard for me to tell you what will be torn up, put down or moved as it is not funded and has no timetable at present.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:05): My question is to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: —the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister inform the house about the work undertaken by public servants in the Office of the Chief Information Officer?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the member for Torrens for the question. It is a timely question because there have been public statements recently by the Leader of the Opposition that reflect on the value or otherwise of so-called backroom public servants. As Minister for the Public Sector I am concerned about this commentary and the potential adverse impact it has on workforce morale and community perceptions. While we acknowledge and appreciate the valuable work of doctors, nurses, police, teachers and so forth, it is important to recognise the Public Service is also made up of tens of thousand of dedicated, hardworking individuals who all make a significant contribution to South Australia.

In my portfolio, I have an equal appreciation for those working in back offices at RevenueSA and Shared Services, for example, as I do for front counter staff at Service SA. It was therefore disappointing to hear the Leader of the Opposition say last Friday on ABC radio, and I quote:

Public service numbers in this state are to my mind heavier in bureaucrats rather than front-line services.

Such talk damages morale and recruitment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You will listen to the minister's answer.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: This government has maintained and extended front-line services. We make no apology for that. But it is simplistic to say that important functions of government can operate without so-called bureaucrats. Last week I visited the Office of the Chief Information Officer, where approximately 140 people are employed. The OCIO handles much of ICT planning, development and implementation across government.

The office manages the Central Data Network which supports agency access to shared resources including email and the internet, also the public sector's telephone network and the state's ICT infrastructure. Most of these individuals we will not meet during our working day but you will meet them when you drop your kids off at school, you will meet them in supermarkets and on sporting fields. They may be backroom public servants but front-line services would not function without them. Our community and the state's economy would suffer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: —if these people were not employed in these essential jobs. I am proud—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport, order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: —of the public servants who work in my portfolios whether it is on the front line, the centre-line or the back line. They are all valued members of the public sector team, and I know all of my parliamentary colleagues on this side of the house also have a similar pride in the South Australian public sector. This begs the question: what is the basis of the negativity that sits so deeply embedded in the ranks of the opposition?

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Question time has finished.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is a pity. I did want to ask the minister why his Premier said last Friday that we had too many public servants and they are cutting them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will members leave the chamber if they are going to make a lot of noise. Order!

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:09): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I would like to provide further information to the house in relation to some questions on notice that were tabled yesterday. The information at the time of supplying them was correct but after the supply of the information some of the facts changed. The budget for the 2012-13 year for the Modbury Hospital redevelopment is \$9.694 million as a result of re-profiling of that project, and the final expenditure for 2011-12 was \$1.284 million. Those facts should be read in conjunction with the information provided in the questions on notice that were tabled.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:09): Last week, students and parents received the results of the NAPLAN tests that those students sat in May this year. South Australia's NAPLAN results have set new lows for South Australia, performing worse than all other states in grade 3 writing, grammar, punctuation and numeracy, and in year 5 grammar, punctuation and numeracy. South Australia did not reach the national average in any of the 20 categories this year or last year, and South Australia managed to meet the national average standard in only one category out of 20 categories the previous year. South Australia has once again performed much worse than our interstate counterparts.

The minister in her answer to questions today said that we have done better this year, but last year we went backwards in 14 out of 20 categories. In comparison, Western Australia went forward in 14 out of 20 categories. But we still went backwards in eight categories, on last year's results, in NAPLAN results this year. So it is a very poor outcome for South Australia's NAPLAN results.

Remember, NAPLAN results are about testing the system, and there is no doubt that the system here in South Australia, run by Labor, is failing. What is Labor's response? Last year, minister Portolesi said our poor results were due to the fact that we have a higher proportion of lower socioeconomic families in our state. Blame the families, blame the kids. That is exactly what Premier Weatherill said when he was education minister the year before. He used those same terms, that we have poor NAPLAN results here in South Australia because we have a higher proportion of lower socioeconomic families.

This year, South Australian students made no improvement or went backwards in 13 out of 20 categories: in 13 out of 20 categories there was no improvement or they went backwards. This is after going backwards again last year. What is minister Portolesi's response to that? She said that she would do things differently. A bit of déjà vu, as this is what the then education minister, Jane Lomax-Smith, announced after Labor was embarrassed about its poor NAPLAN results in 2008. She said:

Parents can be reassured that if their child is not performing at the national minimum standard, they will receive intensive support at school.

What did Premier Weatherill say when he was embarrassed as education minister in 2010 by the NAPLAN results? He said:

Students who achieved below the national minimum standard in these tests will be supported through their individual learning plans, which ensures ongoing targeted support.

This is a cut-and-paste of what the former education minister said just two years earlier. Then, of course, minister Weatherill, just a few weeks later, went on to cut \$8.1 million from the numeracy

and literacy funding for schools. If you do not believe me, minister Portolesi, it is all there in Budget Paper 6, page 115—\$8.1 million. What happened to those plans, those intervention plans that the ministers have announced in the past?

This year, the minister has announced that she will be announcing—announced that she will be announcing—a new strategy in response to yet another year of poor NAPLAN results here in South Australia. That sounds to me that Labor has no plans for NAPLAN. Let us look at what has happened to NAPLAN results in South Australia under the Labor government. Madam Speaker, I have a statistical table, and I seek leave to have it inserted into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Mean scale score		SA	SA	SA	SA	SA	SA	Aust	Aust	Aust
		2008	2010	2011	2012	2011 v 2012	2008 v 2012	2008	2011	2012
Year 3	Reading	400.5	401.6	402.2	408.2	1.49%	2%	400.5	416.2	419.3
Year 3	Writing	415.1	410.8	400.1	403.1	0.75%	-3%	414.5	415.5	415.4
Year 3	Spelling	396.7	387.9	392	402.4	2.65%	1%	399.5	406.3	413.9
Year 3	Grammar	396.7	398.9	403.6	405.2	0.40%	2%	403.2	421.6	423.6
Year 3	Numeracy	388.8	379.9	379.4	376.8	-0.69%	-3%	396.9	398.4	395.1
Year 5	Reading	477.9	476.4	478	483.2	1.09%	1%	484.4	488.4	493.2
Year 5	Writing	480.8	479.5	469.7	463	-1.43%	-4%	486.5	482.5	476.5
Year 5	Spelling	479.5	479.2	474.1	481.7	1.60%	0%	483.8	484.3	494.3
Year 5	Grammar	488.3	486.9	474.9	474.9	0.00%	-3%	496.2	499.7	490.5
Year 5	Numeracy	460.4	472.7	470.9	471.5	0.13%	2%	475.9	488	488.4
Year 7	Reading	533.5	543.1	533.8	536.6	0.52%	1%	536.5	540	541.3
Year 7	Writing	538.1	537	528.8	516.2	-2.38%	-4%	533.7	529.3	517.9
Year 7	Spelling	539.7	539.3	533.2	536.4	0.60%	-1%	538.7	537.8	543.1
Year 7	Grammar	528.8	532.3	528.4	541.3	2.44%	2%	529	533	545.9
Year 7	Numeracy	536.2	538.2	534.9	528.8	-1.14%	-1%	535	544.9	537.9
Year 9	Reading	574.9	567.2	572.9	569.9	-0.52%	-1%	578	579.6	574.5
Year 9	Writing	571.2	566.3	560.3	549.5	-1.93%	-4%	569.4	567.7	553.3
Year 9	Spelling	575.4	572.4	575.1	569.2	-1.03%	-1%	576.9	581.5	576.6
Year 9	Grammar	564.7	573.8	567	567	0.00%	0%	569.1	572.8	572.8
Year 9	Numeracy	571.1	573.2	572	573	0.17%	0%	582.2	583.7	584.0

Mr PISONI: If we look at where we were with year 3 writing in 2008, we sat at 415.1 on the score; this year 403.1, a 3 per cent deterioration in the outcome in that area. What has happened at a federal level? We have seen some improvements in that area. We have seen year 3 numeracy suffer the same fate, down from 388.8 in 2008 to 376.8 in 2012, a 3 per cent deterioration in the outcome; but, in the meantime, we have seen the national average sitting at 395.1. So, where we have seen South Australia deteriorate in 10 out of 20 categories and not shift in three of those categories over the last four years, there have been improvements nationally in 13 categories.

Time expired.

PEACHEY BELT

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:15): Today I would like to report to the house on birthday celebrations I attended on Sunday, when I represented the Minister for Social Inclusion (Hon. Ian Hunter). That was the 50th celebrations for the Peachey Belt held at Swallowcliffe Primary School in Davoren Park.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: Yes, I agree, we had much to celebrate. It was wonderful to see many original and new residents at the celebrations. Many have since moved away, and they came back to join in the celebrations, and the fact they came back for the celebrations is a testament to how

strong that community's bonds and connections are. They came together that day to celebrate the milestone occasion and share memories, which also demonstrate true community spirit.

It was also an opportunity for the many people to reflect on the journey of their own lives that have taken place over the last 50 years, and those memories included: dusty paddocks slowly making way for new houses, shops, schools and ovals; unsealed roads and no footpaths; children playing in the streets, parks and schools; and families with high hopes for the future of their children and grandchildren. As the Lieutenant-Governor recounted about the hopes of a later generation of immigrants, they came to Australia with 'suitcases full of dreams'.

For most, those dreams have been realised. They have raised children and grandchildren and there have been many good times. There have also been some times which have been not so good. As the fortunes of the state fluctuated, so did the wellbeing of the Peachey Belt community. Despite their hardships, the local community has shown great resilience and stuck together. The celebrations on Sunday are testament to that resilience. The photographic display told stories of the highs and lows of that community.

The story of the Peachey Belt migrants is similar to that of other migrants throughout this community. They are stories about leaving behind family and friends for a new life across the other end of the world. Now their children, grandchildren and, in some cases, their great-grandchildren carry their legacy. I have great empathy with those people who were brave enough to leave their place of birth to find new opportunities for their families.

Despite some tough times, this community has survived and once again is prosperous. A lot has been achieved since 50 years ago, with many positive changes occurring and, although some are still to be achieved, a bright future lies ahead for the community. For example, the John Hartley B-7 school and the Mark Oliphant B-12 college have been built and provide a focal point for the local communities and great success. There are new community facilities such as a GP clinic, a childcare centre and improved transport services, as well as wetlands and bicycle paths. New commercial and retail facilities are on their way for the Curtis Road Town Centre that will offer employment and economic opportunities.

These developments, along with the hundreds of engagement, training and employment opportunities that have been undertaken through the life of the project, are ensuring that the future is looking bright for the Peachey Belt.

Five rounds of Playford Alive initiatives funding have resulted in more than \$612,000 being given to 58 projects that provide community benefits in the area. These projects have improved educational outcomes, provided numerous activities and supported key groups, and range from training and employment programs to sporting activities and cultural events. Playford Alive also encourages community wellbeing through the Community Fun Day (in which many community groups, including my office, participate) and rewards efforts through the Local Heroes awards. RenewablesSA is working with the community to continue building on the successes and achievements of the past.

The strength of the Peachey Belt community has long been evident. The activities on Sunday would not have been possible without the efforts of a small group of people who take enormous pride in their community and its history and who want to shape and influence their community's future.

I would like in particular to thank Betty Alberton and Shirley Harris, two tireless community workers. I would like to thank the City of Playford, a number of government agencies and also all those non-government agencies who work together for the betterment of the community which is in the Peachey Belt. All these people and these groups represent the very best of this community. I would like to thank these volunteers from Imagine Peachey for organising the wonderful celebration events, and happy birthday to the Peachey Belt.

FLINDERS ELECTORATE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:20): Today I would like to talk briefly about some of the accomplishments of constituents of mine who have excelled in their various fields and who have achieved public recognition for their efforts. First, I would like to talk about someone who has already been mentioned in the house here today, and that is Kieran Modra. Kieran is a Paralympian. He was born in Port Lincoln in South Australia, and he has been visually impaired since birth.

The minister quite rightly pointed out that, less than a year ago, Kieran was lying in a hospital bed with fractured vertebrae in his neck and lower back. He recovered from that in time to take up training and be in London for the Paralympics, where he managed to win a gold medal in the men's individual pursuit team. What is extraordinary about Kieran is that, of course, he has been competing in the Paralympics since 1988. He first competed in Seoul in athletics, and he was successful there.

He went on to take up cycling, and he has achieved gold and bronze medals right through Atlanta, Athens, Beijing and now London; so, my congratulations to him. He is an extraordinary athlete and deserves much recognition, having won in his career nine medals in total, five of which are gold. He also received an Australian Sports Medal in 2004, and he was named the Australian Male Paralympian of the Year. Congratulations to him. He has also been awarded an Order of Australia.

The second person I would like to talk about today is Australia's 2012 Farmer of the Year. The winner of that award is Peter Kuhlmann, who farms at Mudamuckla, which is about 35 kilometres east of Ceduna. My congratulations go to Peter because I do not think that he would deny—or anyone would deny—that it is a sometimes difficult environment in which to farm. Peter farms with rainfall of around 275 millimetres on highly alkaline soils where there are very limited crop options.

Peter has demonstrated that the life of the modern farmer is not just spent on the farm but also requires a real focus on running his business, and my congratulations go to him. He has been an early adopter of technology, and he is at the forefront of improving Australia's ability to feed the world. Once upon a time that sort of area was known as marginal country. I understand that it is now known as low rainfall country. It has its own challenges, but Peter and many of his peers are rising to the occasion. It is good to see someone from South Australia and from Eyre Peninsula recognised for their efforts.

Paul Trevor of Port Lincoln received the Outstanding Bravery Medal award a couple of weeks ago. He was at a party and he saw a lady, who was not known to him, engulfed by flames. He threw himself upon the lady, Mrs Bauer, and managed to extinguish the flames. His reaction was instinctive. He said that being in the presence of the other medallists and finalists was 'very humbling'. His act took him just a few minutes, but he was ultimately nominated by Mrs Bauer's husband. My congratulations go to Paul as well.

Finally, I would like to finish off with an old, dear friend of mine and our family, Mr Don McSweeney. He has also been awarded an Order of Australia, but very recently he was inducted into the South Australian National Football League's Hall of Fame. To put this into some sort of perspective—and Don will not mind me saying this—he is around the four score years. He is fit and well. He received the award on the same night as fellow inductees Ken 'KG' Cunningham, Garry McIntosh and Mark Ricciuto, which puts him in some very esteemed company. Don's record as a player, administrator and coach and his all round dedication to the great game of Australian rules is legendary on the Eyre Peninsula and now throughout South Australia. He began playing football for Cummins way back in 1945.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: I should declare an interest, the member for Stuart says, and I would proudly declare an interest in this particular grievance.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: As his protégé.

Mr TRELOAR: Not quite, member for Stuart. He started playing way back in 1945 and had a very distinguished career as a player and as a coach. He is a life member of numerous leagues and associations. My congratulations go to him, his wife Eileen and daughters Raelene and Debbie, who were also present. I also know that he is able to recite *The Man From Snowy River*.

The SPEAKER: It is always a pleasure to see someone from Eyre Peninsula going places. Member for Mawson.

GLENCOE CENTRAL PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:25): I rise today to wish the Glencoe Central Primary School a very happy 40th birthday. I was there when the school opened in 1972, which came about after the closure of Glencoe East and Glencoe West primary schools. I was at the Glencoe West Primary School, following in the tradition of both my grandmothers and my mother, who went to

that school. By the time they closed it in 1972 there were about 30 students left at that school. I for one was very glad to see the government of the day, a Labor government, closing two schools to make one really good school.

Glencoe Central is a fantastic school and I was proud to be invited back there a few weeks ago to make a speech and talk about my recollections of the school. It was terrific to see a former teacher, Val Hunter, who was my grade 1 and 2 teacher. She was a real stickler for spelling, I remember, and also reading aloud. We would have parents come in and listen to us read aloud. It is one of those things that I think if you get it early, that skill and that talent and that love of reading, but also reading aloud, it can lead to all sorts of places.

I look back, from this chamber now, to those days and think about how important they were in my formative years as a five and six year old. As I said on the day to Mrs Hunter, I thanked her personally and I thanked her publicly in my speech because all of our teachers, wherever they are in this state, play such an important role. While those memories never leave us, it was also great to hear Mrs Hunter say that she has been following my career.

They call them SSOs now, but back in 1972 they called them teachers' aides. Mary Phelan was the mum you had at school when you had left your mum at home. She was always there with some comforting words. She was the person you would go to if you needed a Disprin or a bandaid or something like that. I thank Mrs Phelan and all those teachers' aides who have looked after so many kids around the state over the years and the SSOs who have taken over that role, they play a very important role in not only supporting the students but supporting the teaching staff.

The school opened with an enrolment of 100 students. I was not there for the first week, I had the mumps and I was very upset about that because we had closed down the old school and we were very much looking forward to moving into the new school with the brand new desks. I was thinking that they would all be worn out by the time I got there and that I would not necessarily have the best spot in the class, but I must say that after a week I sort of fitted in quite well. I met all of the new kids from the Glencoe East school and I thought it was the biggest school in the state.

It was interesting to go back there a couple of weeks ago and see that the play area, which I thought was massive, is not quite as big as I thought it was and that Mrs Hunter is not as tall as I thought she was. It puts it all into perspective. The other thing that put it into perspective was going from a school of 29 kids to a school of 100 kids. I really did think it was the biggest school in the world.

A few years later, when I was in grade 5, we moved to Adelaide. David Tassell, who had been the principal at Glencoe Central School, became the principal at Pennington Primary School, so the three of us kids moved to Pennington Primary School for a few weeks while we were working out where we were going to live. The Pennington Hostel was just down the road from Pennington Primary School, so we had all these refugees from Vietnam. There were lots of English migrants in there, but we could not actually understand a lot of what was happening because where we had come from in the South-East there was not a lot of multiculturalism. There were a lot of English and Irish backgrounds and third and fourth generations.

The other thing about Pennington primary was that it had two-storey buildings. We had to go upstairs to get to the classrooms, which was completely different to having one open unit at Glencoe where we had grades 1 and 2 in one class, grades 3 and 4 in Mrs Peacock's class, grades 5 and 6 in Ms Daveron's class, and then Mr Tassell was the teacher of grade 7.

It was really great to see the 57 students who are there now, and they are doing a great job in carrying on the tradition of Glencoe Central Primary School, which is really well supported by the local community. I congratulate all the parents as well not only for the work they did on making the 40th birthday celebration a great day but also for the work they do day in, day out to make sure that the school is a focal point of the local community.

PLATE, MR ADAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:30): I rise today to speak on a sad occasion, but also to acknowledge and pay tribute to a member of your electorate, actually, Madam Speaker—Adam Plate from Oodnadatta, who I hope most people in this house know or at least have heard of. He died nearly four weeks ago in the Targa rally in Adelaide. I certainly send my sympathies and condolences to his wife, Linnie, and three adult daughters, Alice, Tilly and Ruby, on this very sad occasion.

My relationship with Adam was one of friendship. We were not close friends; I do not want to oversell this, but certainly we knew each other for many years and would bump in to each other occasionally. I remember very well that we came across each other, strangely enough, in the middle of the night in different places in the outback before we actually met each other. We were just crossing paths at roadhouses, essentially, getting fuel or buying food in our various travels.

It was not until about the middle of 1999 when Adam came into Spuds Roadhouse at Pimba, which I was a shareholder of and managing at the time, and asked to use our loading ramp late at night. Of course, we clicked and said, 'Well, who are you?' and 'Who are you?' and realised how we both fitted in to each other's paths. We enjoyed bumping in to each other very frequently over many years. The last time we saw each other was in January this year when I was at Oodnadatta. We had dinner in his and Linnie's home, again late at night, as was our custom, probably just because that is when we finished up our days, before we both headed off exceptionally early the next morning.

I would like to pay tribute to Adam and his contribution to the outback and to Oodnadatta. I also put on record the fact that he was a polarising person. He was a person who had lots of friends, lots of acquaintances and lots of people who did not agree with what he said, because he went about things in a very passionate, forceful, genuine and earnest way, over nearly 40 years in Oodnadatta. There were certainly people who did not agree with him from time to time, and there is no shame in that.

Madam Speaker, as you would know very well, people in the outback are quite forthright. They cannot muck around; they do not have time and they do not have the luxury of not speaking their mind when they have the chance. Adam, and I for many years (and you to a certain extent in your travels, Madam Speaker), lived in that world and understand that very well.

The reality is that Adam made a very significant contribution to Oodnadatta over a very long time. He did things, he planned things and he shared opportunities. He was a very down to earth and hands-on worker and contributor, and also a visionary in many ways. Even at times when people did not agree with his vision or his action, if nothing else, it got them thinking about what they should perhaps be doing instead.

I pay tribute to his contribution not only to Oodnadatta but also to the outback of South Australia more broadly. I recognise also, Madam Speaker, that you spoke at his funeral in Adelaide on 31 August, and I thank you for doing that very much. I attended his memorial service a week later on 7 September in Oodnadatta, which was an absolutely marvellous occasion. It was a beautiful service, tastefully done, that included people from all walks of life. There were people from the city there. There were people who would not have left Oodnadatta many times in their life there.

Everybody was included and it was an absolutely remarkable service, led by Father Paul Bourke, who is certainly an important identity in outback South Australia. He has a marvellous way of supporting people of all faiths, or potentially of little faith. He includes them exceptionally well in whatever service he leads. I would also like to pay particular tribute to Linnie, Alice, Tilly and Ruby. Let me say that they were really the stars of the day and they represented themselves, Adam and their community exceptionally well in their send-off for Adam on that day.

The SPEAKER (15:35): Thank you, member for Stuart. I would also like to add my comments to that. I am a dear friend of Linnie's, and Adam was an absolute outback character—a legend in the outback. He had a thousand people at his funeral in Adelaide, which was pretty incredible, I think, for anyone. I think Father Paul topped that off there when he said he welcomed everyone there 'who had ever had an argument with Adam, and that would be everyone in this room' but he got his point across every time. He was a legend. He did incredible work for Oodnadatta and for the outback. Linnie, Alice, Tilly and Ruby can be very proud of him and the memorial he left. I am glad you brought that up today.

OSBORNE COMMUNITY CLUB

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:35): I rise today to inform the house about a wonderful club operating in my electorate—the Osborne Over 50s. I want to let you know about it because it is yet another example of the health and liveliness of our community.

There has been much made of the fear in declining community activity and volunteering and in people just getting out of their houses and interacting. That concern is legitimate and yet, wherever I go in the Port Adelaide electorate, I see abundant evidence that people in my community are looking after each other and are having fun doing it.

The Osborne Over 50s is a great example. It is an extraordinarily lively club with activities available for every day of the week. These activities are all about having fun and cover physical exercise, the mental challenges of complex games and also excursions.

The club meets in the Osborne Community Hall and provides a place for people from all around the Lefevre Peninsula to meet up and enjoy themselves. The diversity of the peninsula community is well represented in the club with people who have just moved in and people who can trace their families back for four generations in the Port Adelaide area. There is unity too in the love of the area, the desire to feel safe and in a healthy environment, the caring for the next generations and the desire to see our local community prosper.

When I visited recently, we had a great conversation about the need for the impact on the peninsula of increasing exports to be carefully managed. It is a narrow piece of land with many different uses trying to exist alongside each other. The peninsula is home to Outer Harbor, which means many trucks and trains moving freight with all the attendant road safety, air quality and noise issues. There is also heavy and light industry, older infrastructure and modern shipbuilding, which is not only highly significant to the South Australian economy but also employs many locals.

On the environment front, the peninsula is surrounded by the dolphin sanctuary and has a high-quality conservation reserve at the tip. It is also the home of thousands of people. All of these land uses need to be able to coexist in a very small area, and the discussion we had at the Over 50s was very much about how to make sure that the residents are central to the way that the area is managed. I thank the people of the club for welcoming me, and I commend them on their lively and active club and their genuine engagement with their community.

CLASSIFICATION (PUBLICATIONS, FILMS AND COMPUTER GAMES) (R18+ COMPUTER GAMES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995. Read a first time.

CHARACTER PRESERVATION (MCLAREN VALE) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

No. 1. Clause 3, page 2, lines 10 and 11 [clause 3(1), definition of district]—Delete 'the prescribed day) but does not include the areas marked as townships on the deposited plan' and substitute '26 June 2012'

No. 2. Clause 3, page 2, lines 13 and 14 [clause 3(1), definition of prescribed day]—Delete the definition of *prescribed day*

No. 3. Clause 3, page 3, line 2 [clause 3(1), definition of relevant authority]—Delete 'or a provision of this Act'

No. 4. Clause 3, page 3, after line 4 [clause 3(1)]—After the definition of *relevant authority* insert:

relevant council means a council whose area includes part of the district;

No. 5. Clause 3, page 3, lines 5 to 8 [clause 3(1), definition of residential development]—Delete the definition and substitute:

residential development means development primarily for residential purposes but does not include—

(a) the use of land for the purposes of a hotel or motel or to provide any other form of temporary residential accommodation for valuable consideration; or

(b) a dwelling for residential purposes on land used primarily for primary production purposes;

rural area means the area of the district not including townships;

No. 6. Clause 3, page 3, line 11 [clause 3(1), definition of township]—Delete 'the prescribed day' and substitute '26 June 2012'

No. 7. Clause 3, page 3, line 13 [clause 3(2)]—After 'characteristics of the district' insert:

and locations within the district

No. 8. New clause, page 3, after line 19—After clause 4 insert:

4A—Administration of Act

This Act is to be administered by the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Development Act 1993*.

No. 9. Clause 6, page 3, line 35 [clause 6(1)(a)]—After 'rural' insert:

and natural

No. 10. Clause 6, page 4, line 5 [clause 6(2)(b)]—Delete 'or a township under this Act'

No. 11. New Clause, page 4, after line 5—Insert:

6A—Development Plans relating to townships to be prepared or amended by councils

Despite Part 3 Division 2 of the *Development Act 1993* (including section 24(1)(fbb) of that Act), a Development Plan, or an amendment to a Development Plan, that—

- (a) applies to any part of a township; and
- (b) does not apply outside the area of the council where the township is located, may only be prepared under that Division by—
- (c) the council for the area where the township is located; or
- (d) the Minister (within the meaning of that Division) acting with the consent of the council for the area where the township is located.

No. 12. Clause 7, page 4, lines 6 to 8—Delete clause 7

No. 13. Clause 8, page 4, lines 10 to 14 [clause 8(1) and (2)]—Delete subclauses (1) and (2) and substitute:

- (1) This section applies to a proposed development in the rural area that involves a division of land under the *Development Act 1993* that would create 1 or more additional allotments.
- (2) A relevant authority (other than the Development Assessment Commission) must not grant development authorisation to a development to which this section applies unless the Development Assessment Commission concurs in the granting of the authorisation.
- (2aa) If the Development Assessment Commission is the relevant authority, the Development Assessment Commission must not grant development authorisation to a development to which this section applies unless the council for the area where the proposed development is situated concurs in the granting of the authorisation.
- (2a) No appeal under the *Development Act 1993* lies against a refusal by a relevant authority to grant development authorisation to a development to which this section applies or a refusal by the Development Assessment Commission or a council to concur in the granting of such an authorisation.

No. 14. Clause 8, page 4, line 16 [clause 8(3)]—Delete ', wholly or partly,'

No. 15. Clause 9, page 4, line 29 [clause 9(1)]—Delete 'involved in the administration of' and substitute:

responsible for issuing statutory authorisations under

No. 16. Clause 9, page 4, line 31 [clause 9(1)(a)]—Delete 'a statutory authorisation under the relevant Act' and substitute:

such a statutory authorisation

No. 17. Clause 9, page 4, lines 35 and 36 [clause 9(1)]—Delete 'obligations imposed on the person or body under this Act' and substitute:

objects of this Act in relation to the statutory authorisation

No. 18. Clause 10, page 5, after line 3—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) In conducting the review, the Minister must (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) consult with, and consider any submissions of, relevant councils.

No. 19. Clause 10, page 5, lines 4 to 7 [clause 10(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) The review must include an assessment of—
 - (a) the state of the district, especially taking into account the objects of this Act and any relevant provisions of the Planning Strategy; and
 - (b) the family, social, economic and environmental impacts of this Act; and
 - (c) the impact of this Act on local government in the district; and

- (d) any steps that have been taken or strategies that have been implemented to address any negative impacts of this Act,

and may include such other matters as the Minister thinks fit.

No. 20. New clause, page 5, after line 9—After clause 10 insert:

10A—Reviews relating to townships

- (1) The Minister must, at intervals of not more than 5 years, undertake a review to determine whether any alterations should be made to the boundaries of the areas marked as townships in the plan referred to in the definition of *township* in section 3.
- (2) In conducting a review, the Minister must (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) consult with, and consider any submissions of, relevant councils.
- (3) The Minister must cause a report on the outcome of the review to be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after its completion.

No. 21. Clause 11, page 5, after line 13 [clause 11(1)]—Before paragraph (a) insert:

- (aaa) make provision in relation to the referral of any application for development authorisation to the Development Assessment Commission for the purposes of section 8(2); and
- (aa) prescribe fees in respect of any matter under this Act and provide for their payment, recovery or waiver; and

No. 22. Clause 11, page 5, after line 28 —After subclause (3) insert:

- (4) Before a regulation is made under this Act, the Minister must (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) consult with, and consider any submissions of, relevant councils.

No. 23. Schedule 1, page 6, after line 8 [Schedule 1, clause 3]—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 22—after subsection (4a) insert:
- (4aa) Before making any alterations to the Planning Strategy to incorporate provisions which address any character values of a district recognised under a character preservation law (or to alter any such provisions), the Minister must (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) consult with, and consider any submissions of, relevant councils (within the meaning of the character preservation law).

No. 24. Schedule 1, page 6, line 11 [Schedule 1, clause 4, inserted subsection (5a)]—Delete 'or incorporate'

No. 25. Schedule 1, page 6, lines 18 to 23 [Schedule 1, clause 5(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

No. 26. Schedule 1, page 6, lines 27 and 28 [Schedule 1, clause 6, inserted subparagraph (x)]—Delete ', acting at the request of the Minister responsible for the administration of a character preservation law,'

No. 27. Schedule 1, page 6, line 34 [Schedule 1, clause 6, inserted subparagraph (x)]—Delete 'making the request'

No. 28. Schedule 1, page 6, lines 35 and 36 [Schedule 1, clause 6, inserted subparagraph (x)]—Delete 'or a township'

No. 29. Schedule 1, page 6, line 36 [Schedule 1, clause 6, inserted subparagraph (x)]—Delete 'the relevant' and substitute 'a'

No. 30. Schedule 1, page 6, after line 37—After clause 6 insert:

6A—Amendment of section 46—Declaration by Minister

- (1) Section 46(3a)—delete subsection (3a) and substitute:
- (3a) A declaration under this section cannot apply with respect to a development or project within—
- (a) the Adelaide Park Lands; or
- (b) a character preservation rural area.
- (2) Section 46—after subsection (16) insert:
- (17) In this section—
- character preservation rural area* means an area that is defined as a rural area under a character preservation law.

No. 31. Schedule 1, page 7, line 3 [Schedule 1, clause 7]—Delete 'responsible for the administration of the *Development Act 1993*'

No. 32. Schedule 1, page 7, line 4 [Schedule 1, clause 7(a)]—Delete 'that Act' and substitute 'the *Development Act 1993*'

No. 33. Schedule 1, page 7, lines 7 and 8 [Schedule 1, clause 7(b)]—Delete 'or a township, or part of the district or a township' and substitute:

, or part of the district

No. 34. Schedule 1, page 7, after line 13 [Schedule 1, clause 7]—After paragraph (b) insert:

and

- (c) (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) consult with, and consider any submissions of, relevant councils in relation to the matters specified in paragraphs (a) and (b).

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:44): I would like to make a small contribution. I am quite concerned about an article I read this morning in *The Advertiser*, with the Premier saying that he has told the Prime Minister that she is going to face the 'wrath of South Australians' unless she backs changes to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. The Premier has now, for some weeks, had a taxpayer funded campaign going, representing some 13,000 members of South Australia, and that is going to be the 'wrath' of what South Australia is going to send over by way of message to the Prime Minister.

There are 20,000 people in my electorate who are dependent and reliant on and need the water security here in South Australia, not 13,000. He represents 1.6 million people in South Australia; of that 1.6 million, about 1.5 million rely on the River Murray. While we have the Premier out there banging away on the Save the River Murray campaign, he is not addressing the issue. He is not over in Canberra with Tony Burke. He is not over there with Craig Knowles, the Chairman of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority campaigning for what South Australia needs.

It is of real concern to me and my constituents that he continues to have a taxpayer funded 'save the Jay Weatherill' campaign. I am extremely disappointed that we now have six points that the Premier wants the Prime Minister to look at. It is outrageous that we have had this plan on the table for nearly two years and now he has six points of interest that he refuses to deal with. He refuses to go to Canberra and put on the table not only with the water minister, not only with the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, and not with the Prime Minister. First of all he is saying, 'We need to return enough water to meet key environmental outcomes.'

Today we have the river being manipulated around the Chowilla regulator that is being constructed. We are not using our environmental water for the environmental outcome we desire, that he is banging the drum about so much. He tells us, 'We need to keep the Murray Mouth open.' While we manage the river so that we can build the Chowilla regulator, it is not using that environmental water to its best advantage. The Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder today owns over 1,200 gigalitres. We have designated areas that are going to benefit from that 1,200 gigalitres and yet we are manipulating the river here in South Australia so that we can continue to build a regulator—outrageous.

We talk about securing salinity and water level targets to protect the Coorong and the Lower Lakes. He continues to ignore the solutions in the Lower Lakes and the Coorong. We look at construction of a pipeline from Lake Albert into the Coorong. It would address the salinity in Lake Albert and it would address the flow into the Coorong. He continues to ignore the solution-based approach. We look at providing flows to restore the flood plain that I have already mentioned such as Chowilla. We are letting that water go past our gate and trickle out to sea. We are not using it to our best advantage.

Again, he is focused on a campaign, he is not focused on the outcomes for the River Murray. He is not focused on any more water security for South Australians, for the communities, for the irrigators, for the nearly 1.5 million South Australians who rely on the River Murray for their water supply in one way, shape or another. We talk about investing in strengthening regional communities. There is a \$240 million Water Industry Alliance campaign that the Premier should be over in Canberra lobbying our federal water minister on. He should be lobbying the Prime Minister for a fund structure that will strengthen our regional economies and diversify the regional economies that rely on the river because in a minute, when the Premier says that we did not get what we want, he is putting South Australia at risk of not getting a plan.

Again, we need to be recognising South Australia's 40-year cap on the River Murray. We are recognising South Australia's cap on those 40 years of efficiency gains, and yet he is not over there putting an argument to the Prime Minister. I am not going to be here banging the drum for a Victorian premier, but he has solution-based approach. He has gone there and put solutions on the table to Craig Knowles, to Tony Burke, and yet we have a Premier over here telling everybody that he is going to save the river with a \$2 million campaign. It is outrageous that he is not being proactive. He is not solution based, he is not looking at what we can actually do to address the infrastructure gains and how we can best manage buybacks to the commonwealth government.

There is \$400 million sitting on the table to address the Menindie Lakes north of Broken Hill. He has not addressed that once. That is \$400 million that would address a 174-gigalitre saving in the Menindie Lakes; five gigalitres evaporates out of that lake every day of the year and yet we are looking past that because we want him to spend \$2 million on a campaign that represents 13,000 South Australians, not the 1.5 million South Australians who rely on this water reform.

We need to look at food production. We hear the Premier banging on about safe green food, produce and wine. They rely on security out of that River Murray. The majority of the communities along the river rely on it. We look at the Clare Valley and the Barossa Valley. They rely on River Murray water as well. We look at Eyre Peninsula. We have heard the member for Flinders talking about the Natural Resources Committee's finding on water shortages and water issues over there. Again, we are relying on the River Murray, and we have a Premier out there focusing on a campaign that is not addressing the solution-based approach. He is resting his laurels on untested science.

He came up to my electorate when he was first elected as Premier and he put three statements in place: 4,000 gigalitres, no water from the irrigators here in South Australia, and a High Court challenge. He has now put the science on the table. He is now looking at a 3,200 scenario, and he is now looking perhaps at a High Court challenge. I challenge the Premier to get out there and be proactive for South Australia. Be proactive for the River Murray and stop having a \$2 million Jay Weatherill campaign.

Again, we look at salt loads. We hear this figure of two million tonnes of salt that has to be exited out of the mouth every year. Where does that figure come from? Again, it is a populist figure, not tested by science. We look at the salt interception schemes that are addressing salinity. Salt interception schemes take out 250,000 tonnes of salt a year, and yet we are talking about two million tonnes of salt that has no basis behind it.

Again, I am frustrated having an electorate that is totally reliant on the River Murray. I have constituents whose businesses revolve around it directly; others have businesses that revolve around it indirectly. There are many businesses that rely on water supply that will not get one drop by this campaign; not one drop. The High Court challenge will not put one drop of water back into the river. It will not give us any more certainty; it will not give us any more assurance of what we are going to prop up our businesses with.

The Premier and his minister need to be over there with a solution-based approach. It is something that they have failed to recognise, failed to acknowledge and failed to address. I have met with the chair of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and he continually tells me that he wants solutions put on his table. He does not want political rhetoric. He does not want fighting campaigns. That is not addressing the issue. Again, it is frustrating that this Premier continues to have his photo with the Prime Minister in the paper, he has the populist campaigns, he is painting trucks, he is launching boats. It does not put a drop of water back into the river. It does not give anyone who relies on the River Murray any more assurance that they will have any more water security for their livelihoods, for their businesses, for the future of this state.

We look at our desal plant. It has been wound back to almost a standstill because we have good flows in the river. Again we have 45,000 megalitres coming down the river. What are we doing with the 45,000 megalitres? What are we doing to address the environmental outcome we need with that water flow? In 2010, 123,000 gigalitres came into South Australia. We still have salinity issues in Lake Albert. We still have overtopping at the barrages. We still have highly saline water in the Coorong. We are not addressing any of these issues. I would like to think that I, the member for Chaffey, am a solution-based MP. Being in opposition is frustrating as hell; it is not giving me the opportunity for the Premier to listen and do something proactive about addressing reform to the river.

SEAFORD RAIL BRIDGE

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:54): I rise this afternoon to talk about a very special celebration in the south over the weekend. On Saturday night and Saturday afternoon we invited the community to come along and celebrate the completion of the Seaford rail bridge, which is the third longest, incrementally loaded bridge anywhere in the world. People in the local area have been watching it grow during the past year as span by span from the north and the south have been pushed out during the construction phase until, finally, just over a week ago, the bridge joined up in the middle.

On Saturday, we had nearly 10,000 local people come along and enjoy face painting and displays by the local aviation club and by the very hardworking people from the CFS and SES. Not only are they there when we need them in times of floods, storms, bushfires and car accidents, but they are also training day in, day out and week in, week out, and it was fantastic to see them meeting with local people and showing off what good work they do in the local community.

The bridge, now that has completed, will help form part of the extension of the Noarlunga rail line through to Seaford, which is expected to take 10 minutes off the travel time from Seaford into the city and attract 6,000 passengers on a week day, something that the community has been really keen to have for several years. It is great to see it all coming to fruition now. There is 5.7 kilometres of dual track in the extension. The stations and park-and-ride facilities are at Seaford Meadows and Seaford. There is a bus interchange at the Seaford station which will help people from areas like Aldinga, McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat and Willunga get to the train station. It will be a much shorter bus trip than currently to Noarlunga.

The rail overpass bridge is also being built at Old Honeypot Road, and road bridges are being built over the track at Goldsmith Drive, Seaford Road and at Lynton Terrace. To all those people who have been inconvenienced during the building of these major works, we say sorry but, by building them, it means that there are going to be no railway crossings over the roads so that will, in fact, mean a much smoother trip for people on trains and also motorists.

The Onkaparinga River, of course, proved to be somewhat of a challenge, and the fact that previous governments had sold off different lots of land meant that the corridor that was available to put the train line down did not meet up with the shortest crossing point at the river. It meant that we had to construct a 1.2 kilometre bridge, which obviously is not cheap. It cost \$291.2 million, and I want to thank the federal government for paying for the bridge. The state government will pay for the electrification and extension to Seaford, but we could not have done it without that \$291 million from the federal government.

I really want to thank our local federal member, the member for Kingston, Amanda Rishworth. Amanda is a champion at going in to bat for our local area and I cannot think of anyone I would rather work with to get funding for major infrastructure projects. Together, we have been able to get a fair bit of money out of our respective governments, and the south is being set up now for a fantastic future thanks to the infrastructure that is being put in place.

We worked together to get the McLaren Vale overpass, an \$18 million build which will save a lot of time and, more importantly, a lot of lives. We had an awful triple fatality at that intersection a few years ago. The state government increased the vision lines, as they are called, by extending the left turn lane to McLaren Vale from the Victor Harbor Road. At the time, I said, 'Congratulations, but it is still not what we need long term. When the money is there, we really need an overpass to get people safely onto the Victor Harbor Road from Main Road, McLaren Vale.' It is a deadly intersection and I am very glad to have worked with Amanda on this one.

We have seen the bridge come together over the past year and now this overpass is being built. The first cars will be on that next month and, by the end of the year, it will be pretty much completed and ready for commissioning in the new year; and during the autumn they will plant the trees and other vegetation to do the landscaping on it. It will add a lot to our local area in terms of safety but, also, ease for tourists to get around as well.

If we are going to talk about making it easy for tourists, there is nothing better that we could do than to get rid of that stupid Liberal one-way expressway. Nothing confused people more than having to ask, 'What time does the road open?' Far dinkum, anywhere else in the world you go, you do not have to find out what time the road is open. Maybe you need to find out what time the plane leaves, what time the bus leaves or what time the train leaves, but here you have to find out and book ahead to get onto a road.

It was very unusual planning by the former Liberal government. But even worse than building the one-way expressway was not building those bridges across the expressway long enough to allow for future expansion. It is all very well for them to say, 'We didn't have the money, but we did have the land there to do it.' Well, if you had the money, why not spend a fraction more just to make those bridges long enough? Everyone coming up and down the expressway these days comes across the 60 km/h and the 40 km/h zones. They are there because the former Liberal government did not build the bridges long enough. We have to slow people down where work is being carried out, and the only reason that work is being carried out is to extend the bridges and to blast out the rock face as well. I apologise to everyone in the south who has to put up with these daily delays. I can guarantee that, by mid-2014, not only will they not have the delays anymore but they will have an expressway that goes both ways 24/7.

MARCHE CLUB

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (16:00): As part of the adjournment debate today, I would like to speak about an event I attended on Saturday at the Marche Club in the north-eastern suburbs. I attended an exhibition of the history of Italian migrants from the Marche region in Italy to South Australia. The exhibition, which was opened by the Hon. Grace Portolesi, was sponsored by the Marche Club and comprises photographs, artefacts and documents of a group of people who left their place of birth to build a new and better life in South Australia from the early 1920s and also the 1950s and 1960s.

The collection includes copies of many personal letters that record the lives of the Marchigiani (people from the Marche region) immigrants in South Australia. The exhibition represents a historic and cultural record of the experiences of these immigrants as they built new lives in South Australia, and importantly how they adapted and flourished in their new home.

The exhibition panels display photos and a brief history of the experiences of various families who migrated to South Australia from the Marche region. Some panels also document the history of the Marche Club itself and the service that it has provided to people from that region. The exhibition enables the children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the Marchigiani to explore the history of this community in South Australia.

As the minister said in her opening speech, the exhibition, which coincides with a day of celebration of all things Marchigiani, is about the parents and grandparents who sacrificed much to create a new life here in South Australia. The exhibition is also the story of the contribution that migrants have made to the development of South Australia and, in fact, Australia as a whole.

I wish to congratulate all the members of the Marche Club and all other volunteers who have worked very hard to put this collection together and to display this wonderful exhibition totalling over 800 individual items. Certainly, the exhibition is one which the club can be proud of and one which actually portrays a very positive image of the contribution that migrants have made to this country. As I said, on the day this exhibition was a major event, but it was also a daily celebration of everything which is important to the people of the Marche region. There was a whole range of foods available on the day. There was a lot of music, etc.

Mr Bignell: Dancing?

Mr PICCOLO: I am not sure about the dancing—not one of my strong points, but certainly there were many other events. A whole range of people attended on the day. One really important thing which occurred on the day was that letters were read out which mothers had written to their daughters, etc.

At 16:05 the house adjourned until Thursday 20 September 2012 at 10:30.