

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 September 2012

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW IMPLEMENTATION) BILL

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (10:31): 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) (10:31): I move:

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

Motion carried.

LIQUOR LICENSING (SUPPLY TO MINORS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. Read a first time.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is about empowering parents to make decisions relating to when their own children are introduced to alcohol. Currently in South Australia it is an offence to provide a minor with alcohol in a public place—in a park or on a beach. It is an offence to provide a minor with alcohol in a licensed establishment. It is an offence to provide alcohol to a minor anywhere in South Australia, other than in a private residence, and in a private residence alcohol can be provided to any minor by any adult. This inappropriately usurps what should be the rights of a parent.

This is a matter that has been addressed in the Eastern States: in Tasmania, Queensland and New South Wales by Labor governments, and in Victoria by a Liberal government. This need not be a matter which attracts the partisan politics that unfortunately underpins so much legislation. This is something that one would hope would be a mature legislative policy response to what is a very serious issue in our community.

On 28 July 2011 I first introduced a bill very similar to the one that has just been tabled. This bill is a refinement of that and has been subject to much feedback from many members of the community, in particular the police—and I will get to that later. In that speech I outlined particularly some detail relating to the adverse health affects of alcohol consumption by young people. I gave some detailed statistical evidence showing the nature of the problem we have in Australia of far too many young people drinking far too much alcohol far too early, and also in that speech I discussed some of the issues relating to the legislation interstate and demonstrated that, whilst this bill and bills of its nature, can never be a catch-all and cure all, they nevertheless have made a significant level of assistance in those other states.

There have been prosecutions for supply. It has been able to be policed and, while it does not fix everything and it will not fix every circumstance, they have made a contribution. It is a tool in the armoury of government and of law enforcement in assisting to reduce the rate of teen drinking in our community.

I bring briefly to the attention of the house the fact there are too many young people drinking. The most recent data from 2008—and I believe there will be an update soon, which hopefully demonstrates some better figures—from the Australian secondary school survey into students who consume tobacco, alcohol and over the counter illicit substances in 2008, it identified that one in five 14 year olds has had a drink in the last week, one in nine 13 year olds has had a drink in the last week, and one in twelve 12 year olds in Australia has had a drink in the last week. That is two children in every average year 6 class in the nation, three children in the average year 7 class and six children in the average year 8 class who were drinking last week, who will be drinking again next week and the week after that and the week after that.

The effects on a young mind of alcohol introduction at such an early age are significant. Again, I direct members back to my speech of 22 July last year, where I went into some detail, and in particular quoted from the Alcohol and the Teenage Brain Report by Professor Ian Hickie of the Brain and Mind Research Institute at the University of Sydney, one of Australia's leading experts in this field, although, especially in recent weeks and months, he has had plenty of others backing him up with similar findings.

But the damage with young people drinking indicates that there are some key issues. This has become particularly noted in the last 15 years as our medical technology and mapping of the brain has advanced significantly. In particular we know that the frontal lobes of the brain, which relate to complex thought, decision-making capacity and inhibition, undergo their critical phase of development during the teenage years, during early adolescence and the teenage years, just when you do not want them to be affected by alcohol.

Secondly, alcohol even in small doses in adults particularly goes towards reducing the activity of the inhibitory responses in the brain. So the brain responses that would normally function when they would stop somebody from acting in a foolish or dangerous way are inhibited by alcohol, particularly in the teenage years. Thirdly, alcohol on all of us has a sedative effect: if you have too much alcohol you lose control of your fine motor functions, but at the same time you also start to go to sleep. That fine motor control function is also lost by teenagers who drink, but because of their heightened levels of stimulation they do not have the sedative effects, they do not go to sleep, they simply lose control.

Fourthly, the research points to concerning levels of mental health problems, particularly anxiety and depression, displaying amongst those who have had frequent and significant exposure to alcohol during the early and mid-adolescent years. Fifthly, young people who are already displaying elements of anxiety, depression or psychotic disorder, who also add alcohol to that cocktail, are at very high risk of self harm, attempted suicide, accidental injury and persistence and recurrence of their primary mental health function. These are elements which often affect adults who drink alcohol as well, but all of these elements are significantly heightened when young people drink alcohol. It is clearly something that we need to address as a community when so many of our young people are drinking so regularly.

Parents are concerned about this. This bill came into being as a result of parents coming to me as their local member saying, 'How can we deal with this? How can I stop my child from binge drinking on the weekend when it is a choice of either letting them go to their friends' parties where I know they will have alcohol, even though the parents who are hosting these parties have not talked to me about it, or stopping them going to that without risking complete social isolation and ostracism?'

It is a real concern. Many parents would come to many members of parliament, I suspect, with similar concerns. The fact is that there is nowhere for them to go at the moment. This bill gives them somewhere to go. It has been driven by parents and it is supported more broadly, of course. It is supported by health experts; it is supported by school leaders. The peak bodies of all of the school groups—public, Catholic and independent—have all come out as recently as this week in the media to call for legislation of this nature.

I note that the Hon. Trish Worth, former member for Adelaide and currently chair of the DrinkWise organisation, along with Associate Professor Michael Baigent of DASSA (Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia) and Flinders University, and also Jaime Holland from Pembroke School came out in October last year to brief members of parliament who are interested. I thank the many members who came along to that briefing session.

I particularly thank Trish, Michael and Jaime for coming and giving that session. Trish spoke on public policy, Michael Baigent on the health effects and Jaime Holland on how it plays out in school communities. It was a very worthwhile briefing session and I think many people got some good perspective. There is a broad range of support.

Starting from the parents' perspective, I note that Jane Doyle—the fabulous Jane Doyle—news reader for Channel 7 and also commentator on FIVEaa summed up really well actually one of the things that this bill can do for parents. I will use Jane's words because she is a marvellous speaker:

...I think the most significant part about the proposed legislation is that it gives parents somewhere to go; forget about the penalty stuff, but it actually gives you somewhere to go and say 'well actually it's not correct', because what you get from parents who are serving alcohol to 16 and 17 year olds is that they say they're going to

get it anyway and so we're going to serve it to be responsible—as a parent who doesn't want their child necessarily involved in that you've got nowhere to go... You can't say to them 'it's illegal, you're doing something wrong at the moment' because they're not [it is not illegal]. And so it's a really good message to give parents somewhere to go.

Parents, when confronted by their children pressuring them to allow alcohol to be served at their parties will finally be able to say, 'It is not appropriate to do so. The law says that it is not appropriate to do so.' If the children push and say, 'Actually, we can get everyone's permission,' it will at least ensure that there is discussion held with every parent involved so that people are talking about these issues. We need to educate the community and educate parents that they cannot just serve alcohol to another person's child.

Think about it from this perspective: going back to fundamental principles, why should an adult be able to give a mind-altering substance to a minor who they do not have a duty of care for and do not have a personal relationship with? Anyone with children would think about this fact that there are so many 14 or 15-year-old children drinking at the moment. Why should they be supplied alcohol by somebody who you do not even know in a circumstance which you have no control over? Geoff Munro, the policy director of the Australian Drug Foundation wrote to me saying:

Without this legislation, any person can give any child any amount of alcohol without that child's parents knowing or approving.

Michael Baigent wrote to me, saying:

Over the last decade we have learnt more about alcohol and levels of intake associated with harm...I think that it is hard to see reasons for opposing what you have proposed. I think it is an important Bill that hopefully is supported.

That is Associate Professor Michael Baigent, clinical director of the Centre for Anxiety and Related Disorders, senior specialist at DASSA and a board director at *beyondblue*. The District Council of Peterborough wrote to me, saying:

A few years ago, a youth died in Peterborough as a result of an adult supplying liquor to a group of youths. The liquor was home made and apparently those concerned regularly supply it to the youth in town. So until it is made illegal to supply a minor with alcohol with meaningful penalties, this situation is always hanging over the community.

The Federation of Catholic School Parent Communities wrote to me, saying that they are pleased with this bill and noting that the bill would:

...encourage and empower parents to set clear boundaries regarding access to and supply of alcohol both when hosting parties in their own home or when their own children are invited to attend parties at the home of others.

I have received dozens of letters from high school governing councils around South Australia, but I particularly want to note the first one that came in because they summed it up quite well. The Renmark High School Governing Council wrote to me saying:

As parents of high school aged children, many of us struggle with the very issues you mentioned in your speech and are encouraged that you are acting on these concerns. We would like to offer our support for this amendment bill.

Professor Brenda Wilson, chief executive of Cancer Council SA, said:

Cancer Council SA supports your bill to make it unlawful for anyone other than the child's parent to provide alcohol to a minor and commends your endeavour in moving a private member's bill.

Time prohibits me from going through too many more. But, in particular, I want to note the contribution from then acting police commissioner, Gary Burns, now, of course, our police commissioner. He noted that, 'Despite the concerns that have been raised by some, these bills can be policed effectively.' Acting commissioner Burns, as he was then, suggested five methods that would make last year's bill easier to police, and I can tell the house that we have adopted four of them. The five that he has suggested are:

1. Police intervening at a party be allowed to remove only a small number of samples of alcohol, rather than all alcohol present, in order to supply evidence. We have included that in the bill.

2. The police commissioner said that a lower maximum penalty would be appropriate, so we have lowered the maximum penalty.

3. The police commissioner has suggested that the fine should be expiable, so we have made the fine expiable. The maximum penalty is \$2,500, the expiation fee is \$210, and that will make it easier to enforce.

4. The previously identified six factors relating to the application of the law; for example, how intoxicated the child was and the state of the supply. The police commissioner suggested that those six factors be removed and the offence of supplying alcohol to a minor be an absolute offence, either an offence or not. We have complied with the police commissioner's suggestion there.

5. The police commissioner suggested that the onus should clearly be on the adult supplying the minor with alcohol to establish that they had obtained parental or guardian consent. We have not followed up on that discretion because we felt that it was perhaps making it too difficult for parents.

This bill is about making things easier for parents—making the opportunity of their nurturing, guiding and educating their own children easier and giving them an opportunity to be backed up by this parliament and backed up by the laws of this state when determining how their children should react to an instruction that, 'No, we don't want you to have alcohol because you're 14 years old and it's terribly bad for you and it could have terrible consequences,' and he cannot say, 'Well, I'll just go to my mate's place, and his dad lets us have a couple of beers.'

I think this can be backed up with a strong education campaign. I hope that the government takes this on board and either supports this bill or introduces something very similar because, for all the talk about alcohol-related violence in our community and for all the talk about alcohol abuse by consenting adults in licensed premises, fundamentally it gets back to: why do people have alcohol problems?

The research suggests very strongly that most alcohol problems can be traced back to when somebody started drinking. There is a high correlation between early alcohol introduction and significant alcoholism down the track. This bill will help to address that. It will give tools to parents to be able to best look after the interests of their families, and it will be fundamentally, I think, of assistance to law enforcement, to our education system and to parents in assisting South Australia's community to deal with some of the problems related to alcohol abuse.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (NATURAL DISASTERS COMMITTEE) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:49): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I bring to the attention of the house that this is a bill to amend the Parliamentary Committees Act to introduce a natural disasters committee as a standing committee of the parliament. A different form of the bill has previously been through the house and has been dealt with. The Natural Resources Committee of the parliament recently released a report that recommended the establishment of such a committee. That committee, called the Natural Resources Committee, is a multiparty committee—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Most of them are.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, it is multiparty as distinct from biparty. The reason I am introducing this is that the government suggested that because of the way that the previous bill was drafted the committee as proposed could not have general oversight on an ongoing basis of natural disaster issues and, indeed, they claimed that it could not have conducted an inquiry of its own motion. I checked with parliamentary counsel and I read the Parliamentary Committees Act and that is certainly not the advice back from parliamentary counsel or, indeed, a fair reading of the Parliamentary Committees Act. Regardless of that, I have adopted the government's criticisms of the previous bill and brought into this bill the capacity for the committee to have ongoing oversight of natural disaster issues. That is, the words are:

The functions of the committee are—

- (a) to take an interest in and keep under review—
 - (i) measures that have been taken, or could be taken, to protect life and property from the effects of natural disasters; and

- (ii) measures that have been taken, or could be taken, to reduce the incidence of natural disasters; and
- (iii) the operation of any Act that relates to natural disasters; and
- (b) to inquire into, consider and report on such matters concerned with natural disasters as are referred to it under this Act; and
- (c) to perform any such functions as are imposed on the Committee under this or any other Act or by resolution of both Houses.

The Parliamentary Committees Act, of course, allows the committee to move a motion, to conduct its own inquiry anyway. So that covers off the previous criticisms by the government of the earlier bill. I am not going to go through and hold the house on the need for this particular committee. This is my third attempt over a period of about five years to try to get a committee of this nature established within the parliament. I would simply conclude my comments by referring members to the previous *Hansard* as to the reasons why I think the parliament and, indeed, the state would be better served through the establishment of a natural disasters committee as proposed in this particular bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

ROAD TRAFFIC (EMERGENCY VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Thompson:

That the report of the Select Committee on the Road Traffic (Emergency Vehicles) Amendment Bill be noted.

(Continued from 14 June 2012.)

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (10:55): I am pleased to be able to speak to the report of this select committee. It was established to look at how we could implement what I believe to be the commitment of the two major parties in this house—that is, the two parties—to protect emergency services workers. I am not sure of the position of the Independents, but I am sure we will soon find out. I am sure they also share the desire to protect emergency services workers when they are protecting us.

Emergency services workers, in general, wanted the speed past their worksites to be reduced from 40 km/h to 25 km/h. This is consistent with the speed passing road workers actually on the road and working. Emergency services workers and volunteers both point out that, when they are at a site attending to a community emergency, they are in an even more difficult plight than road workers in that they are often so focused on saving life, limb and property that their own life and limb, and the property of the emergency services agency, is not what they are first focused on—even though they have much training these days that reminds them that their life is as important as anyone else's.

The member for Stuart introduced a bill last year to reduce the speed from 40 km/h to 25 km/h; however, the Minister for Road Safety suggested that we might need to have a little bit of discussion about how this could be implemented and whether it was, indeed, desirable. Advice received from agencies was that there were some complications involved with this.

Accordingly, a select committee was established, consisting of the members for Stuart, Kavel, Light, Taylor and me, who became the chair. We advertised the terms of reference widely, and held one session where we invited the various parties—volunteer associations, unions and emergency services agencies—to come before us and tell us their concerns, their reasons for wanting to reduce the speed from 40 km/h to 25 km/h, and their concerns about the way this could be implemented.

The committee was immediately convinced by the written evidence about the value of reducing the speed from 40 km/h to 25 km/h. The evidence produced was quite clear that someone struck by a car at 25 km/h is far less likely to be injured than someone struck by a car at 40 km/h. As a community, we do not want our emergency services workers to be injured in any way; certainly not by passing traffic. So the committee recommended that the maximum legal speed from motorists passing emergency services vehicles using flashing lights be reduced from 40 km/h to 25 km/h.

However, in listening to the evidence from the various bodies it was clear that there were some difficulties regarding the current law, which provides for past a red and blue flashing light or a vehicle displaying a red and blue flashing light. In particular, in the situation of a bushfire,

emergency services vehicles are likely to be spread quite some distance along a road and people would be operating between those vehicles and outside the range of those vehicles. We therefore considered the next important thing to do was to protect the workers around the vehicles not only when they were at the vehicles, because it almost seemed as though the legislation was protecting the vehicles rather than protecting the workers, and clearly we want to protect the workers, so we looked at a way of extending that protection.

We discussed issues like signs that might be carried to say 25 km/h, but we found that that did not suit all emergency vehicles, so it was agreed that the simplest way was to use red and blue flashing lights, whether it be by placing two vehicles at the end of a scene—we thought the legislation should cover the area between the vehicles, not only the vehicles themselves—or putting red and blue lights on the roadway. These were simple things to be carried on board as, particularly in ambulances, the space is very carefully used with all their equipment and they did not want to be carrying a lot of extra signs etc., but a little red and blue or blue flashing light could be easily dealt with.

Our next recommendation was for the determination of an emergency services speed zone. Some concerns were raised about the likelihood of somebody losing their licence by failing to reduce their speed all the way down to 25 km/h. Concern was raised that if somebody was in a 110 km/h zone, and they came around a corner and did not have enough time to slow down reasonably to 25 km/h, they could face quite a considerable penalty, not only financial but particularly the more severe penalty, in my view, of losing your licence for an unfortunate reason.

So, we considered whether there should be some way of dealing with that and suggested for consideration that there might be a defence that reasonable efforts were made to scale back, that normal speed enforcement not apply but that instead the enforcement should relate to whether the driving was reckless or such as to endanger life or wellbeing. We were aware that there were provisions in the Road Traffic Act already allowing for careless driving, and reckless and dangerous driving, so we considered that there could be an aggravated offence of driving in a manner that was careless or reckless or dangerous in the case of emergency services workers.

It is common not only in the Road Traffic Act but also in criminal codes overall for aggravated offences to apply when particularly vulnerable people are involved. This usually involves children or aged people or people with disabilities, but in this case we considered that emergency services workers could be considered as a class of people who warranted particular protection in the case of careless, reckless or dangerous driving and, therefore, proposed that there be an aggravated offence.

The aggravated offence would give a maximum penalty of three years' imprisonment, and we found that some people thought this rather a large penalty and difficult to cope with. We pointed out that it is already a two-year penalty and that the normal formula when there is an aggravated offence was to increase the existing penalty by 50 per cent. However, I certainly understand from the reaction I have had that some in the community find this difficult to deal with and that it is really important when we are looking at the protection of emergency services workers that we engage community cooperation in this process.

In some ways, I think our most important recommendation was that there be an education campaign around the protection of emergency services workers. We strongly recommend to the government that it finds funds from some place. We know that funds are not easy to find at the moment, but we hope that there will be an education campaign about the need for drivers to respect and protect those people who are protecting us and not to drive recklessly at speed, gawk etc., so as to impede the work of emergency services workers and, more importantly, affect their safety.

When we had various emergency services organisations as witnesses, we discussed with them the possibility of them joining in an advertising campaign to protect workers. We had the suggestion that firefighters come out regularly as one of the most trusted occupations in our community, so using firefighters themselves to ask for public cooperation in protecting their lives might be a useful strategy.

However, we discussed the possibility that every time a notice goes out from one of those organisations, when they are advertising public meetings, such as the CFS does—every year the CFS holds meetings to inform people both in the country and in the fringe metropolitan areas about how to protect themselves, how to prepare their properties—that those advertisements also include a provision asking for the protection of emergency services workers and a reminder that the speed

past an emergency services site is now 25 km/h, which it will be if the amendments moved by the member for Stuart are accepted in this house.

I would sincerely like to thank the staff who supported us, including parliamentary counsel, who found some of our suggestions rather unusual and had to work hard to come up with a formula, and all those gave evidence and made submissions. They are the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, United Firefighters Union of South Australia, SA State Emergency Service Volunteers Association, SA Country Fire Service Volunteers Association, Ambulance Employees Association, SA Police, SA Country Fire Service, SA State Emergency Service, SA Metropolitan Fire Service and SA Ambulance Service.

In summary, I think it can be said that all parties saw the protection of emergency services workers as a high priority. There was concern about the way the existing legislation is able to be enforced, so we thought to explore other ways in which it might be enforced. There was general support for an emergency services work sign being established—general, not initially unanimous—and there was then concern expressed about how the proposed provisions might be enforced. It seems that this is quite a challenge, so the committee also recommended that the implementation be reviewed in three years to see if we have been able to improve the protection given to our emergency services workers. I commend the report to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:08): It is a pleasure to rise to speak on the Select Committee on the Road Traffic (Emergency Vehicles) Amendment Bill. Let me just say at the outset that I appreciate the fact that the government and the minister moved to establish this select committee to look into a private member's bill that I have put forward. I believe that there is very genuine bipartisan—and, I believe, from the Independents as well—support for this move in principle. This is a very important issue. I thank the members of the committee, the member for Light, the member for Taylor, the member for Kavel, and the Chair of the committee, the member for Reynell, for the way in which they have gone about this work in a very genuine fashion.

I will not go into great detail because, having just listened to the comments of the committee's Chair, the member for Reynell, I think they are 100 per cent accurate and 100 per cent thorough, and I endorse them. I thank her for her outlining of that. I will comment very quickly on something which she picked up on. The last recommendation of the select committee's report refers to recommending an advertising and awareness campaign. Like her, I think that is probably one of the most important recommendations. One reason that is so important—and it dovetails right into the core of this bill, which is trying to reduce the speed limit from 40 km/h down to 25 km/h—is that that education campaign can be so much more effective and so much cheaper if all the relevant speed limits are 25 km/h. We already have 25 km/h as the speed limit applicable for school buses, many road work situations and—

The Hon. R.B. Such: Schools.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —school zones—thank you, member for Fisher. Now we are trying very hard to make this the speed limit to protect emergency services workers on roads at emergency service scenes. Clearly that education campaign can be much more effective if we are pushing the same message, the same number and the same speed limit in all situations.

I advise the house that I have tabled amendments and I will move them at a later date. I also thank all the people who provided information, whether written or submissions in person. At the request of the member for Reynell, I add one that she meant to include in her remarks but did not have the information to hand: Mr Norman Hoy and the Royal Automobile Association. Thank you to all those people and to the staff, Ms Lauren Tester and Mr Paul Collett, who helped us.

My last remark is to say that this is an issue that has been very important to the emergency services in general for many years. It is a pleasure that all of us in this house can be working as quickly as possible to finally get this law changed so that they can have the protection that they deserve.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:12): I commend once again the member for Stuart for bringing this matter to the house and the select committee that has had a look in detail at this proposal. It is a given that workers in any environment should be able to work safely and without the threat of being harmed or killed, and that certainly should apply when people are on a road or near a road.

I have a couple of observations. I think it is critical that, if people are required to slow down—I imagine that there will be flashing lights—in all these situations, there is adequate and

appropriate signage. What we see happening with some of the current road work signs brings the system into question. I had someone contact my office yesterday who pointed out that there are some road work signs on Happy Valley Drive and Manning Road that have been there since March of this year, and no work has been undertaken. That brings the system into question.

I think it is very important, whether it is for emergency workers, road workers or whatever, that the signage is appropriate and clearly visible but also, when the emergency or roadworks have ended, that those signs be removed. On more than one occasion—not just from yesterday—signs have been left up for months and it is not the right thing to be happening. I think the government, through the Department of Transport and the Minister for Road Safety, needs to have a close look at that.

I think there are some concerns about aspects of the law as it relates to road workers and the current protection. According to my legal advisers, the question of roadworks and people speeding through them has not been tested in court here, so we have not had any ruling by a judge on the adequacy and appropriateness of those laws. I have had some interaction with parliamentary counsel. It is not their job to run the parliament but they are pretty smart people, and they tell me there is some concern about whether or not the current protection for road workers is appropriate and adequate. I think it is an issue the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Road Safety need to have a look at.

I will just add quickly that I am interested in and would like to hear a response on whether this should apply to, for example, Royal Automobile Association people attending. From memory, I think about 10 years ago one of the roadside assistance people was killed on Anzac Highway.

I pose the same issue in relation to council workers who are called out for an emergency or Department of Transport or any other emergency-type people. I understand this provision, as currently presented, will not protect them in any way. I would just ask that consideration be given to those particular categories because, if you think about it, an RAA staff member attending a broken-down vehicle is likely to be in a highly vulnerable and dangerous situation by virtue of the fact they are dealing with a broken-down vehicle on the road. I just raise those issues, but I am very supportive of what the member for Stuart has introduced. I commend the select committee on their thorough analysis of this issue.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (11:16): First of all, I would like to commend the committee and say that this is a great example of how committees work so well in this parliament. Those committees act in a bipartisan way and come up with ideas that will make it a better place for the people of our state, so well done to that committee.

As a member of the CFS for many years, I have attended many roadside accidents and fires. Most people use their common sense but, unfortunately, there are some idiots who will just drive straight past you at 100 km/h, and it is quite frightening when you are dealing with road accident victims or bushfires. So, I certainly support those speed limits being brought into place and thank the committee for what they have done.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (11:17): I would like to thank the members for their comments and just note that I have now found my notes. I would like to record my thanks to the committee staff for their excellent support for the difficult work the committee did. It was very cooperative, but finding a way of making this system work better than the previous system did was not easy.

I thank Paul Collett and Lauren Tester from the parliamentary staff and Aimee Travers from parliamentary counsel for the work they did in helping us explore options. I am pleased to hear that it seems that everybody in the house will be supporting the receipt of this report, and then we will go on to the more difficult part of considering how to implement it.

Motion carried.

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have two sets of amendments filed. It will be the second set that I will move at a later date. I appreciate the discussions I have had with the minister and the fact that, in principle, she supports the amendments, but I respect the fact that she needs to liaise with her colleagues, and that has not been possible for her to do before today.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

CITY OF ADELAIDE (CAPITAL CITY COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 September 2012.)

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (11:22): This is yet another attempt by the member for Adelaide to place herself on the Capital City Committee. It purports to be a proposed law, a bill, a normative measure, but, in fact, it is for the benefit of one identified person, and generally our procedures frown upon such attempts in the parliament.

The difficulty that the Adelaide City Council presents to the state is that it is essentially a suburban council superimposed on the capital city, and it behaves like a suburban council. Let me give just a few illustrations. One is that it has permitted parts of the Parklands to be fenced for private tennis courts and the gates locked. The Adelaide City Council recently issued a leaflet regarding Adelaide Oval, in which it said that the Parklands were the property of the ratepayers of the City of Adelaide. Of course, the Parklands are the property of all South Australians, not ratepayers of the City of Adelaide.

Ms SANDERSON: Point of order, Mr Acting Speaker: relevance. This is not an opportunity to berate the Adelaide City Council; this is about a bill in parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): There is no point of order. I am listening carefully to the member.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Another illustration is the North Adelaide Railway Station, a beautiful 19th century building, which would be ideal for a cafe or a restaurant. When an attempt was made in the 1990s to make it a restaurant, the faction associated with councillor Anne Moran, of Mills Terrace, North Adelaide—

Ms SANDERSON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker: this has nothing to do with the context of my bill. I draw the member back to the context of the bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Forces associated with councillor Anne Moran were successful in Adelaide City Council on stopping the North Adelaide Railway Station becoming a restaurant because it would spoil the residential amenity of people living up the hill on the other side of the golf course, in Mills Terrace. Apparently, the clash of knife on fork in the restaurant would generate so much noise that they would be disturbed in the quiet enjoyment of their homes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Point of order. I am trying to be reasonable here, but this is ridiculous. Clearly, the member is talking about a completely different matter. I understand he has a long-held history of frustrations with the City of Adelaide, but this is a bill relating to the City of Adelaide's Capital City Committee—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It's why we need a capital city committee.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It is—to make decisions for the future, not to have a historical perspective put upon it by you.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): There is no point of order. I will listen carefully to the member.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It is mischiefs like these that the Capital City Committee was designed to address. I was there, a member of the parliament, when this committee was created by legislation. It was a decision of the previous government not to put the then member for Adelaide, the then member for the state district of Adelaide, the Hon. Michael Armitage, on the committee. He did not serve on the committee in its original existence under the state Liberal government between 1998 and 2002, and there was a good reason for that, that the committee could not fulfil its role in addressing mischiefs such as these while an ally of the Adelaide City Council was placed on the committee in the guise of giving proper representation when, in fact, it would skew the committee in favour of the city council and against the government of the day, and that was a Liberal government.

The member for Adelaide assumes that if you are elected to the exalted position of member for the state district of Adelaide you must by dint of your elevation be a member of the government. And great is her discomfiture at finding herself the member for Adelaide and not a member of the government. What a shock! Well, from time to time the member for Adelaide will be

in opposition. From time to time the member for Adelaide will not be a member of the government, and this is one of those occasions.

However, I point out to the member for Adelaide that when the last Liberal member for Adelaide was a member of the government, indeed was a minister in the government, his government, his Liberal government, did not put him on the committee, and for good reason. The committee is meant to be a balance between the state government, representing the interests of South Australia as a whole, and the Adelaide City Council, representing the suburban interests of a particular kind of North Adelaide householder, one of the minority who vote in city council elections.

Now, to hold that balance there must be equal representation. To put the state member for Adelaide onto the committee would spoil that representation and at this time give the Adelaide City Council an effective majority on that committee, which would defeat its purpose. So, the government will not be supporting this bill. We will not be supporting it on principle. We would not support it whomever the member for Adelaide was.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:29): I would like to thank members in both houses for their contributions regarding this bill. It is great to have the bill passed in the upper house, where the majority of members are able to analyse the bill and judge it on its merits and not simply be told how to vote. I am extremely disappointed that the government has indicated—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Point of order: Mr Acting Speaker, the member for Adelaide has just impugned the motives and reflected on the integrity and the motives of this honourable house. She has implied that we did not give meritorious consideration to the bill. My understanding is that standing orders do not permit that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): I think that it is correct. I think the member for Adelaide should withdraw that.

Ms SANDERSON: I withdraw that. I first introduced this bill in 2011, then again in May this year due to the proroguing of parliament. I found it quite astonishing that the member for Taylor saw my attempt to gain better representation for the people of Adelaide as an opportunity for political or media pointscoreing. Since being elected, I have introduced several bills in response to pleas from constituents as that is my duty, to serve my electorate. I also mention that I have been successful on one occasion so far, which is a rarity in this house.

The member for Taylor seems quite concerned about the equal numbers of local and state government members on this committee. If this is her main issue, I ask that we amend the bill. There are several options: first, we could remove one of the government members to keep local and state representation the same; we could add another councillor, making it four plus four; or we could include the member for Adelaide as an observer with no voting rights. This is not about my trying to control the group, which would be pretty hard—

Time expired.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:31): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable private members business to be extended by five minutes.

Motion carried.

CITY OF ADELAIDE (CAPITAL CITY COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:32): This is not about my trying to control the group, which would be pretty hard with one vote from seven. This is about representing the people of Adelaide as their elected state member, it is about providing them with information, it is about putting forward their views, it is about knowing what is planned for the City of Adelaide so that when people call my office extremely concerned about the proposed changes I have the information either to allay their fears or to help them. In fact, I would be doing the council and the government a favour, as much of the disquiet in my electorate is due to having only part of the information or hearing rumours or not completely understanding the implications.

I would also like to correct the statement made by the member for Croydon in his original speech a month or so ago, when he stated:

I find it touching that the member for Adelaide thinks that the seat of Adelaide should always be a seat that is with the government.

At no point did I state that. What I was saying was that since the inception of the bill in 1998, the member for Adelaide had, until 2010, always been part of the government and thus had a way of getting their opinions and views heard, and a way of accessing the information that was discussed. I am not saying that the member for Adelaide must be on the committee, but when the member for Adelaide is not part of government it is unjust that their views cannot be heard and that they cannot access any of the information—even the minutes of the meeting.

As we know, for eight years the previous member for Adelaide was the chairperson in her capacity as the minister for Adelaide, a Labor-created ministry. I will wind up my remarks and commend the bill to the house.

The house divided on the second reading:

AYES (16)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.	McFetridge, D.
Pederick, A.S.	Pegler, D.W.	Pengilly, M.
Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R. (teller)	Such, R.B.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Venning, I.H.
Williams, M.R.		

NOES (20)

Atkinson, M.J. (teller)	Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.
Bignell, L.W.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Conlon, P.F.	Fox, C.C.	Geraghty, R.K.
Hill, J.D.	Key, S.W.	O'Brien, M.F.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Portolesi, G.	Rankine, J.M.
Sibbons, A.J.	Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G.
Vlahos, L.A.	Wright, M.J.	

PAIRS (10)

Redmond, I.M.	Weatherill, J.W.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Whetstone, T.J.	Rau, J.R.
Evans, I.F.	Piccolo, T.
Marshall, S.S.	Kenyon, T.R.

Majority of 4 for the noes.

Second reading thus negated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRAFFITI CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 3.45pm on Wednesday 17 October 2012 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET 2012) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 1.00pm on Thursday 20 September 2012 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:43): I move:

That Ms Chapman be substituted as manager at the conference with the Legislative Council in place of Dr McFetridge.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I move:

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

Motion carried.

FISHING SUPER TRAWLER

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:43): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes—
 - (i) the significant concerns of the South Australian community, commercial and recreational fishing groups, and conservation groups about the presence of the FV *Margiris* in our region and the proposal for it to operate in the South Australian Small Pelagic Fishery;
 - (ii) the importance of the Small Pelagic Fishery to the South Australian fishing industry and the marine ecosystem;
 - (iii) the potential risks that this immense trawler would have on threatened, protected and endangered marine species and potential impacts on fish species that are commercially important to our state;
 - (iv) the potentially devastating effects that this super trawler may have on the South Australian sardine industry which makes a significant contribution to our state's economy; and
- (b) opposes the proposed operation of the super trawler in the Small Pelagic Fishery; and
- (c) strongly urges the federal minister to reject the application for the FV *Margiris* to operate in the Small Pelagic Fishery.

As I am sure all members are aware, earlier this month the super-sized fishing trawler, the *Margiris*, now called the *Abel Tasman*, sailed into our state waters and into a sea of controversy. The arrival of this massive trawler understandably generated significant public interest and concern among fishers, conservation groups and the broader community. There is widespread concern about the trawler and its potential impact on local fisheries, marine mammals and marine ecosystems.

South Australians are passionate about the environment, both on land and in the sea, and they are passionate about their fishing. They want to ensure that our marine environment is protected and our fisheries are sustainable. In recent weeks I have been contacted by many of my constituents who have expressed their outrage on this issue and I know many other members have also been contacted by concerned constituents. It has been good during the past couple of weeks since I gave notice that I was introducing this motion to hear people from all sides say that they are quite concerned about the trawler.

I am hoping to keep my comments brief today so that we can hear from as many people as possible from all sides of the house and get that feedback so that we can take the speeches and the motion from here and pass it on to our federal colleagues so that they are aware of the feeling here in South Australia about this super trawler.

I understand the trawler was seeking to operate under a commonwealth fishing permit in the small pelagic fishery, which extends from just above the Queensland/New South Wales border right across southern Australia to north of Perth. The fishery is in commonwealth waters, which is typically around three nautical miles out from land. The size of the vessel is astonishing. It is 143 metres in length, and I am told it has a cargo capacity of more than 6,000 tonnes of fish. This would be the largest fishing vessel ever to operate in Australian waters and I am told it is the second largest ever built.

Given the sheer size of this ship, there has been significant concern raised about the risks to some of South Australia's unique marine life. Waters adjacent to South Australia are home to many threatened, endangered and protected marine species. The operations of this vessel could put at risk some of our iconic marine species, including the Australian sea lion, southern right

whale, New Zealand fur seal, Australian fur seal and the bottlenose dolphin. We must do all we can to prevent these important species from being impacted.

I am told there is also a risk of localised overfishing, which could in turn impact the local food chain. The targeted fish—jack and blue mackerel and redbait—are food for a range of marine life, including seals, dolphins, sea birds and southern bluefin tuna. The possible loss of these targeted species from the food chain in an area could potentially have serious local impacts on marine life. I understand the sardine industry is particularly worried about the potentially devastating impact this super trawler could have on their industry. The Small Pelagic Fishery overlaps important sardine fishing grounds, and the industry believes there is a very real risk of significant quantities of sardine by-catch.

I was very pleased when, earlier this month, the Minister for Environment and Conservation announced that the state government had written to the federal fisheries minister asking for him to intervene and ensure this vessel does not operate in Australian waters. Since that time, as members would be aware, the federal environment minister introduced legislation that will effectively defer any decision on approval for this fishing activity until a scientific assessment is undertaken. I understand that this legislation passed the commonwealth parliament yesterday. We are very pleased the commonwealth has taken action to stop this trawler from operating at least in the short term.

It is absolutely imperative that all the potential impacts are better understood before any final decisions are made. However, while we welcome the action taken by the commonwealth as a positive step forward, we must ensure that the concerns of the South Australian community are represented in this debate, and it is clear that South Australians do not want this giant trawler operating anywhere near South Australia.

For those who have travelled, particularly to Europe, it is interesting to see what has happened to their traditional fishing grounds and how many of them have been decimated. I was at a private lunch in London a couple of years ago when South Australian kingfish from around the Port Lincoln area was served up to a select group of people, including the food and wine writer from *The Sunday Times* and the chief food and wine buyer from Harrods. They were trying kingfish cooked six or seven different ways, and it was all about promoting the clean, green fish that we have on offer from here in South Australia.

People who live near where they traditionally were able to get fish know that those fish are not there any more because people have overfished those regions for the past several decades. They are looking to places like South Australia where we fish in a sustainable way and we look after our fishing grounds. What we do not want to see is a repeat of what happened in Europe happening here. We all need to stand together as one to protect not only what is a vital industry for South Australia that puts millions and millions of dollars into the state economy each year but also the fish breeding grounds of all sorts of species.

As we have heard, the sardine industry is really concerned because when you take those sardines out—and even though it is a by-product of the catch—when you throw them back in they do not survive. It is all very well to say, 'We didn't intend to catch those sardines; we are going to put them back and they will swim away.' They will not: they will die.

I am looking forward to hearing other contributions from people today, and hopefully we can wrap this up in fairly short time so we can send a message to our federal counterparts to show the sort of passion South Australians have for our environment and for our fishing industry. The government maintains that the application for the super trawler to operate in the Small Pelagic Fishery should be rejected, and I urge all members to support this motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:50): I wish to speak to this motion regarding the FV *Margiris* or the *Abel Tasman*, as it has been rebadged. This vessel has been rebadged in commonwealth waters as the FV *Abel Tasman* and is operated by Seafish Tasmania, a joint venture between Seafish Tasmania and Seafish Tasmania Pelagic, and is committed to long-term sustainable fishing in Australian waters. One point has remained constant throughout the super trawler debate: the *Abel Tasman* would only fish in commonwealth waters, those waters being outside the three-mile state limits, thus making it a commonwealth issue and not a state issue and, to spell that out, not a South Australian Labor government issue.

The operator of the FV *Abel Tasman* has met every requirement, abided by existing rules and complied with regulations. As one political commentator states, 'Its only crime was to run into a government in a tight political spot that is looking to attract votes on the back of a populist

environmental campaign.' This can be said of the federal and current South Australian Labor governments. The knee-jerk reaction by the federal government has put Australia's reputation as a stable investment country at risk, adding to a growing list of decisions that have penalised investors. As another commentator reports:

Investors already spooked by abrupt decisions and reversals on mining taxes, the carbon tax and live cattle exports now have one more reason to worry about sovereign risk—governments changing the rules after the money has been committed.

The reaction by the federal government has also drawn a lot of criticism, sighting the influence of the Greens.

The Liberal opposition acknowledges and supports sustainable fisheries management and sustainable fisheries practices, and in particular the South Australian commercial and recreational fishing industries. We recognise that the development of the fishing industry in South Australia and a commercial fishery needs to be based on a sound marine science platform. As a result of the federal government's inconsistent approach to policy we have seen 50 employees lose their jobs at Seafish Tasmania, and lose a considerable amount of money as a result of the introduction of the two-year ban on fishing while science is explored. Seafish Tasmania confirmed that it will be looking at compensation, which is expected to be in the tens of millions of dollars.

The state Labor government is happy to use science as an excuse where it sees fit, not having done so when implementing its marine parks policy and also in the debate on the River Murray. The federal Labor government has overreacted and backflipped on policy. The Liberal opposition believes the federal Labor government has not shown respect to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority and the CSIRO.

Some facts about the Small Pelagic Fishery: the *Abel Tasman* is targeting small pelagic fish—redbait, jack mackerel and blue mackerel—and has an 18,000-tonne quota already, which has been transferred from other vessels. No boat size limits apply in the Small Pelagic Fishery or in any fishery managed solely by the commonwealth. The Small Pelagic Fishery is managed by the Australian Fisheries Management Authority under a statutory management plan. The total allowable catch for each species and each zone of a fishery is set annually by AFMA in accordance with the Small Pelagic Fishery harvest strategy, a strategy that was signed off on by the Hon. Tony Burke when minister for agriculture, food and fisheries in 2008 and revised in 2009.

The harvest strategy policy was developed as a direct response to a ministerial direction calling for AFMA to take a science-based approach to setting total allowable catches and effort in commonwealth fisheries. The harvest strategy is based on sound science and recognises the ecological importance of the species and is precautionary. The harvest strategy requires that research is undertaken into the stock biomass, a fishery-independent stock assessment technique known as the daily egg production method. The objective of the Small Pelagic Fishery harvest strategy was:

The sustainable and profitable utilisation of the small pelagic fishery in perpetuity through the implementation of a harvest strategy that maintains key commercial stocks at ecologically sustainable levels and, within this context, maximises the net economic returns to the Australian community.

The SPF harvest strategy is similar to approaches successfully applied in other large fisheries for small pelagic species, for example, the South Australian sardine fishery, and has been developed to account for key fishery-specific attributes, such as:

- recent catches are limited by economic constraints and are considered by the SPF Resource Assessment Group to be below the maximum sustainable level and there is potential for sustainable expansion of the fishery;
- SPF species are an important food source for many threatened, endangered and protected species and other species and it is therefore important that the SPF harvest strategy takes into account the ecosystem role of these species; and
- small pelagic species are caught in high volumes and have low unit value. Additionally, there are high capital costs associated with the large-scale catching units and specific processing infrastructure required. As a result, fishing operators need to have a heightened efficiency.

But, most importantly, as a result of aiming to achieve this objective, minister Burke signed off on a point that welcomes mid-water trawlers such as the *Abel Tasman* to fish commonwealth waters for

small pelagic fish. I quote from the AFMA guidelines: 'There are considerable economies of scale in the fishery and the most efficient way to fish may include large scale factory freezer vessels.'

Commonwealth and South Australian fisheries policy has been well-managed with quotas in place to address overfishing in each fishery. However, quotas have been continually cut by state and commonwealth governments, making commercial fishing in certain fisheries unviable. To make it viable to fish, many quotas have been consolidated into one licence and, as long as the rules do not allow overfishing in any one area, this is seen as a sensible approach to fishing. In the same way that other industries increase size to cut costs and maximise efficiency, so is it sensible that the fishing industry is headed that way.

It is argued it should be encouraged that these quotas be filled with the least amount of cost in order to free up resources for other uses. The proposed operations of the *Abel Tasman* have met all requirements of Australian fisheries policy and the federal environmental protection laws. A strict quota has been set for the Small Pelagic Fishery and the fisheries management arrangements for the fishery have been strategically assessed by the federal environment department on several occasions, most recently in 2012. Quotas are in place in order to manage fisheries and to avoid undesirable flow-on effects of those fisheries on the food web and ecosystem.

Seafish Tasmania has had ranging quotas from 15,000 tonne to 26,000 tonne over the past 12 years, with 18,000 tonne considerably conservative in the scheme of things. The quota assigned to Seafish Tasmania was based on science performed by SARDI—our own scientists—and the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies at the University of Tasmania and reviewed by the CSIRO.

The result was a joint report by several marine scientists confirming that the Small Pelagic Fishery is sustainable and that the quotas set are conservative. There is a strong scientific basis and understanding of what is required of fishery management to protect the food web and broader ecosystem, and dependent fish, bird and marine mammal populations in particular, when conducting a fishery that targets the forage fish in that ecosystem. These requirements include that management be more conservative where there is a more scientific uncertainty about the forage fish or the food web. The harvest strategy for SPF was borrowed heavily from experience gained in the South Australian sardine industry.

Localised depletion is where fishing reduces the abundance of fish in a local area and for a period of time. Several scientists, including representatives from SARDI, CSIRO and the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, give confidence that food web impacts of the SPF on predators and the SPF species themselves, including through localised depletion, are unlikely.

Under the well-managed guidance of AFMA and PIRSA—and I say PIRSA, not DEWNR—fishing gear is regulated heavily to reduce bycatch and this is no different for the *Abel Tasman*. AFMA has committed to 100 per cent observer coverage to monitor bycatch and other aspects of fishery operations for the factory trawler.

There has been extensive research and sampling conducted on mid-water trawlers such as the *Abel Tasman* by the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies of the University of Tasmania researchers and AFMA observers, with many reports finding that mid-water trawl operations had minimal levels of catch of non-target species.

Stringent bycatch conditions have also been set under the well-managed guidance of AFMA. Fishing gear is regulated heavily to reduce bycatch. AFMA must be informed of all catch landed and verifies this information. If operators are found to have caught more than their quota, strict penalties apply. Small Pelagic Fishery operators must hold quota to cover bycatch of species that are subject to quota management in other commonwealth fisheries.

We do, however, recognise the concern outlined by industries such as the South Australian Sardine Industry Association that there can often be, and I quote from Paul Watson, the executive officer of South Australian sardines, 'a capacity for mistaken identity of species.' Mid-water trawl operations in the Small Pelagic Fishery include ongoing and effective observer coverage to monitor such interactions with seals and dolphins along with strategies that reduce capture and mortality rates.

Voluntary avoidance measures are in effect. The measures are simple: move-on rules that stop fishing and move the vessel to a different location if dolphins are sighted. In addition,

SPF vessels are required to use a seal-exclusion device. Voluntary ongoing measures and monitoring assesses excluder devices and manages the ongoing risk of marine mammal interaction and capture. The Australian Fisheries Management Authority also has a dedicated team of enforcement officers and a range of enforcement powers. I note that the federal government has set this ship on its way. We do not oppose the motion.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (12:00): I certainly support this motion. If we allow this type of fishing to happen in our federal waters, it will make a complete mockery of both the state and federal marine parks. I have always said that it is not marine parks we should be looking at but that we should be looking at the major threats to our marine environment, and I believe that a ship such as this is an extreme threat to our whole marine environment. It will threaten the biomass and the entire food chain of our marine species, which then will make it much harder for both amateur and professional fishermen of all species to make a living. I am certainly against it.

A trawler such as this will turn our seabed basically into a desert. If somebody was doing something like that on the land, they would be thrown in gaol tomorrow, so I am certainly against trawlers such as this operating in any of our waters. You have only to look at what has happened overseas where these types of activities have happened: it has put their whole fishing industries at threat or they have collapsed. In many of these countries, you cannot get any decent type of fish to eat because of past practices with ships such as this. I commend the motion.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (12:02): I rise to speak in favour of the motion from the member for Mawson on the *Abel Tasman* trawler. There are two reasons that people have raised serious concerns about this trawler. The first is the real danger that the trawler will damage our sardine fishery. This fishery is highly important to our economy and particularly for some of the local economies of our regional fishing towns. Any risk to that fishery must be avoided.

The second reason is that the industrial scale of this vessel, whose dimensions have been described so well by the member for Mawson, is highly concerning for small and medium-sized fishing operations. The local fishing community in South Australia is made up of small and medium-sized operations of fishing companies, including many family operations. Quite rightly, these communities are concerned about the impact on their ability to compete when such a massive ship, and potentially the first of many should it be allowed to come here, comes into their area of operation.

What these reasons add up to is a legitimate disquiet about the impact of changing the way in which we fish in such a significant way, and we have a right to question this. We do not have to be acquiescent about massive changes, and we can choose what happens in our waters. I support the motion.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:03): I rise to make a contribution today on this motion from the member for Mawson. It is particularly important to my electorate, given that the fishing vessel *Margiris* is currently tied up at the wharf in Port Lincoln and has been for some weeks. My information is that, as of this morning, it is still there. Unfortunately, through events beyond the control of the boat and the company itself, it has nowhere to go at this point in time.

I have said on occasion in this place that Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast of South Australia supply about 70 per cent of this state's seafood. The fishing industry is well established, has been long established, and it is a very important part of our regional economy in that part of the world. There has been discussion about the vessel *Margiris* since its arrival some weeks ago. I have to say that it was not altogether an unexpected arrival, given that the application for quota has been in the process for some two years. It was a federal allocation of some 17,800 tonnes out of the Small Pelagic Fishery. That quota was awarded to what is now known as the *Abel Tasman*, and they had every intention of fishing that quota.

The first the vast majority of the population of South Australia knew about the arrival of this ship was when it steamed into the harbour at Port Lincoln (Boston Bay) to take on fuel and supplies and television crews from Adelaide arrived to film Greenpeace bobbing around in their rubber dingy. They were, of course, dwarfed by this fishing vessel, which I understand is the second largest of its type in the world, although I have to add that this fishing vessel was in turn dwarfed by the grain carriers which were also loading in Port Lincoln.

There has been a mixed response amongst the local population and amongst the local fisheries in Port Lincoln. It has already been mentioned today that the sardine industry have their concerns. I have had many conversations with their executive officer. I am going to read from a media release they put out a couple of weeks ago. I quote:

The sardine industry is fully supportive of continued development of Commercial Fisheries in Australia. [We have] no issues with the science behind the allocation setting process for the FV MARGIRIS...

Mr Paul Watson, their executive officer, states:

All fisheries must be based on sound science including the Sardine Fishery and to be honest, management decisions should never be persuaded by public perception.

An interesting quote, I think. He goes on to say:

Unfortunately though, what we have here is a situation where an operation such as the FV MARGIRIS will be targeting a species of similar behaviour and size such as red bait, and it is Industry's view that it will be difficult to differentiate between the two.

Therein lies the problem. The problem is around bycatch, and we recognise that. In fact, bycatch is an issue in any fishery. The tuna industry, on the other hand, has been less critical and even supportive of the operation of this vessel, given that they too were once a fledging industry and understand that the development of a new sector needs to evolve based on sound science and the latest technology.

Much good science has gone into this. It has been mentioned that SARDI, the CSIRO and the Institute for Marine and Antarctic studies have all had input into the allocation of this quota, which was a viable quota up until yesterday when the federal government decided not to allow this vessel to fish. The essence of well-managed fisheries is good science. We say often and we say proudly in this place that South Australia has well-managed fisheries. We are recognised around the world for that, and we can be genuinely proud of that as a state. I do believe that we have done our very best, particularly in the last 30 years, to manage our fisheries to a sustainable level.

So, we are not opposing this motion, member for Mawson, even though as a local member representing a strong fishing community I have some reservations about some of the framework of the motion; we are not opposing it. I am very conscious that we need in this state to foster a productive landscape, but I also concede that that landscape has to be managed effectively, efficiently and sustainably. So, with those few words I will thank the house for its indulgence.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:08): I called in and saw the ship last week at the wharf in Port Lincoln, and it certainly is huge and the equipment is quite fantastic. It is loaded with the very latest in fish handling and detecting machinery, and everything else. It is a large vessel, of course, costing a lot of money. I certainly appreciate why this bill has been brought to the house by the member for Mawson, but I am concerned that this issue has been hijacked, so to speak, by the environmental people of the world, and it has become extremely emotive. I am sure that whatever we did, whatever we say, would not matter because public opinion out there says that this boat should not be allowed to fish. Like true politicians, we all fall over like little leaves and say, yes, we will go along with public opinion. I am not about to be one to go against that, but I do express my concern that really this boat was given every licence to come here with the expectation to fish.

I wonder who will now pay the compensation, because there is no doubt that it will be due and payable. The cost of bringing the ship here from where it came from—I think it was Ireland or Wales or somewhere—would be huge, and then they were not able to fish. I think there will be a compensation bill, but I hope that is for the federal government and nothing to do with the South Australian government. I can certainly appreciate the public opinion out there. We hear the argument about the size of the net, which is four times the size of an ordinary net—

Mr Griffiths: It's 200 metres.

Mr VENNING: It is 200 metres across, and an ordinary net is 50, so it is four times the size.

Mr Griffiths: And it's 600 metres long.

Mr VENNING: It is 600 metres long, so I can see the problem with a net that size. It could certainly cause a lot of damage, whereas with a small net I believe the bycatch could probably swim around and out of that. I would have some concern about anything trying to swim around a big net that size. So we do bow to public opinion here. I am not one who normally does that, but it would be foolish to do anything else at this moment. However, it is sad to see that the issue has been hijacked. I do not oppose the motion, and I commend the member for Mawson, who brought it here.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:11): I welcome the debate on this issue, and commend the member for Mawson for bringing it to the house. These are the sorts of issues that we should debate in this place; it is not the only issue of course, but it is an important one.

I think there are several points here. I think we have to be very careful that we do not, in effect, end up raping the whole of the fish stocks around Australia. It has happened in other parts of the world, and we should learn from what has happened elsewhere. Earlier this year—and this was on a privately funded deviation into Cornwall—at the fishing village East Looe I had a look at some of the statistics there, and for many years they were taking out something like 120 million fish per annum. No wonder there are not many fish left in those waters.

There are a couple of aspects to this issue, and one is the size of the vessel. Clearly, people could get around that issue by having three smaller vessels, or a number of smaller vessels, which would end up catching the same amount. What you need is proper management and proper science on which the catch is based or authorised. I am not sure that in this instance the process was as thorough as it should have been; I do not know, I am not in a position to know, but I think it is important that the process of determining the catch be scientifically based and thoroughly done. I am sure that is what will happen from now on.

I think it is unfortunate for a company to invest a lot of money to bring a vessel here and then find that, in effect, the rules have changed. If you want people to invest or be involved in your economy you have to have consistent policies and practices that give certainty to people investing. That is one of the reasons no-one invests in baseload power stations, because they are not sure what the future holds. So while I am not shedding tears, I do have some sympathy for the owners of this vessel for bringing it here and then finding that they cannot use it.

I do not believe it was the appropriate size of vessel to be used here, or elsewhere. I heard someone say that the fish of the catch could be feeding the people of Africa; I think that is a bit of a long bow. I believe most of the small fish they are targeting would have been used in the tuna and other industries. That highlights another point. We do not use the potential of our sardine fishery as we could and should. Sardines are very good for you—they are hard to fit in those tins, but they are a good fish, good for the ticker—and we have a very significant supply of sardines here. In Fremantle, Western Australia, they were canning some of theirs, and we could do a lot more in terms of making a value-added industry here, and I would like to see that happen.

In summary, I think this was a process that was not well handled at the federal level. The government has now bowed to public opinion because people were outraged that a vessel of this size could be deployed here but, as I said earlier, what you will find now is that they will use probably three or four smaller vessels which will have an aggregate catch which is probably somewhat similar.

What we need is science. To the credit of the prawn fishing industry in both gulfs here, they now have a sustainable industry that will keep them, their children, grandchildren and others in employment well into the future, as well as supplying prawns on a sensible, scientific basis. The same thing has happened in Western Australia with their lobster industry. As a result of proper controls, the rock lobster fishers in that state say that they are better off than they have ever been. They basically have a guaranteed supply because the industry is properly regulated, properly managed and, by having protected zones, they are now getting bigger rock lobster and more money for it.

I think the member for Mawson has undertaken a community service here by bringing this issue for debate. It is a pity that we did not know this development was going to happen before the vessel set sail for Australia. It would have been probably better for us to have the debate much earlier rather than now. We know that the federal government has put the stopper on it, but they need to go back to base one and look at the science involved in this whole industry.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (12:16): I, too, support this motion. I want to express my concerns. I think the motion does that quite ably but I am particularly interested in the third point in paragraph (a):

the potential risks that this immense trawler would have on threatened, protected and endangered marine species and potential impacts on fish species that are commercially important to our state;

I feel very strongly about that particular point, and I commend the member for Mawson for bringing this to the house, and I am pleased that it appears that the whole of this house supports the motion.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:17): I want to thank everyone who spoke today and the cross-chamber support that the motion has received. I think this is when parliament is at its best, when people can bring in here concerns from our local communities and the wider community. I agree with the member for Fisher that perhaps it would have been better had we known about this vessel before it set sail, and a lot of angst could have been avoided for the owners of this ship and the people who have contracted it to come here. Sometimes communities do not know what is happening until things are further progressed than other people would have liked.

What we cannot do is not respond to that community sentiment and those community concerns simply because people could point and say, 'This has been in the planning process for two years.' In general, the South Australian public became aware of this over the last six to eight weeks, and I think it is our duty as local members to represent the people in our local constituencies and bring their concerns in here. As I mentioned at the outset, I will be passing this motion and all the comments made in here on to our federal counterparts, the federal Minister for Fisheries, as well as the federal Minister for Environment.

I would like to pick up on a couple of points from the member for Hammond. He did not say, 'We support the bill,' he said, 'We don't oppose this bill.' I notice that he also did not oppose super trawlers. He said that it was a knee-jerk reaction from the Greens. I have to say that there are a lot of people out there who are not Greens' supporters who are concerned about this ship. I point to people in the fishing industry as well as from the conservation area, who have very real concerns about this.

People say that the science has been done on this, but the science was done on the cane toad, too, when we decided as a country to bring that in to look after the cane beetle. So, science does not always get it right and, if the public has concerns about it, it is our duty to bring it in here, have the discussion and then pass those concerns on to the people who can make the decisions, and in this case it is the federal Minister for Environment along with his colleague the federal Minister for Fisheries.

It was also mentioned that 50 jobs are involved. Yes, people had been hired to go and operate this trawler and go out and fish on the super trawler, but think of the millions of fish that could have been caught by this, and think of the hundreds and thousands of jobs that could have been lost in the fishing industry into the future had the federal government not intervened and if this super trawler was allowed to go out and decimate our fishing stocks.

We need to look at the future. We do have a proud history of sustainable management of our fisheries and we need to be ever vigilant and keep an eye on that into the future, because damage done to that not only means the loss of our fishing grounds, it can also mean the loss of our international reputation as a haven for clean, green food. With that, I put the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

DEFENCE FORCE NURSING OFFICERS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:21): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of nursing officers and physiotherapists in the Australian Defence Force and Australian Defence Reserve, including women who previously served with—
 - (i) the Australian Army Nursing Service;
 - (ii) the Royal Australian Air Force Nursing Service;
 - (iii) the Women's Royal Australian Naval Service;
 - (iv) the Australian Army Medical Women's Service;
 - (v) the Royal Australian Army Nursing Corps;
 - (vi) the Royal Australian Army Medical Corps; and
- (b) acknowledges the considerable sacrifice nursing officers have made in defence of our country at home and overseas in operations that span from the Boer War to Afghanistan;
- (c) notes the public service many returned nursing officers continue to provide after active service;
- (d) particularly commends the service of Sister Gwen Henderson and physiotherapist Audrey Abbey who, as colleagues of Sister Vivian Bullwinkel MBE, rendered distinguished service in World War II; and

- (e) notes all servicewomen are commemorated every year at the Bangka Service held at the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields on the Sunday closest to 16 February, the anniversary of the Bangka Island Massacre in 1942.

I would like to speak today with great pleasure about the motion I have put forward, which is to recognise the importance of nursing officers and physiotherapists in the Australian Defence Force and the Australian Defence Reserve. As the member for Taylor, I am grateful that I have been given the opportunity over recent months to be involved in the defence and veterans' affairs portfolios and I have developed a strong interest in these portfolios, particularly in relation to the nursing officers I have met during this time.

While the structure of the nursing services has been reformed throughout Australian history, their commitment to defending our country on home soil and overseas has always remained strong. I speak on this motion today because their efforts need to be commended and formally recognised. Australian nurses have been at the forefront of conflicts for more than 100 years and I would like to share some of the rich history that relates to this.

Even before Australia had an organised military nursing body, the Australian nurse Sister Mary Jane Armfield was sent to South Africa in July 1879 during the Zulu War. There she treated hundreds of casualties with limited supplies in run-down, makeshift hospitals. Sister Mary Jane Armfield is believed to be the first Australian nurse to receive a Royal Red Cross, a military decoration for exceptional services in military nursing. More than 80 Royal Red Crosses have been awarded to outstanding Australian nurses since this time.

Australia's first military nursing body was the New South Wales Army Nursing Service and it was made up of 14 nurses who spent three years in South Africa during the Boer War. The nurses were mostly unmarried and well educated women aged between 25 and 40. Many Australian nurses showed immense dedication to their work, serving across several wars. Nellie Gould was one of the nurses posted to South Africa and went on to enlist during World War I in 1914 at the age of 54. She went on to travel to Egypt, France and England, and she too received a Royal Red Cross.

Throughout World War I, over 3,000 Australian civilian nurses volunteered for the Australian Army Nursing Service (AANS). They worked in military hospitals, ships and trains in Britain, India, France, Belgium and the Middle East in terrible conditions. Following the Gallipoli campaign, endless streams of casualties were ferried to the Greek islands of Imbros and Lemnos, as well as to Malta, Egypt and Britain, and these nurses assisted them throughout the journey with limited supplies whilst battling diseases, seasickness, overcrowding and poor ventilation in their workplaces.

Matron Grace Wilson, in August 1915, was sent to the Greek island of Lemnos to help casualties from Gallipoli. The equipment and medical supplies that were meant to be there were delayed by three weeks. She persevered with no sanitation and limited water, and her team treated over 900 troops, despite the harshest conditions. There was only a 2 per cent mortality rate. She was awarded a Royal Red Cross for distinguished service in the field as a result of this work.

Between 1916 and 1919 over 500 Australian Army nurses were stationed in the British hospitals throughout India, where they nursed hundreds of Turkish prisoners of war and British troops that were wounded. Australian nurses were sent to India as British nurses were considered to be unable to adjust to the hot working temperatures.

During World War I there was an enormous amount of dedication and ingenuity displayed by Australian nurses. In 1914, 300 nurses left for Egypt to aid the casualties being sent there from Gallipoli. Having limited hospital spaces, they assisted in turning an Egyptian amusement park into a 1,500-bed hospital. It was during World War I in 1916 that the AANS nurses were given officer status, which was a very important achievement. A matron held three stars, a sister two stars and a staff nurse one star. Although this was a great achievement, nurses continued to receive half the pay of their male equivalents, and it would take a long time before this changed.

Throughout World War I the AANS did not allow married women to serve, so many Australian nurses were determined to find a way to assist the cause and signed up to travel with the Red Cross. The Red Cross Bluebirds were a group of Australian nurses who were posted to France in 1916, and some of these women joined to be closer to their loved ones already fighting in the war in this area.

By the end of World War I, Australian nurses had proved themselves to be an undeniable necessity to the medical military services that we provided to our troops, and in World War II

5,000 Australian nurses served throughout the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Britain, Asia, the Pacific and Australia. Seventy-eight of these nurses died, mostly due to conflict or as prisoners of war.

More and more military nursing services were established as a result of the increasing need. The Royal Australian Air Force Nursing Service was formed in 1940, followed by the Royal Australian Navy Nursing Service in 1942. In 1948, the Royal Australian Army Nursing Corps was also created. The greater demand for nurses never deterred their spirit or commitment to giving the best possible patient care standards. A testament to this is the story of Matron Best, who was stationed in Greece in 1941. When the fighting in Greece intensified, she was ordered to evacuate some of her nurses. When she asked who wanted to leave their posts and go, they all replied with a resounding no.

After Japan entered the war, most Australian nurses serving in the Middle East were sent home to work in military hospitals in every state, as northern Australia was being prepared for an inevitable attack. In 1942, as Singapore fell to the invading Japanese army, nurses such as Sister Vivian Bullwinkel put themselves in extreme danger to secure the wounded onto evacuation ships at the docks. The ships carrying the wounded and evacuees were targeted by Japanese bombers in the Bangka Strait the following night as they attempted escape.

The SS *Vyner Brooke*, carrying Sister Bullwinkel, was sunk as survivors clamoured ashore. As Japanese soldiers arrived on the beach, they rounded up the collection of surviving nurses and servicewomen and massacred them in cold blood. Sister Bullwinkel was badly wounded and was the sole survivor. She endured another three years of capture, internment and brutality before she could tell her story.

Another example of the commitment to nursing in our history was on 19 February 1942 when the Japanese bombed Darwin, killing 252 people. The hospital ship *Manunda* was hit, but continued to aid the wounded. Sister Margaret de Mestre was the first Australian nurse to die from enemy action on home soil during this attack. The following year, in 1943, the hospital ship *Centaur* was sailing to New Guinea when it was torpedoed by a Japanese submarine. The attack killed 268 people, despite the ship being clearly marked with a red cross. Only one Australian nurse survived out of the 64 passengers.

The wreckage of the *Centaur* was not discovered until 2009, 60 kilometres off Moreton Island. Not only was the *Centaur* used to raise support for the war at the time, but the discovery of the wreckage is a more recent reminder of the devastation and hardship serving Australians put up with during wartime over many years. Those nurses who did make it to New Guinea were stationed in Port Moresby, and there they treated the wounded on the Kokoda and Milne Bay campaigns.

Following World War II, the world was gripped by a cold war that spanned nearly 30 years. During this time Australian nurses were sent to Korea, Malaysia, Indonesia and Vietnam. Indeed, I have very many Vietnam vets in my electorate. The Vietnam War saw Army, RAAF and civilian nurses sent to South Vietnam, where they mostly attended to traumatic amputations caused by mine explosions. Between 1967 and 1971, 150 military nurses and 200 civilian nurses were working in Vietnam. Nurses recall working 14 days straight during the 1968 Tet Offensive.

Even though they put their lives at risk, they returned home and were often met with anti-war sentiments and protests, despite their healing capacities. With the Vietnam War came advancements in medical and military technology. This is evidenced when you look at the casualty figure survival rates, with 8.5 per cent of casualties dying after reaching hospital during the Second World War, compared with 3 per cent during the Vietnam War. At the time, nurses were being trained as Medevac nursing officers who did aeromedical evacuations between Vietnam, Malaya and Australia.

The 1970s brought some changes to the nursing officers. They had progression of the status of women in the military. Female nurses were given the same pay as their male equivalents and were able to remain in the service after marriage or having children. It was also a time that the first male nurses began to serve. This was largely due to the lobbying of Group Officer Betty Docker, the director of the RAAFNS between 1970 and 1975, and in recent times Australian nurses have served in war and peacetime in the first Gulf War, Rwanda, Timor-Leste, Cambodia, Bougainville, the Solomon Islands and Afghanistan.

The extraordinary story of Squadron Leader Sharon Cooper of the RAAF demonstrates the exemplary dedication nursing officers have to their work. In 2004, she was involved in a helicopter crash while serving in East Timor. Her recovery involved learning how to walk again, but by

2005 Sharon Cooper was assisting aeromedical evacuations from the devastating Bali bombings in Indonesia. Following this, she was made the officer in charge of the Australian treatment facility in Tarin Kowt in Afghanistan for three months in 2008, and during her time her team experienced the largest number of Australian casualties in one attack since the Vietnam War. About her time in Afghanistan she says:

There is little more confronting than treating one who wears your uniform. I struggle with the knowledge that I cannot deliver my team to their families in the same condition I received them.

Her words reiterated the need to recognise the important contribution nursing officers have made to the defence of our forces and our nation and how they show incredible understanding and hard work in the most intense and unfamiliar circumstances that many of us would struggle to fully comprehend or understand.

Today, both men and women serve as nursing officers and continue to give the highest level of care to those who need it the most, for civilian and military people in our nation and overseas and our neighbours, whether their countries have been destroyed by war, natural disaster or civil unrest.

I would like to finish my speech today by recognising and honouring Sister Gwen Henderson OAM, who sadly passed away in August this year at the age of 103. She was one of South Australia's last surviving World War II nurses. She had served in Palestine, Syria, Egypt and Port Moresby. After returning from war, she spent decades contributing to the Returned Sisters Sub-branch of the RSL, which eventually saw her receive a well-deserved Medal of the Order of Australia for her services to the veteran community.

The stories I have told today are simply a snapshot of the broad captivating and heroic contribution nursing officers have made to the Defence Force. They are stories that need to be told as they continue to work tirelessly to protect Australians and our neighbours. I would particularly like to thank those honourable women who personally have shared their stories with me over the past months, and they include Pam Ward, Kerrie Barrett, Gaynor Tilley and, from my own local Two Wells RSL sub-branch, Jennifer Dowling and Cheryl Fittock. I also thank all nursing officers who have served our country and, more importantly, the lives and wellbeing of our servicemen and women, both past and present. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:29): I will make a brief contribution. I commend the member for Taylor for bringing this before the house as it is important that, whilst we generally focus on the contribution of men in the armed services, we should not overlook the fact that for a long time, over 100 years, we have had many women serving in the various arms of the Defence Force. Without debating the merits of some of the wars that we have been involved in—the Boer War is one that, I think, we could debate and raise a few questions about—we are focusing on the service of people in these battles and wars and, in particular, the contribution of those in the health professions.

I currently have a female relative who is a health professional serving in one of the combat areas. I will not be too specific because it can put them at risk, but I have always had a very high regard for nurses, not just those in the military. With very few exceptions, I have always found them to be very fine, dedicated, caring people.

On my recent trip to Western Australia, I met by accident a lady who knew Vivian Bullwinkel. If people who suggest that females might be a bit reticent, delicate or sensitive and unable to stand up for themselves met some of these people, including this lady from the town of York in Western Australia, it would dispel any notion that somehow women are not capable of doing tough things and enduring.

One of the things she said about Sister Bullwinkel was, in that atrocious massacre of the nurses, the nurse in charge, before they were shot, told the nurses to face the enemy and stand tall, which they did. Vivian Bullwinkel survived because a dead nurse fell on top of her and the Japanese thought she was dead, but she actually survived because a colleague who was dead fell on her and the Japanese did not detect that. I did not meet her personally, but she was apparently an outstanding person, not only in terms of nursing but in all aspects of her character.

I think it is important that we remember that, as I say, whilst most of the people who served have been men, there have been a lot of women who have served and some of them have paid the ultimate price, including those who were massacred. There were not many nurses killed in World War I. I think there was one royal nurse who got hit by a shell in a tent while administering care to

the soldiers but, irrespective of the numbers, we acknowledge their commitment and the sacrifice they have made—not only people like Sister Vivian Bullwinkel, but all of those women who have served in the health professions for well over 100 years.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:37): I, too, would like to speak to this motion. I had the honour of attending the funeral of Sister Gwen Henderson, one of the last remaining World War II nurses here in South Australia. In the past few months, South Australia has lost Betty Bradwell at the age of 96, Edith Eadie at the age of 104 and Gwen who was also 104. These women led extraordinary and long lives. I would like to put on the record the statement that the Premier asked me to read on his behalf to Gwen's family:

The State and people of South Australia mourns the loss of Miss Gwen Henderson O.A.M., one of South Australia's last surviving World War Two nurses.

Sister Henderson's story is one of sacrifice and service.

She enlisted in 1940 and served at Woodside Camp Hospital and Wayville Camp Hospital until drafted for service overseas.

Sister Henderson served in Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and in Port Moresby and Lae in New Guinea. This included service at the desert site hospital of Buseilli, Egypt, treating casualties from the Battle of El Alamein.

After the war, Sister Henderson continued nursing before retiring as Senior Sister, Out Patients Department, Daws Road in 1968.

Sister Henderson joined the Returned Sisters Sub Branch of the R.S.L. in 1947 and after decades of tireless work was made a life member of the R.S.L.

She was subsequently awarded a Medal of the Order of Australia for service to veterans through the Returned Sisters Sub-Branch of the Returned and Services League of Australia.

Sister Henderson made a unique contribution to our nation and her fellow Australians, both in and out of uniform. Her selfless dedication will never be forgotten.

The loss of Sr Henderson comes shortly after the loss of Sr Betty Bradwell, OAM and Sr Edith Eadie, AM. The loss of these three great ladies sees the passing of a unique era.

The State and people of South Australia recognise and thank Sr Henderson for her service, and extend their condolences to her family.

Lest we forget.

Sister Henderson is survived by her nephews and nieces Janet, Trevor, Warren, Julie, Roger, Graham, Paul and their families. It was a pleasure to meet them at the ceremony in the Florey Chapel. We do mourn the loss of such a great woman.

I was also able to get an obituary on Sister Edith Eadie AM (nee Butler) from *The Advertiser* of 18 August. She is important, of course, because both Sister Eadie's grandfather and uncle were premiers of South Australia, and her father, Colonel Charles Butler, became well known for running the South Australian rural weekly *The Chronicle*.

Edith Eadie joined the Australian Army nursing service in 1940 and sailed for England with 20 other South Australian nurses, and she had a long and distinguished career in the services. She married a Japanese prisoner of war survivor, Dr Norman Eadie, on her birthday in 1950. Through their shared experiences of the war, they had become close. Norman died in 1984, and Edith continued to live at Glen Osmond until three years ago. Edith is survived by her nephews David and Philip Marshall and their families.

This unique service by these wonderful women is something we do not see quite as much of these days, and we certainly do not hear as much of it. I commend the motion to the house and look forward to its passing.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): The ever popular member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:41): Thank you, sir. I do not know about the first bit, but anyway. Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words on this motion. I think it is a good motion, and I support the member in her desire to get it through the house. There is no question that it will get support from both sides of the chamber.

For me, there are a couple of names that come to mind. I have to remember Sister Patsy Darke. When I went to boarding school at the tender age of 12½, Patsy Darke was the boarding house matron, and she was mother to some 120-odd boys, I think, at that time. She was ruthless in a very friendly manner. Patsy Darke, who had been a nurse during World War II, had never

married. She went on to live a long and full life. Patsy was a wonderful woman. As boarders, we used to shoot down at about half past eight, from memory, and Patsy was normally having a few tipples by that time of night with a couple of the other school masters. I remember Patsy with a great deal of respect.

The other one I will mention is Sister Lilla Lashmar. Lilla Lashmar was on the *Vyner Brooke*, along with Vivian Bullwinkel. She was not much more than a girl, as I understand it, from Antechamber Bay on Kangaroo Island. She perished on that day, along with the others who were butchered by the Japanese on that sad occasion. Because of her, I always followed the life of Vivian Bullwinkel with a great deal of interest.

The member for Florey talked about others who have gone recently. They are a generation that has all but disappeared, I would suggest. They did a magnificent job. However, in fairness to the mover of the motion, the motion recognises nursing officers and physiotherapists, etc. who have served from the Boer War right through to today, so we should not forget what women who are performing nursing and physiotherapy roles in Afghanistan are going through as we speak. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:44): I, too, join with other members of the house in supporting the motion the member for Taylor has brought to the house. The member for Taylor raised five specific points in her motion, and she also highlights the respective services nursing officers and other service people have served in. Obviously, I support all the remarks made by the other members. In my role as shadow minister for veterans' affairs, it is clearly very important that we do identify, highlight and pay tribute to the nursing officers and other members of the Defence Force in those respective capacities for the assistance and care they provide. Clearly, they played a critical role right through all the different areas of operation. In the motion the member for Taylor talks about those operations both at home and overseas that stand from the Boer War to Afghanistan, so they cover a significant part of the history of our country.

One point I would like to make is that in attending the ANZAC Day march we see all the returned servicemen but you also see the returned servicewomen march in the ANZAC Day parade. There are people who march on that day who are obviously from the area of nursing, because you see these ladies march in their old uniforms, and that illustrates the broad nature of service that people have provided to our country.

In the motion, the member for Taylor specifically highlights Sister Vivian Bullwinkel and also the commemorative Banka service held at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields every year. I recall from a previous role working for the member for Schubert some years ago that a memorial garden in the Lower North, the outer Barossa Valley, had been established in the township of Kapunda to commemorate Vivian Bullwinkel. That person has had a strong connection to the Kapunda community. It is my understanding that it is a lovely garden established in Kapunda to commemorate Vivian Bullwinkel. We know there is a lot of history and significant other issues concerning that matter.

I have not yet had the privilege to attend the Bangka service, but I look forward to attending it, hopefully in 2013. I have only just recently been appointed the shadow minister for veterans affairs (late last year) and have not attended that service. However, in speaking to people who have attended the Bangka service, I understand it is a very moving event and it pays to due tribute to those whose memories are commemorated there. Obviously on this side of the house we unreservedly support the motion, and I look forward to contributions from other members.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:49): I also wish to support the member for Taylor and commend her on bringing the motion before the house and recognise the excellent words spoken by all members of the chamber who have contributed to the debate. I wish to talk about a person who has not been mentioned yet and who is involved in some way. I am very proud of the fact that the Yorke Peninsula football and netball leagues now celebrate ANZAC Day with a special commemoration medal that goes to the best player in A grade netball and football.

They do so in recognition of two Yorke Peninsula people who paid the supreme sacrifice. As it relates to nursing, one is Lieutenant Annie Merle Trenerry, who was part of the Bangka massacre, but in a slightly different context. Annie was a lieutenant in the 2/13th Australian General Hospital. She had been in Singapore for five months. She was with 65 nurses, who were part of the *Vyner Brooke*, with 240 women and children. When they were strafed by the Japanese and forced into small dinghies to try to escape to the closest islands—some 10 miles away, I understand—Annie was actually part of a group that was never sighted again. So she was not part of the Banka

massacre, the disgraceful killing of 22 brave Australian women, but she was with some other nurses, with women and children, tending to the wounds of those who had suffered as a result of being shot at by the Japanese. Sadly, like many others in all theatres of war, their remains were never found.

I am particularly proud that Yorke Peninsula celebrates her contribution to our society and our life, and her contribution to the Australian Defence Force overseas. It displays it in a very respectful way; there is a memorial at the Morchard Cemetery, and there is a medal presented each year to the best player in A grade. I actually think that the last recipient was Amy Brokenshire, who is the daughter of the Hon. Rob Brokenshire from the other place, who was playing for Paskeville. It is done out of great respect.

I think it is indeed wonderful that this chamber has been brought together to talk about sacrifices made by Australians to ensure that our world is a safer place. So, member for Taylor, well done.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:51): Very briefly, I commend the member for Taylor. The member for Kavel just reminded me—and my memories are now flooding in—of when we commemorated Sister Vivian Bullwinkel in Kapunda. I have actually forgotten the name of the four ladies who were present on that day, with a large gathering of the community. Those four ladies, who commemorated this at the memorial down in the main street of Kapunda, were very highly decorated. I remember who one of them was, because she was the world famous White Mouse. Nancy Wake was there; an absolutely extraordinary woman. What she achieved, and lived! What they said about Vivian Bullwinkel was just fantastic. My memory does not allow me to recall who the other women were, but they were extremely decorated women.

As the member for Kavel just said, they created a special garden in Kapunda at Dutton Park, and I suggest members go there. It is absolutely beautiful. There is a bust of Sister Vivian Bullwinkel, and all the story is there. The way the Kapunda people maintain this garden just tells us how much the community very much respects what these people did. I commend the member for Taylor for bringing this motion to the house; we certainly support it.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:52): I would like to thank all the members here today who contributed their feelings and thoughts on the importance of this motion to the house, and their recognition of the nursing officers who have assisted our Defence Forces as well as our nearby neighbours in peacekeeping, natural disasters and war time over the past years of our nation's history—and even before we were a nation, in the time of the Zulu War. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

GONSKI EDUCATION REVIEW

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:54): I move:

That this house notes the Gonski report and indicates its support for educational reforms that are progressive and cater for all students.

The motion is not quite a fence-sitter. I personally support most of what is in Gonski but I think it is important that we debate these issues. Some people may disagree with the report and this gives people an opportunity, whatever their view, and whatever the view of their electorate, to indicate it here.

The term 'Gonski' has now become part of the language. People say 'You're a Gonski' or 'You're going to be Gonski'. I think it was important for the federal government to commission the Gonski report. In the report, Professor Gonski and his team have indicated that Australia has a relatively high-performing schooling system when compared to international benchmarks such as the Program for International Student Assessment.

The first point is that the report is not a damning indictment of our education system, and by 'system' I include state systems, Catholic and independent in that terminology. Whilst we can do better and, certainly, the Gonski report indicates how that might be achieved, the first point is that it is not a report that is damning in terms of what is happening in our schools in Australia or in recent times at least.

However, despite that general positive assessment, the report indicates that there has been a decline at all levels of achievement in Australia in the last decade, particularly at the higher end of scholastic achievement. For example, in 2000, only one country outperformed Australia in

reading and scientific literacy and only two outperformed Australia in mathematical literacy. In 2009, six countries outperformed Australia in reading and scientific literacy and 12 outperformed Australia in mathematical literacy. So there is a gap in regard to our highest and lowest performing students and that is where Professor Gonski and his colleagues suggested that we need to do more and have suggested ways in which we can improve performance.

One point that the Gonski report highlights is the need to tackle more vigorously, and better fund, students who are disadvantaged as a result of low socioeconomic background, those from Indigenous backgrounds and so on. I think that is good and I believe we should spend significantly in those areas.

There is one significant deficiency in this report, and I think that there are a couple of others. One is that there is no focus on children at the other end of the spectrum, the talented and gifted, and many of them are discriminated against because our system in many aspects does not cater for children who are talented and gifted. Whilst we need to address the issue of disadvantage, whether it be as a result of economic circumstances or some physical or mental disability, whatever it may be, we also need to focus on the children who have a particular talent or gift, whether it is musical or other forms of academic achievement, because I do not believe the current system, across the whole board, does that. In regard to Gonski, I think that that is one area they did not pay enough attention to. I have written to the Prime Minister pointing out what I believe is a deficiency in the report.

I do not think anyone in here would argue against helping those who need greater support. I personally came from a family which was by no means well off, in fact it was quite the opposite, but education was seen as the key to trying to improve your lifestyle and opportunities in life. Everyone in our family has taken advantage of our education system. One sister married a millionaire. That is another option. It is an easier option than the academic one, and you get to travel around the world every year, but when you go down the academic path, you only go to places like Victor Harbor or probably the Barossa if you are especially lucky. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

CHAMBER FILMING

The SPEAKER: Members, first of all, I will talk to the media and remind them that over the last couple days there have been a number of incidents where they have been filming people who are not on their feet and also a photo appeared in the paper that looked like it had been taken of somebody who was not on their feet in the chamber. I remind you to observe the conventions of the house as far as media are concerned, or we will have to say that you cannot come in here.

I also notice one of the members has material on display on his chest today which he could be named for. However, in view of the nature of the material that he is displaying, I have to say that I will let him get away with it today. He is wearing the right colours, so it is okay. Go Crows at the weekend!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (15 May 2012).

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

1. It is expected that the review regarding the management of emergency patients at the Flinders Medical Centre will cost approximately \$66,000.

2. The Adelaide Health Service was dissolved in 2010 with the creation of Local Health Networks, namely Central Adelaide Local Health Network, Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

The review included recommendations that are applicable to all hospitals and will be implemented across the state.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET 2012) BILL

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:02): I have to report that the managers for the two houses conferred together and that no agreement was reached.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (COVERT OPERATIONS) ACT

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In April 1995, after the High Court decided an appeal called *Ridgeway v The Queen* in favour of the accused, the parliament passed the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 with the support of all sides of politics. The object of the legislation was to place the law of police undercover operations on a legislative footing and to ensure that certainty existed in the law. The High Court ruling on entrapment by police of drug dealers and other criminals had created uncertainty for the police and the courts.

As honourable members may be aware, one of the safeguards that was built into the legislation, which significantly extends police powers, was that there should be notification of authorised undercover operations to the Attorney-General and an annual report to the parliament. The Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 was incorporated into and replaced by the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009. That new act added reporting obligations about other legislated aspects of covert operations. The current statutory provisions have not been the subject of any noteworthy comment by any court.

I am pleased to assure the house that the legislated system is meticulously adhered to by both the police and my office. The details of the police notifications form the basis of the report that the statute requires me to give to parliament. I table the report.

QUESTION TIME

STATE ECONOMY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why, after 10 years of Labor government, our state now has the nation's lowest business confidence, the nation's lowest retail sales growth, the nation's lowest export growth, the nation's lowest growth in housing starts, the nation's worst performing workers compensation system, the nation's highest youth unemployment rate, the lowest property sales figures in 27 years, and the nation's highest taxes?

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has to understand that there were a lot of imputations in that question that I hope she can justify. However, if the Premier chooses to answer the question he can.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:05): We don't accept the characterisation of the South Australian economy in the way in which the honourable member has described. We have, as a state, set out a very clear vision for the future of our state. It builds on our traditional strengths in agriculture, food and fisheries. It seeks to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You have asked the question and the Premier is answering it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am articulating a vision for the state, which is something that those opposite are incapable of doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They are incapable of articulating a positive vision for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: We have listened to the Premier for half a minute. He has been debating and not attempting to answer the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: When you ask a question that will inflame the government, I think you can expect to get a whack back, but, Premier, you will return to the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: South Australia has grown over the last financial year by 2.4 per cent in 2010-11, while Australia's gross domestic product grew by 2.1 per cent, so that completely contradicts the proposition advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. We grew faster than the national average in the last 12-month period that was recorded. Our per capita GDP growth has outstripped the national average also, consistently, in the last period of time. These are incontrovertible statistics which are—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The opposition are always fond of picking and choosing, like a box of chocolates, those things that they like the look of.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What I am telling you is that the general measure of our economy, which is gross state product, grew faster than the national average in the last measurable year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is the simple truth and the simple facts. Like all economies within the national economy, there are different effects depending on the nature of the particular statistic that you are looking at. For instance, in relation to investment, we grew faster than the other economies which are described as the non-resource economies. For instance, the economies of Australia—when you take out of the national economic picture Queensland and Western Australia, the rate of investment grew here stronger than in any of the other states. That is a fact, it is an incontrovertible fact, and it is a sign of the economic strength of South Australia.

Our per capita GDP growth—that is, the growth of the state as standardised for the number of people living in the state—is also stronger than the national average. This is evidence of robust strength and growth in the state economy, not signs of weakness. I know that those opposite only have one strategy, which is to talk down South Australia and not offer any alternative vision for South Australia. Of course—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —we know why that is. It is because the leader is incapable of delivering that because she rules a divided party, a party that does not give her the space to allow her to articulate a vision, because why would you?

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: I think the Premier is clearly going into debate now.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is responding to your question, but I would ask him to go back to the question. Have you finished? The member for Taylor.

EMIRATES AIRLINES

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:09): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier advise how the decision by Emirates to add Adelaide to its expanded global route network will benefit South Australia?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:09): I had the privilege this morning of attending at Adelaide Airport to represent the state government on the occasion of the official celebration of the beginning of what I am sure will be a wonderful relationship between

Emirates Airlines and South Australia. The event today was attended by His Excellency the Governor, Jane Jeffreys who, of course, is the chair of the Tourism Commission and who has done a fantastic job in that role, and Senior Vice-President, Salem—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It was also attended by Emirates Senior Vice-President—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Are you done? Okay. It was also attended by Emirates Senior Vice-President, Salem Obaidalla. He represents the Far East and Australasia aspect of their operations. They flew for the first time ever a Boeing 777 aircraft from Melbourne to Adelaide specifically for the purpose of this promotional flight. It is the first time they have done that at all. They did advise me that, if they had had more time, they would have been able to bring a new plane—this one is, after all, nearly six weeks old!

The plane, just for members who might contemplate using the service that is going to be provided by Emirates, had eight first class, 42 business class and over 250 economy class positions on the plane. It can carry over 24 tonnes of cargo, in addition to looking after the requirements of the passengers. As members might recall, from 1 November this year, there will be four flights a week to Adelaide rising to a daily service from 1 February 2013.

I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Adelaide Airport. The people there have worked tremendously hard to bring this outcome. I would also like to congratulate the Minister for Tourism and the Tourism Commission. During my time as tourism minister, I tried to bring this off and didn't succeed. I am happy to concede that my successor has done what I did not find possible. I would also like to congratulate my ministerial colleague the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, whose department has done a fantastic job in conjunction with these people.

What are we going to get out of this? We are going to get one of the world's biggest, fastest growing and best airlines flying directly in and out of Adelaide every day. Secondly, we are going to have enhanced opportunities for trade—in particular, some of the just-in-time perishable trade goods which I know DMITRE is looking at adding to in terms of export opportunities—and, of course, tourism is going to be enhanced by this option.

Some of the members opposite, who might have spent a long time sitting in Singapore airport on their way to somewhere, will be pleased to know that the flight from Adelaide to most of Europe will now take 20 hours, including a 70-minute stopover in Dubai. You may also be interested to know that, for the first time, people will be able to fly direct to the east coast of the United States, to New York, with one stop.

This is a pretty dramatic change from what we have been used to here in South Australia but, even more importantly, the reverse is also true. People from the east coast of the United States will be able to land here in Adelaide with just one stop, people from Europe will be able to get here to Adelaide in just 20 hours, direct, and we are also going to have markets opened up to the Middle East which, up until now, has been an area that has been unserved by adequate flights.

If that was not enough, there was also an announcement today which, I guess, has already been heralded to some extent in the press. The arrangements that are coming up now between Qantas and Emirates mean that, particularly for Australian travellers, all of the strength that Qantas Airways brings with its network here and overseas, and its facilities here and overseas, will be linked in with those of Emirates.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister has used his four minutes plus a bit.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he has, but I was allowing him to finish his statement.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, it is good news, Madam Speaker. It will mean that people who have a relationship with Qantas through their frequent flyer programs and Emirates will be able to have opportunities to mutually take advantage of this opportunity. This is fantastic news for Adelaide. It is a great opportunity. I welcome it, and I know the Premier and the government strongly welcome the arrival of Emirates, and we look forward to a long and happy association with it.

STATE BUDGET

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): I am a bit puzzled. I, too, welcome the arrival of Emirates. I just do not understand why the rule applies only sometimes. My question is to the Treasurer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Have government revenue forecasts declined since the May budget and, if so, by how much, given that, since the budget, housing starts are down by 7 per cent, new home sales are down by 17 per cent, there are 12,000 fewer jobs and the Olympic Dam expansion has been cancelled?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:16): I will give a full update when we release the Mid-Year Budget Review, but I think it would be fair to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —that, broadly speaking, revenues are on track as we forecast them at budget time.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister inform the house about positive developments within the mineral resources sector?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:16): It's all true. Madam Speaker, I was delighted yesterday to join representatives from the Resources Industry Development Board, your local community of Whyalla, and Arrium, formerly known as OneSteel, at the official reopening of the Iron Baron mine. Madam Speaker, as you would well know, the Upper Spencer Gulf and the Middleback Ranges are the birthplace of Australia's iron ore sector and remain the cornerstone of our nation's steel-making industry.

The historic reopening of the Iron Baron mine highlights the continuity of iron ore mining in the Upper Spencer Gulf region, which has stood the test of time for over a century. Set to provide more than 100 jobs, Madam Speaker, it will support a range of businesses across the Upper Spencer Gulf region and, in particular, your home town of Whyalla. Local suppliers were instrumental in the development, with many Whyalla-based companies—in fact, nearly all—subcontracted to perform numerous aspects of the work. Iron Baron is yet another example of the myriad resources projects across the state that are providing employment opportunities for those living in regional South Australia.

Arrium, as one of South Australia's premier iron ore producers, is rejuvenating South Australia's rich iron ore sector through the Middleback Ranges and beyond. Arrium's recent achievements, coupled with plans to expand its port facility and to double its export volumes, builds on a long history of successful operations in Whyalla. Indeed, these initiatives will hold Arrium in good stead as it seeks to increase exports from six million tonnes a year to 11 million tonnes by 2013. This will see Arrium's workforce double from 1,000 to 2,000. With the reopening of Iron Baron, Arrium has embraced modern technology and techniques to improve efficiency and extract the value of the site. Arrium has demonstrated true leadership in generating new-style solutions to effectively and efficiently rework this mine site.

It is important to recognise that projects of this nature are the result of excellent project planning skills, production and construction. I pay credit to the numerous teams who have worked together to successfully bring the Iron Baron project online. Importantly, I congratulate the hard work of my department and the efforts of our state's hardworking public servants. The close working relationship between Arrium and DMITRE shows yet again why South Australia is regarded as one of the world's best regulatory environments for the mining industry. As Greg Waters, Arrium Mining chief executive, made it clear at yesterday's opening:

DMITRE, rigorous, disciplined and no 'free kicks', but their knowledge, commitment and style enables a 'win win' outcome.

He went on to say that Arrium has the confidence to push ahead, not looking over its shoulder if the regime or rules change again. Without this, you cannot do projects like this, particularly in today's market.

This government recognises how pivotal the state's Public Service is in fostering resource and energy projects for the benefit of all South Australians. We know that, without the hard work of the resources and energy group and those across DMITRE, South Australia would not see projects such as the Iron Baron mine and would lose out on billions of dollars of investment in our state's resource sector.

This government recognises that without the diligent approvals process of well-informed and experienced public servants, the approvals process would instantly grind to a halt. This would not only increase the risk of poorly managed mine sites but also threaten billions of dollars of investment and thousands of jobs. This, of course, could all be at risk if the Leader of the Opposition's plans come to fruition. Members opposite want to reduce the size of the minerals team by at least 25 per cent.

This government recognises the importance of providing a stable and world-class regulatory regime, an environment that has allowed not only Iron Baron but a number of minerals and energy projects to be developed across this state. It is clear opposite that their counterparts in the Queensland Liberal government—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister has exceeded the four minutes allowed to answer a question.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired, but I think his answer has expired also.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Health. Have orthopaedic surgery appointments been deferred at Modbury Hospital following a dispute between the government and specialists and, if so, how many patients are affected and are nursing staff having to take leave?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:21): I thank the member for Morphett for his question. I have some information about this, which I am happy to share with the house. I am advised that the Modbury Hospital orthopaedic surgeons—and I think there are about half a dozen, but three senior ones—were offered new contracts of employment in accordance with the standard contract that had been developed by the Department for Health and Ageing. These are, as I understand, visiting medical specialists, and we recently negotiated new arrangements and they are being signed with specialists who work part-time (that is what a VMS is) right across the state.

The Modbury Hospital orthopaedic surgeons have sought a collective agreement via codicil as an addendum to the offer of employment, more recently via what they call a quality and safety agreement between the orthopaedic surgeons at Modbury and Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. The items identified in the codicil are not employment issues but, rather, operational matters and include:

- committing to administrative support and office equipment;
- removing the requirement to work across multiple campuses and maintaining existing medical practitioner staffing levels and engaging additional, up to four, medical practitioners where existing medical practitioners are of remedial standard;
- having dedicated car parking for the Modbury Hospital visiting medical specialists within a certain distance from the boom gates, I understand;
- selecting the Modbury Hospital head of the orthopaedic service from within the existing group of orthopaedic surgeons at Modbury Hospital (that is, to not follow the human resources process for the selection of a head of service);
- allowing the Modbury Hospital orthopaedic unit to remain independent of the northern Adelaide health network clinical division structure (in other words, having a separate autonomy);

- establishing appropriate resources for a diabetic foot and ankle clinic within two years;
- immediately recalling provisions as prescribed in the SA Health Visiting Medical Specialist Enterprise Agreement 2009; and
- expanding the arthroplasty service agreement provided at Modbury.

In other words, they have a whole lot of conditions which are outside of the realm of the industrial arrangements which we have entered into with others. The Northern Adelaide Local Health Network senior managers have met with reps of the hospital group on a number of occasions. SA Health's position is that the codicil, or similar arrangements, do not form part of any employment conditions.

The conditions requested by the Modbury Hospital orthopaedic surgeons are a matter for management and are operational in nature. The chief executive officer and the director of medical services of the network have had communication with the AMA to attempt to resolve the matter. Correspondence was sent to them on 9 September seeking the surgeons involved to provide a written collective consensus on the matters they consider to be negotiable or not negotiable. At present, the orthopaedic surgeons refuse to accept the offer of employment.

My understanding, from when I was briefed on this last week, is that one or perhaps two operations have been delayed. This is clearly unfortunate, but we have to operate a system-wide approach. I do not want to go back to the days which were all over the place, when I first became health minister, where we had breakout arrangements in place with various groups of surgeons. We have a standard set of arrangements, and if they do not like those conditions, which are outside the enterprise agreement, they should discuss it with management and get a resolution that way.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the public response to the request for people to send a message to the federal government that we need a better Murray-Darling Basin plan?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:24): I thank the honourable member for his question. With the tabling of the Murray-Darling Basin plan imminent, we are calling on all supporters of the Fight for the Murray campaign to make their voice heard in Canberra. This call comes after a sustained effort by our state government to push for an improved basin plan on the basis of the best available science, a comprehensive submission that we have made to the authority, and extensive discussions we have held with the river communities. It also follows representations that I have made personally to the Prime Minister and the water minister—and, of course the Minister for Water and the River Murray has also made those representations—environment groups, and a delegation to Canberra by six mayors who represent regional and irrigator communities in South Australia.

What we put was simply this: the river needs more water to be healthy. It is not a very complicated debate. We are calling on them to write to the federal minister and the Prime Minister to tell them that the Murray-Darling Basin performance must deliver six crucial points, which include: returning more than 2,750 gigalitres to the river; recognition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I do concede that those opposite folded their hands on the first round, held up the white flag—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Settled for the Mazda.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Settled for the Mazda and not the Rolls Royce.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right, surrender. Can I say, Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that unlike those opposite, we also stood up for river communities and said that they should be recognised for the historical sacrifices—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —they have made to cap their take from the river, which they did in 1969. We have also asked for investment in our river communities to drive value-adding industries that will guarantee a long-term future for those communities. So we are advocating on behalf of all South Australians, and that is why all South Australians are behind our position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, absent a few on the other side, a few malcontents. As of this morning, I can advise the house that more than 2,400 people have already sent a message to Canberra, that the Fight for the Murray campaign members have gone past 14,000 and more than 9,400 people are getting involved in the fight for a better plan on the campaign's Facebook page. The public is standing up with river communities, and the government will stand with them. I encourage anyone who cares about the fight for the Murray to go to the fightformurray.com.au website and send a message to the federal government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that we need a better plan, and turn their backs on those who wish to haul up the white flag.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Will the minister confirm that only 16 years after the Adelaide Oval is upgraded it will again be 'outdated and in need of upgrade'? If so, why will around \$600 million of taxpayers' money be spent on this option? A briefing by Rod Hook to the Premier, obtained by the opposition under FOI, states:

By 2030 all of South Australia's current sporting venues will be outdated and in need of upgrade. This may include the redeveloped Adelaide Oval, which will then be 16 years old.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:29): I note that immediately I stand up the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who takes so many points of order, howls interjections. I just ask, if he is a stickler for the standing orders, that he might allow me to speak without interruption. It is a serious question from a serious member of the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: A contender.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: A genuine contender.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for mines, order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for mines, order! Stop provoking them.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I must correct one part of the question where he refers to \$600 million. The construction contract on Adelaide Oval from memory is some \$450 million. In fact, the initial—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is amazing what pieces of information set them off, isn't it? In fact, the initial contract is let for less than that. There is some remaining money.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am trying to answer a question from a serious—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, you have asked a question, the minister has asked if he can have some quiet to answer it, please do so.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What we do know is that all members on the other side other than I must say the person absent, the very interesting person now absent in Lebanon, were serious critics of this proposal. That remains their position, it is sad that it remains their position, and the truth is, given the presentations—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister has been going for a minute and a half and he has not got near to answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Well I'm surprised that the minister has been able to talk over the noise. I would ask you to keep quiet on the left. The minister will go back to the substance of the question which he has been answering.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am entirely on the substance of the question, Madam Speaker, our new Adelaide Oval. I have had a presentation; the oval involves, can I say, as good as is done anywhere in the world the latest BIM (best in modelling) program, with the people working on the oval working on a three-dimensional computer projection all at once, so that what you see on the computer project is actually what you get, not artists impressions as we got in the past. It has cut months out of the job, cut expense out of the job, and I assure this house that what we will see is the finest sports stadium of its size in Australia, and I will be very surprised—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order, member for Stuart?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 98: the minister is not going anywhere near the substance of the question which was 'Please confirm that only 16 years after the oval is upgraded, it will again be out of date.'

The SPEAKER: I don't think you can make that proposition, member for Stuart. I don't think there is any point of order there. This is entirely relevant to the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I would have thought the question about the standard of the oval and whether it needs to be upgraded in 16 years, and the quality that they are building is absolutely relevant, and I assure people that what they will get is the finest sports stadium in Australia. It will have better seating than any sports stadium in Australia, it will have more capacity for food and beverage than any other sports stadium in Australia, it will have a piece of decking behind the northern end of the ground which will be the most popular place at the oval, and it will be one of the best places to watch cricket and football in Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Oh, the member for Norwood is confused again, well I'm afraid that is not my fault. What I would say to those on the other side, if they suggested this stadium is outdated in 16 years, then what about every other stadium in Australia that will not be as good as this, and will not offer to people there as much amenity as this oval does?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart, point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 98: clearly debate, the question was not about any other stadium, it was about the Adelaide Oval.

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart, you can sit down. I don't think you understand that standing order. If it is relevant to the question, the minister can answer any way he chooses. It is not debate.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The annoying thing about this question, and it is driven by the hostility of these people to South Australia having a world-class stadium—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —is that they don't tell you what the brief was about. The brief was about the capacity for a Commonwealth Games. If there is a Commonwealth Games bid and if it is won, there may well need to be additional capacity. When we talked about the World Cup in soccer being a potential, there were aspects that had to be built for that, including warm-up areas and surrounding areas that you don't need for a cricket and football stadium.

So, to say it would need to be upgraded without mentioning that the whole question was about the Commonwealth Games is the sort of trickiness that we expect, and we certainly expect better from the member for Stuart. He normally doesn't engage in such things and I'm sure he has been put up to it by someone else.

The truth is that I invite the opposition to take a briefing from those who are building the oval because they take great pride in what they do—and justifiably. It will be the finest sports stadium in Australia. We already have the world's best cricket ground. It will be the finest sports stadium in Australia. It will be the finest amenity for punters, and it will be around and enjoyed long after those on the other side are consigned to the rubbish bin of history.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Yes, the member's time has expired. I can see that now, thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery of a former premier of South Australia, Lynn Arnold. It is good to see him here today. I do not normally mention groups, but there is also a group of people here from Huntfield Heights Neighbourhood Watch. I think Neighbourhood Watch is a particularly important organisation in our communities. We all have them and we appreciate them, so it is very nice to see them here. I think they are guests of the member for Mawson. Welcome here.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister advise the house about the importance of the role of the Public Service in the regions?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:35): I am very happy to answer this question and I thank the member for Lee for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hammond, order! Minister, can you sit down until we have some quiet on both sides of the house. Minister for Transport, I can hear you, order!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: We currently have a non-metropolitan unemployment rate of 4.9 per cent, a very healthy figure. There are currently more than 21,000 public servants working in our regions. For instance, there are currently more than 7,400 education employees in our regions,

including teachers, school services officers, Aboriginal education workers, regional directors and administration staff. This would be cut by almost 1,860 under the opposition's jobs policy. That same policy would deliver staff cuts of around 13 at Mount Gambier.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: standing order 98, Madam Speaker, debate. The minister is clearly debating the answer to the question—clearly.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the minister to stick to the question as given and not comment. Stick to the substance of the question, minister. I won't uphold that point of order.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: That would see 13 at Mount Gambier North Primary School, six at Port Augusta Special School, 24 jobs lost at Port Lincoln High, 20 at Gawler High, nine at Port Pirie West Primary, and eight at Renmark Primary. In the vocational education training sector, TAFE SA Regional employs over 650,000 staff, all very important to the development of skills in this state. A 25 per cent cut would reduce numbers by 160 people in rural areas. There is little doubt that this would likely result in many regional TAFE campuses becoming unviable and having to close.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: A 25 per cent cut to regional health services would result in a loss of 1,400 positions, seriously affecting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is another point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: I don't believe that the minister is answering the relevance of the question. I don't believe his answer is relevant to the question asked.

The SPEAKER: The question was, 'Can the minister tell the house about the impacts of cuts to the Public Service in regions?' From what I am hearing, he is answering that question.

Mr WILLIAMS: No, he's not, Madam Speaker. He is making some sort of fictitious argument about a fictitious set of cuts—or is the minister detailing the government's policy, that these are the cuts they are going to make?

The SPEAKER: Thank you. You have made your statement. You can sit down now. Minister, can you be careful in your wording of your answer.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: We would see serious impacts right across rural and regional South Australia in the event of a 25 per cent cut to the workforce. We would see potential cuts to 68 health service positions in Mount Gambier, 48 in Port Augusta, 54 in Port Pirie, 31 in Port Lincoln, 36 in the Riverland, 59 in Whyalla and 34 in Gawler, all of which would seriously compromise the standard of health care in our regions. The opposition's policy would also result in police numbers being cut by at least 25 per cent across the region.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, standing order 98: the minister is clearly now debating, and he is referring to something which he thinks is the opposition's policy. He is completely wrong.

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, the question was a very open question. It is very hard to define what the question meant so, minister, you can answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am with you, Madam Speaker. It is very hard to understand what the question meant and I suspect it should have been ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: I think a lot of other questions could be ruled out of order also if I start getting too tough. Minister, you have about two minutes left.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: The opposition's policy would also result in police numbers being cut by at least 25 per cent across—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. This is not the opposition's policy but even if it were the answer is out of order because it is debate.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What's the standing order?

Mr WILLIAMS: No. 98, Patrick. Go and read it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I said even if it were, the answer is still out of order.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. You don't shout at each other across the chamber. As I said, it is a very wide-ranging question. There are no borders on the question. I guess the minister can answer how he chooses.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Thank you, ma'am. A 25 per cent cut in police numbers across the regions equates to 233 positions. This would result in 27 of the 110 existing country police stations having to close. There would be 26 fewer police officers on the Limestone Coast and a cut of 31 in the Yorke and Mid North region which includes Port Pirie. The Eyre and western region, including Port Lincoln and Whyalla, would be left with 38 fewer police officers while the Far North, including Port Augusta, would experience a cut of 41 officers. In the Barossa, 22 officers would be cut and the Hills Fleurieu region would lose 34.

The impact on important rural services provided by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA would be considerable with more than 60 staff under threat from a 25 per cent cut. The cut would be felt across regional centres like Ceduna where potentially Biosecurity SA's eight quarantine staff who keep our state free of disease and pests would drop to six. In Yamba, the Riverland PIRSA has 13 inspectors working from a large quarantine station to keep the state free of pests and diseases. This number would drop to 10 or less under the proposed cuts of 25 per cent. PIRSA currently employs six fisheries officers in Port Lincoln to look after compliance to protect our valuable fish stocks. Potentially one or two of these positions would be lost with a 25 per cent cut in numbers. Our regional public servants are doing a good job but it is unrealistic to suggest you could cut that number by up to 7,000 without affecting vital services in our rural cities and towns.

The SPEAKER: I want to advise the minister that was a very general question. There was no need to refer to the opposition in that question. You can talk about a general cut across the board and you didn't need to bring the opposition into it.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:42): I have a supplementary. My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. How many PIRSA employees' positions have the government terminated in the regions in the last three years?

The SPEAKER: That is a new question. It is not a supplementary.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:42): Far less than you want to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel, order! Somebody else was shouting over there. I think it was the member for Norwood. It usually is.

Mr Marshall: I can't believe that.

The SPEAKER: It is usually you, so you can cop the blame this time as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Would you please have some order for the very gentlemanly member for Morphett.

POLICE APPOINTMENTS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:44): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and your judgement is correct as usual. My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister confirm that she has disputed the recommendation of the police commissioner over the appointment of a new deputy commissioner?

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) (14:44): Absolutely not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Transport Services. Minister, can you outline to the house the importance of the Public Service in delivering a safe public transport system in South Australia?

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (14:44): I thank the member for Ashford for this question. Our latest figures show that there are more than 994 people working hard to provide safe public transport to South Australians, and 79 per cent of those are on the front line. Every single one of those people is crucial. Enhancing safety is foremost in my mind as we increase our efforts to encourage greater use of our public transport system, and our Public Service has been key in delivering that system. Cooperation between the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and SAPOL's Transit Services Branch plays a vital role in the provision of a safe and secure environment for public transport users, and I would expect nothing less.

Plain-clothed and uniformed transit police regularly circulate throughout the rail and bus networks as part of ongoing operations. SAPOL has increased its transit branch from 74 officers to 102 as from 1 July 2012, and I would like to thank minister Rankine for her support there. These resources are increasing proactive and responsive policing teams in line with initiatives shared with the Public Transport Services Division, such as the use of roving patrols across the rail network, with a focus on reducing fraud and antisocial behaviour.

SAPOL officers are also given an annual ticket to travel on all public transport services. This allows them to travel in uniform or in casual clothing at any time. The intention of this initiative was to allow police officers to intervene in any on-board incident at any time. The public transport security group of PTSD provides regular reports to the Transit Services Branch of SAPOL. These reports identify areas of concern on bus, rail and taxi services. We are continuing to monitor CCTV cameras, and we currently have more than 300 in place at a number of stations.

Security guards are also present on every single train which leaves the Adelaide Railway Station from 6pm until the last service each day. This represents an increase of more than 50 per cent compared to 2001. On-board security guards are provided for on trams from 6pm until the last service on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. These safety measures are non-negotiable for our community. Commuters deserve to travel on a safe system, and all of these enhanced safety measures, which this government has implemented for our public transport system, would be threatened if the Liberal policy of savage public sector cuts—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: standing order 98. This is debate. You have just instructed the previous minister about debate in attempting to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for MacKillop. Minister, I would ask you to remember that it is not to comment on Liberal policy.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Perhaps I may finish my sentence.

The SPEAKER: You can talk in a very general term.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Okay. All of these enhanced safety measures, which we the Labor government have implemented in this state—we the proud Labor government have implemented in this state—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.C. FOX: —the proud, proud Labor government has implemented in this state—could be threatened by some unknown forces, that may or may not surround us at this point in time, if certain decisions were to be made by certain people who may or may not be here tomorrow.

EMERGENCY SERVICES COMPUTER AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:48): Again, my question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. If the minister believes that the \$36 million computer aided dispatch system SACAD is working 'exactly as it should', as she told the estimates committee on 21 June, why are volunteers complaining of serious system faults? The CFS Volunteers Association wrote to the minister on 18 July to outline numerous ongoing issues with SACAD. The CFS volunteers have given the minister until 1 November to fix the problems or there will be a public campaign to alert the public of 'elevated risk to the community' because of the ongoing faults with SACAD working 'exactly as it should'.

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) (14:49): I thank the member for Morphett for his question, and can I correct from the outset that the SACAD program is a \$33 million program. It always has been a \$33 million program.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The \$36 million is inclusive of GST, which I think you understand we don't pay. Anyway, it is a \$33 million program that we have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —implemented.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: As I have said on numerous occasions in this place, this is a very complex, high-tech new computer aided dispatch system, one that we needed to invest in because the old system was at risk of breaking down. Should that have occurred, people in our community would be at risk. It is working as it should in that not one incident hasn't been responded to. Not one incident hasn't had the resources that it needs to be attended to. The concerns that have been expressed by some CFS brigades are around—

Dr McFetridge: And the police and the ambos—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, sorry.

Dr McFetridge: —and the SES.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett, order! You've asked your question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You are quoting directly from a letter from the CFS Volunteer Association and the concerns that have been expressed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —are that too many resources have gone to an incident, not enough. SACAD operates on the information that has been fed into it by—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —the various agencies, and that has been provided at a local level. There has been a business reference group established. Every complaint that has been lodged has been dealt with by that business reference group, and I understand the Chief Officer makes regular contact on a daily basis with the volunteer association to see whether there are any new or emerging issues that they have concern with.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT CENTRES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: What facilities are being established to support integrated NRM service delivery to assist regions across our state to conserve natural resources and use them productively in a sustainable way?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:51): I truly thank the member for Torrens for her very, very important question and acknowledge her commitment to improving the environment in which we all live. A key ingredient in developing a more integrated approach to NRM is being delivered through the establishment of natural resources centres in each of the eight NRM regions. The centres will make it easier for farmers, for industry and communities to connect with their NRM board and to participate in decision-making in relation to local NRM issues by bringing together relevant agencies and expertise.

To date, I have officially opened centres on Kangaroo Island, in the SA Arid Lands, Eyre Peninsula, and the South-East. I am looking forward to opening the remaining centres in Ceduna, Clare and Gawler over the coming weeks. Of course, last week, I think it was, I was at Murray Bridge, and I acknowledge the local members who attended that particular opening and, indeed, I acknowledge all the local members who have attended the openings to date.

The way in which agencies are involved in the centres is being determined on a region-by-region basis. For example, in the South-East region, the NRC offers information about the South East NRM Board as well as services delivered through the department (DEWNR) and the EPA. Service SA is also co-located in this centre.

In addition to achieving conservation objectives, an integrated multiscientific approach is taken to improving productive uses of natural resources to help maintain and improve water, soil and biodiversity. On a general level, the NRM boards actively support farmers through initiatives such as whole farm planning and farm business enterprise.

NRM staff continue to provide critical support to the agricultural sector through on-ground weed control activities, focusing on removing regional outlier infestations of significant weeds and preventing them from becoming widespread and causing significant economic, environmental and social impacts. This is valuable work and saves our primary industries millions of dollars in losses associated with land becoming less productive.

NRM boards are working with landholders across a variety of other sustainable agriculture programs, including monitoring soil acidity, reducing the impacts of wind and water erosion, removing feral animals and weeds from public and private land, improving irrigation efficiency, and building landholder knowledge and capacity. I have welcomed the attendance, as I have said, of the various local members at the NRC openings and their show of support for the important role that NRM and other officers play in our communities.

This is somewhat at odds with the negative comments about dedicated public servants we have often heard from the opposition. Only last week, among other statements—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Standing order 98: debate. The minister's answer has nothing to do with the question.

The SPEAKER: I would beg to differ on that, member for Stuart. He has been talking about the NRM boards.

Mr Brock: Yes, what's the government doing to integrate NRM boards?

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I presume you are answering the question?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, I believe I am, ma'am—most certainly. Only last week, among other statements that were made by the opposition leader about cutting one in four staff—and, of course, that has some implications, as we have learned, and would have implications on staffing levels in these areas—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Standing order 98: debate. You have already had to—

The SPEAKER: Thank you. You have made your point of order, you can sit down. Minister, and ministers, I would ask you to keep some sanity in question time to stop these continual points of order. I would ask ministers not to refer to Liberal policy but to stick to sort of general scenarios in answering their questions.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, I promise not to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —at all talk about what is the stated position of their party room on job—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, you have just directed the minister not to go there, and he has completely—

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I do not think you have a point of order there—

Mr WILLIAMS: —ignored your ruling.

The SPEAKER: —but, minister, I will refer you back to my statement.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, I promise not to go there, as I said.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. You upset them.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I promise not to. The opposition leader mocked a group of dedicated public servants—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker: it is out of order for the minister to disregard what you have just instructed him.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether he disregarded it, because I did not hear his last statement because of the uproar. But the minister knows now that he will not refer to Liberal policy. Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, I will not refer to their party room policy. The South Australian public are celebrating the Year of the Farmer campaign. We all support that, don't we? The opposition leader told 891, as she told this place in June, as follows:

...I've also told the story of recently being in Rundle Mall and seeing 14 people from Natural Resources Management wearing clown wigs and other things entertaining children under the canopy in Rundle Mall, when we know that we've got too many rabbits and foxes and pest plants and so on. We need to be a leaner government...(Do you get rid of the clowns?) Yes.

On the advice of the agency, it turns out there were no NRM officers nor exhibitors who either wore, acted or displayed anything that might have been considered clownish. There were—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —just officers at work supporting and promoting our farmers, and that is what NRM officers do. I think it is clear to all who was doing the clowning around. The health of our local natural systems is an important environmental goal, but it is also a critical element that helps to underpin the success of our primary producers, our food manufacturers and associated businesses. Madam Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister, your time has expired, even though we gave you some extra time for interruptions.

FAMILY BUSINESSES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister outline how many of the 11 recommendations from the Thinker in Residence report, 'The future of family business in South Australia', by Dr Dennis Jaffe, have actually been

implemented, and what is the total budget for the minister's department that has been allocated to support the 50,000 family businesses in South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:58): This government stands by and supports family businesses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I grew up in a family that had a mortgaged house to run a small business. I know what small businesses go through. I know that the most important thing we can give small businesses is fairness. What we have done as a government is to go out and give those small businesses some equity and fairness. We have given them the Office of the Small Business Commissioner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Office of the Small Business Commissioner—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Standing order 98: relevance. My question was very specific: how many of the 11 recommendations—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr MARSHALL: —from your government's Thinker in Residence report—

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Norwood—

Mr MARSHALL: —have you actually implemented?

The SPEAKER: —you have asked your question. There is no point of order. What the minister is talking about is relevant to the question. The minister can answer how he chooses.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This government has nailed its colours to the mast on small business. We stand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are 142,000 small businesses in this state; many of them are family businesses. Many of them have to deal with unfair and predatory practices and they had no voice. This government has given them a voice, and who voted against that voice?

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: 98, relevance. My question was: how many of the 11 recommendations of your own government report have you actually implemented?

Honourable members: None!

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled on that. Minister, continue your answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First of all, that's not true, and you know it's not true.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood and the Minister for Trade will not shout at each other like that across the floor!

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, I do not want to get emotional, because when I get emotional I make mistakes. You make mistakes when you get emotional, and I do not want to get emotional. The truth is this that this government has nailed its colours to the mast.

Mr Marshall: How many recommendations—

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Norwood, leave the chamber for the rest of question time!

Mr Marshall: Hopeless!

The honourable member for Norwood having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Coward!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: I believe the word 'coward', directed to the member across the chamber, is unparliamentary. I ask that the minister withdraw and apologise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the minister say that. Minister, did you say 'coward'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, I responded, I regret it, I withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: in defence, I do report that on being evicted the member for Norwood yelled 'hopeless'. I hope he wasn't reflecting on you, but he certainly provoked a response from our member.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. He has gone now. Minister, would you please complete your answer?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, Madam Speaker. This government has nailed its colours to the mast on small business. We are standing up—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, you can go too for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This government is formulating an advanced manufacturing strategy. Previously, the member for Norwood asked the government: how many of the recommendations of the Thinker in Residence report by Göran Roos are we implementing? We went a step better: we have asked him to develop our advanced manufacturing strategy. While we are developing our advanced manufacturing strategy, it is also prudent to redevelop your small business strategy. On top of that, we introduced an Office of the Small Business Commissioner, an advocate for small businesses. He will bring in codes of conduct—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order: I think the minister may be confused. He was asked about the report of Dr Dennis Jaffe, not Göran Roos, and he is responding on the report of Göran Roos.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: 'Jaffe', actually, but never mind.

The SPEAKER: Minister, get back to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This government has outpaced and outwitted the opposition on small business since the last election.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the minister is debating the answer and, also, there is no relevance to the question in anything he has said in his rant so far.

The SPEAKER: I have pointed out on many occasions that if it is related to the question it is relevant. They can answer how they choose.

Mr WILLIAMS: But, Madam Speaker, that is the point; it is not related to the question. The question was specifically: how many of the recommendations, the 11 recommendations? Was it one, two, three, or zero?

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Sit down! Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The cornerstone of this government's small business policy is the Office of the Small Business Commissioner. We have stood by and given them equity, given them a voice. The NTA, the Council of Small Business Australia, the Farmers Federation, those bastions of hotbeds of socialism, backed this government. Only two groups opposed our reforms: the Franchise Council of Australia and the Liberal Party. Even the newsagents stood by us on the Office of the Small Business Commissioner. They know that the best policies for small businesses are advocacy and a fair playing field, and that is what we have given them, and you have walked away from them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (15:04): Can the Treasurer tell the house about the outcome of the meeting he had with some sawmillers in the South-East?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:04): New Zealand's richest man, the owner of Carter Holt Harvey, Mr Graham Hart, has been seeking to renegotiate the terms of their supply contracts with ForestrySA, which they entered into in an open-market process. Mr Hart has threatened to close down his two sawmills in the South-East and put 1,000 people out of work if his demands are not met.

In order to protect the South-East community and the timber industry, the government and ForestrySA have attempted to negotiate a sensible outcome by providing both long and short-term relief to Carter Holt Harvey during this difficult trading period. These attempts have been rejected.

Mr Pederick: What about the others?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If the member for Hammond gives me a moment, I will get to the others. There are more players than just Carter Holt Harvey milling timber in the South-East. I certainly do not want to give one mill an unfair advantage over all the other smaller mills, which are also employers in the region. This week I met with the chief executive of Gunns, and three owners of smaller mills—South East Pine Sales, N.F. McDonnell and Sons, and Whiteheads Timber Sales.

As employers of hundreds of timber workers, they consider it inappropriate for the government to meddle in the timber industry in a way that gives one player a financial advantage over the others. They voiced strong concern to me that if the government gave Carter Holt Harvey what it was demanding it would be detrimental to their businesses. They told me plainly that they wanted the government to make sure that the interests of the entire industry were protected and that one big player not be allowed to muscle out the smaller millers in the region.

To give in to Carter Holt Harvey demands at their highest might well destroy the timber industry in the Green Triangle. The price being sought by Carter Holt Harvey in the long term would make it unviable to produce the high-quality, structural grade timber that is produced by ForestrySA and other foresters in the region. Instead, timber growers would be forced to grow lower quality, smaller diameter wood, most of which would be destined for export markets, or sell the land they have for other purposes.

I was very receptive to the arguments put to me by these sawmillers. The government has to strike a balance to look after jobs in the region but not give one sawmiller an advantage over all the others. I have given my commitment that the government will consult with them before any decision is made, while considering industry assistance options.

As is her way of late, I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has changed her mind after her initial call for legislation to be introduced to direct ForestrySA to give in to Carter Holt Harvey's demands. The government will continue discussions with all small millers and continue to work with the South-East community to ensure the viability of the timber industry.

BULK COMMODITIES PORT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why is the state government applying to Infrastructure Australia for funding to build a bulk commodities port on Eyre Peninsula when the minister for industry and trade has publicly stated that the state government has no intention of returning to the ports business?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:08): If I heard the question correctly, it was: why are we seeking funding for a bulk port facility when the Minister for Manufacturing has ruled out us building it ourselves.

Ms Chapman: No, going into the ports business.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Going into the port business? We would like the commonwealth to spend commonwealth funds in South Australia on a port. I would have thought that would assist

us, in not having to provide the funds ourselves. I am struggling with the import of the question here.

Can I indicate to the member for Bragg that the commonwealth has, on occasions in the past, I believe in the interest of clearing bottlenecks, either made offers or has funded ports in other states. It is not my particular area of expertise, but I believe some funding was advanced for ports in Western Australia.

We believe that there is a bright future for the mining industry in South Australia. We believe that there will be a need for a bulk commodities port that we do not have at present and we have been doing work with Flinders Ports around Port Bonython. We have met, and so has the Premier, a number of potential Chinese investors including those investors who already have a memorandum of understanding around—it is not Sheep Hill anymore, it is called Port Spencer—all very wise. The notion that we should not ask the commonwealth for funds to accelerate or enhance such a thing seemed very strange to me.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Bragg.

BULK COMMODITIES PORT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:10): Will the minister then confirm if there is any part of the proposal which includes any contribution from state revenue?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:10): I have to say I am struggling to remember the details of it. It would depend on what the response was from the commonwealth. If the commonwealth said to us that there were a possibility of funding, if there was something from it ourselves, that does not mean that we would be getting into the port business. It does not mean, for example, that if we offer an assistance package to Mitsubishi or we offer an assistance package to the forestry industry that we are getting into the timber industry, although we are in the timber industry, I must say.

Mr Pederick: You're getting out of it.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, and there we go, we're 'getting out of it'. Again, the confusion on the other side. We are in the timber industry to sell timber. What we do is sell timber, and what we are proposing to do is sell timber from our timber industry. We believe that if you want us to be in the timber industry, that is the best thing we can do. As I understand the proposal with the Treasurer, instead of selling this rotation, we are selling a number of forward rotations because we get a good deal for it. So, what we are doing, in business—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —is selling timber—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —on the best possible terms and we think that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —is pretty smart. I know you think we are not very good at business but we think selling on the best possible terms is a pretty smart deal.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: All very interesting with forestry but I have asked about the ports and whether there is any state money in the proposal to Infrastructure Australia for the ports proposal, from South Australia's revenue?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sorry, I did respond to interjections and I should not have done that. Can I indicate to the member for Bragg that I am not sure that we are going to see any funds from the commonwealth on a port. If there were some, they may apply conditions and they may ask

us. But I can guarantee this to the member for Bragg: I have no budget for a contribution to a bulk commodity port and I know of no minister that does.

TERTIARY ENTRANCE RANKING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise why in the year 2000, 44 per cent of South Australian students received a tertiary entrance ranking in maths, physics and chemistry, but now that figure has fallen to just 37 per cent, well behind Labor's own Strategic Plan target of 45 per cent set in 2003. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the statistical data taken from the government's own Strategic Plan Progress Report to substantiate the figures I have just quoted.

Leave granted.

Percentage of students receiving a Tertiary Entrance Rank (TER) or equivalent with at least one of the following subjects: mathematics, physics and chemistry (2003 baseline).

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
All students	44	42	41	39	38	37	35	35	37	37	45
Male	55	53	52	51	51	48	45	46	47	48	(target)
Female	37	34	33	31	29	29	28	27	29	29	

Source: SACE Board of South Australia

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:13): I will be very happy to look at the data—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You will not shout at the minister.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —that has just been tabled by the member, because the data that was tabled by the member yesterday was also laced with inaccuracies. But can I say that we have invested heavily, over \$50 million, in terms of a primary maths and science strategy, and we also have a STEM strategy. We are absolutely committed to promoting maths and science in our schools. Can I remind this place—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Can I remind this place that, on a world scale, Australia, and South Australia in particular, have outstanding education systems. In fact, it has been acknowledged by people outside of Australia, we rank higher than the USA, we rank higher than France, higher than the UK—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr PISONI: My question was asking why we have slipped from 44 per cent to 37 per cent in the number of students—

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, I suggest—

Mr PISONI: —who get a pass rate in maths, physics and chemistry.

The SPEAKER: —you wait for the end of the answer. Thank you, sit down. No point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, have you finished?

ROAD SAFETY

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:15): I am sure that all in the house will be cheering on the Crows on Saturday.

Members interjecting:

Mr SIBBONS: There is a mutiny going on now.

The SPEAKER: Very beautiful colours, member for Mitchell.

Mr SIBBONS: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I enjoyed your ruling earlier. My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Can the minister advise the house what upgrades the state government has undertaken on the Dukes Highway and how this will make the trip to Melbourne safer for Crows supporters travelling to Victoria for this week's preliminary final?

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) (15:15): I thank the member from Mitchell for this question. Following the mighty Adelaide Crows' triumph over Fremantle, thousands of supporters will be packing their bags and their cars and heading to Melbourne for Saturday night's game against Hawthorn. It has been three years since South Australian supporters have had the chance to watch one of our teams play a final at the MCG. I am pleased to advise the house that much work has been done over that time to ensure the most popular and direct driving route to and from Melbourne is much safer than ever.

Since 2008-09, \$67 million has been invested in the Adelaide to Melbourne road corridor. Improvements include upgrades to 15 existing rest areas, and six new rest areas incorporating toilets, shelters with seating and solar lighting, installation of 40 kilometres of wire rope barriers, the removal of hazards such as large trees and protecting bridge structures along 100 kilometres of road, 65 kilometres of carriageway audio tactile line marking, and the widening of the centre-line gap between the two lanes to 1.2 metres along 33 kilometres of roadway. Along with the audio tactile marking separating these lanes, this provides drowsy drivers with an automatic alert as well as extra recovery space. Two new overtaking lanes were completed last year and another three overtaking lanes and one lane extension will be finished by Christmas this year.

Of course, improved roads are just one factor in a safe journey. Drivers need to put their safety and that of their passengers and other road users above all else at all times. This year we are on track to have the lowest rate of serious injuries ever recorded in a calendar year. There have been 100 fewer serious injuries recorded right now than at the same time last year, and we also have a recorded 68 fatalities to date compared to 82 at this time last year. This is progress, but it does not change the fact that every single death and serious injury causes families and communities significant heartache. Every one of these incidents changes lives forever. I urge Crows supporters and anyone travelling these roads to take the advice from Adelaide captain Nathan van Berlo: the best goal is getting home safely. Go the Crows and fingers crossed we will get to do it again next weekend.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am really looking forward to that game this weekend. Best wishes to the Crows. The Leader of the Opposition commented that you may look good, member for Mitchell, but you do not look like you would make the team, despite the jumper.

Mr SIBBONS: Point of order, Madam Speaker!

The SPEAKER: We wish the Crows all the best at the weekend. We would love to see them in the final. I also congratulate West Whyalla on their win in Whyalla in finals at the weekend, particularly the under-14s also, who won their premiership. The house will note grievances, and I call the member for Norwood. It is nice to see you back.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

FAMILY BUSINESSES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:18): It is good to be back. I rise today to talk on the very important sector which is the family business sector here in South Australia. I note that yesterday was indeed National Family Business Day. This commemorates the important contribution that the family business sector makes to our economy in Australia. Probably in no other state is it as important as it is here in South Australia. We know that around 50,000 family businesses exist here in South Australia. They employ South Australians, they generate employment and they generate wealth for us here in South Australia. In fact, 70 per cent of the businesses in South Australia are family businesses. They are crucial and this is an important sector that we on this side of the house understand.

It is easy to identify some of the iconic family businesses here in South Australia. I think very few of us would not have heard of Coopers, Haigh's and Robern-Menz. These are the high-profile iconic family businesses that each and every one of us knows about, but there are many other family businesses that go about their work employing South Australians, creating economic prosperity for our state, that are not so high profile and so this is an opportunity for each of us in

this house and each of us around the country to say thank you to the very many hardworking families that are driving our economy.

This is particularly pertinent, of course, to us here in South Australia with the recent announcement of the indefinite postponement of the Olympic Dam expansion and also the federal government defence spending cuts which mean a real hiatus between the end of the air warfare destroyer contract and the start of the future submarines contract. Whilst these are two extremely important sectors for South Australia, because of these delays they have put us in an unenviable position where we have to find out where we are going to create some economic activity and springboard from this bad news into a bright future.

The family business sector is rooted here in South Australia. They do not just jump around wherever the deal is best. They are here in South Australia and they are here to stay. They have patient capital and we applaud them for that. In recent times the government has recognised this and recently the government commissioned a Thinker in Residence, Dr Dennis Jaffe, who came out and presented a very fine report which was commended by the Liberal opposition. This report was entitled 'The future of family business in South Australia'. Dr Jaffe made 11 recommendations and they were excellent recommendations. Again, I say they were supported by the Liberal opposition. It is, of course, very disappointing to us on this side of the house that, after many years of having this report in the department, when you look through it now none of the 11 recommendations are currently in play. This is a huge disappointment.

There are 50,000 businesses. I asked the Minister for Small Business during estimates could he tell us how much of his budget was allocated to these 50,000 businesses. No answer three months down the track. How many of the 11 recommendations have been implemented? Again, no response three days down the track. He was not here yesterday otherwise I would have asked him these important questions on National Family Business Day. He was out of the parliament. Fair enough. He came in today. I asked him the questions again. We had six minutes of prevarication with no single answer.

This is an important sector of our economy. It is one we should be working on in a bipartisan way to support but this government does not have a focus on family business. In fact, not only that, they are actually quite disparaging about this important sector. Let me just tell you a couple of the comments made in this house by the minister and by the Premier recently. During the Holden debate, minister Koutsantonis made the following comment:

No-one at Holden inherited a job. Not one person inherited a job at Holden—not one. They all got it through their own hard labour.

He was implying that people working in family business are not working hard and they do not deserve their position. It was a direct attack on the sector. Premier Weatherill earlier this year said:

Many of you here—

referring to the Liberal opposition—

have run a few into the wall, and many of you have just inherited something from mummy or daddy.

This is absolutely unacceptable. Far from being an easy ride to inherit something from 'mummy and daddy', transitioning a family business from one generation to the next, let alone through multiple generations, is one of the most difficult things to do. It takes years of education, training, mentoring and support to transition effectively. We call upon the government to take this sector seriously. They are the backbone of the South Australian economy. It is about time they are allocated some resources to this sector and recognise them for the true champions of the economy that they are.

Time expired.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:24): The actual number of public servants in South Australia was the subject of much discussion in this place on Tuesday following comments by the Leader of the Opposition that she wanted to reduce the size of the public sector by up to 35,000 people. With the current headcount of 101,000 public sector employees—that is, full and part-time employees and not full-time equivalents—a reduction of 35,000 would bring the headcount for the public sector down to about a 65,000 figure nominated by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition was very clear that head count and not FTE was the metric she was using, because the leader was recorded as saying in a media interview—and quite

unequivocally—that the 65,000 figure included part-time employees. The opposition leader did not say that an incoming Liberal government would reduce the size of the public sector by 35,000 in FTE terms, because this would reduce the public sector from around 85,000 to 50,000 in FTE terms.

At least that is what we understood the opposition's position to be until the member for Davenport waded in with a question, arguing that the 2002-03 budget papers showed that the full-time equivalent workforce was 66,933 people. He was either totally confused by the proposition being advanced by his leader in relation to a reduction in the public sector head count or the opposition has actually discussed their proposed reductions in terms of reducing the FTE numbers by up to 35,000, which would leave a shell of a Public Service of around only 50,000 FTEs.

Either of the courses of action now seemingly being floated by the opposition would, of course, have a devastating impact on those people made redundant and their families, and on the state's economy and the government's ability to deliver services. Despite what we can only assume to be the member for Davenport's confused reference to full-time equivalent numbers, the Leader of the Opposition is still wrong. No Liberal government for the period for which we have been able to access records has run a public sector with as few as 65,000 public servants, full and part time. As I indicated in question time, as at June 2002 there were 83,821 full and part-time public sector workers.

To reiterate, the reason for the differences between the figures supplied by myself and those supplied by the member for Davenport are obvious. Firstly, public sector numbers can be reported in terms of head count (the number of individuals) or full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. As I stated from the outset of my remarks today, the Leader of the Opposition was quite clear last week that she was talking about a reduction in people, not FTEs. This was the point of reducing from 100,000 to 65,000. The member for Davenport is therefore seeking to compare apples with oranges (FTE with head count) instead of apples with apples (head count to head count).

Another important point is that information on public sector FTEs printed in the budget documents before 2003-04 reflected only a subset of public sector workers: those aligned with the major government departments reflected in the budget portfolio statements. FTE information in the budget papers was widened in 2003-04 to more closely align with the annual survey of the state's public sector workforce conducted by the Commissioner for Public Employment, which members will know is tabled in this place. The actual FTE figure at 30 June 2002 was 69,770 and not the 66,933 quoted by the member for Davenport and, as I have said, the actual number of individuals at the time was 83,821.

What we saw on Tuesday during question time was a confused attempt to provide some rationale for the leader's inaccuracies, again highlighting the opposition's lack of preparedness for office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COUNTRY FOOTBALL

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:29): Ma'am, I heard you mention football in Whyalla. I would like to talk about winter sports in my electorate, and say 'Go, the Crows!' before I start on that. I probably do not need to point out to many in this place, on this side anyway, that football and netball in particular are absolutely crucial to regional South Australia throughout the winter. If it was not for football and netball and what the codes achieve, we would not have a lot of social interaction in rural South Australia and, indeed, probably across Australia.

In particular, I would like to talk about this forthcoming weekend on the Fleurieu Peninsula. The netball finals finished last weekend and, unfortunately, Langhorne Creek beat Victor Harbor in the A grade.

Mr Pederick: Hear, hear!

Mr PENGILLY: Victor had won two in a row. You will get yours, member for Hammond. However, in the Great Southern League A grade football grand final this weekend, being held at Yankalilla, Yankalilla takes on Langhorne Creek. Hopefully, they can give them a flogging. Hopefully, they can give the member for Hammond's boys a flogging, but we will wait and find out on that. Langhorne Creek won last year and Yankalilla have certainly come a long way to get into it.

On Kangaroo Island, the football finals will be played. The netball finals were on last weekend on the Fleurieu but, this weekend, there are football and netball grand finals on Kangaroo Island. In the A grade, the Dudley United team is playing Parndana at Wisanger Oval. Parndana, I think, are running for their fifth A grade premiership in a row, so the rest of the island is pretty keen to see them get knocked off.

More to the point, football—and I want to dwell on football—is a wonderful, wonderful thing for young people, as is netball. It trains young people. I know, in particular, Donald Lade—the father of former Port Power player Brendon Lade—who is a football institution over on the island. He is absolutely passionate about getting young people to play football, to learn some skills, to learn some discipline and be taught a way of life. I commend Donald Lade on that.

It is part of the social fabric, as I say. It teaches them discipline, it teaches them manners, it puts some training in place for a future and, indeed, what you find with both football and netball—and I daresay soccer, hockey and whatever as well—is that they become involved in running the clubs, the leadership programs and committees, and really learn all about the country way of life.

I think it is just absolutely critical that sport be encouraged in South Australia. All the focus is on the big boys in the AFL or the not quite so big boys in the SANFL or soccer or whatnot but, if you did not have country sport at grassroots, you would not have a lot of these players coming through to play at senior levels. That is why it is worth spending some time in this place encouraging them and putting forward the fact that it is a wonderful grounding for the future.

I look forward to this weekend, as I say. Unfortunately, I will not be able to get to both games, but I know that Yankalilla people are preparing. They have a big working bee on there tomorrow to get their grounds and clubrooms ready and there will be a huge crowd there at Yank on Saturday.

Likewise, there will be a big crowd at Wisanger Oval. Wisanger Oval is the only privately owned oval on Kangaroo Island. The rest are all owned by the council over there, but Wisanger is proudly privately owned. I happen to be one of the oval committee that holds that oval in trust. It will be a good day and, once again, I wish the Crows well but, equally, I wish all people playing in country sports finals this weekend, of which there will be multitudes across the state, all the best, and may the best teams win.

DEATH WITH DIGNITY ACT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:33): The state of Oregon in the USA passed the Death with Dignity Act in November 1994, with 51 per cent in favour. After a number of legal manoeuvres to try to repeal the act, something similar to the referendum at the 1997 general election rejected a further bid to repeal the act by a margin of 60 per cent to 40 per cent. The Death with Dignity Act was finally enacted in late 1997.

Since then, a total of 596 residents of Oregon have used the provisions of the act to end their life. Oregon has a population of 3.8 million. In the 14 years that death with dignity has been available to people with a terminal illness, an average of 43 people have made use of the act each year. South Australia has a population of 1.7 million. Applying the Oregon experience to South Australia, we could expect approximately 19 people each year to make use of a similar act in South Australia.

Have the floodgates opened in Oregon since the Death with Dignity Act was passed? The answer is no. Have the elderly been murdered using the Death with Dignity Act? The answer is no. Has palliative care research and funding declined since the Death with Dignity Act? No; in fact, the funding has increased. Have depressed people used the Death with Dignity Act to end their life? No, depressed people are not eligible to use the act.

Are doctors using the Death with Dignity Act to decide what patients should die? The patient must make the decision, which must be documented and witnessed, with further waiting periods after the decision is made and then reconfirmed before the prescription is written. Have vulnerable people been targeted to be killed using the Death with Dignity Act provisions? No; each case history in Oregon shows that the patient requested assistance to die with dignity and made the choice themselves. Has death tourism developed in Oregon since 1998? No; provisions of the act are available only to residents of Oregon, such as a registered voter. So, why is it that in South Australia we continue to be misled, lied to and encouraged to be afraid of voluntary euthanasia?

When I heard the story of Tony Nicklinson in the UK (a previously active man who had had a locked-in syndrome since a stroke in 2005) and how he starved himself to death a couple of

weeks after the British High Court rejected his attempt to have a doctor legally end his life; when I also heard about Mark Leigep, who has been in a coma since an accident in 2006, and the dreadful dilemma of his mother, Joanne Dunn, about asking doctors to starve her son to death as this was the only way out of a desperate situation; when I hear young people overwhelmingly telling me they want to choose when and how they die if life becomes intolerable—I know that it is time for South Australians to be given the right to die.

In Oregon, the provisions of the Death with Dignity Act are available to people with a terminal illness. In my view, it is people like Mark Leigep who should be entitled to a dignified death, and I also believe that those whose life has become intolerable should also have access to drugs to assist them to die in a dignified way and, if they choose, in the company of their family and friends.

We know that in Oregon most people who use the Death with Dignity Act are elderly and suffering from cancer. The judgement that someone should be forced to stay alive if life has become intolerable to them—that medical treatments cannot control the pain, the indignity or the effects of the cancer, and they have to wait until they can get enough doctors to agree that they are expected to die within six months—is to me inhumane and not a judgement that I as a citizen of South Australia feel entitled to make. It is time that we made more informed, objective and compassionate decisions to allow people for whom life has become intolerable to die at a time of their choosing and to die with dignity.

SNAPPER FISHERY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:39): I want to talk about snapper today and raise a few concerns that have been put to me by my community. In late August, I first had an email from Mr John Sandercock who, in addition to being a business operator in Ardrossan, is the President of the Progress Association there. He certainly recognises the importance that fishing per se, and recreational and professional fishing, plays in the economy of Yorke Peninsula. He was very concerned to have been advised of some draft plans which were out, with some level of consultation, which talked about an extension to the closed season.

I think it is fair to say that a high level of frustration exists amongst quite a few of us. I know that Adrian Pederick, the member for Hammond and shadow minister for fisheries, has attempted to have briefings with the minister and her staff. I know for sure that two dates were set for that, but both of them were cancelled. The first one I wanted to be part of, so it was very disappointing to hear that it had been cancelled. It was intended to be during a sitting week a fortnight ago. Since then, I have sought my own opportunity for a briefing, and basically have also been told no. They are not prepared to give you one until the draft plans are out there, which I find very frustrating. As someone who represents the community, I should have the opportunity to be briefed early and the chance therefore to make an informed input to it.

So, for local members and the shadow minister to be excluded creates a level of frustration that minister Gago needs to respect. I have read the answer to a question from the Hon. David Ridgway that she provided to the other place, and I can assure her that, no, it is not just a matter of trying to find a suitable date: it is a matter of being told it is not available yet. That is all really disappointing. I have raised that point, but now I want to talk about what the impact will be if there are significant changes to the economy of the area.

I am a frustrated fisher person, like many people. I would like to be a lot better than I am. I have great memories as a 20 year old going snapper fishing and catching two 15 pounders, like a double-header, on one line. That was just the best fishing day ever for me. I know how attractive snapper fishing is to the people who come to the Yorke Peninsula and the people who live on the peninsula. I also respect the need to preserve the fishery and the species.

I understand that the fishery has to be managed and that you have to ensure that regular estimates are being placed on the catch that is being taken from the area, to make sure that the fish species are there for many years going into the future and that it represents no threat at all. I understand that the minister has a responsibility to ensure that a review is undertaken, but I would urge the minister to ensure that consultation occurs.

My great frustration is that it is so late before the prime tourist season that we still do not know what the changes will be. Some people deliberately choose to go to Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent, to those areas, for their holidays because of the snapper fishing opportunities they provide. If they have their holidays booked—and charter boat fishers are very upset by this—and

they suddenly have these booking opportunities taken away from them because the closed season has been extended, it is going to have significant impact upon the economy of the Peninsula.

I know that the local government authorities in the area are very concerned. The Yorke Peninsula council and the Copper Coast council and the Barunga West and Wakefield Regional Council have met collectively. They have asked for an opportunity to meet with the minister to make the minister appreciate their concerns from their perspective. The rec fishers in the area would like to see some changes made to some of the opportunities provided to the pro fishing network.

I am a person who tries to look at it in very balanced way, and I recognise the pro fishers have to have an opportunity to make a living and to provide a source to fishmongers and markets so that people can buy fresh fish if they cannot fish for themselves, but we have to make sure that we get the balance right.

So, I urge the minister to ensure that any changes have very wide consultation, that industry perspective is taken into account, that the regional impact statement is undertaken and considered by any person associated with this industry, and that we get a chance to make a decision that gives everybody some middle ground, so that there may have to be some compromise, but with the opportunity to move the economy forward, and also so that we do not find that there is a large number of very aggrieved fishers out there who suddenly have their rights taken away with little or no warning.

VIRGINIA TOWNSHIP

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:43): I rise to speak today about one of my electorate's most diverse and energetic communities, the township of Virginia. More specifically, I would like to share with members some of the great community events I have had the pleasure of attending over the last few weeks. At the beginning of this month I was able to attend the Virginia Netball Club presentation dinner held at the Virginia Sporting Bodies clubrooms. This club represents those values of volunteering and community spirit that all members here seek to foster in their various electorates.

I am very happy to see from such a small township such a high level of participation from all sectors of the Virginia community. On that night I was honoured to sponsor the club with one of my annual community sports leadership awards, which this year was presented to the modified netball under 8s team, and all the girls who played got a prize.

A special mention must go to the whole Forby family who have worked have over many, many years to make sure this club is a success. They organise local teams in the area very well and are well-loved by the team members and the families that have been involved in this club for many years. I wish them all the very best for next year, and I am looking forward to visiting the club soon in its new shed that has been supported by a grant from the state government.

On the same weekend I was able to attend the Festa di Maria Santissima di Crochi, hosted at Our Lady of Assumption Catholic Church in Virginia. This feast day is celebrated by the large Italian community in Virginia and attracts participants from all corners of the Adelaide Italian migrant community together with the whole Virginia community. Celebrations begin in the middle of the year with a fundraising dinner and dance. I have been to this in the past, and this year I was happy to donate a large prosciutto for their annual auction, and it fetched a very nice donation for the committee which assisted with the festa.

The streets of the town become filled with people on the second Sunday in September, with a colourful procession of banners and flower-bearers paying tribute to the saint who guided their particular migrant community to their new homeland in search of a better life for their children. Now in its 33rd year, the feast is organised by a fleet of dedicated volunteers, particularly president John Bergamin, secretary Natalie Gentile, Domenica Bergamin, and parish priest Father Anthony Paganoni. A special mention on behalf of the committee must go out to the late Guiseppe Piscioneri, who carried the feast and the community's traditions for many years. He is well recognised and well loved by people even though he has passed.

Last, I would like to pay tribute to the Virginia branch of the Country Women's Association, of which I am a member. I had the pleasure of volunteering, for the third year this year, at the Royal Adelaide Show with these ladies. Many of these dedicated ladies spend weeks preparing for the rush at the Royal Adelaide Show, either serving food or cooking in the kitchen upstairs at the Country Cafe. It serves as the biggest fundraising event for the CWA each year.

I would particularly like to put on the record my thanks to Raeleen, Evelyn and Val for their help in the days over the last couple of years, and all the lovely ladies for their hospitality—especially for allowing me a promotion this year, going from making tea and coffee to serving food: pies, pasties, hotdogs and milkshakes.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs VLAHOS: Yes, two years of graduation. I look forward to continuing my relationship with these three special and fantastic community organisations that typify the wonderful community spirit that is the lifeblood of so many of our communities in South Australia, particularly in the electorate of Taylor. They should not only be celebrated and supported by those in their local community, but shown as much support as possible from members in this house.

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

Second reading.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995 to provide for an R18+ classification for computer games, consequent upon the commonwealth Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (R18+ Computer Games) Amendment Act 2012 and to regulate the display and advertising of R18+ DVDs and computer games.

Australia does not have a classification category for games that are intended for adults. The highest classification currently available for computer games is MA15+ which means that many computer games that are classified as R18+ overseas are modified, sometimes several times, to bring them within the MA15+ classification so that they can be sold in Australia.

Following 10 years of negotiations between the commonwealth, states and territories, and a long and comprehensive public consultation period, there is agreement to introduce a R18+ classification for games. The consultation process carried out by the commonwealth showed overwhelming support for an adult classification for computer games. The R18+ classification will bring Australia into line with the classification systems in many overseas countries and will ensure that games that are unsuitable for minors to play are properly classified as adult material.

In particular, games that are R18+ overseas should no longer be modified in an attempt to fit within the MA15+ classification here. These games will properly be restricted to adults. This is likely to lower the risk of games that contain high levels of violence being available to minors. The RC, in other words, refused classification, will still apply to material that does not come within the national classification guidelines for 18+ games.

I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted into *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

The Classification Board and the South Australian Classification Council must classify a publication, film or computer game in accordance with the National Classification Code and the national classification guidelines. New draft guidelines for the classification of computer games have been developed by Classification Ministers. The first draft was publicly released by the Commonwealth in May 2011 for comment. The final Guidelines were recently agreed to by the Classification Ministers. The new guidelines will include the new R18+ classification and have been carefully drafted to balance the underpinning principle of the Classification Code that adults should be able to see, hear and play what they want and the need to protect minors from being exposed to material that may harm or offend them. For that reason, the draft Guidelines take into account the interactive nature of computer games and how that may affect the impact of the content of the games on the individuals playing them. The Classification Board will be required to specifically address interactivity as a separate criterion when classifying computer games.

We have also taken the opportunity in this Bill to address concerns from industry about the regulation of display and advertising of R18+ DVDs, because the same restrictions will soon apply to R18+ computer games. The current provision, section 40A, was the result of amendments introduced by the Hon. Dennis Hood MLC in 2009. Section 40A sets down strict requirements for display and advertising of R18+ films, with a \$5,000 penalty attached. The Australian National Retailers Association, following discussions with the Hon. Dennis Hood, has requested amendments to allow some flexibility for retailers who are concerned about the risk of prosecution from inadvertent breaches of section 40A requirements. The proposed amendments will provide for retailers to comply with a code of practice to be prescribed by the Regulations. The Code will be developed in consultation with the retail industry, and

it will be a defence to a prosecution for an offence against the display and advertising requirements that the defendant complied with a code of practice prescribed by the regulations.

The introduction of an R18+ classification for computer games is a sensible and long overdue reform.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995*

4—Amendment of section 15—Types of classifications

This clause amends section 15 to provide for an R 18+ classification for computer games.

5—Amendment of section 40A—Keeping R 18+ films with other films

This clause makes a minor amendment to allow a defence where a prescribed code of practice is complied with (consistently with proposed section 60A to be inserted in relation to R 18+ computer games).

6—Amendment of section 56—Demonstration etc. of RC computer games

This clause makes a minor drafting amendment to include the matter currently covered by section 58(1) in section 56 (and therefore allowing the substitution of section 58(1), discussed below).

7—Repeal of section 57

This clause repeals section 57 because the offence currently contained in that provision is now being relocated to section 58(1c).

8—Amendment of section 58—Demonstration etc. of unclassified, R 18+ and MA 15+ computer games

The offence relating to RC games that is currently contained in section 58(1) is being relocated to section 56 and this clause substitutes new offences relating to R 18+ games and relocates the current offence relating to MA 15+ games from section 57.

9—Amendment of section 59—Private demonstration of RC and R 18+ computer games in presence of minor

This clause creates an offence relating to private demonstration of an R 18+ computer game (by a person other than a parent or guardian), consistently with the provisions in the Act relating to R 18+ films.

10—Insertion of section 60A

This clause inserts a new provision on keeping R 18+ computer games with other computer games, to ensure consistency with the provisions relating to R 18+ films. As discussed above, a new defence is however included which allows for compliance with a prescribed code of practice.

11—Amendment of section 62—Sale or delivery of certain computer games to minors

This clause inserts a new offence relating to sale or delivery of an R 18+ game to a minor by a person other than a parent or guardian.

12—Amendment of section 63—Power to demand particulars and expel minors

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 63.

13—Amendment of section 64—Leaving computer games in certain places

This clause extends the current offences relating to leaving an RC computer game in a public place or, without the occupier's permission, on private premises to R 18+ games.

14—Amendment of section 69A—Liability of occupier for R 18+ advertisements in video stores etc.

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 69A and allows for a new defence which allows for compliance with a prescribed code of practice.

15—Amendment of section 71—Advertisements with computer games

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 71.

16—Amendment of section 80—Powers of entry, seizure and forfeiture

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the provision governing powers of entry, seizure and forfeiture.

17—Amendment of section 91—Regulations

This clause is consequential to clauses 5 and 10.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

ADULT LEARNERS' WEEK

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:54): I am very pleased to be able to report to the house on the winners of the Adult Learners' Week awards for 2012. I was pleased to represent the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and many other things the other night at a wonderful function to celebrate adult learners. The Adult Learning Program of the Year, an award sponsored by Adam Internet, was won by the Glandore Community Centre in Marion. The winner of the Adult Learning Community of the Year, sponsored by Adult Learning Australia, was the Taperoo Community Centre/UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide. The winner of the award of Adult Educator of the Year for a volunteer, sponsored by Credit Unions SA, was Tanya Moralee from Bedford industries.

The joint winners of the Adult Educator of the Year (Paid) award, jointly sponsored by the WEA and South Australian Council of Adult Literacy were Susan Lang from the Glandore Community House and Simon Cho from Bedford Training. The member for Mawson, I am sure, was very proud to learn that the Adult Learner of the Year, sponsored by TAFE SA, was Sue Steer from the Hackham West Community Centre.

Mr Bignell: I have sent a congratulatory letter already.

Ms THOMPSON: The member for Mawson has already moved to congratulate Ms Steer. I was also pleased that for the first time ever the Adult Learner of the Year was recognised at this year's training awards functions. Sue Steer was present with her husband and able to be acknowledged by the wider training community.

Adult community education plays a vital role in our community. At the moment some transformations are occurring in that area and in this process it is really important that we not forget the value of adult community education, but add value to it by allowing centres, if they choose, to engage with the wonderful Skills for All program. There is no doubt that Skills for All offers opportunities to South Australians to learn and develop workforce skills in a way that has never been possible before.

The adult community education sector has an important role in this, in that it is usually in that sector that people who have not experienced success in learning can take their initial steps to successful learning outcomes. Often they do not realise that they are learning. They think they are just doing something, or maybe learning to do something, but not really appreciating at first the extent to which they are building their literacy and numeracy skills, building their communication skills, building their confidence, learning more about the world around them, getting support from other members of the community centre and generally enhancing their lives.

In my study trip that I undertook to London, Manchester and Glasgow in January (I hope members note that this was not a great big holiday, going to those places at that time of year) I was very interested to hear that a lot of the debate in Britain about the role of adult and community education is similar to that in Australia. There is a lot of concern that the value of education in the adult sector is not being recognised.

While the state is prepared to fund and support general education in school, up to year 12, and in university, for the people who do not access either completion of their schooling or university, the direction of funding is generally towards vocational education. This has become very much the case in England, yet there are strong advocates there talking about the equity in enabling all people, particularly those who did not obtain a successful year 12 qualification, to have access to education, not just skills, at later periods in their lives.

There has been quite a bit of research in Britain linking the value of learning to health outcomes. While I was there I heard a number of stories about successful programs. One program that moved me was undertaken by the City Literary Institute, generally known as City Lit, the largest adult training organisation in the UK. They ran a program for homeless people. Interestingly it was not about getting them housed first and then teaching them things. It was about teaching them things and in the process they will learn things that will help them with housing, health management and many other things.

I spoke extensively with Nick Moore, the deputy principal of City Lit, and also with Dr Peter Lavender, the senior research and policy analyst for the National Institute of Adult Continuing

Education. Nick told me that one of the most moving stories in his long career in education was of a young homeless man who had engaged in one of their basic courses about organising your life for homeless people. Part of the package was that he got a canvas shoulder bag with City Lit written on it. He said that now he was not a homeless person as his first classification, he was a student, and this gave him great pride and joy.

The integration of Skills for All into the adult community education sector takes a lot of thinking through. At The presentation of the Adult Learners' Week awards, I expressed my thanks to both officers of DFEEST and the community sector for trying to work through the difficult process of bringing together a large organisation that is used to looking at outcomes, deliverables and training that are evaluated and accredited and community organisations that are used to responding to the needs of the community as expressed in conversations, by events that occur in the community and responding quickly to opportunities to enable the community to learn further.

This is quite a complicated process and, while I think it is extremely valuable that Skills for All is now delivering accredited learning through community centres, it is even more important that the value of adult and community education in and of itself not be forgotten. I congratulate all those who were nominated for the Adult Learners' Week awards. I especially congratulate those who won and I thank everybody who volunteers or works to keep the adult and community education sector a strong and viable part of our community.

INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTIONS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:02): I take the opportunity to talk a little bit about Chinese adoptees and their recent good fortune in having a situation related to their birth certificates overturned by the government. I will start by commending the government for seeing sense in relation to this matter and I will just touch briefly on what the issue was.

This morning in private members business I was due to move the Adoption Registration Amendment Bill 2012 of which I gave notice in the first half of this year, and I think we would probably have been dealing with it in July had it not been for the situation in relation to this chamber. I withdrew the bill this morning but, for the house's awareness, the bill had two significant clauses. One was an amendment to section 21 of the Adoption Act, that being in relation to recognition of adoption under foreign law, and it was a simple deletion of the words 'will be' and the substitution of the word 'is' in section 21(a1). The second clause was an amendment of section 41 in relation to registration, and that matter was consequential to the first part.

This situation that was presented to me by the group known as South Australian Chinese Adoption Support Inc. was that over the last 12 years as we have had intercountry adoption arrangements with China, there have been some 200 to 300 Chinese adoptees brought into South Australia and lovingly adopted by the adoptive parents who are now looking after them. Most adoptions that take place under intercountry adoption arrangements take place in Australia. The child is arranged through the two governments in agreement, brought to Australia and then adopted legally here.

Our current provisions have always maintained that a birth certificate can be supplied to a child of an adopted parent where the adoption takes place in Australia. However, in our intercountry adoption agreement with China the adoptions take place in China and so they are not covered by the clause under the Adoption Act. The Adoption Act enables Births, Deaths and Marriages to provide a birth certificate but it did not require that Births, Deaths and Marriages provide a birth certificate.

For the last 12 years, this group of 200 to 300 adoptees from China have been the only group of children adopted in Australia who have been unable to get new Australian birth documentation. This presents a problem for them later in life. It presents a problem when they are registering for school sporting events, when seeking a driver's licence or a marriage certificate, and a range of other things. Think about how important your primary source of identification, a birth certificate, is when you are getting those things. It is hard to get a driver's licence without a birth certificate. It is hard to get your first 100 points of ID. It is hard to get a passport and take overseas trips, as a number of these families have found.

This issue was first raised about eight years ago with the then minister. The Chinese Adoption Support group has been seeking to have this rule overturned with Births, Deaths and Marriages. Most recently, at the beginning of this year, the Facebook campaign started by this organisation. Parents were encouraged to write to their local members of parliament and to various ministers.

A range of responses has been received from ministers, most of whom have been passing the issue from minister to minister. It ended up with the Attorney-General, the Deputy Premier, whose initial response was to write back to parents saying that Births, Deaths and Marriages liked to record facts that had happened as they had happened and that therefore birth certificates would not be provided. This corresponded with the information provided by the department to SACAS and other groups over many years.

The Liberal Party's response when I met with this group was to consider the issue in our party room. It took us one meeting to agree to the policy of supporting this group in getting birth certificates to make these children's lives easier in the years to come. It took us a second meeting to agree to the bill, which I was planning on presenting this morning, which would guarantee that the birth certificates would be provided. We gave notice of this in the house a little while ago. During the last sitting week, we announced the policy to the media and we looked forward to moving the bill.

I am very happy that we received a phone call from the Deputy Premier's office during that week. Nigel Holden, who is the President of SACAS, the Chinese Adoption Support group, got a phone call from Births, Deaths and Marriages suggesting that they might like to come in. We got a photo of the first three adoptees very proudly holding their birth certificates two weeks ago. They were presented with their birth certificates during the last sitting week, so two weeks ago today, and they are very proud and very happy. One of them was having their birthday party on the Saturday two weeks ago and she was thrilled. She said that it was the best birthday present she could ever have had.

I have received a number of letters from the parents of these adoptees over the last two weeks, and they are absolutely thrilled. I thank the government. I am not aware whether there was a sudden change of heart in the minister's mind or in Births, Deaths and Marriages, but the point is that the outcome is a good one. These adoptive parents have now been advised that over the coming months a special form will be created for them, and that information will be provided through the South Australian Chinese Adoption Support group. All these children will be able to get birth certificates, just like any other adoptive child, reflecting their current arrangements.

The opposition is thrilled. We are glad that the government jumped on board. I note that Family First and the Liberal Party had both committed to this policy on the Chinese adoption website over the last few months. I think some of the other Independents had also given favourable responses. As I said a couple of weeks ago on ABC radio, 'better very, very, very late than never'. Nevertheless, we are very glad that the government has supported this group of parents and children.

FOREIGN WORKERS

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (16:08): I know it is unusual for me to rise in this place to speak, but I want to speak about a really important issue that happened in my electorate over the weekend. Members may have heard that at approximately 8.10 on Saturday a fatality occurred during a routine maintenance program on board the CSL floating offshore transfer barge in the sea near Whyalla. The floating offshore transfer barge is a facility utilised to export Arrium's (OneSteel) Project Magnet iron ore to vessels anchored outside the Whyalla harbour limits.

The person killed was a 37-year-old Filipino national who was working in Australia on a 457 visa. I pass on my sincere sympathy to the family of the worker, and to all his workmates and those involved at the facility. I have had a number of concerns in the last couple of years about the welfare of 457 visa workers in my area and also the use of 457 workers in some instances, because I know there are lots of people in Whyalla who would be happy to work in that particular facility. I would ask the company involved, which is Inco Ships Pty Ltd, to cooperate, and I understand they are cooperating very strongly with SafeWork SA, other authorities and also the Department of Immigration.

Currently, the organisation, which has operated in Whyalla for five years continuously, has a workforce complement of 13 per roster and only four of the crew actually have Australian residency or are Australian citizens. The remainder are on 457 visas. They work in Whyalla for three months and then fly back to their country of origin.

Iron ore from OneSteel Whyalla is loaded onto the barges at the pellet plant jetty. It is towed out by tugboat—a magnificent sight to see—to the ship loader which is several kilometres from shore. The iron ore is then unloaded from the barge via the ship loader to the cape size

vessels that are moored out there, and that is done through a series of conveyor systems. Generally, about 12 to 16 employees usually live on board.

On 21 June 2011, I wrote to minister Chris Bowen (the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship) regarding a number of issues of concern that had been raised by representations from local employees, from other residents, from workers and also from unions, particularly the MUA. We wrote to minister Bowen about these concerns and my office also contacted OneSteel—at the time it was OneSteel—and expressed our concerns.

I understand a very detailed investigation was made as a result of my representations, but also by the unions and others, and a detailed investigation by the Fair Work Ombudsman was carried out as a result of this. A lot of work went into it. I would really like to be able to say a lot more on this issue, but I understand there are investigations happening and I would hate to prejudice those investigations or any court case or whatever may follow, if it follows.

So, I will be quiet about issues that have concerned me, but I want to read into the *Hansard* the media statement from SafeWork SA. I spoke to SafeWork SA today. I know they are putting incredible effort into this, and I have every confidence in them because I have every confidence in my local workplace SafeWork SA employees and the work that they do.

I grew up in an industrial town. I grew up in a family that had the safety of workers very much in mind all the time. Occupational health and safety is primary in our considerations in Whyalla. I also want to thank Jamie Newlyn for his involvement in this as well because I know that the MUA has been very careful in looking after what has been happening in Whyalla. SafeWork SA issued a statement on 15 September saying:

SafeWork SA has been informed of a workplace fatality which occurred at Inco Ships Pty Ltd, Whyalla earlier today, Saturday 15 September 2012.

SafeWork SA inspectors are on-site with an investigation into the matter now underway.

SafeWork SA will investigate the circumstances surrounding the incident, including any breaches of the *Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986* as well as all parties with potential responsibility for workplace safety.

SafeWork SA will not be releasing any further information about this matter while the investigation is underway given information and items gathered may later be used as evidence in legal proceedings.

I think that media statement probably covers my reasons for not saying too much more. Again, I give my sympathy to all who have been affected by this dreadful fatality, particularly the family of the worker who died.

I know we see a number of 457 workers in my office. They are very hardworking people, who are really there to support their families back in their countries, particularly those who come from the Philippines. They have a very difficult time. They are away from their families for such a long time. I know the fly-in, fly-out workers in Australia have similar problems. These people really work very hard and put a major effort into it. My sympathy does go to his family because they probably will now have serious financial problems. I also hope that they are looked after in this.

It is very sad when you lose a worker. It is very sad for an industrial town, because a lot of these things do not need to happen. It is such a tragedy for people when they lose a worker in a situation like that. A young life; I understand he was only 37 years old. It is such a tragedy for us, and the town has been deeply affected by it, as would any place where something like this happens. I hope we can find some solutions to this. It is a very, very important issue, and I wanted to bring it to the attention of the people in this place and for them to understand how serious the situation is and that we hope that some satisfactory conclusion can be found to all of this.

PETROLEUM AND GEOTHERMAL ENERGY (TRANSITIONAL LICENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

REAL PROPERTY (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 16:17 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 October 2012 at 11:00.