

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 April 2013

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 February 2013.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:33): I rise to support this important move by the member for Davenport, the Hon. Iain Evans. I am currently on the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, and I am also on a select committee that is looking into the rules and regulations surrounding the welfare of companion animals—a very worthy committee to be on. Certainly, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee is one of the areas that I am very keen to be involved with in this parliament, as all members will know.

Can I say that I have been a member of the Country Fire Service since 1985 I think it was I joined and the captain of a very busy brigade at Happy Valley, and I am currently a member of the Kangarilla brigade and try to help whenever I can. My wife and I own a property between Meadows and Kangarilla, next to Kuitpo Forest, and we are very aware of the potential for a disaster in our Adelaide Hills.

This natural disasters committee that has been proposed by the member for Davenport is a committee that this parliament should consider most seriously. It is not if we are going to have another disaster in South Australia such as Ash Wednesday, the 1956 flood and the earthquake back in, I think it was 1956 as well, but when, and we had better be prepared for that.

On the ABC this morning I was listening to some reports about how volunteer groups are not getting the continuing support they require to look after people after the Tasmanian bushfires and the need to make sure that all volunteer groups are getting the support that they need to do the job that governments cannot do. Their job is not for the first five or 10 minutes after an earthquake or bushfire: it is for five days, five weeks and, sometimes, five months after we have had a natural disaster. So it is very important that we make sure that we are aware of all the ramifications, complications and permutations that are going to face this government and parliament should there be a natural disaster in South Australia.

We are earthquake prone, we are certainly bushfire prone, and we have seen floods. In fact, in my first year in this place we had floods at Glenelg North that, while considered relatively minor in area, affected 200 homes, and some of those people were impacted for months afterwards and, in fact, years in some cases where insurance issues were still being fought out and argued over.

We need a standing committee of this parliament to look at all the issues that we are going to be faced with should there be a natural disaster. To say that that is not necessary I think is being very naive. The cost involved in running this committee would be a fraction of what could be saved should this committee be able to do what it is intended to do, that is, prepare plans, talk to people and make sure that we are prepared.

The government last year set up the Community Safety Directorate to oversee our emergency services. It was put into the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. I think that was an interesting move by this government. It simplified the reporting to the minister by the various emergency services, but it is still not enough to prepare the parliament and the departments that this government controls. It is still not enough to make sure that they are well and truly prepared for the next looming disaster.

We hear a lot of talk about climate change and its long-term effects. Whether that is disease, drought or climate chaos (as some people are calling it now), it is something we have to be prepared for. It is the Boy Scouts motto of 'Be Prepared'. If it is good enough for the Boy Scouts, I think it is probably good enough for this parliament to be prepared.

The Hon. C.C. Fox: Scouts.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The Scouts, sorry, not the Boy Scouts. I am corrected by the member for Bright. The Scouts motto is 'Be Prepared'. If it is good enough for the Scouts, it is good enough for this parliament to be prepared, and a natural disasters standing committee of this parliament I think is the most effective and efficient way of being prepared.

It is going to take a lot of preparation, a lot of investigation and a lot of planning, and it will also involve putting in place protocols and procedures to make sure that when we have a natural disaster, not if, this parliament and government can react just the way we have in smaller cases in the past, to a lesser degree, say, with the 1956 floods, the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfires and the Wangary bushfires. There have been good responses but it has not been as planned as it possibly could have been.

This committee is something the government should consider. It should consider supporting the member for Davenport's bill, and I think it is a move that will be supported not only by members of the emergency services—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: —the need to make sure that we are all prepared—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett will be seated. I call the member for Torrens to order. She is making it almost impossible for the member for Morphett to be heard. Member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. This committee is vital for the future and safety of South Australia. To anybody on the government benches who says that this is something that is already being covered, just go and talk to your emergency services. Go and talk to your volunteers in the SES and CFS. Go and talk to the Salvation Army and the Rotary clubs who pick up the pieces after these disasters; go and talk to them. We should be as prepared as we possibly can, and this is a step we should be taking today to make sure that when the next disaster happens we are prepared.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (10:40): I do not want to be disrespectful to my colleague the member for Morphett, but I have never heard anything so silly in my whole life with respect to that contribution. What the member for Morphett did was just tell us how it is critically important that we have a standing committee of parliament to properly prepare for natural disasters. The member for Morphett did not give any other reason as to why it should be convened or how they should do it, only that it is critically important to do so.

I had some time in the fire brigade—19 years—and my view at that stage was that the further a politician could be away from any critical incident, the better it was for those people on the ground. I cannot for the life of me see what contribution this parliament would make with respect to preparedness for natural disasters. It is like transposing partisan political views in the place of professional people who are currently charged with the responsibility of ensuring that that preparedness is there. The other thing is that I think—

Mr Gardner: So, you're going to abolish all the committees then?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, maybe that is something that should be discussed as well because there are a heck of a lot of reports collecting dust around this place—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Colton be seated.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Morialta to order; he has a habit of interjecting at a volume just below the threshold for being warned. The threshold will be lowered today. Member for Colton.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you very much, sir. I think I was at the point of suggesting that what this motion is about is substituting partisan political views for the professional approach that is taken by our emergency services with respect to better informing government because they are the professionals, whether paid or not, in regard to how to properly prepare for those natural disasters.

The reality is that it is going to be very difficult, as I think the member for Morphett might have said—and I will stand corrected if he did not say this—to earthquake-proof a place. It would

be very difficult, but we can do it by getting expertise that does not lie in this place to better inform the decision-makers (being the government) about where those funds and resources should be best allocated based on that expert advice.

One of the other points I would like to make is that during this time in government we have seen a significant increase in the number of paid personnel who are directly responsible for the preparedness and the management of natural disasters in this state—unprecedented in the time of this state's history. We have also seen unprecedented increased levels of support with respect to volunteer organisations. We have seen that level of professionalism adopted by the CFS and the SES, unheralded in the history of this state.

We have seen, I think as recently as this week—and I will stand corrected—an announcement to establish a training centre and centre of excellence for SES volunteers down towards the airport. For the life of me, I cannot see what benefit will arise from this motion whatsoever; I think it is a nonsense.

We also have a system of select committees that can be convened at any time to undertake any role directed by this government. I have not heard one good reason from any of the speakers today—do not look so worried, Iain, it's alright; not everyone agrees with what you are putting forward—

Mr Venning: You're supporting professional firefighters, aren't you?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Professional firefighters, that's right. And the reality is—

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Colton be seated.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport looks like he would like to make a point of order.

An honourable member: He hasn't even had the time to sit down.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, I haven't had time to sit down; you're right. The member is referring to members of the opposition not by their electorate, but by their name, sir.

The SPEAKER: I am appalled. I call the member for Colton to order, and I never want to hear it pass his lips again.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am as ashamed of myself as I know you are of me, sir—and it won't happen again. For the life of me I do not understand what members of parliament would be able to contribute with respect to such a standing committee. I note the interjections of the member for Schubert who said something about a former professional firefighter, and that is right. Leave this work to professionals to advise parliamentarians, not parliamentarians who suddenly feel like they are the panacea and the answers to everything. It is just nonsense.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Sir, I remind you that the member for Chaffey is interjecting, but I do not mind that. It is just that we have standards here and he is breaching those standards at this time, sir. To me, this motion is absolute nonsense. The member for Davenport has the right to put forward anything he wants with respect to matters being considered by this parliament. I urge everyone here to take a dose of common sense and vote against this motion.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert. I apologise to the member for Chaffey but the member for Schubert 'barsed' the next speech.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (10:46): I rise to support this motion put forward by the member for Davenport and refute the comments just made by the member for Colton. I cannot agree because we need to have at least a watching brief and, as a parliament, to be a conduit between the people of South Australia and the people who protect us from these natural disasters.

We have a history of pretty serious natural disasters in this state. I remind the house of some of them. On Black Friday in January 1939, the South-East of South Australia, Victoria, southern New South Wales, ACT and Tasmania all experienced fires. Overall, 36 people died in Victoria on Black Friday alone. The total number of deaths was 71. Fires destroyed more than 700 homes, 69 sawmills, many businesses and farms and other buildings. Approximately 1,300 buildings were lost.

In the Mount Lofty Ranges bushfires in 1980 which most of us would remember, and I am sure the member for Colton does, the fire burnt 8,000 hectares in one day, destroying 51 homes, the Anglican church at Longwood and 75 farms along with orchards and market gardens. The damage bill was estimated at more than \$30 million. Ash Wednesday occurred in 1983. In total, 28 people died, including three CFS volunteer firefighters. More than 1,500 people were injured; 383 homes and 200 other buildings were destroyed, and 160,000 hectares were burnt.

On Eyre Peninsula, Black Tuesday in 2005 was the worst fire in South Australia since the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires. Nine people died, more than 110 were injured, approximately 82,000 hectares were burnt. Essential services were destroyed with loss of electricity, telecommunications and water supply; 79 houses were destroyed, 26 extensively damaged; 139 vehicles were destroyed; 325 sheds were destroyed; and 66,300 kilometres of fencing was destroyed. Livestock deaths totalled 46,500. One aircraft worth \$100,000 was destroyed.

These were serious events in South Australia. There were also other natural disasters, including earthquakes and local flooding. We also have unnatural disasters, and I think that the member for Davenport would include this. I was in one—a train derailment. It involved a vital bridge at Crystal Brook about 22 years ago. It took out the bridge, and the railway line was rendered useless. We lost our access to the east and west.

I cannot see any reason why this bill should not be supported. I cannot agree with the member for Colton. It is pretty rare that he and I disagree as vehemently as this, but knowing his background he should understand mine. I have been a member of this house for many years. I have been on committees and I have to say that some of the committees do not do too much, but in this instance this one could be proactive. I do not think the member for Davenport has this as a highly paid committee, but even if it just sat there and was in existence briefly for, say, two or three times a year and was briefed by the heads of our emergency services, it would be of value alone. So when we had these crises this group could certainly oversee, listen to and be the conduit between this place, the people of South Australia, and the emergency services.

Again, this is not new: the member for Davenport has raised it before. He is passionate about it and I agree with him, and I think the house should, certainly in an apolitical manner, support it. We are always going to have natural disasters and we need to be the best equipped we can be. I congratulate the member for Davenport, and I certainly support this motion.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (10:50): I rise to oppose the bill. It is not something that—

An honourable member: Typical.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What, typical? Common sense, yes, is typical of this side—stupidity on that side.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Will the Minister for Manufacturing be seated. The member for Chaffey is not to insult people across the chamber. He is not to obstruct the business of the house and, accordingly, I call him to order. I give notice that all these warnings will be carried over into question time, therefore lowering the threshold for removal from the house.

Mr GARDNER: Can I ask for a point of clarification, sir?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr GARDNER: I am not aware of you so far issuing any warnings so that members may correct their behaviour in the manner you desire. Can you clarify if there have, in fact, been any warnings this morning?

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for Morialta is correct. They were callings to order—pre-warnings. He is right again. The Minister for Manufacturing.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Thank you, sir. Neither were you wrong, sir; you were merely giving notice of your intention to carry through warnings.

Mr Gardner: Don't tell the Speaker what to do.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: No, I wasn't; I was upholding his honour. As many speakers have said before, this bill seeks to establish a permanent natural disasters committee with various

functions but essentially to inquire into, consider and report on such matters concerned with natural disasters.

It is my opinion, and I think that of the government, that it is not something that another committee cannot do; it is not something that, for instance, the Environment, Resources and Development Committee could not do in this parliament—and I will come to that at a later point. Natural disasters have come in the past, particularly bushfires. I was a child in 1983 and living at Norton Summit when the Ash Wednesday bushfires went through. My sister and I pretty much just sat in the lounge room as that fire went past. That was an interesting experience for me at age 11, and for my sister who was nine at the time.

Obviously, since that time there have been other fires in the state and most notably, of course, as the member for Schubert said, the Eyre Peninsula bushfire. That bushfire occurred for various reasons and there has been an inquiry into that, of course, or there was certainly an investigation into the matters surrounding that fire. However, I suspect there was nothing or very little there that could not have been investigated previously by the ERD Committee of this parliament. I think that is not something that a committee of this parliament could have prevented.

My understanding of that fire was that it was about decisions made on the ground, combined with weather conditions that were not necessarily anticipated and that caused the fire to jump out of control. It is unlikely that a specific committee of the parliament would have been able to prevent that disaster—and it was a disaster. It was also shown at the time that the government's response to that situation was very good.

I think many members of the government are proud of the way that the government managed to arrange affairs over there in the immediate aftermath of that fire to assist the community. I think it has been regularly remarked upon that that was, in the scheme of things, a well-run response to a disaster. It is unlikely that a committee of the parliament would have improved that.

As we saw, as part of the Emergency Management Act, there was a comprehensive structure set in place (this is in 2004) to set up a framework for how government and the organisations around government—the police and the fire and emergency services—would respond to various incidents including terrorist attacks, hazardous goods incidents, disease, human disease (I imagine that means an epidemic style), transport infrastructure failures, and natural disasters including earthquakes, tsunamis, bushfires and floods.

So, we had quite a significant act passed by this parliament in 2004 and is in place on the statute book. It allows the state to organise its affairs and organise itself to respond effectively to natural disasters. It establishes a State Emergency Management Committee which oversees the development and preparation of a state emergency management plan, and there are committees of the parliament that could inquire into the processes of that committee.

The ERD Committee could take part in that, of course, and I will come to the terms of that later as to what it can and cannot do. I suspect the Economic and Finance Committee, which has a broad purview, could look into the operations of the State Emergency Management Committee. When I was chair of that committee, we managed to have fairly broad questioning of witnesses on various topics from time to time. I imagine that continues under the current chair, as it has previously.

There is the ERD Committee, as I mentioned before; and there is also the Economic and Finance Committee, the committee in another place that inquires into the operations of, specifically, the finance, I suppose, but it can inquire widely into the operations of various government bodies including—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: The Budget and Finance Committee.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: The Budget and Finance Committee, thank you member for Davenport. It can look into the operations of the State Emergency Management Committee. There is no reason why it cannot do it. Further, I would have thought that it could look into the development and preparation of a state emergency management plan.

As a member of cabinet, we have an Emergency Management Committee, and I have attended a number of meetings. It meets regularly, and there is fairly comprehensive planning that goes on as part of that. It has held exercises, both in my time in cabinet and previously, on how to respond to various situations and scenarios. So, the planning goes right up to cabinet and right down back through agencies and everything else. The plan outlines guidelines, procedures,

processes, arrangements and organisational structures for the prevention and response to state emergencies.

The Emergency Management Committee can also establish a number of advisory groups, such as the State Mitigation Advisory Group, with the chair of SAFECOM; the State Response Advisory Group, whose chair is a member of the South Australian police force; the State Recovery Committee is chaired by a member of the Department for Families and Communities; the State Protective Security Advisory Group is chaired by the South Australian police; and the State Pandemic Influenza Working Group is chaired by the Department of Health. All these advisory groups are set up to prepare the plans to deal with these various contingencies.

Evidently, the framework of the Emergency Management Act 2004 provides a comprehensive structure around which the government has put in place a series of preparatory structures and plans. So, the implementation of a parliamentary committee for natural disasters would not greatly enhance or benefit the existing legislation for the management of natural disasters. There are certainly committees within the parliament that can do the job that is being suggested by the member for Davenport.

The terms of reference are there, for example, the terms of reference of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, and there are four main points, including that they can investigate any matter concerned with the environment. For example, they can investigate matters of controlled burns and fuel load. They can investigate any matter to do with the environment, so immediately bushfires, floods and any natural disasters come under that purview.

They can, in fact, investigate any matter concerned with the resources of the state. Again, that has a wide and broad application. They can investigate any matter concerned with planning and land use—again, a lot of the effects of natural disasters which, as the member for Morphett said, are always going to happen. A lot of the effect depends on land use at the time. Planning decisions made many years earlier—perhaps 10, 20, 30 years earlier—always seem to be, with hindsight, interesting decisions. So the land use aspect of that is certainly well within the purview of the ERD committee. Finally, there is any matter concerned with general development of the state.

So within those broad arrangements and within the flexibility generally allowed in these committees by their chairs—I admit that there are many other members of this parliament who have been around longer than me, but my experience of this parliament has been that the chairs have allowed fairly broad questioning on matters that come before them—there is no reason to think that the ERD committee or any other number of committees could not make a contribution to the preparation for natural disasters in this state.

As someone who has experienced the effect of natural disasters, I am not at all concerned with voting against or arguing against this bill from the member for Davenport. I am completely satisfied that the committees in this parliament have the power to investigate the matters at hand.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:01): I rise to support the bill brought before this house by the member for Davenport, and also to support comments made by members on this side of the house. I too would like to declare my interest, I guess, in being part of starting quite a large grass fire as a young fellow out bringing in lame sheep during the shearing season. It really is something that lives with you forever, to watch large amounts of country burn—and all started by an exhaust system on a brand-new ute.

Watching the fire burn underneath the ute, moving the ute and trying to put it out was a terrifying ordeal, and then seeing what came away from the grass fire. Nearly 3,000 hectares were burnt. Again, it is something that I live with forever. Fortunately no one was hurt, but a lot of livestock was fire affected and smoke affected, and there were sheds and one homestead that were impacted.

In my electorate of Chaffey we have been fortunate enough not to have endured any large-scale natural disasters for some time now, but the scale and impact of natural disasters that can be experienced across this state cause me real concern. Establishing a permanent natural disasters committee is certainly a concept I am willing to support; being prepared for any potential disasters is the best approach. As I said, in my electorate of Chaffey potential disasters include flooding, in particular, and the threat of bushfire. These have both been of major concern for many years.

We have seen instances where prescribed burns and burn-offs have gotten out of hand, and that is too often an issue. To hear the member for Colton this morning come out and say 'Leave it to the experts'; well, as I recall it the member for Colton was the minister responsible for

allowing prescribed burns, and then we watched them get out of control and impact on significant farmland, on significant regional communities.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: I notice that the member for Newland is trying to interject. I do not think there are too many bushfires in Newland and I do not think there are too many bushfires in Colton, so for anyone to interject—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Chaffey be seated. There is a point of order from the point of order specialist. Member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I wonder whether we could get the acoustics checked, because there seems to be an acoustic curtain where the Speaker can hear interjections from this side of the house but not the other side of the house. I am just wondering if there is an acoustic curtain, Mr Speaker. However, I draw your attention to the minister, who is interjecting, which is clearly against standing orders.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully, and ruthlessly deal with members on my right. Member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but I do have the curtain up and I cannot hear a word that the member for Newland is saying. Again, the impacts of prescribed burns that get out of control are well documented. They have had a significant impact, particularly on the regions here in this state, and I think that needs to be put on the record. Chaffey has also been the destination for people affected by natural disasters in their own home. People from the electorate have moved from their own home to interstate and overseas after natural disasters have occurred in their areas in recent times. I can certainly appreciate the impact that such disasters have on families and communities and the need to ensure that they are prepared for any natural disaster.

When something like a natural disaster has the effect of tearing apart communities, destroying family homes, threatening lives on such a significant scale, I believe that the parliament has a role to look at what it can do to minimise those harms. I would like to initially touch on the threat of bushfires and the many issues that Chaffey and South Australia must be prepared for, including such things as training volunteers and funding for equipment that seems to disappear on a regular basis through budget constraints. Again—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Chaffey be seated, please. I call the Minister for Manufacturing to order. The member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: As I said, maintaining the training of volunteers and the funding for equipment is vital particularly when looking at budgetary constraints and the defunding of those departments. Evacuation plans, house design and communication strategies are vital for preparedness and dealing with natural disasters. We need to look around this great state, the country as a nation and all around the world and at our preparedness for natural disasters, including the communication that needs to be put out to prepare people, to evacuate people and to get people ready for any impending disaster that is potentially on their doorstep.

During the drought many irrigators in the Riverland decided to exit their properties or, in recent times, have stopped watering their fruit trees and vines. That is creating fuel for a potential bushfire disaster on those windy, hot days that potentially put houses on the outskirts of those vacant properties at real risk. This situation has seen blocks of land infested with weeds, dead dry fruit trees posing a major bushfire risk. In fact, a patch of dead citrus trees in the town of Renmark, located in the middle of the town, was burnt off previously, and embers blew into backyards lighting up shade sails, lighting up anything that was flammable.

I can speak from firsthand experience from watching a neighbour burn off trees. I pleaded with him not to light the fire; so he lit the fire. My synthetic tennis court caught on fire and my trampoline caught on fire. My kids' toys were smouldering in my backyard. They are the sorts of things that can get out of hand. That is just an example of what can happen in the regions.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: Exactly. Imagine what impact this would have if all those dead trees on the property were on fire, which then set fire to a lot of the vacant neighbouring properties that had dead piles of trees.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Chaffey be seated. I call the member for Taylor to order and I warn the Minister for Manufacturing for the first time. The member for Chaffey will be heard in silence. He deserves that much.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think we really need to be more proactive when it comes down to the issues that can be prevented before they turn into situations where lives are placed in danger. There is no detailed plan or system about how we govern fire risks. That is something I envisage a natural disasters committee could oversee. The member for Davenport put it well in his previous second reading speech on this matter. It is concerning that for so long South Australia has lacked a committee specifically designated to reviewing and proposing ways in which we can deal with natural disasters, especially when there are areas in the state which are so prone to disasters, like bushfires.

The member for Davenport's proposal of a natural disasters committee would include responsibilities of obviously actively reviewing our processes in the instance of a natural disaster and proposing measures by which we could mitigate the damage done by natural disasters, both before and after the event.

Some of the examples are not just about bushfires but about natural disasters. It has obviously been very well documented that the last major flood here in South Australia almost totally wiped out Riverland towns back in 1956, particularly when Renmark was flooded due to high rainfall in the catchment areas, with all the rainfall accumulating at both the Murray and the Darling rivers and then coming into the state and almost washing us out to sea. The flood is actually considered to be the biggest flood recorded for the River Murray and led to the construction of the Menindee Lakes.

Many Chaffey residents remain concerned about the preparedness for flooding. For example, as the member for Colton may well know, the issue of the levee bank in Renmark became very topical in 2012, but we still have seen nothing done to prepare that town for the instance of a flood because those levee banks are obviously in very poor condition. It is almost leaving a community, a town, at risk if we were to be inundated with high floodwaters.

That levee bank with its rabbit holes almost looks like a piece of Swiss cheese. It has been tampered with, it has been moved, it has been shifted, and they are the sorts of issues that this committee could deal with. Again, part of the problem in this issue is that no-one knows whose responsibility it is to maintain the banks. Is it the state government's? Is it the council's? At the moment, it has become a real blame game, and that is of real concern.

Bushfires are also a risk in Chaffey, and the sheer volume of vegetation in South Australia gives us an even stronger cause, so it is essential for us to have a well thought-through system. No-one who has been through Chaffey could any more support the member for Davenport's idea of putting a committee together, so I welcome it.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:12): I, too, join with my colleagues on this side of the house to support this particular piece of legislation the member for Davenport has brought to the parliament, and I just want to make some comments in relation to this bill. Let's look at this for what it is. Let's look at what is going on here in the parliament for what it is. The government does not like it. The government is not supporting this bill because they did not think of it. It is not their idea. They do not like it because it is not their idea: it is an idea that has come from the opposition and so they do not want to support it, and they have form. The government has form on this, and they are looking at any and every reason not to support it.

We have heard a number of speakers on the government side with pretty thin, frail and flawed arguments as to why they are not prepared to support it. The member for Colton's argument for not supporting it is extremely flawed and, if you expand his argument, why have any parliamentary committee in this place? He says it is not necessary. Well, I can tell you that the Natural Resources Committee made a recommendation that this natural disasters committee be established.

I know that the member for Colton himself, prior to being a minister, was the chairman of the ERD Committee and that he currently sits on two parliamentary committees. So, if he thinks it is

such a bad idea to have a parliamentary committee established to look into and oversee in a parliamentary role, then why does he not resign from the two committees he currently sits on? I would like to know the answer to that.

Be that as it may, the member for Ashford stood up in this place a couple of weeks ago and (basically) spoke in support of the establishment of this committee, but she is locked in by the intransigent rules of the Labor government, where if she uses her own free vote then she will be expelled. If she votes against what the party policy is then she will be expelled from the party. I will quote from the *Hansard* of 7 February. The member for Ashford, who is the presiding member of the Natural Resources Committee, said:

As I said, I am not in a position—

I wonder why—

to support this proposal from the member for Davenport, but I think it is a really good idea.

What does that tell you? It tells you that the presiding member, who is a member of the government, thinks it is a good idea but because her colleagues collectively (the Labor government) does not think it is a good idea, because it is not their idea, it is a member on this side of the house's idea, they are not supporting it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel will be seated. I call the member for Florey to order. She is making it very difficult for the member for Kavel to get his point across. The member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. While I am quoting from *Hansard* I would also like to highlight a couple of other points that the member for Ashford made in her contribution on 7 February. It goes to the point that the member for Newland, the Minister for Manufacturing, made that he thinks that some of this work can be taken on by other committees. I will quote again from the *Hansard* and it knocks the member for Newland's idea out of the park for a six:

I think that the Natural Resources committee and the Environment, Resources and Development Committee have more than enough work to do.

It is not those two committees' focus to look at matters of natural disaster in this state. I will quote from the presiding member's foreword when the Natural Resources Committee brought down its final report on the bushfire inquiry. It was published in 2011 and it is as relevant today as it was a couple of years ago. I will quote this paragraph, which is a direct quote from the committee report:

The Committee strongly supports Iain Evans' call for a Standing Committee on Bushfires recommending that it may be opportunistically broadened to consider all Natural Disasters, including bushfires, floods, earthquakes, riverbank collapse, tsunamis, extreme weather events, hazardous material and pollution emergencies, pest plagues and agricultural diseases.

So, they are all very important points that are raised in that paragraph from the report brought down by the Natural Resources Committee. Given that argument, I strongly support, together with my colleagues on this side of the house, the bill that has been brought to the parliament by the member for Davenport.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:19): I would like to speak on this because it is something that concerns my electorate directly, with some of the rivers that are in the Taylor catchment. Certainly, the Gawler River has previously (before I was the member) flooded and affected many of the horticultural areas in the area. The thing that concerns me about the Liberal proponents of this amendment bill to set up a natural disasters committee, which is yet another paid parliamentary committee within the parliament, is it seems sometimes that people are more concerned about their pay rates than they are about doing their jobs.

Members interjecting:

Mrs VLAHOS: No, no. I sincerely think that sometimes people fight to go on committees simply so that they can get the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor will be seated. I call to order the member for Kavel, who was particularly rowdy yesterday in question time and has been rowdy again today. I warn the member for Morialta for the first time, and I call the member for Davenport to order. I hope

never to see an outpouring of interjections such as I just saw on my left, at least not before lunchtime. The member for Taylor.

Mrs VLAHOS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. I also would like to say that, in my time as the member for Taylor, I attended a CPA conference for the Asia-Pacific region relating to disaster management planning. In fact, many things came up at that very informative and educative forum I attended in Brisbane with some of our Pacific neighbours, who do indeed encounter a lot of natural disasters—inundation, floods, tsunamis, all sorts of things are visited upon them that we do not experience, with good grace, at this point in time.

One of the things that came up was the need for national disaster management, which will not be addressed by this parliamentary committee. The assumption that, within Australia, South Australia alone has all the information to be able to deal with this information is plainly arrogant and full of hubris. We need to work in a nationally coordinated approach. We send people across to other states to help them when they are suffering the misfortune of natural disaster, and we need to make sure that we consult with other states in a national plan, and the federal government is pursuing this course. Sandy Holloway, a well-known person who coordinated the Sydney Olympics and who has gone on to become somewhat of an expert in disaster management, has written on this issue at a national level, advocates for this approach.

Rather than having a piecemeal state approach, we would be better off leaving it in the hands of the professionals and letting them work out a national disaster management approach that balances all the things we on our side of the house have spoken about today—rather than having another paid committee of the Parliament of South Australia, so that people can feel good and make namby-pamby statements on committees so that they can go back to their electorates and say, 'I was defending my patch even before something happened,' which is what some people on committees do, not to say that they do not do other good work on committees as well.

In closing, I am against this Parliamentary Committees (Natural Disaster Committee) (No. 2) Amendment Bill 2012 on several grounds, most of which have been raised by the member for Colton and the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, and I will be voting against it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11:23): I want to make some comments in relation to this legislation. Clearly, the government is not supporting this. This is a sector that is already very heavily scrutinised—

Mr PENGILLY: A point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will be seated. The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: I seek your clarification, Mr Speaker. The member for Taylor spoke and then, as I understand it, the call should have gone to our side. The member for Davenport was on his feet before the minister, sir. Can I ask for a—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: He closes the debate; that is why he stood up.

The SPEAKER: The answer to that, as members have helpfully voiced from the floor, is that, if the member from Davenport spoke, he closed the debate and then no-one further on the government side would have had an opportunity to speak. The second point to make is that earlier, after the member for Chaffey spoke, I gave the call to the member for Kavel, so there were two opposition members in a row. So, on those two grounds, I see no argument, on principle, against having two government members in a row speak. I hope that explanation satisfies the member for Finniss. He's nodding; he must be satisfied.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am glad that he gets some satisfaction in the house. The Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. This is an area that is already heavily scrutinised by some significant and legitimate bodies. We think this proposal has the potential to be, at best, another unwarranted distraction for our emergency services but, at worst, an opportunity to politicise the good work our emergency services undertakes. I understand that new members in this house who saw the video of the Canberra fires (I understand it was presented to the select committee) would have been horrified by that, but in the last 10 years this government has responded in a proactive and strategic way to disaster management and bushfire risks. Some of the examples are:

- in 2003, after the Canberra bushfires, we had the Premier's Bushfire Summit. I attended that summit, and the fires and how we could do things here in South Australia as best we could to prevent similar occurrences were a strategic focus of that;
- the 2003 Emergency Services Review, chaired by John Dawkins;
- the 2005 independent review of the Wangary bushfire by Dr Bob Smith;
- the 2007 Minister for Emergency Services Review of Bushfire Management in South Australia;
- the 2008 Review of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 by Mr John Murray;
- the 2008 Deputy Coroner's inquiry into the Wangary bushfires; and
- the 2009-10 South Australian bushfire task force.

The emergency services sector has followed and responded to other bodies of work from around Australia, including the Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission, the Canberra fires report and the Perth Hills fire report. SAFECOM has advised me that all these reviews and reports undertaken by independent and expert people have one thing in common: not one of them recommended the establishment of a parliamentary standing committee for bushfires or natural disasters. There was not a single recommendation out of hundreds of recommendations contained in all these reports spanning over 10 years.

This government has continually worked towards making our state safe. Another process duplicating this work will do nothing but divert our agency staff from getting on with the job. The current standing committees, such as the Natural Resources Committee, can adequately inquire or investigate matters relating to bushfire and natural disasters. Parliament also has the estimates committee, question time and the Auditor-General's Report, all providing specific overview.

There are also other bodies that provide a forum for bushfire and disaster management and governance: the board of the Fire and Emergency Services Commission; the State Emergency Management Committee and the Emergency Management Council, chaired by the Premier; the State Bushfire Coordination Committee; zone emergency management committees; and bushfire management area committees.

In short, the sector is already closely monitored and this would add another taskmaster for agency heads to answer to, in particular the CFS, SES and MFS. Quite often, we hear in here the opposition attacking the levels of bureaucracy in the sector, and going down this path will simply add to it. There is also a major risk that our emergency services staff and volunteers will be so tied up with responding to another committee that they will be distracted from their very important roles. A standing committee would just put further pressure on front-line firefighters and rescuers if they have to try to predict how their decisions may be perceived by a parliamentary committee. Would it not be much more preferable to have them focusing on dealing with an incident?

Already we have seen this with the recent report of the Natural Resources Committee requiring the Minister of Police to recommend that the Mitcham council have a zero tolerance policy on illegal parking in fire prone areas. I do not say this to ridicule the suggestion, but surely the existing committee or its members could approach the council directly on this, rather than compelling a minister to perform something outside their core duties? At the same time, the committee also asks that a doorknocking campaign be considered.

What the committee seemed oblivious to were the large resources already directed at the Mount Lofty Ranges. This involves 12 CFS community education officers spread around the state, with five focused on the high-risk area of the Mount Lofty Ranges. Over the past three years, in the Mitcham council area alone, the CFS has run over 120 meetings with a total attendance of around 3,000 people.

In 2010, over 200,000 bushfire survival kits, including information, a DVD and a bushfire survival plan template, were mailed to residents in high-risk areas across the state. The majority of these were sent to those living in the Adelaide peri-urban interface. Fifty per cent of the CFS multimedia campaign budget goes specifically towards raising awareness of bushfire danger and survival strategies in the peri-urban area. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:31): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the importance of country hospitals to small country towns; and
- (b) recognises the extremely valuable contributions that the health professionals make to the quality of care to local residents and to rural and regional communities more broadly.

I would like to just start out by making it very clear that when I say 'health professionals', I am deliberately talking about the very wide range of people who contribute to health in country communities. Of course, immediately doctors and nurses spring to mind, and when I say doctors, it is typically local GPs who come to people's minds. Those people do a fantastic job and they really are at the core of most health services that we receive in country, rural and remote South Australia, but of course there are many others.

There are many allied health workers and in fact there are many city-based specialists who come out to country areas to provide their medical support and service as well. I would just like to make it clear that I am talking about everybody who provides this support at country hospitals in country South Australia and, of course, in other associated medical services, including private practices.

In the electorate that I represent—the electorate of Stuart—we actually have nine hospitals: Port Augusta, Kapunda, Jamestown, Peterborough, Burra, Eudunda, Booleroo Centre, Orroroo and Leigh Creek. Every single one of them is exceptionally important to their local communities, obviously for the health service they provide but in many other ways as well.

I would also like to point out that many people I represent in the electorate of Stuart also get supported very well by hospitals just outside of our electorate. People from Stuart are served by the Hawker hospital, the Quorn hospital, the Nuriootpa hospital, Waikerie Hospital, the Mannum hospital and others including, very importantly, hospitals in Adelaide. I think that it is important to point out, too, that there is an enormous amount of cross-support when it comes to this issue.

I am focusing on country hospitals but it is fair to recognise that country people do get support in Adelaide, and it is also very important to recognise that city people very often get a lot of support in country hospitals when they are there for work or business or travelling for tourism. When they fall sick or have an accident, they need our country hospitals very much as well.

As I have mentioned in this house before on a different topic, I was very fortunate last year to have the support of an intern from the University of Adelaide, Ms Alexandra Grigg, who is a very capable young woman who did some work for me looking into the benefits and important contribution that infrastructure and government services make to rural and regional South Australia, over and above their primary function for being there. I accept that we do not put medical services in place when medical care is not required, but they do a lot of very good work in addition. I will read some quotes out of her report:

...investment in rural health facilities in South Australia has a positive effect on the communities (sic) volunteer rates (as a percentage of town population), population and age group spread.

Age group spread is a very important indicator of community health—lots of young people, lots of middle-aged people, lots of old people. Whether the total population is small or large, having that good spread of ages is very important. Another quote:

...the regressions show, health facilities increase part time employment rates by 30.54% within a community.

Again, another quote:

Health facilities in regional communities not only provide health services that meet the requirements of both young and old, but they also provide employment opportunities and training for the towns' residents. Through the engagement and participation of the whole community, health facilities in regional South Australian communities add to the social welfare of the district and contribute constructively to community strength.

Again, I quote:

Health facilities, including local hospitals, generate a sense of identity and pride within regional South Australian communities...As a result, these services facilitate a high degree of community involvement through volunteerism...Consequently, support networks are strengthened and a sense of trust is generated...In turn, people are attracted to districts with these facilities as they provide benefits above their primary purpose of health care. Subsequently, investment in regional health facilities increases community strength and social welfare...

Again, I quote:

...health facilities in regional South Australian communities provide multiplier effects throughout the community above their primary purpose, encouraging community involvement through volunteerism and providing employment opportunities both directly and indirectly within the community...The intimate size of country hospitals in South Australia enables these facilities to tailor their services to the requirements of the community...Whilst the cost of maintaining regional South Australian health facilities is extremely expensive...the removal of these services significantly compromises the strength of local community...

Finally, I quote:

Long term, social equity considerations must be used in conjunction with economic rationalism to fully understand the influences infrastructure expenditure has on community strength. Future regional development and infrastructure policies in South Australia need to consider the social welfare and indirect economic multiplier effects associated with investment or disinvestment in sporting, health, educational and transport facilities in remote communities. Infrastructure investment in regional South Australian communities provide benefits beyond their primary purpose.

Lastly from that report, I would like to provide some information from a website which Ms Grigg created and it can be found by looking up 'communitystrengthinregionalsouthaustralia'. On that website she has highlighted the economic multipliers, and this is specifically with regard to healthcare facilities. The economic multiplier effects include direct and indirect employment opportunities, increased demand for local goods and services, and increased expenditure throughout the wide community.

The social multiplier effects include increased trust, immediate access to support networks, increased volunteer participation, increased social inclusion, increased group diversity, and lower mortality rates. Lastly, I quote from the website where Ms Grigg has written:

...health care facilities significantly increase the clusters of businesses in a community, furthering the multiplier effects of the institution. Furthermore, health care facilities based in regional South Australian towns increases their full time employment rates by 33%, holding all else constant.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I am sure that you will agree that that information, which is a small part of Ms Grigg's research, is very compelling. I would like to add some information to those facts for the house. She is not working in a social context, health context, sport or any other context—Ms Grigg is a young economist. This information is factually based on a very extensive study of facilities throughout regional South Australia.

This is exceptionally important for us, and I say again: over and above the very obvious healthcare benefits, this is exceptionally important because we need to keep people living and working in our regions. All these benefits that the health services supply in addition to health care support are keeping people in regions. If you do not have good health care, you will not have families with young children staying. If you do not have good health care, you will not have older South Australians staying.

Let me point out that all studies clearly show that, while we have approximately one-quarter of our state population living in regional South Australia, those people actually generate between two-thirds and three-quarters of our gross state product. If the people do not live in the regions, that gross state product will not be generated and our entire state will suffer. This is very important and something that is often lost on members in this house who are not intimately connected with regional issues. If you do not have the services, the people cannot live in the country. If the people do not live in the country, our whole state will suffer economically—that is very important.

They suffer because country towns, without the health services, will not have aged care, they will not have chemists, they will not have a GP, they will not have grocery stores, they will not have food services, they will not have other maintenance suppliers, and they will not have hospitality facilities like hotels and many others. The health service generates the people, creates the jobs and keeps all those people there working. Without those facilities, people will not be living in country South Australia.

Of course, I am reminded of the government's country health plan, which was brought forward quite a few years ago. Regional South Australia stood up defiantly against the government to knock back that country health plan. The government had absolutely no choice but to knock it back. I remember going to many public meetings attended by hundreds of people, where people made it really clear that, in the regions, they understood all the things I have just spoken about. They got it, they knew it, it was their life and it was their children's and grandchildren's futures that were at stake. Clearly, the government did not get it, and I am here to remind the government again, every single day, how very important this is to regional South Australia.

Part of the government's health plan it did not reverse was the removal of local hospital boards. Local hospital boards, which comprised a combination of health professionals, government representatives and local people from the local area contributing to make decisions on the running and management of their hospital, were disbanded and replaced with health advisory committees (HACs). Many of the good people who were on the local hospital boards transferred across to the health advisory committees. As a local member of parliament with, as I said before, nine hospitals in their constituency and the opportunity to nominate people onto those HACs, I can tell you that people do not want to be on them. They do not want to be on them in the same way that they did want to be on the local hospital boards.

The reason for that has nothing to do with the name change. The reason is that the government also took away the decision-making authority those local people had to have a positive impact on the running of their health services. There are certainly some people—a minority of people in my electorate—who have hung on and continue to represent their communities the very best they can, but they also tell me that it is not working, that it is not a good system, and they are incredibly disheartened. They are in the minority. Most people have just left and walked away because they do not see that they get a direct benefit for the volunteer time and effort they put into their local communities because it is not transferring into decisions in their local communities.

These are decisions which you would think would be very readily understood by the government—decisions such as how to spend tens of thousands of dollars or, in some cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars the local community has fundraised for their local hospital. But now local people are not allowed to decide how that money is spent. They have to bow down to the government in Adelaide in regard to decisions on how that money gets spent. You can imagine how heart wrenching it would be to have raised hundreds of thousands of dollars, in some cases over decades, and now be told, 'But now we have changed the system. You don't get to decide how your money is going to be spent in your region.'

That is a prime example of the reasons that local people do not want to participate in the way that they did—not because their hearts are not in it, but because they do not have the opportunity to make the decisions. I reiterate again that our policy as a Liberal opposition, if we are successful at the next election, is to immediately reinstate those local hospital boards and provide that authority back to people that they used to have, because it is an exceptionally important thing. The local health professionals understand that they were better served in their work previously when they had that active local involvement.

I will turn to the Royal Adelaide Hospital very briefly. While it is in Adelaide, it does link in very directly to this argument. At the last election we had a policy to renovate the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the government had a policy to build a brand new hospital. The reality is that over the entire life of the project there would have been approximately a billion dollars saved by renovating versus rebuilding. People can argue, 'Well, one might have blown out, the other might have blown out; one might have been cheaper, the other might have been cheaper,' but the reality is that over the life of the project approximately a billion dollars could have been saved. The gap would have stayed about the same.

We would have put that money into all of the other hospitals throughout the entire rest of the state, including some in Adelaide, but all of the benefits throughout Regional South Australia as well. It is no wonder that the government is now running out of money, is in a dreadful position financially and is struggling to financially support health care in rural and regional South Australia: because it made that decision. There will be a brand new flash hospital and no doubt it will be a good job. We can argue about whether or not it will be good enough, but the reality is that the government let go of the opportunity to have an extra billion dollars over the entire life of the project spent on other healthcare services throughout South Australia. That would have benefitted regional South Australia enormously and meant that we were not in the difficult situation that we are today.

Time expired.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:47): I commend the member for Stuart for his motion. There is no doubt that country hospitals are vital to all towns and all communities. It is not just about the regions. They are vital for existence so, again, I commend the member for Stuart for his motion. I will start off by talking about the importance of country hospitals. My electorate is made up of many small towns that rely on the small country hospitals, and my constituents are very proud and passionate to support them. They really are part of the fabric of a regional community.

If we look at a bit of history of how country hospitals have been supported over many years, it is about the community taking some ownership and giving recognition to the importance of what country hospitals represent. Over many years, country hospitals have slowly been wound back and in some way, shape or form, sadly, defunded in many ways. What we are seeing these days with this current government in particular is centralisation of health, particularly in country health. It really has started to play out over the last few years exactly what centralisation means. In essence, it is taking away a lot of the ownership. As I have said, the regions have a respect for their hospitals and for the staff, particularly for the doctors and nurses—the frontline people who are there and provide the services, but also the people who support those country hospitals.

Today it is about being able to commend and express appreciation for their valuable contribution. A good percentage of the community population is part of the health system. It is not just about nurses and doctors, it is about the supporting staff around the hospital. It is about the maintenance staff, the cleaners and administration. It really is a network that in most country areas is the biggest employer of that town. Again, it is providing a vital healthcare service, but it is also providing a vital employment opportunity for community members.

I would like to talk a little about the hospitals I have in my electorate—Waikerie, Baramera, Berri, Loxton and Renmark; and with the electoral boundaries about to change, I will take in another three hospitals—Pinnaroo, Lameroo and of course Karoonda. That really does put a significant amount of hospitals in any one electorate, although, as the member for Stuart has said, he has many hospitals in an electorate that is vast in this state's land layout.

What I would like to touch on is obviously the community having ownership of hospitals. As the member for Stuart has said, the community have lost some of that touch with country health and country hospitals because of the taking away, I guess, of some of the direction of those hospital boards and now giving it to the health advisory committees. I think the health advisory committees are doing a great job. They have been compromised and the boards have almost lost some of that ownership or the conduit into the community, if you like.

To give one example of what country communities do to look after, support and care for hospitals, to keep their hospitals' doors open, to keep the facilities maintained and to put extra services into their hospital, I know that recently the Berri Lions Club donated a new ultrasound machine for the birthing unit, a \$60,000 piece of equipment, to the Berri Regional Hospital. That is the sort of thing that some of the service clubs are doing. Just last week, the Hon. Rob Lucas from another place, shadow spokesman for health, visited a country hospital and the aged-care facilities in my electorate, as well as the Flinders regional training facility. He was very impressed with the community's ownership of their hospitals.

Let's look at some of the moneys that are in the coffers that, sadly, the state government almost has control of at the moment. Two of the hospitals in particular have had large accounts through their boards but which now come under the HACs. The government has taken control of that money, the very money that the community have raised and the very money that has been bequeathed to those hospitals. They are taking control of it essentially so that they can actually use that money for their budget bottom line. I think it is outrageous that the government is dictating to a country hospital how they can spend their money for the benefit of the hospital. It is sad to see that happening.

The Berri Hospital is now being turned into a general hospital for the Riverland. It is supported by all the outlying towns' hospitals—Renmark, Loxton, Baramera and Waikerie. I have already mentioned the soon-to-be Chaffey Mallee hospitals at Karoonda, Lameroo and Pinnaroo, which I am sure I will learn more about. I think the essence and fabric of country hospitals has already been underlined in what I have said. Again, there are always issues in these hospitals, particularly with visiting specialists and being able to attract specialists, doctors, nursing staff and administration staff to those hospitals so that we can continue to keep the health services that these small communities so much deserve.

The Berri Hospital has 36 beds with acute illness facilities. That has a 24-hour accident and emergency service, and it has an accident and emergency service provided by River Docs, which is something fairly new. I touched on the Flinders University campus and, in 2002, the Renmark Hospital supported its new rural clinical school initiative with 20 students beginning a Bachelor of Nursing degree at Renmark. In 2005, that intake rose to 30. That gives an opportunity to regional students (regional wannabe nurses and doctors) to be able to train in the regions—to live at home and train.

The burden of having to train away from home is an extra cost. It is living away from home and having to find accommodation, not being around your friends, and not having the social upbringing you are accustomed to. It is not only about learning a new profession: it is about being supported by your family and friends. The Flinders University campus in Renmark is one of 17 across the nation, and it is an excellent opportunity for regional wannabe nurses and doctors to train in the country.

Loxton Hospital has for a long time been regarded as a very important part of the Loxton community. It is almost famous for its birthing facilities and family-style apartment suites. I visited it last week, and it really does provide a unique experience, where the mother-to-be can come and give birth and the rest of the family can come in and live in the hospital while they are going through one of those life-changing experiences of giving birth and bringing into the family a new loved one. I commend Loxton for what it has achieved. Sadly, Loxton has money in the coffers and is not able to spend that money. I look at all the hospitals within the regions, and I commend what they offer. I have much more to offer but, sadly, my time is up. I commend the motion.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (11:57): It is my pleasure, also, to rise to support this motion, and I commend the member for Stuart for bringing it to the house. Many members would be aware that I have a particular passion for the small hospitals around this state, particularly because I spent 28 years of my life serving on the board of the Stirling District Hospital and, indeed, only gave up that position when I was elected as leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party and could no longer find the time to devote to that hospital. It stands, I think, as a shining beacon of what can be achieved by communities if only government will get out of the way.

That brings me to the main points I want to make. When you go back to the very early days of this government, one of the very first things they did (incompetent as they have been over the ensuing years) was engage a chap by the name of John Menadue from New South Wales—at considerable expense—to tell us what I think was the bleeding obvious in the first place. He came, at considerable expense to the taxpayers of this state, and, surprise, surprise, the conclusion that Mr Menadue came to in his report a decade ago, or more, was that we need to focus on primary health care. We need to focus on the care out in the community and preventative health care.

How better could we achieve that than by supporting the many hospitals across our state? Look at hospitals like, for instance, the Keith hospital. The government, in the last couple of years, decided it would withdraw funding from the Keith hospital. The Keith hospital had several major things going for it. It was a combined asset created—

Mr Whetstone: I was born in Keith.

Mrs REDMOND: The member for Chaffey was born in the Keith hospital, which means it is a place of historical significance to this state. Where would we be without the Keith hospital and the member for Chaffey having been born there? That hospital provides not just hospital care but it combines also an aged-care service and a medical centre; and, indeed, Keith happened to be the point to where the rescue helicopter from the Royal Adelaide Hospital could get without having to refuel so it could pick up and retrieve patients and get them back to the Royal Adelaide. So, it was a significant point and, of course, it was at the junction of two major highways which have been the source, sadly, of many significant and severe accidents in this state.

It was a vital part of the healthcare for not just the people in and around Keith, but for all the people traversing the roads between Melbourne and Adelaide, and indeed many other places around this state. But, this government chose to say, 'No, we're going to withdraw the funding,' because the then minister for health said, 'This is a private hospital.' He kept saying, 'This is a private hospital; why would government spend money supporting a private hospital?'

That illustrates, more than anything else, the completely erroneous thinking of this government, because it is private only in the sense that it is not a public hospital. It is a community-based hospital. Nowhere else can the government actually get a hospital where the land has been provided by the community itself; where the buildings are provided by the community itself; where the running of the hospital (via its board) is provided, generally at no cost, by volunteers from the community itself; and where the running costs are kept to a minimum because the people who are engaged in the provision of services (such as cleaners, cooks and so on) are able to do the duties for all of the different sectors, thus making the running of the hospital much cheaper.

When we talk about hospitals, we generally talk about something called 'occupied bed days'. Occupied bed days have a particular cost, and to have a facility such as the Keith Hospital, the occupied bed day cost for this government compared to the occupied bed day cost of any of

the public hospitals completely paid for by the government is minuscule because of the contributions that these communities make. They make these contributions for a very good reason; it is because they are used to caring for themselves and each other, as evidenced by their responses in all sorts of situations.

And yet, this government, in its bizarre wisdom, decides they are going to pull the money from hospitals such as Keith, Moonta, Glenelg and Ardrossan. All of those hospitals were in that same boat of providing to the public of this state—whether or not they were locals—the ability to get assistance at a hospital. Apart from that, there is the issue of the fact that people need to be able to access health care closer to home a lot of the time.

What this government has focused on doing all along is centralising all of the health care in this state into the hospitals in the city, and indeed even from the Queen Victoria, that used to be, and now the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the western suburbs. They are centralising from there into the city itself. That makes no sense. What we need to be doing, according to the government's own report by Menadue, is actually focusing our attention back into the community so that people are kept better out in their communities, and we do more preventative work out in the community.

The member for Stuart made the very realistic point that regional areas in this state will die if we do not actually allow the people who live in those areas to have the facilities that they need to be able to have a reasonable life out there. The member for Chaffey made the point about the money that is held by these hospitals that cannot be spent, and I am sure we will hear more about that from other members.

The other point I want to make is that not only have these hospitals run very efficiently, they continue to enjoy the support of the community. In the case of the Stirling District Hospital, for instance, I am able to say that our local op shop, known as the Stirling Community Shop, makes a profit every year. It gets second-hand clothing, largely, and a few other goods, and it sells those and makes a profit. From that money, it provides to the local hospital things like electric beds, which cost many thousands of dollars each and make a significant improvement in not only the care of the patients but the ability of the nurses to do the care, because they are helpful for lifting, and so on.

That is regularly provided by the community supporting the community shop, which in turn supports the hospital. I know, from my observations and discussions at numerous hospitals around the state—I have visited most of the hospitals around this state; including those up in the Riverland, over on Eyre Peninsula, and up in the northern parts of the state—that community support is inherent in the way that country people in this state help our hospitals, and thereby help the overall health budget.

One of the things about the health budget in this state is that we know that it is escalating at a rate more rapid than the CPI and more rapid than the rate at which the budget is going up. Indeed, under the management of this government, our budget is in steep decline, so we have a situation where common sense makes it manifestly evident that we would should be supporting these hospitals which do so much to support themselves. Instead of that, this government chooses time after time to kick sand in the face of the people who are involved in supporting these hospitals and says, 'We are withdrawing our funding. We are going to make life difficult. We are going to close these down because we have a better, bigger, newer operation.'

To replace our country hospitals, what are we going to have? We are going to have a bill of \$1.1 million each and every day for 30 years because of having the new Royal Adelaide Hospital when I am guaranteeing you that that money would be better spent if we put more facilities out into our communities where they are needed most. No-one is suggesting that we need to have a burns unit in every hospital or the ability to deal with heart situations and so on. Absolutely, on our population, we need some things centralised but we need to be able to provide basic, good, sound health care, and that could include hospitalisation in our country hospitals right around the regions of our state. That is the only way we are going to have a sustainable state and make the regions of this state sustainable.

They provide a huge economic boost to this state through mining, agriculture, the marine areas and they account for a greater percentage of the economy of this state than the amount that is spent on them. I thank the member for Stuart for bringing this motion before the house. I think it is a much needed motion and I look forward to seeing the government support it.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua) (12:07): I am beginning to enjoy my Thursday backbench duty in this place. You never know what issue is coming before the place, which I may—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, you never quite know what is on until you get here, of course. The order of business does change from time to time, member for Heysen. I am pleased to talk on this debate. I heard only the last part of the member for Heysen's speech but she articulated, I suppose, the Liberal rhetoric which does not bear any resemblance to the real facts of life in country South Australia. I know probably more about country health than any other single person in this place because I was the minister responsible for country health—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —for seven years. I know about all of the hospitals, not just the ones that happen to be in your own patch. I know about the whole system and I know in particular how that system has been strengthened and developed over the seven years that I was in charge of it and it continues to be developed. There is a view being put by those on the other side, and they like to put it in their own community—it goes does well obviously—that the big, nasty government in the city is wasting all the money on themselves and they are ignoring people in the country, but the reality is vastly different.

I do not have the mathematics in front of me but I do know that over the term of this government, the investing in country health has increased dramatically. There is now more elective surgery happening in the country than it ever did before, not just the volume of surgical procedures but the complexity of surgical procedures as well. We have strategies in place to increase the amount of mental health services provided for the country. There were some legislative changes that were needed to make that happen which have occurred but there has also been investment in places for people from the country who have mental illness to be attended to.

We have a network of TV screens which allows patients to be helped by trained psychiatrists in the city who in the past would not have had access to those helpers because of the technology that has been put in place. We are developing a strategy to increase the amount of cancer services available for people in the country. All of that is being done at great expense and with a great deal of care to make sure that fewer people in the country have to come to the city.

It happens. I went to a country hospital, Port Pirie Hospital, which had a very good local chemotherapy service which had been developed locally at the hospital, and I was told that about 25 per cent of country chemotherapy was conducted at that one hospital. That did not mean that a lot of people from the country were going to Port Pirie but that many people in the country who could be provided with chemotherapy in the country were coming to Adelaide.

Port Pirie was a standout, but that is because of a system that we used to have, where individual hospitals made their own decisions about what services they may or may not provide. There was no system-wide approach but, because I had developed an integrated approach to country health, I was able to say, 'We're going to have a strategy to make sure that we optimise the amount of chemotherapy that can be provided to people in the country.' As a consequence, I think we identified a dozen or so hospitals in larger communities where chemotherapy will be rolled out, all done in an integrated way with the leadership of Dorothy Keefe, who is the chief oncologist at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

In addition, of course, to the increase in services, we dramatically increased the amount of capital spend in country health, and we are upgrading a number of the major hospitals: the Whyalla Hospital; Port Augusta Hospital is having work done; Port Pirie; Port Lincoln; Berri, a major redevelopment at Berri; and, of course, in Mount Gambier. Other hospitals have had capital works on them, as well.

All of that is the truth, and yet those truths are ignored by the Liberals, who are focused on rhetoric which maintains an attitude of victimhood which they perpetuate in relation to their own constituents because that is how they get elected. They say to their constituents, 'Don't look at the facts—'

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 125, words to be objected to when used. I take great offence to the fact that the minister would impute that there is any improper motive in this motion. If he had had the opportunity to listen to my speech, I think he would understand that what he is saying is incorrect. I think words like 'only put these things up so that they can get elected' are completely inappropriate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order, and can I remind members that they were heard in silence, and I expect the member for Kaurna also to be heard in silence.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I did not hear what the honourable member said; I am sure he made some reasonable points, and I do not cast any negative comments about him. I am talking generally about his party which for decades has made a practice of the game of victimhood in relation to their constituents in order to optimise votes. They make the claim that the government ignores them and that the government believes that the city ends at Gepps Cross or wherever it happens to be, and all the expenditure is in the city.

The former leader of the opposition, the member for Heysen, made the exact point, member for Stuart, in her contribution when she said that the money being spent on the Royal Adelaide Hospital would be better spent in the country, saying that the country had been neglected. I was making the point that the country has not been neglected; in fact, there has been an increase in capital expenditure, there has been an increase in services that has not been acknowledged by those on the other side who continue to repeat in their communities that the country has been neglected by this government. It is completely untrue. If you do not like that analysis, that is fine: you come forward with your own analysis. I am just telling you what I observed over a number of years.

In relation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the other truth which members on the other side neglect to put to their constituents when they talk about the city hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, is that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is the biggest country hospital in South Australia. On any average night, about 25 per cent of the patients who are in that hospital come from country South Australia. It is a hospital for all South Australians. It is not a hospital for the people of the city. If you say that people in the country would be better off if all that money were spent in small country towns to provide infrastructure which could not be utilised because the services would not be there—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You will have your chance to have a say later, if you like. The interjections just show, I think, a lack of good behaviour on the part of those opposite. The point I am making is that if members opposite believe, as a member for Heysen was saying, that that money would be better spent on country facilities, they would be facilities which were stranded because the services would not be able to be provided to the people in the country who need the services of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

If you have advanced cancer, an advanced heart condition or an advanced brain condition, or you need a transplantation or you are in a traumatic accident, you do not get those services in any of the country hospitals no matter how splendidly they are equipped and no matter how dedicated the doctors and nurses are. You only get them in a major hospital such as the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Royal Adelaide Hospital's infrastructure is outdated; it is in a state of powerless decline and it is impossible to maintain it to the standard of a modern facility. This government made the very strong and good decision, in my view, which hit—

Mr Venning: Go look at the Barossa; it's a lot worse than that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This government made the correct decision, a commitment for the future of our community, to properly invest in a hospital which will serve all citizens of the state, including those from the country. As I say, one in four of those patients, on any average day, are country people.

I would agree with the sentiment of this motion, that this house notes the importance of country hospitals to small communities, but I think it is more important to note the importance of country hospitals to country people. If the argument is that we have to keep providing infrastructure in order to prop up small country towns—I acknowledge that that is a sentiment that is often expressed—that does not necessarily mean that the community is getting benefit out of that investment for their health services. The health department has to invest in health services to benefit people's health, not to benefit the community's survival.

That is something that is a by-product, I suppose, of having a hospital in a town. However, our focus has to be on our planning and the health department's focus has to be on what are the health needs of a community. It would be bad to neglect the health needs of a particular community

by spending too much money on something which it did not need for its health benefits but rather, for other purposes.

That is a hard decision that needs to be thought through and discussed with the health advisory councils, and I understand that the health advisory councils have all been through a process of developing 10-year plans to do just that. Finally, I would like to recognise the outstanding work done by people in local communities: the health professionals who do deliver high-quality care in sometimes very difficult circumstances a long way from support and advice. I would be churlish not to recognise that.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (12:17): I certainly support this motion. One slight change I would like to see is in part (a) which states, 'notes the importance of country hospitals to small country towns'. I would also add there 'to regional communities' because really that is what all of this is about. Our hospitals and health services in our regional communities are extremely important to all of us.

The Mount Gambier and District Health Service is a major regional hospital for the South-East region and some areas of Victoria. About 63,000 people are catered for in the South-East and up to another 20,000 in western Victoria, so it is an extremely important hospital to all of us. The hospital has a 78-bed public capacity and also a further 20-bed private hospital there. There are currently at least 25 resident doctors, nine Mount Gambier specialists, 19 visiting specialists and 270 nursing staff practising in the Mount Gambier and District Health Service.

The health service has a total workforce of some 440-odd people, of which close on 300 are full-time equivalents. The health service provides a broad range of health services which include: acute in-patient care (that is overnight and same-day patients); a 24-hour, seven days a week accident and emergency department with on-site salaried medical officers; general surgery; general medicine; a high dependency unit; obstetrics and gynaecology; orthopaedic surgery; ophthalmology; paediatric services; ear, nose and throat; a cardiologist; a physician; consulting rooms; pre-admission clinics; out-patient services; rehabilitation; palliative care based in the hospital; mental health services; and an accredited teacher facility.

Just on the teaching facilities, I think that has been a great initiative, both in the Riverland and in the South-East, where students from Flinders University who are in their final years of becoming GPs actually come into the country areas to train. That system has worked exceptionally well, and many of those students, once qualified, have returned to the country areas. That has been a great initiative. The South-East Regional Community Health Service provides a broad range of services across the South-East including:

- allied health services (occupational therapy, physiotherapy, social work, dietitians, speech pathology and podiatry);
- the community nursing programs, which are home-based visits and centre-based nursing clinics;
- immunisations;
- diabetes education, including the DAFNE program and a nurse practitioner;
- continence advisory services;
- a respiratory support nurse;
- health promotion screening and prevention programs, including Pit Stop, community education, events, etc.;
- facilitated physical activity, including tai chi, Easy Moves for Active Ageing, Wise Moves, walking groups, Come 'n Try, Hands On Health, and falls and balance groups;
- Home and Community Care programs, including an Aboriginal-specific HACC service, which provide assessment, social support, respite care, domestic assistance, personal care, maintenance, home modifications and equipment;
- the Women's Health Program, which includes health screening and support and a breast care nurse;
- the palliative care service, which is home-based and integrated;

- a geriatric evaluation and management team (assessment and care planning for older people at risk of functional decline, including access to a geriatrician);
- rehabilitation (ambulatory and inpatient within the hospital);
- GP Plus strategies, including support for clients with complex needs, care coordination, minimisation of avoidable hospital stays;
- a Rapid Intensive Brokerage Service and Country Home Link (support to enable the minimisation of hospital stays);
- cardiac rehabilitation groups and individual support pulmonary rehabilitation;
- cancer care coordination and support;
- transitional care packages, which is home-based restorative care for older people;
- drug and alcohol services, and a drug diversion program for youth;
- renal dialysis, which is in-centre dialysis and home-based support (this is something we did not have at all a few years ago, but I think we now have about six units and there are plans to grow that further);
- aged-care services, including aged-care assessment, community aged-care packages, day care and day therapy centres, and a community-based respite program;
- children's services, which include paediatrics, early childhood intervention and service development, child development clinics, and allied health therapies both individual and group;
- chronic conditions prevention, self-management and support programs including Moving Towards Wellness group;
- community midwifery and ante and postnatal support;
- youth programs; and
- an equipment loan service.

From all that members can see how important our regional health service and our hospital are to our entire community. In 2009-10 the Mount Gambier and District Health Service had a total of 8,819 patient discharges, including 2,931 day patients. The public hospitals had a bit over 5,000 overnight and close on 2,000 same day patients, and the private hospital had 850 overnight and 950 same day patients.

The Mount Gambier and District Health Service Emergency Department had 16,823 patients, and the outpatients/consulting rooms had a further 14,285 patients. The Mount Gambier and District Health Services operating theatres had 5,107 elective and emergency procedures (that is both public and private patients). The Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service maternity and paediatric ward admitted 1,633 patients, and there were 575 births. The high dependency unit admitted 760 patients, the medical ward admitted 971 patients, the surgical ward admitted 1,844 patients, and the day only ward admitted a further 1,287. The top five reasons for admission to the Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service were: neonatal care, normal delivery, lens procedures, metabolic disorders, and Caesarean delivery.

The South-East Regional Community Health Service provides allied health services, community nursing, aged-care services, children's services, chronic conditions programs, mental health programs, and equipment loan across the South-East region. The service has approximately 320 staff across the South-East and 350 volunteers, some shared with the Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service. The South-East Regional Community Health Service has approximately 5,000 to 6,000 active clients across the South-East.

Going forward from where we are now, I certainly congratulate the government on securing the \$26.7 million funding program to do major building works at the hospital. Through those works, we are going to have a new six-bed mental health unit, which has been lacking in the South-East for many years. Of course, a lot of people who are now flown straight through to Adelaide when they have acute disorders with their mental health can now be handled within their own community.

Our public dental health service, which has up to a four-year waiting list, is going to go from six chairs to 10, so that will certainly help. Our A&E services are to be more than doubled so that

people will be able to be seen much more quickly. Of course, oncology services will also be improved. Just yesterday, I met with the mental health people from Country Health SA.

Time expired.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:27): I cannot let an opportunity go past to speak on a motion such as this. I commend the member for Stuart for bringing it in here. I have been an unwavering advocate for country hospitals and the importance they have in their respective communities for as long as I have been in this place, and that is now almost 23 years. I served on a hospital board for many years before coming here. It is unfortunate that the state Labor government does not value the importance of country hospitals to small towns. I heard the member for Kaurana say a few words and will refute them entirely.

We have seen much evidence of this in recent years. The Keith community had to fight tooth and nail for \$300,000 to be able to continue to run their hospital. The government also cut funding to the Ardrossan and Moonta private hospitals. In the 10 years that this government has been in office, country facilities have been ignored and generally rundown; we just have not had the funding.

In fact, the hospital they are walking away from—the beautiful Royal Adelaide—is far better than most country hospitals, particularly the Barossa hospital. It is a disgrace that you are leaving a building the people in the Barossa would love to have. Everybody knows—and the minister certainly knows—the condition of this hospital, yet you allow it to continue. The beautiful Barossa should have the facility. That really is a disgrace.

When I first arrived in this place the then Bannon Labor government closed the Blyth District Hospital and it devastated that small community. Country hospitals do provide peace of mind to their communities, not just peace of mind that residents in the small towns will be able to access medical treatment when and if the need arises. The existence of hospitals in rural and regional areas also provides a sense of stability for the future of these small communities. It would be extremely remiss of me, given the topic of the country hospitals, not to take the opportunity to again raise the matter of the need for a new hospital in the Barossa.

I have said ad nauseam in this place that the two facilities we have in the Barossa at Angaston and Tanunda are outdated and inefficient. They are only seven kilometres apart, which creates financial inefficiencies with staffing and managing two sites so close together. The facilities are outdated and not of a standard people would expect from modern health care, particularly in the beautiful Barossa. These two facilities also lack services that should be offered: dialysis, modern operating theatres, chemotherapy services, and the list goes on. Also a helipad is desperately needed.

As I have done many times before, I pay tribute to the staff who work so hard to provide the very best of care in these facilities, and I note that the member's motion highlights this. I know many people who have received treatment at either Angaston or Tanunda hospitals and they speak very highly of the level of care they received.

Another very important country hospital in my electorate is the Mannum hospital, which has a public aged-care facility for the most vulnerable members of our community. I visit this facility regularly as a very dear friend resides there. The facilities are in desperate need of an upgrade. There are no private bedrooms. Bathrooms are shared between four residents. I think there are several rooms that do not have windows and are used as a thoroughfare for other residents and visitors to access the sunroom.

This facility is extremely important to the local community because Mannum is a very important place strategically, but it has repeatedly been ignored by the current Labor government. I understand there have been plans for some time for new single rooms to be constructed at this facility but again, as is the case with all projects in country areas, the government says it does not have the funding to carry out such plans.

I pay tribute to the staff who work in this facility. The care and compassion they show and the manner in which I have seen staff try to maintain the dignity of residents, as much as the shared living conditions allow, is admirable. The member for Finnis has just showed me the front page of the *Stock Journal* and you would not guess what the headline is. It is exactly this: 'Rural health needs a check-up.'

Mr Pengilly: Two million lost through ineffective resources.

Mr VENNING: Two million dollars lost through inefficient resources—so there it is. The rural media is certainly onto it, and I commend them for that. The Mannum hospital also needs a helipad. There is a space for that and there is some discussion.

I also pay tribute to Crystal Brook Hospital. I note that the member is here, and I am a constituent of his. The facilities offered at Crystal Brook are absolutely first-class, in total opposite to the Mannum and Barossa hospitals, and considering it is so close to Port Pirie that is amazing. Many of the resources supplied to Crystal Brook Hospital come from the local community.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: You have a particular interest in the aged care facility?

Mr VENNING: Yes, I have. Both my parents were farewelled from this hospital, and can I say that the care that they got was absolutely fabulous. Many families pay their gratitude by leaving bequeaths to upgrade those facilities, showing appreciation in a very tangible way.

Crystal Brook does need a helipad, and Dr Bill Griggs from the emergency retrieval unit said just that, because of its vital position near the highway. A helicopter would be able to land there at all hours and in all weather, able to retrieve and stabilise passengers coming down from the north. It is a great spot and we really do need a helipad. That will be one of the prime projects I will be dealing with in the community when I leave this place. I think the future of that hospital depends on the vision of a helipad close to the hospital, not down the other side of the town.

There can be no debate that country hospitals are vital to their communities. I have been extremely disappointed in recent years to see the demise of input from community members through health advisory councils, commonly known as HACs. I heard what the minister had to say; well, I am sorry, but I could not disagree more. Compared to when local hospital boards were in place—I know that the Barossa health advisory board no longer has any GP representatives on it, no local government representative and only a couple of community representatives despite there being places for many more to be involved—health advisory councils have been a disaster, a total failure. They have curbed people's enthusiasm to want to serve because they have become so bureaucratic, nothing more than a mouthpiece for the minister.

HACs have removed the powers people had to make an effective contribution, to bring about change, to provide real representation to the community and to serve their community. We had a wealth of experience and knowledge on our local hospital boards and all of that has been lost since they were abolished and replaced with health advisory councils as a result of the Health Care Act 2008.

The Kapunda Hospital—which used to be in my area, but the member for Stuart has it now—had money bequeathed to it, a lot of money, and donated, to provide a new aged health care unit. How incensed was I, as the local member, when I heard that they were denied the ability to spend their own money on their health facility. There was war, and it took some months for them to say, 'Okay, it's your money, you spend it how you like, but we were going to control it.'

They wanted to put it through their facilities and it was going to lose about a third of the total money—no way. Eventually, common sense did prevail, but this sort of business goes on. The review that was handed down this time last year about the implementation of the 41 HACs was far from complementary, and I quote:

The ingredients for a successful change were not evident, lacked effective implementation, or were still under development, despite these relationships operating for three years.

The level of satisfaction with the governance arrangements between country HACs and the local health system from the perspective of community members, HACs and local health service staff is low.

Country HACs...are not well supported or promoted by the health system.

That is from the Health Performance Council Review of Country Health Advisory Councils' Governance Arrangements, December 2011. So, there it is: refute that. It is a disgrace. It is clear that HACs are not being supported and have been set up to fail. This is another bad Labor experiment that has failed dismally. I would dearly love to see hospital boards reinstated—and our government will—so that country communities can again feel they are able to truly serve their local hospital that is so important to their small town, and for them to resume ownership and input into it. Yes, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will starve our country hospitals of funds to sustain them.

Again, I commend the member for raising this motion today. Nothing could be more important to a country town than its hospital. It is a hub for a lot of activity. A lot of the hospital

boards had, or did have, a working group of people who used to raise money for that hospital. They provided local catering services in those communities.

What did they call them? The women's auxiliaries, that is what they called them. They are all gone because people on the other side of the house do not understand what these groups do in the community. These hospitals were largely self-funding. Now look at what you have. You have destroyed the incentive, you have taken away the machinery, you have killed off that desire that people have to keep that facility there.

I commend the member for this motion again and not just the hospital itself but the people who work in it, the people who serve, and a lot of them are volunteers, so thank you very much for that. I include in that the ambulance service because we really need these people to be the front-line providers of our health care. I support this motion and congratulate the member for Stuart.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (12:38): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will be very quick, but I thank you very much for the opportunity of speaking on this very important issue for country people. As other members have indicated, I also thank the member for Stuart for bringing it to the attention of this house. Hospitals in country areas have been a mainstay of not only employment opportunities but also the well-being and safety of the people living in those regions, and for people who are travelling on the roads, the tourists, whether they are from Adelaide, interstate or international. This state has promoted itself as a great place for tourists and one thing we must ensure we have is good medical facilities and we must maintain that for the well-being of our communities.

I will be very quick because I think there are other members who want to speak. Country hospitals provide economic growth and employment opportunities. In my electorate of Frome, prior to me becoming the elected member, the small community of Blyth had a beautiful hospital and it closed. That was a loss to the Blyth community and for employment opportunities there. Whilst there was another hospital a small distance from Blyth, it certainly made a big difference. The service station went and the general store started to fall apart; they are still going, but it was a mainstay of the community of Blyth.

Port Pirie Regional Health Service is the second biggest single employer in our community of Port Pirie; well and truly over 350 people are employed in that hospital. It is one of the best hospitals outside Adelaide and, I would say, within the state, and I am very proud of that. As the member for Schubert has indicated, the Crystal Brook hospital, even though it is only 20 kilometres from Port Pirie, is renowned for its birthing facilities, the specialists and the operations performed there.

This state has to ensure that we do not close, or threaten to close, any more South Australian country hospitals. When I first entered this place after the 2010 by-election, I asked the previous minister for health a question, and he gave me an undertaking that the South Australian Labor government was not looking at cutting any more hospitals or services in Country Health in the regions. I again put that challenge to both the current government and the current opposition to give a commitment that they will not close any more country hospitals or further reduce services in the regions.

Another thing we need to ensure is important for the population there. I am not too sure who mentioned it, but one-quarter of the population of this state live in the country, but over two-thirds of the resources and the income for the state is generated from the regions. If we do not have hospitals, schools and associated activities out there, we will not have people living in the regions and we would not then be able to produce two-thirds of the state's revenue to ensure that this state continues to move on.

I would also like to mention the local hospital boards. I hear that members of the Liberal Party on this side of the house have given an indication that they will revert back to hospital boards if they are elected. I will be watching that very closely because I believe that the current system of the HACs does not really understand how regional hospitals and communities work, which has been mentioned. There are quite a few locations in the electorate of Frome where the local community have put substantial funds into the local hospitals for equipment and so forth.

One community, where over \$2.5 million is going to be bequeathed, should have the right to spend that money on issues and items within that hospital, but they cannot do it under the current system. I certainly believe that, if we could go back to local authority and delegation and let them be able to spend that bequeathed money on stuff that is required by those hospitals, it would be a great thing. I will stop there to allow other speakers to make a contribution. Certainly, I am

very passionate about country hospitals, and I will be keeping a very close eye on both sides of politics.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:43): I thank the member for Fisher for allowing me to speak now. I try to be fair in all this. I listened to the member for Kaurana's contribution, and I do recognise that, in my electorate, Wallaroo Hospital has had some investment, with an A&E facility and also a chemotherapy unit that have been upgraded, and considerable effort has gone into that. However, I do want to put on the record some issues that relate to the community I serve—and I try to say the same thing all the time, no matter where I am.

I have four public hospitals—Balaklava, Yorketown, Maitland and Wallaroo—and I have what used to be a public hospital at Minlaton but is now an aged-care facility, and I have community hospitals—a term I use very strongly—at Ardrossan, Moonta and Mallala. So, in that way, I do respect what the member for Mount Gambier was saying when he talked about regional communities—that it is not necessarily small country towns; regional communities benefit from these hospitals, too.

I am a bit of a hospital brat, actually. My mum retired last year as a nurse. I grew up in Yorketown, where there was a hospital, even though, sadly, it lost obstetrics, for example, about four or five years ago. I am lucky that, since the age of eight, I have lived in communities that have always had country hospitals. I live in Maitland, a town with 1,000 people, and it is the biggest town I have lived in. So, in that regard, I am very lucky.

But because I have lived in a few communities, and because I have read the history of those townships and spoken to people, I understand a bit of the effort that has gone into putting them there and therefore have the respect for the fact that they are there and the significance they have for the communities they serve, not just the town but the area around it.

I was in this parliament when the suggestion of what I classify as Country Health mark 1 was moved, and that was in mid-2008. Anybody who was around the place listening, watching and talking to people would never forget it, because it made country people rise as one when it came to the importance of their hospitals.

In my area, I arranged for three what I would call public meetings, where there was an opportunity for the department, and the minister was good enough to ensure that there were two staff from his department at each of those meetings to put the departmental position. I had local doctors speak and Health Advisory Board members, as they were then, before they were council members, and Vickie Chapman as the then shadow minister for health spoke too. I chaired those.

At Yorketown I had 700 people, at Balaklava 500 people and at Maitland 400 people. I have never seen such a crowd. It was just fantastic, because it was people who in some way had been impacted or who recognised the importance of the hospital, and they were prepared to fight and to do whatever it took to be there. I commend those people. They argued the case, they wanted to know the information, they were upset by what they were told, they were concerned about the future, and they chose to use the democratic principles that we have in this nation very strongly to put their voice forward.

Some change did happen, and I recognise that. It needed to, because it would have potentially absolutely decimated the people of those areas. The member for Stuart's motion talks about the significance and the importance of them, and it recognises the contributions that have been made. The town I lived in had the centenary of its hospital last year. It has existed for 100 years. It had a celebratory dinner. I went to the opening of a healing garden that occurred on the Sunday.

It is a reflective place where people who are dealing with terrible circumstances, be it themselves or their families, can go to be in nice surroundings and a bit away from the sterility of the surrounding building where the hospital is to reflect upon that and try to get some personal satisfaction from it. That is a wonderful thing too, and there was a big crowd at that, because it is not just everybody who is there for the centenary. They had 150 people, I think, for the dinner, but it was the people who wanted to pay their tributes; that is good.

I have been very concerned about the withdrawal of funding from, in my particular area, Ardrossan and Moonta hospitals. The previous minister used the term 'private' all the time. I take up the member for Heysen's words that they are community hospitals. That is what I have always believed also. At the hospital's request in Moonta a public rally was organised, again late on a Friday afternoon, I think at about 5 o'clock.

Moonta hospital is a bit of a U-shape and there were 1,000 people there on the lawns in front and on the roads out the front—1,000 people from that town had come out to fight about that. That was the withdrawal of funding that impacted on accident and emergency and on bed spaces.

In the Moonta case—the member for Heysen referred to this, about the relativities of cost—Moonta was providing beds in a private hospital, in a community hospital, as part of the public system as an overflow opportunity at, I think, \$104 per night, compared to what I believe then was the RAH cost to provide a bed of about \$1,400 a night. So it was making those beds available at less than 10 per cent of the cost and that opportunity was withdrawn.

Moonta and Ardrossan have decided to move forward and I put on record the member for Kaurna's assistance to ensure that future financial plans were prepared for those hospitals, to give them some surety and to access a better level of funding from the federal government for aged care services. I understand that that occurred; the member nods too.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: And they are better off now.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes; they are. It has created some change, but the withdrawal of funding support that recognised A&E services and the impact that that has had has still greatly concerned me. Aged care is one issue and A&E is one issue too, and Keith has been very strong on that. When we had the public meeting at Maitland (it was about mid-2008), I had one person stand up at the back of the hall in the elevated area who had been a board member for 24 years, and he talked about how much had been raised in that community for the Maitland hospital.

That chap is about to celebrate his 70th birthday on Sunday. He lives in the same street as me. He is the Old Fella from television, the comedian Mr Rod Gregory. He told me that in his 24 years on the board they had raised \$2 million. That is not just tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands, but \$2 million had come from a community to go towards health services in that area because of the regional community's commitment to it.

When you hear that sort of figure, how can you dispute it? How can you argue against what a community believes about a hospital and the importance that it places upon it? It is not just political rhetoric opportunities that we take here; this is putting on record the actual facts and the respect that people hold for it. As a son of a nurse, I will always respect the health professionals and the volunteers who work in hospitals. I am particularly pleased that part (b) of the motion recognises that, because in many cases these are people who have given up decades of their life to serve people.

Again, in the town I live in at Maitland, Dr Bill Chappel, who has now retired from medicine, was the sole practitioner for Maitland and the surrounding area for about 30 years. I cannot even begin to imagine the pressure on one person being the sole doctor in an area to respond to every health issue where they are not able to be serviced by the nursing people in the hospital, where the doctor has been available at their beck and call. He is an outstanding man.

Sadly he lost his wife a couple of years ago but he is still involved in Rotary and he is still involved in the community, and I tell you that when Dr Bill stands up and talks, people listen to him because of the respect that is held for him. That is where part (b) of the motion is particularly relevant and it is symptomatic, I think, of all the professionals and all the people who work in hospitals. No matter what role they hold and what level of importance might be attached to it, they have all contributed to it.

When we support this motion, we do not do it for political pointscore; we do it from absolute sincerity to try to recognise the importance placed on country health and the importance it holds for the future. Other members have reflected on tourism numbers; it is very important that hospitals are available for them, too. I want our communities to grow; it is very important that hospitals are available for them, also.

Collectively, yes, there are 500 people or thereabouts from regional South Australia in the RAH and in metropolitan hospitals each evening being treated in some way, so when the member for Kaurna talks about the RAH being the biggest country hospital in the state, I can understand the significance of that, but we should never lose those existing hospitals—and I think there are about 55 or thereabouts—because they are an important part of our great state and they need our support now more than ever.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:51): I will be brief because I believe other members want to speak. I commend the member for Stuart for bringing this motion. As I have said before and I say again, this is the Parliament of South Australia and our responsibility and our concerns

extend beyond Darlington and Gepps Cross. Whilst I have a principally urban electorate, there is some rural part to it. I think it is important that we remember that country hospitals are critical in terms of the sense of community and providing a service to the people who live in the town and in the surrounding areas.

One of my sisters trained at the Victor Harbor hospital many years ago and another one became Director of Nursing at Karoonda (which was very convenient when we went rabbiting because we could call in at 3am and get a cup of tea and a biscuit), so within the family there has been a connection with some of the country hospitals. Beyond just the hospital per se—and I know members have acknowledged doctors and other health professionals—what does concern me is that the health outcomes in rural areas are generally below those of people who live in the city. And it is not just males in country areas: overall, the health outcomes are not as good.

There is often lack of access to medical services in terms of having check-ups, screening and so on and there is often difficulty in accessing treatments for things like cancer. I know there has been some progress in some areas in terms of providing additional facilities but a lot of country people still have to travel to get basic medical services. I put it to the major parties to consider that there should be a charter of services so that people, irrespective of where they live in South Australia, get a reasonable service when it comes to health or other matters. Western Australia has had Royalties for Regions, but I think there should be a basic charter that encompasses basic services, particularly health, for people who live in country areas.

This is an important motion. Whilst there have been some improvements, I think it should be acknowledged that country people like to have a sense of ownership of their local hospital and I think they should be allowed to have a major say in the provision of medical services and hospital services in their area and not have those services left totally in the hands of bureaucrats. I commend this motion. It is important and I acknowledge that more needs to be done to ensure that country people can keep their hospitals, that they are maintained and that the services provided are of the highest quality.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:54): I also wish to say a few words regarding this good motion put up by the member for Stuart, and the comments from the member for Kaurana only serve to further inspire me. I have never heard such a diatribe of verbal diarrhoea regarding country health in all my born days. It shows clearly that the member does not really understand country health, and for him to pontificate on what a wonderful job was done during his tenure as minister I find absolutely bewildering.

These hospitals are critical. Along with schools in our country communities, the communities are particularly centred around their hospitals. Former minister Lea Stevens understood that, and she did not adopt the recommendations of John Menadue and that, ultimately, cost her her job. I think that that was most unfortunate because Lea Stevens understood that country towns and communities with hospitals, or towns with adjacent hospitals, revolved around those hospitals. They were great sources of employment, and they were great sources of pride to those communities.

Earlier, I think the member for Chaffey referred to what is going on now with the HACs, the Health Advisory Councils, and the fact that some of those most loyal people from the board days are still on the HACs and find themselves in a totally useless situation. They come to me from the South Coast District Hospital, Victor Harbor HAC, and from Kangaroo Island, the two hospitals in my electorate, and they say they want to get out because they are achieving absolutely nothing.

They feel as though they have been blown away by the bureaucracy and the dictates of the minister of the day. It is a sad indictment of the sick way in which this Labor government has treated country hospitals in South Australia. That is not how it is meant to be, and I sincerely hope that, should we be lucky enough to win the election in March next year, we will instigate a proper system of some form of local or regional management into our hospitals, which are still much loved despite the best efforts of the Labor Party to stuff them up properly. That is what I hope.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Here we go. I seek protection from the wet blanket attack from the other side, sir. It is interesting that they do not like it. They can hand it out but they do not like it. You want to come to our country hospitals and have a look at what goes on around them and how they are, as I said, loved by the community, and how the community has put (and in some cases still tries to put) enormous amounts of money into those hospitals. Those hospitals used to be, by and large, completely run by the community, initially through local government. In a past life, I had

dealings with the member for Flinders' father, when he was heavily involved in country health, and that went through the local government sector.

There are still some older members of the community who believe that local government still runs the hospitals; they have not done so for a long time, but that is the way things go. In relation to the second part of the member's motion regarding health professionals, I am proud to be involved with the health professionals who operate in my units. Just at the moment we are going through a process where the Department of Health under the current minister is trying to screw down the doctors at South Coast District Hospital and also over on Kangaroo Island. So, we have these two completely useless arguments going on because the bureaucracy has just taken over the complete running of the hospitals.

What a difference there was when the regional boards were in place. I happened to be chair of the Hills Mallee Southern Regional Health Service Board before I came into this place. We did not have this sort of tension existing between the doctors and the department because the regional general manager, Mr Kevin Eglinton, who is an extremely good operator, along with other RGMs around the state, was able to actually put in place agreements which work well.

But no, along came the state Labor government under the former minister and decided to throw the baby out with the bathwater—it 'didn't work'. It's only worked for decades and decades. Local management worked for decades, and then on to regional boards. He wasn't satisfied with that. He had to chuck it all out. So, I sincerely hope that we get some common sense with the return of the Liberal government in this state.

Along with the disastrous mess that this government has made of everything else—400 jobs this week, wasn't it, guys? Along with the disastrous mess they have made here we need to revert and fix up what has happened in our country hospitals and bring some self-management back in. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

CITY FRINGE DEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 95 residents of Dulwich, Rose Park and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to consult with affected residents concerning mixed-use, medium-to-high density multi-storey buildings on Fullarton Road, Greenhill Road and Tudor Street.

CHINA DELEGATION

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Later this month, I will be travelling to China, including Hong Kong, accompanied by the largest South Australian government-led business delegation to travel to China. This visit follows the release of the government's economic statement and the vision it lays out for the future of the South Australian economy. It is about seizing opportunities, capitalising on our export strengths and furthering the goals set out in our seven strategic priorities.

The timing could not be better, following immediately upon the new relationship with China forged between the Chinese and Australian leadership just this week. More than 40 business leaders, industry representatives and departmental executives will join me in spruiking South Australia's mining, energy, resources and agribusiness sectors, as well as showcasing our premium food and wine and world-class education offerings.

The delegation includes some of our peak bodies, such as FoodSA and the SA Wine Industry Association, along with representatives from our universities and our arts and service sectors. China has one of the fastest-growing economies in the world, and the growth in demand from China appears to be sustainable well into the future. South Australia's diverse economy is ideally placed to partner with China.

As I have previously outlined, the economic statement spoke of the need for South Australia to become increasingly outward looking and open to the opportunities of export markets, particularly the emerging markets of Asia. It also made clear that our state's economic growth in coming years depends on what we do now. That is why we are taking action and doing it on multiple fronts, including by building strong strategic relationships with high-growth economies such as India and China.

The visit, which will run from 21 to 29 April, will start and end in Hong Kong where we will be furthering our ties and engaging South Australian expatriates, alumni and business contacts with close connections to our state. These individuals make up a network of ambassadors for South Australia and they are some of the best promoters of our state.

In addition to Beijing, where a series of meetings will be held with key Chinese government agencies responsible for trade and investment, the visit will focus on our sister province, Shandong Province, which has a population of 95 million people and a GDP of \$803 billion. In Shandong, we will hold a cooperation and economic forum, which represents the new and deeper relationship developing between us.

The visit will be about relationship building, paving the way for further collaborations, promoting South Australia's products and capabilities and showcasing our investment opportunities. We know that there is a growing middle class in China that is willing to pay higher prices for premium, safe products, such as our premium food and wine produced in a clean environment with stringent regulatory settings.

It is my intention on this visit to put South Australia squarely on the map for Chinese investors in our sister province—something our new brand will help to do—and to support our business delegation in building new markets and opportunities in China. I will report back to the house on our achievements after we return.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

South Australian State Emergency Service—Volunteer Charter

QUESTION TIME

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by the government's election promise to create 100,000 new jobs by 2016?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:05): Yes, that is our intention.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): Supplementary: the Premier has just said that he stands by his election promise to create 100,000 new jobs by 2016. Can he explain to the house how he is going to create 2,500 jobs each month between now and 2016 to fulfil this election promise?

The SPEAKER: I will grant that as a supplementary. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:05): I thank the honourable member for his question, and this gives me a wonderful opportunity to set out the key priorities in the economic statement. This is precisely the challenge that the economic statement seeks to respond to. It chooses four areas of the economy—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Kavel to order.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, I am sorry, I warn him the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —on which we will focus our attention, and it talks about three things that we need to change about what we are doing in South Australia, or at least do much better and more deeply than we ever have before. The four areas, of course, are advanced manufacturing, sharing the benefits of the mining boom with the whole of South Australia, making sure that we do promote our premium food and wine grown in a clean environment, and also the vibrancy of our CBD. So much of a modern region is driven by the transactions and values that are promoted by its capital city, and this is a crucial area of economic opportunity for our state.

We are already seeing very substantial Chinese investment now. I noticed the Datong group were out promoting themselves today with a very substantial investment they have achieved off the back of the groundbreaking planning reforms by the Deputy Premier. These are the areas we will focus on. The three things that need to change about our state, the three things that we need to do better at—

Mrs Redmond: The government.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Heysen to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The three things that we need to draw on—some of these are strengths, but we do need to do more of them—is that we need to be more outward looking. We have to realise that we are living in one of the fastest-growing areas of the world in world history. Or, as some China watchers would say, China is now returning to its rightful place as leading the world economy. Being part of that region, the opportunities for us are extraordinary. So, Asia, India, China—and, of course, the purpose of the visit is to explore those opportunities. The second area that we—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the deputy leader to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The second thing that we need to do more of is recapture our traditional strength of being an innovative culture: doing new things for the first time, making sure that we actually do new things in new ways—

Mr Gardner: After 11 years of Labor.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Morialta for the second time. There will be no further warnings. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —going up the value chain in terms of what we offer. We know we cannot compete with low-cost jurisdictions; neither should we seek to compete on the basis of driving down to the lowest common denominator—I know a proposition those opposite are attracted to. Indeed, one of the speakers at their conference (Mr Blandy) has promoted this idea that we should be driving down to the lowest common denominator. We do not accept that approach. We want to go the high road: premium products, high wages, high skills, using our knowledge industries to create the opportunities of the future. Finally, the thing that separates our great party from those opposite is partnerships: partnerships between government, backed by strong business—

Mr Treloar interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, point of order from the member for Unley, but before the member for Unley makes the point of order and shapes it, it is my great regret to call the member for Flinders to order, which I have never done before.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think it's the influence of the member for Kavel; and I warn the member for Chaffey for the first time, who thinks I can't hear him behind the member for MacKillop's head. The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I draw your attention to the Premier debating in his answer.

The SPEAKER: I will listen very carefully to what the Premier has to say, because of course debate would be out of order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and the thing that we have to reinforce and strengthen, and I know it is a contested proposition in politics in South Australia, is

the importance of a strong government, a strong government working with strong business, backed up by a strong community. This partnership—

Mr Marshall: Bring it on.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, we've read your first speech and you don't see a role for government.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is why we need to reassert this strongly—

The SPEAKER: It's a point of order from the member for Unley, and before the member for Unley makes his point of order, the Leader of the Opposition was interjecting on the Premier and the Premier was responding to the interjection, so sin begets more sin. The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: Can I draw your attention to the fact the Premier was again debating and ignoring your earlier direction, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, I have pre-empted your point of order and explained why the Premier was being naughty. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and to turn to that last point, because what lies at the heart of the success of this state in the past and will lie at the heart of its success in the future are partnerships. We know in South Australia that we don't enjoy some of the natural advantages of other places. It means that we have to be smarter, think a little clearer and work a little harder than our opponents if we are to succeed in an ever-changing world. It requires partnerships between government, business and a strong community behind it.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BRAND

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:11): My question is also to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house how South Australia's new brand is progressing since its launch last month?

Mr Venning: Of course he can, he gave it to you.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:11): I thank the honourable member for her question and I am delighted to report that more than 170 South Australian businesses and organisations have already expressed an interest in using South Australia's new brand to market themselves at home and abroad. Of these, 82 businesses and organisations, big and small, have officially registered to use the brand, and 16 are already using the brand in various ways.

I am told that Douglas Park Organics, one of South Australia's clean and green food producers, has placed the brand on their orange juice label. Some are using the brand on their websites, in brochures and emails, while other businesses are currently developing designs. The Adelaide Convention Centre has used the brand in a magazine advertisement, it is developing a billboard, and the brand will feature on the newest brochure of KI Outdoor Action.

I am also pleased to join with the South Australian Wine Industry Association, the member for Schubert will be pleased to know, as they become the first major industry to adopt and use the state brand through their push to make us known as the wine capital of Australia. These are exactly the ways we wanted the state brand to be used. It is designed to bring to mind the qualities of South Australia, a place that is creative, industrious, innovative and, most of all, open to the world.

The new brand is also displayed prominently in several locations at Adelaide Airport and on the SA Power Networks LED screen at the junction of Greenhill Road and ANZAC Highway. State government agencies are also adapting the brand for use across various parts of government, and I was very pleased to feature it on the front page of the economic statement.

We have also taken the brand abroad, launching it last week in London to 235 expats, British businesses with South Australian ties and a couple of Aussie icons came along, Barry Humphries and Kathy Lette. I am told the guests loved the new brand and saw its potential in selling South Australia and our story to the world. I know that some people have taken some time to warm to the brand, and we expected that, but we do believe in its importance for the state's future economic development.

As I outlined in the economic statement and as the previous answer indicated, increasingly we are going to have to look beyond our borders for the opportunities that present themselves for South Australia. That means encouraging the people, the ideas, the resources, the visitors and the students to be part of the South Australian story. First, to create that preference for people to choose you, they have to be aware of you, and the key thing to create awareness is to create a strong brand, and that is what we are doing.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is again to the Premier. Why are 12 per cent more South Australians unemployed since he became Premier?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:14): These are the factual matters: since actually coming to government, 129,200 new jobs; since the last election, an extra 14,700 new jobs; since I assumed this role, an extra 2,400—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Adelaide to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, those are the factual matters. What completely—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Just before you make the point of order; if the point of order is going to be, 'I asked about unemployment and the Premier keeps talking about employment', that's not going to be a very good point of order, is it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr MARSHALL: Relevance, sir.

The SPEAKER: Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think the truth of the matter is today the unemployment figures came out, and what it demonstrated is that South Australia's unemployment rate remains steady when the national rate actually increased. And so, the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: As downcast as they are about the absence of bad news, they have to search for something in the statistics.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir, and I refer you to No. 137: the Premier has continually ignored your instruction—

The SPEAKER: You mean he's been doing it all day?

Mr PISONI: —not to debate.

The SPEAKER: I will listen very carefully to what the Premier has to say in response to this question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. On the topic of unemployment, generally movements in unemployment figures are broadly consistent with the trends across Australia. In trend terms, we are similar to Victoria (5.7 per cent), Queensland (5.8 per cent), and the national trend rate is 5.5 per cent. In comparison to the world, South Australia's unemployment rate is consistently lower than the OECD and the G20 averages. Based on the latest figure, it is lower than France, Belgium, the United Kingdom and Canada. If we compared the South Australian unemployment rate to countries' unemployment rates, we would be ninth of 34 OECD countries and 10th of the G20 countries. This is—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: A point of order from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MARSHALL: Relevance: we are trying to ascertain why there are 12 per cent more people unemployed in South Australia—what are the reasons for this—not just this diatribe of statistics.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think I've got the point of order. Perhaps the Premier will consider offering information about that also. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, Mr Speaker, the information I am offering to the house is absolutely relevant. On any measure—nationally, internationally or, if you would like, historically (that is, your 7 per cent unemployment rate in February 2002)—South Australia is performing strongly. This is something to be proud of; stop talking down this state!

The SPEAKER: Leader, have another go.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Thank you, sir. My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why the northern suburbs' unemployment rate of 9.5 per cent is almost double the state-wide figure?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. The variations across various regions in South Australia have always been a feature of unemployment within this state. There are regional variations, and they respond to the particular circumstances that exist in those regions.

We know that the northern suburbs of South Australia are a particularly important manufacturing region for South Australia. We know that there is real pressure on the manufacturing sector in South Australia. If we need a reminder about that, we only need to point to the circumstances of Holden's announcement just a few days ago. We know that a number of component manufacturers were already taking steps to lay off staff in anticipation of decisions by Holden to reduce production levels.

Consistently, there has been a lower level of employment in some of these areas that have traditionally been in areas of the economy which are responding to the international global conditions which are placing pressures on those industries. That is precisely why we have responded to those pressures with a plan to actually address them. There is absolutely no point in describing the bleeding obvious unless you have a positive solution for the future. We have; we have published it, we've put it out there, and what you have—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is a detailed, articulated plan for the future of South Australia.

Mr PISONI: Point of order. Again, No. 137 refers to obstruction. On numerous occasions, you have asked the Premier to not debate, and he continues to do so, sir.

The SPEAKER: In your opinion. In fact, I think the Premier is offering information relevant to the answer and accordingly, member for Unley, I call you to order. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I return to the economic statement, a plan which (1) sets out where we have been in this state, since 1836 to date; (2) describes the current circumstances; (3) describes the opportunities that exist in this state; (4) sets out an ambitious vision in each of these four areas; (5) sets out a plan on how we can get there. On all of those matters we have burst into print. We have made ourselves accountable. Where is your plan?

Mr Pisoni: You've had no plan for eleven years.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Unley for the first time.

OPERATION DISARM

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:20): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney please inform the house about the response to the government's illegal firearms reward scheme?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. Six weeks ago with my colleagues, the Premier and the Minister for Police, I announced an illegal firearm reward scheme to encourage members of the public to do in those carrying or using illegal firearms. Operation Disarm, as it is being called by SAPOL, commenced at the beginning of March and the response has already been very encouraging.

I can inform the house that, as of today, there have been 105 calls to Crime Stoppers in response to this campaign. This information provided by the public has led to the seizure of 32 firearms, 13 arrests and a further 11 reports. In addition to the action against firearms offenders, this intelligence has also led to other seizures, including drugs. Forensic tests on seized firearms have also led to arrests for other offences in which the firearm was used.

It is clear that this campaign is getting results; with every weapon being removed from our streets a potential crime is being prevented. I understand that the Deputy Commissioner of Police has said that the government's initiative is doing exactly what it was designed to do, that is, take illicit firearms out of the hands of criminals. This is in addition to last year's three month firearms amnesty which saw more than 2,700 weapons recovered in what was the biggest haul ever seen during an amnesty period.

If anyone in the community has knowledge of someone's illegal firearm, they should simply do them in. Rewards of up to \$10,000 are on offer. So far no-one has sought a reward for specific information. We believe this reflects the community's desire to work with the police to remove illicit firearms, and the potential danger they represent, from our society.

The government is doing all it can do and the police are doing all they can do. This initiative is about helping the community to do all it can do. South Australians should not need to put up with idiots carrying illegal firearms. The government and the police have no tolerance for it. This government will do everything within its power to work with the police to get illegal firearms off the streets and bring these people to justice. It is important for members of the public to know they can telephone Crime Stoppers and anonymously make a report which might assist the police in this regard.

OPERATION DISARM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:23): A supplementary: given the Attorney-General's answer to that question, could he please explain to the house why it is that he is calling 32 illegal firearms seized and 24 arrests and reports in one month a success, when the average for the previous seven months, excluding the amnesty, was 180 illegal firearms seized and 67 arrests and reports per month?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think that is a supplementary.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:23): I am very happy to answer that question. I do not know where the honourable member has his figures from, but I can tell you this: I was advised today, in fact an hour or so ago, by the deputy commissioner that the result of this particular campaign has been a doubling of information provided to police through Crime Stoppers above their long-term average of reports relating to firearms.

Each one of those reports to police in relation to firearms needs to be investigated and needs to be pursued. It is my understanding also, as a result of my conversation with the deputy commissioner today, that of the 100 or so complaints that have been received, they have been able to deal with, in the sense of process fully and investigate fully, 50 of those to date from which they have the yield that I spoke to the house about a moment or two ago.

The remaining 50 (or 52, or thereabouts) are continuing to be investigated. Can I indicate to the house that the investigation includes a number of things. As the deputy commissioner explained to me today, to know that a complaint is made of a firearm being at a particular address is not sufficient for the police to go to that address, knock on the door, and say, 'Excuse me, have you got a firearm we can have?' That's not how it works.

What they do is when they have that intelligence, when they have that information, they make due inquiry as to what else they might have relevant to that address, so that when they attend they have some idea what they are likely to encounter. So, to say that within six weeks there has not been the yield that the honourable member is talking about, he is actually talking about a yield produced by an ongoing process. I am advised, as I said, by the deputy commissioner that the yield they have received in respect of complaints to Crime Stoppers—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —about illegal firearms is double.

The SPEAKER: Before we have another supplementary, I warn the members for Heysen and Schubert for the first time. The member for Stuart.

OPERATION DISARM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:26): My supplementary question is: given that the Attorney-General has not disputed the figures that I gave, is he asserting, then, that somehow the rules have changed, that the safety of police entering homes to seize illegal firearms, or make reports or—

The SPEAKER: Yes, we've got the question. The Attorney-General.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:27): Mr Speaker, I did not agree or disagree with the honourable member's figures because I do not know where he got them from—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: David Pisoni.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It wouldn't be the first time in this house where numbers of variable veracity have been used as part and parcel of the question, although I accuse the honourable member of nothing in that regard. I do not know where his sources come from. I do know that I spoke to the Deputy Commissioner of Police about an hour ago, and he told me that the effect of this campaign has been to double—double—the amount of reported information from the public, through Crime Stoppers, about illegal weapons, and he regards this as a great success for SAPOL, and they are looking forward to more.

The SPEAKER: I heard the Minister for Education's insulting remark to the member for Unley, and I call her to order, and I also warn the deputy leader for the first time. The Leader of the Opposition.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Why does the Premier continue to say that the northern suburbs youth full-time unemployment rate of 44.6 per cent is, and I quote, 'a meaningless statistic', when there are 2,000 full-time unemployed young people in Adelaide's northern suburbs according to the ABS?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:28): Because we have outlined this on numerous occasions: it is a completely misleading way to describe the extent of the problem. It is not to minimise the importance of the challenge of meeting the needs of young people in the north, but it is utterly inappropriate to be running around with the number of 44 per cent and comparing it with national unemployment rates of around 5 or 6 per cent and trying to extrapolate from that. It is deliberately attempting to create a picture which is far worse than the true picture is in the northern suburbs.

The truth is that many of those young people are in jobs, many of them are in training, and many of them are in school where you'd expect them to be at that age. So the pool of people who are looking for work is correspondingly so much smaller. On your statistics it is in the order of about 5,000 people. It is an absurd proposition to promote this in some comparison with the national unemployment rate and suggest that there is a massive crisis of that sort. What we are doing on this side of the house is making sure that many more of those young people are in school. When they left office—the previous mob—what they had was—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, these are the facts. You want information; here's information.

The SPEAKER: The Premier—

Mr PISONI: Point of order—

The SPEAKER: No, I don't need the assistance of the member for Unley. The Premier will not refer to Her Majesty's opposition as—

Mr Marshall: Loyal opposition, sir.

The SPEAKER: —loyal opposition—as the 'other mob' and he will not give us a history lesson on the performance of when they were last in government.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: While I have this pause, I am weary of the member for Goyder's soliloquy. Would you please stop. I call you to order. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The day after we attained government, we were visited with school participation rates of the order of 69 per cent. Sixty-nine per cent of students were completing year 12. We have now lifted that to 89 per cent, so I can tell you what a number of those young people are doing: they are in school where they belong, preparing themselves for the jobs that we know that exist in the future, not the shrinking billabong of jobs which exist for those young people who do not actually have the skills and the capabilities to meet the needs of a modern economy. What we have decided to do is equip these young people with opportunities, so that they can seize their future. We were not prepared to allow almost a third of them to actually sit there with a shrinking level of opportunities. That is the focus of this government; that will continue to be our focus.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, supplementary.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Given the Premier's answer that 2,000 people is statistically meaningless, can the Premier—

The SPEAKER: I don't actually think the Premier said that.

Mr MARSHALL: He did say that, sir, last *Hansard*—not today, but previously.

The SPEAKER: Previously—okay.

Mr MARSHALL: Can he perhaps reflect on the total increase in unemployment in the northern suburbs, then, an increase from 15,000 to 19,000? And are those 19,000 people who are unemployed in our northern suburbs also completely meaningless?

The SPEAKER: That is a better formulation of the question.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

Mr Marshall: 19,000 people.

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for his question. Just repeating something with increasing levels of anger does not actually make the point any more cogent. We have said repeatedly that the way in which the opposition has promoted these statistics about youth unemployment—many years ago when youth unemployment was a particular focus, decades ago, when many of these young people were not in fact in school, the statistic obviously gained a certain currency in the public policy debate. That same statistic is used today in a way which really has very little relevance to the true issues at stake.

That is the simple point that we have made. We have never made the point—and it is offensive to suggest that we have made the point—that any one person being made unemployed is not anything other than a personal tragedy for that person and something that this side of the house has always regarded as its key project and purpose. That is why I flew to Detroit and I think, before the wheels were actually down on the ground, the opposition was saying that that was a meaningless trip, a pointless trip, that I should not be there advocating for the people of the north.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir. Again, I refer you to 137. You have warned the Premier time and time again about introducing debate into answers to questions, and he continues to do so.

The SPEAKER: The question, as I recall, was formulated as, 'Why does the Premier keep on saying...?' Therefore the leader was asking the Premier what is in his mind and the Premier is now sharing that with us. It is a rather open-ended question and, accordingly, I warn the member

for Unley for the second time for a frivolous and vexatious point of order that is obstructing the business of the house. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We hear a bit about bipartisanship in these matters. When I took my journey to Detroit to try to secure the jobs of 16,000 people in the northern suburbs—the very issue that we are talking about—it was described by the opposition as a waste of taxpayers' dollars. So much for bipartisanship; you wonder why the hand of bipartisanship is not extended to you. The wheels were not even on the tarmac and you were describing the visit as a complete waste of taxpayers' dollars and you want to be in—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: Clearly, this is debate and, in addition to that, the issue is relevance to the question, which was: 'Does the Premier agree that 19,000 unemployed in the northern suburbs is also a meaningless statistic?'

The SPEAKER: The Premier—well, it was a supplementary, wasn't it? It was a supplementary where the original question was 'Why does the Premier say...?' The supplementary is so open ended that the Premier is telling you why he doesn't agree. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We've heard a lot about bipartisanship in the face of pressures on unemployment rates in the northern suburbs. That has essentially been the motif of the Leader of the Opposition this week.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir: how can this possibly not be debate?

The SPEAKER: I warn the deputy leader for the second time for a frivolous—would the Premier be seated—and vexatious point of order that is obstructing the business of the house, and the deputy leader will go out next time she makes a point of order like that. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This idea of bipartisanship is being advanced, yet we have the most partisan of attacks. How could anybody seriously suggest that I, or anybody in this chamber, regard unemployment of any substantial number of citizens of this state as a meaningless statistic? It is game playing with words. Everyone here knows that the points we were making were about the use of that youth unemployment statistic, used in a way and juxtapositioned to the general unemployment rate, and calculated to create an impression in the mind of the community that the situation was so much worse in the northern suburbs than people might otherwise imagine. That degrades the morale of people. If the key issue in this state, and indeed in this nation, is confidence—and we know it is because we have relatively low unemployment rates, we have relatively low inflation rates, we have relatively strong growth rates—how on earth could that contribution do anything other than damage confidence?

BROENS SA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. How many workers and apprentices are losing their jobs at the Elizabeth-based advanced manufacturer, Broens SA, as the result of the award of a key defence contract by the federal Labor government to an off-the-shelf overseas-based supplier? What action, if any, is the government taking to assist families caught up in those job losses?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:37): I thank the member for Waite for his question. The government, both me personally—a letter may have been sent by the Premier, but, certainly a letter was sent by me to the federal government making representations on behalf of Broens to the federal government about the tender for the work. It was a tender process subject to all the normal probity requirements of any open tender process.

Broens weren't successful in securing the tender. They were underbid by an overseas organisation and the response from the commonwealth government was that probity didn't allow them to provide Broens with any sort of preferable treatment over and above the successful tenderer. It is an unfortunate fact of life that, when you do have tenders of these sorts, the scope for the government to intervene, even when there may be jobs at stake, is very limited. But the state government, I personally, and, indeed—

Dr McFetridge: What did Nick Champion do?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am interested to hear the member for Morphett ask, 'What did Nick Champion do?' Nick Champion did an enormous amount—and I am sure Broens would confirm that—to make representations to the commonwealth government on behalf of that company. We did everything we possibly could; however, it would have been improper, if not illegal, for the commonwealth to override what had been an open tender process—override that process and award a contract to Broens—when another company had been successful.

I don't know the exact number; I haven't had an update from Broens. We will work very closely with Broens to try to secure other opportunities for that company. We are very committed to them. I have been out to the factory, met with the various executives and, indeed, workers in the company. It was one of the first things I did. The chief executive of the Defence Teaming Centre organised for me to go out to the company and I did, I think it was last year, and I was very impressed with the operation and the product. It was unfortunate that they were not able to win this tender but it certainly wasn't for want of trying by the state government.

EDINBURGH DEFENCE BASE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. Can the minister tell the house about the welcome home parade for the Royal Australian Air Force personnel following 10 years of deployment in the Middle East?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:40): I acknowledge the member for Taylor, who has the RAAF superbase (it is a joint base now) Edinburgh in her electorate, and she is a very strong advocate for the defence forces in her electorate. The Royal Australian Air Force has historically been the major Australian defence force presence in South Australia with the personnel of its Edinburgh based squadrons and units being active members of several local communities and making a substantial contribution to our state.

RAAF's airborne maritime surveillance and response capability, initially in the form of the basic P-3B Orion and subsequently the advanced AP-3C variant, has been home based at RAAF Edinburgh in South Australia since May 1978. To recognise the immense contribution made by the AP-3C force to coalition operations in the Middle East over the last 10 years and the support and personal sacrifices made by the families, friends and loved ones, the state government was pleased to sponsor Number 92 Wing's officially approved family and community focused commemorative activities in Adelaide on 23 March this year, including the exercising of their right to march through the city.

Six hundred and eighty RAAF personnel marched in the welcome home parade that was attended by more than 2,000 people, including the Governor, the member for Taylor, the chief of the Air Force Air Marshal Geoff Brown AO and myself. The commemorative activities marked Number 92 Wing's permanent withdrawal from the Middle East and return to RAAF Base Edinburgh, bringing to a close Australia's provision of manned airborne intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance to coalition forces through the conduct of overland missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, maritime patrols in the Arabian Gulf and North Arabian Sea, and counter-piracy missions near Somalia.

Based at Al Minhad in the United Arab Emirates since January 2003, the detachment flew more than 2,400 missions and accumulated more than 23,000 flying hours. Since the early days of the deployment, the AP-3C Orion aircraft and its capabilities have been revolutionised; it has become a world-leading intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance platform operated and maintained by extremely capable and operationally experienced air and ground crews.

Over the total deployment period, Number 92WG rotated more than 3,500 personnel on tours of duty lasting between three and six months. For nearly all members of Number 92 Wing, deployments to the Middle East have been part of life, with many having completed five deployment rotations. The withdrawal of the AP-3C from the Middle East area of operations will allow the wing to return to a more normal 'raise, train, sustain' pattern of activity, including high-end war fighting skills training, as well as continuing to meet its Operation Resolute border protection obligations.

The support that the state government provided for the welcome home parade for 92 Wing sends an important message to the commonwealth government and Defence that ADF members and their families are welcome in, and highly valued by, South Australia.

PLANNING LAWS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:43): My question is to the Deputy Premier as Minister for Planning. Can the minister please inform the house about new laws to streamline planning approvals?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her question. Late last year the Premier led a meeting with building industry groups wherein he and I discussed with them at some length their concerns about what could be done in South Australia to give some incentive and stimulus to the building industry in order to enable them to get on with building, which is what they do, in difficult times.

There were many aspects of that conversation which have, since that time, borne fruit. To speak of but a few, we could look at the HomeStart arrangements that have been made, the stamp duty arrangements that have been made and so forth. But one of the matters that came out of that very important meeting was that, in the interests of reducing red tape and to enable people in the building industry to be able to proceed and just get on with building, private certification of low risk, low impact residential development was a very important priority for these people in the building industry.

I have to report that, today, new laws come into effect, less than six months after I first introduced them into this place, to give effect to this private certification opportunity. The changes will extend to planning approval provisions similar to those that have been in place for building approvals since 1997. Put simply, the government is making things easier for families who are seeking planning approvals. Currently, planning approvals can take months. The changes coming into effect today can cut waiting times to less than a fortnight with potential for turnaround in just days. This also gives the potential for a homebuyer to get all planning and building approvals in one go for a new house and land package.

This is a red tape reduction initiative that is good for families and good for jobs. It is also very good for small business. It will give a further boost to the state's housing industry which employs, of course, many South Australians. The government is committed to supporting the construction industry. We sat down with industry representatives and we are now delivering a reform they have told us will unlock further development in our state. By streamlining planning approvals, we are helping to unlock work for tradesmen and contractors.

I would like to thank the Hon. Mark Parnell from the other place for his work with my department to ensure that these regulations have struck the correct balance. This government will continue to look for ways to support the development industry in these tough times through red tape reductions as well as through investment in public infrastructure. These reforms will strengthen the planning system in this state and help to keep downward pressure on housing affordability.

PLANNING LAWS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): I have a supplementary question. In light of the legislation coming into effect today, Attorney, would you please confirm if you are proceeding with the regulations to allow planners to be private certifiers, in addition to building surveyors, without professional indemnity insurance and without similar qualifications to building surveyors, as I wrote to you about earlier in the week?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:46): Yes, I have in front of me a letter from the member for Bragg, dated 9 April this year, which indicates that she had, on that day, met with the Australian Institute of Building Surveyors and they had raised a couple of matters with her. I have asked questions of my department and have been advised that the regulations are apparently—this is my advice—well accepted by the industry, and that that includes these people.

As to the question about professional indemnity insurance, that assertion has been made by the deputy leader. I don't believe that is the case, but I am happy to take that up. As for the question about planners, I have to say that there are some people who run this line about planners not being appropriate people to conduct certifications.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Oh, dear! I shall give—

Mr Gardner: It was Flinders.

The SPEAKER: It was Flinders, was it? I'll accept the assurance of the member for Morialta that the feminine voice I heard interjecting was the member for Flinders and, accordingly, I warn him for the first time. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It may have been the member for Kavel, Mr Speaker—he is quite a ventriloquist. Anyway, back to my answer, I understand the insurance point and I'm sure we'll be able to resolve that to the satisfaction of the member for Bragg. We need to not lose sight, however, of the fact that some people who have resisted this reform need to be aware of the fact that, in local councils, the people who are performing this task are not necessarily and, in fact, are generally not planners.

So, we really do need to understand the real environment in which these reforms are taking place. I have the honourable member's letter. I am advised that there is acceptance of the regulations by the industry generally and, in particular, the people on whose behalf she wrote to me. However, I am pursuing the question of indemnity insurance and will advise her in due course.

BAE SYSTEMS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:49): My question is again to the Minister for Defence Industries. How many of the 450 jobs to be shed by defence company BAE will be lost in South Australia, what will be the economic impact of the company's decision to contract its footprint from Mawson Lakes into Edinburgh Parks and what action, if any, has the government taken to assist families impacted by the decisions?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:49): BAE Systems has confirmed there will be no direct job losses in South Australian operations as a result of the loss of its land materiel, vehicle and major weapons systems maintenance contract. I presume that is what the member for Waite was referring to. The project-based nature of defence business will always mean that workforce levels fluctuate as projects come online, ramp up and wind down. The company has previously determined on commercial grounds to vacate its Mawson Lakes premises and consolidate at Edinburgh Park. This decision is not linked to the contract loss.

BAE SYSTEMS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:50): What is the impact of it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:50): Well, there are no job losses. Is that what you are asking? No job losses. No direct job losses.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: At BAE at all?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The supplementary question is: are there any job losses at BAE?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I can only provide the advice that BAE Systems has given me, and that is that there will be no direct job losses in its South Australian operations as a result of its loss of the land materiel, vehicle and major weapons systems maintenance contract.

ACCOLADE WINES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Trade. Following the loss of 175 jobs at Accolade Wines' Reynella bottle manufacturing plant in July last year, how many new job losses are anticipated as a result of public reports yesterday that Accolade may be planning further cuts to the company's 1,700 workforce, in what is described as a company restructure?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:51): Accolade Wines has confirmed there will be job losses in Australia. So far it is yet to confirm how many jobs will be lost and so we have no number here for South Australia.

MONDELLO FARMS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:51): My question is again to the Minister for Industry and Trade. How many of the 140 jobs to go as a result of the collapse in recent weeks of Virginia-based potato processor Mondello Farms will be lost in South Australia, and what action if any has the government taken to assist families caught up in the receivership?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:52): It is not possible to say how many will be lost to the economy after the 140 jobs, but the usual process run through DFEEST is that there will be assistance with career planning and training as needed. Particularly with the introduction of Skills for All, we have been able to train more people than ever before and that will be used to train people. Typically it is through DFEEST, and there are other measures as well, and they will be in some way available to families and workers at the Mondello Farms company.

MONDELLO FARMS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:52): Supplementary: again, given the minister's answer, is Potatoes SA chief executive Robbie Davis correct then when she claims that the rising costs of water, energy and other fixed costs of doing business in SA are a key disadvantage in the global export market, especially when competing against New Zealand produce?

The SPEAKER: Where is that quote from?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Robbie Davis, SA chief executive, given on talkback radio.

The SPEAKER: Well, it is contrary to the standing orders—well, no, it is contrary to usage—to ask whether reports in the media are true. The member for Mitchell.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: With your leave, Mr Speaker, I made no reference to the media. She has made the comments publicly and I indicated that they had been made publicly.

The SPEAKER: Yes, but they were in fact from the media.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I think she has repeated them elsewhere.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell.

NATIONAL YOUTH WEEK

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Youth. Can the minister please inform the house about activities held as part of National Youth Week?

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I will take the point of order, which is presumably on the member for Waite's question, after—

Mrs REDMOND: No, sir, it is on the member for Mitchell's question.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mrs REDMOND: Because former speaker Lewis ruled the use of the term 'please' unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I am sure that he did it for the most authoritative reasons and, eager as I am to embrace all of the rulings of speaker Lewis and speaker Gunn, I will investigate the ruling. Is the member for Mitchell finished?

Mr SIBBONS: Thank you.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:54): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to inform the house that last Sunday, 300 young people attended the launch of the National Youth Week held in Whyalla, kicking off a week of youth oriented events and activities throughout the state.

The theme of this year's event is 'Be happy. Be active. Be you', and it is aimed at inspiring young people across the state. National Youth Week is designed for young people to become involved in a range of activities and to have their say on issues that are important to them. Some events are vocationally oriented, others focus on arts or sports, while others again are simply for the fun of it.

National Youth Week has gone from strength to strength since its inception, and there is a great variety of events this year, particularly in the regions. In my own local area, there have been a number of events, including the Service to Youth night, which was held last night. The event provided a forum for high school students and young people to have a casual chat with community leaders to find out about how young people can get involved in events and programs in our local community provided by service clubs like Rotary, Lions, Apex, Zonta and other service clubs.

Also last Saturday night, there was a cinema in the park in Apex Park in Gawler, which was held for families and teens, and included a gladiator ring, jumping castle, face painting, live arts display, food, live music and more. Tomorrow evening in the Barossa region, the member for Schubert may wish to note, the Nite Skate 2013 will be held at Nuriootpa Skate Park, Tolley Reserve.

Once again, there will be live music, food and drink, competitions, information and interactive stalls. A free bus service available from Light Regional Council areas and the outer Barossa Council is being provided. On Saturday, the Playford council is holding its annual Slam event in Elizabeth, which will include a mega skate competition, an aerosol art competition, as well as live music, art, free activities and a—

An honourable member: Are you skating in that?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am not skating, no. These events are just examples of the approximate 300 events being held across the state this week to mark the occasion. We often hear that young people are our future, and while this is certainly true, the case is that young people are very much a part of the present and Youth Week celebrates their contribution to our communities. I am pleased to advise that the state government makes an annual contribution of \$90,000 towards National Youth Week activities. For further information about Youth Week activities, members can visit www.youthweek.com.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the member for Heysen's point of order. Speaker Lewis did rule, I think correctly, that members of the house have a right to information, they do not have to beg for it, and so the use of the term 'please' to a minister during question time is disorderly and I call the member for Mitchell to order.

AIAUTOMOTIVE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:57): My question is to the Premier. Are the 400 jobs at aiAutomotive, many of them in Woodville, secure given Holden's present difficulties and the fact that aiA's parent company, Autodom, went into receivership in November 2012, when the member for West Torrens said publicly:

The debt that Autodom have, about \$6.5 million, has been guaranteed by General Motors Holden and Ford'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question. We are in discussions at the moment with aiAutomotive and I don't want to say too much more on the public record, except to say that I think the future of aiAutomotive is relatively positive, but I don't want to go into the details about that. I don't think there is any imminent threat to aiAutomotive in South Australia. I think partly that is due to the credit that the management in aiAutomotive in South Australia and indeed the workforce here should take, because they are the most efficient element of that whole group, and I think that is recognised by the parent group—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: And Holden.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: And by Holden, and I think that's why they invested and at least took on the debt that allowed that particular business to continue its operation, notwithstanding the difficulty the parent company got into. So, I think the future is relatively positive, but I don't want to reveal the nature of the discussions, which I think are at an important stage.

EXTRACTIVE AREAS REHABILITATION FUND

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Mining. Has there been any irregularity in the administration of the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund, and if so, what is the value and nature of the irregularity?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:59): I am not aware of any, but if you have an accusation to make, make it.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:00): Will the Minister for Education and Child Development be tabling the report from the Debelle inquiry once complete?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:00): My understanding is that is the plan.

SCIENCE RESEARCH FELLOWS

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (15:00): Can the Minister for Science and Information Economy inform the house about the recent appointment of three internationally-renowned scientists as research fellows at our major South Australian universities?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:00): I thank the member for this question. Mr Speaker, the government's economic statement makes it very clear that science and innovation go to the heart of our state's long-term prosperity.

Science underpins the advances, whether in manufacturing, or growing food, or in mining, that we believe are at the heart of South Australia's economic future. That is why this government is working in partnership with South Australian universities to add to our local research capacity in areas, in particular, of strategic importance.

An outstanding example of this is the recent appointment of three new research fellows to each of our public universities, supported by a \$3 million state government investment for the three fellows, and additional cash and in-kind contributions worth around \$3 million from each of the host universities. This initiative is designed to attract some of the very best international research talent to South Australia, and we have certainly achieved that with these appointments.

For instance, Professor Bart Follink is appointed to the University of South Australia. He is a minerals processing expert. His appointment complements our state's economic priority of South Australia as a mining services hub. Professor Andre Luiten at the University of Adelaide complements existing work at the Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing with Professor Tanya Monro—a fine physicist—with his work having broad implications across a number of fields, including medical diagnostics and advanced manufacturing.

Our third research fellow is Professor Colin Raston at Flinders University. Professor Raston is an expert in the fields of clean technology and nanotechnology. His work has applications in fields including energy, medicine and materials technology. By bringing this capacity into South Australia, we are better positioned to develop high-tech, high-value products locally. Together with our many fantastic and outstanding researchers, I believe the new fellows will contribute to South Australia's position as a place of innovation, discovery and the creation of new technology.

I think this initiative demonstrates how targeted investment in research and innovation by government can support not only the creation of new knowledge but also—and this is very important—improved commercial and economic outcomes for our state. I wish the fellows and their research teams—and I have had the pleasure of meeting all of them—every success in their work, and I also applaud the universities for their leadership in these fields of endeavour.

VACSWIM

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Will the government be agreeing to the YMCA's suggestion to change the VACSWIM dates, which would be to the detriment of the Royal Life Saving Society and, if so, why?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:04): I will be working with both groups to work out what the best outcome is for all people—the people who are involved in VACSWIM, that very important training for people who

learn so much over the summer holidays (and I know plenty of people here would have had their own children involved), and also to work with the YMCA and have a look at whatever suggestion they may have as well, to come up with the best possible outcome.

Mr Venning: Do you swim?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes I swim, a couple of times every week, thanks very much, member for Schubert.

The SPEAKER: Well, that interjection just lost a question.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE VOLUNTEER CHARTER

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:05): Last Sunday I had the pleasure of attending the launch of the South Australian State Emergency Service Volunteer Charter, which was tabled in the house by the Minister for Emergency Services today. As the shadow minister for volunteers and a former shadow minister for emergency services and a longstanding member of the CFS, I have had a lot to do with the SES over the many years and I am a strong supporter of the fine things it does for the state of South Australia.

At the current time we have 67 units within the SES, with about 1,600 volunteers who turn out for all sorts of disasters, dramas and rescues, helping the South Australia Police in their work and do an exceptionally fine job, so it is good to see that the government is recognising them in this volunteer charter.

The history of the SES is an interesting one, with the roots of it back in the civil defence organisations and air raid precaution organisations in the 1940s. Then in the 1960s we saw the civil defence organisation maintained in recognition of the role of protecting the community from the risks of nuclear warfare, as it was then. This changed later to the civil defence and rescue organisation, with a focus on day-to-day rescues. The name was changed to the South Australian civil defence and emergency services in the 60s and then in 1974 the organisation was renamed as the South Australian State Emergency Service.

The role of the State Emergency Service nowadays is a very broad one—everything from animal rescues, road accident rescues, trees down on the road and on houses, storms, floods and certainly helping out with fires. It has been a role that government cannot afford to ignore, and with this charter it shows that they are not ignoring it. Certainly I hope that the ideals of the charter are going to be fulfilled, because in the introduction the charter says:

The volunteer members of the State Emergency Service (SES) are fundamental to emergency management in South Australia. Their value and importance is recognised and highly regarded by the South Australian community. Volunteers and the commitment they bring to the community through prevention, preparedness, response and recovery activities remain the core strength of the SES.

As I said, there are 67 units with 1,600 volunteers approximately. The intent of this charter, which is similar to the CFS Volunteer Charter, is to ensure consultation occurs with volunteers about all matters that might reasonably be expected to affect them; consideration of their views when approving or adopting new practices or policies; consideration of their views when reviewing current practices or policies; recognition that there is a mutual obligation and practical partnership based on respect between the parties; that a fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory approach is taken by all; and that the safety of the South Australian community is paramount.

The charter identifies the key roles and responsibilities of the parties. This particular charter lays out the role of the South Australian Emergency Service Volunteers' Association and it has a list of their responsibilities. It then goes on to talk about the SES itself, the volunteers as individual volunteers and also the government of South Australia. The South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission obviously has a role integral with this, as does the State Emergency Service itself.

The need to recognise volunteers is something that we cannot underestimate in this place. In fact, to emphasise the significance of this particular charter, it was signed by the Premier, the Minister for Emergency Services, the Minister for Volunteers, the Chief Executive of the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission, the Chief Executive Officer of the SES and last, but by no means least, the chairperson of the South Australian State Emergency Services Volunteers' Association.

We should never underestimate the value of our volunteers in South Australia. The 2010 figures put the value of volunteering at \$4.98 billion. We could never as a government, never as a parliament, replace the volunteers. Certainly, when it comes to crisis intervention the SES, the CFS, SAPOL, the MFS and all our other emergency workers do an exceptionally fine job. It is a good thing to see that our State Emergency Service volunteers have been recognised in this charter. I look forward to working with the government in a bipartisan way to make sure that the consultation that is promised in this charter is undertaken and we do value our volunteers.

JIMMY'S WALK FOR CANCER

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:10): Today I would like to share with you what is really only the beginning of a remarkable story. On 19 May 2013 a 19 year old from Reynella, Jimmy Harrington, will set out on a 12-month 18,000 kilometre walk around Australia to raise money for childhood cancer. Yes, I did say 12 months, 18,000 kilometre walk around Australia. Jimmy's goal is to raise \$300,000 for the Brainchild Foundation. The Brainchild Foundation is a Queensland-based charity established to heighten awareness and increase support for children suffering brain and spinal cord tumours, and their families. The foundation was established by medical professionals and dedicated families and friends of children with cancer.

Jimmy's determination to make a difference began when he met a young girl named Emily Crook, who had childhood cancer. After a second round of chemotherapy, Emily recovered and the cancer went into remission. Sadly, the cancer returned as brain tumour. Due to the intense chemotherapy that Emily had already undergone, her body rejected further treatment and surgery was not an alternative. All that could be done was to make Emily as comfortable as possible. Unfortunately, she passed away in August 2011.

Jimmy felt he could not sit back and see this happen to other families like Emily's. With the true passion and energy of youth, Jimmy wanted to make a difference—and this is how Jimmy's Walk for Cancer project began. His philosophy was to change the world one step at a time. Jimmy's planning to make this project a success is in itself a huge achievement. There is a detailed itinerary of the walk, including distances covered, dates and locations, stopovers, as well as fundraising, sponsorship and a media strategy.

Using electronic media, Jimmy has enlisted the help of celebrity musicians Seal, Shannon Noll, Jessica Mauboy, Wes Carr and The Potbelleez, whose hit song *Don't Hold Back* seems a fitting theme for Jimmy's journey. He has also met with Delta Goodrem and Lisa Mitchell to discuss the project. With more than 11,500 Facebook supporters, a clothing sponsorship and charity concerts in all major east coast capitals, as well as in Adelaide, Jimmy's Walk for Cancer is building momentum across the nation.

Jimmy's training regime consists of walking or running between 25 kilometres to 30 kilometres a day on both road and treadmill. He regularly walks the 21 kilometres from the Adelaide CBD to his home in Reynella and has undertaken a trial walk/run from Adelaide to Victor Harbor. He is seeking donations and business sponsorship to assist with a support vehicle, shoes and footwear, medical needs and communications for the journey. Fundraising activities are happening prior to and during the walk, and include sausage sizzles, chocolate drives, bingo, movie nights, market stalls and the sale of promotional items.

It is incredibly important to recognise the hard work and dedication of young people like Jimmy. Often our society and communities tend to stereotype young people and, let's face it, more often than not these stereotypes are negative. So, when a young man like Jimmy dedicates himself to helping others in this way, I think it is vital that we share this story. Everyone in the community benefits from a project like Jimmy's Walk for Cancer.

The Children's Cancer Institute Australia's website notes that prior to the 1960s childhood cancer was almost always fatal. Today in Australia survival rates are about 75 percent across all types of childhood cancer. However, there is much more work to be done, with cancer still being responsible for more deaths of children than any other disease in Australia. Beyond the money raised by Jimmy for this important research and awareness work, there are those whose lives he impacts along the way. Already Jimmy has touched literally thousands of young Australians with his passion, energy and positive attitude for change.

This kind of project inspires a sense of community amongst diverse groups from schools, churches, sporting groups and businesses, as well as the neighbours and friends of Emily and her family, coming together to turn heartbreak into something real and something good. Please have a look at Jimmy's website, www.jimmyswalkforcancer.com, and I encourage you all to become

involved with Jimmy's Walk For Cancer and to support an amazing young South Australian attempting to achieve his goal.

Time expired.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:15): Today I would like to talk about marine parks and sanctuary zones. It is a subject I have talked about in the past and we seem to be getting to the pointy end of the marine park process. Despite the best efforts of the opposition and the industries involved, the government seems persistent and intent on rolling out its sanctuary zones.

In the next few weeks and months, rolling out as far as October 2014, wild catch fishers will be receiving letters from the government in an effort to reduce their catch and in an attempt to reduce their effort. It is all about removing effort from the waters of South Australia; unfortunately, it is going to be about removing people from viable fishing industries and coastal communities as well.

There are 19 marine parks around the state. Ten of them are adjacent to the seat of Flinders and contained within that are many of the sanctuary zones, which will be no-go zones as far as the fishers are concerned. The fishing industries that are particularly going to be affected are rock lobster, abalone, the marine scalefish industry and also the charter boat, which is a not insignificant part of the tourism effort, not just on Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast but also around the Kangaroo Island area and Yorke Peninsula and, I am sure, in the South-East as well.

I particularly wanted to talk about rock lobster today because in my mind it would seem that that is the industry that is to be most affected. There are two zones within South Australia: the southern zone which fishes off the coast of the South-East of South Australia and the northern rock lobster zone which fishes on the West Coast, Eyre Peninsula, a big catch off Kangaroo Island and also Yorke Peninsula. It would seem to me that these are the fishers who are most likely to be impacted significantly, at least, by the sanctuary zones.

The rock lobster fishery has existed and has been fished for almost 100 years. Its science has proved that it is a benign industry. It has been well-managed and, in fact, a friend of mine who fishes in the industry says he has never seen the ocean look so good. It has never been better as far as fisheries go, and that is not just rock lobster but other fish as well—tuna, for example, and also sardines.

In 2003 there was an effort made to reduce the number of licences and also reduce the quota in rock lobster in the northern rock lobster zone. It was reduced because it was recognised that there was a drop in the catch. That has achieved the desired effect and catches are at a point now where they are sustainable, profitable and productive. Unfortunately, the sanctuary zones are going to remove those areas that are most productive and that are the best catch areas for rock lobster.

There is no doubt that this effort by the government to reduce the fishing effort will cost jobs. It will cost not just direct jobs in the fishing industry but also in the processing plants that are around our coast. It will cost coastal communities and it will cost the state in lost production and in fact it is going to cost our taxpayers. If I can just read, for the benefit of the house, a letter from the northern rock lobster zone to the government:

The areas targeted by your marine parks—
meaning sanctuary zones—

are our highest catch areas, meaning fishermen will need to find new ground, and also be forced to fish less productive ground. Make no mistake about the financial impact this will have on the industry, as fuel costs and labour costs will skyrocket...these less productive areas will be further impacted by more intensive fishing effort—exactly the opposite of what you should want to achieve from a conservation point of view.

So, this misguided effort is not just costing the fishing industry but also costing the state and the taxpayer. There has been an attempt to estimate the effect on the fishing industry. With the rock lobster industry, there has been an estimation that it will have a 5.7 per cent effect on the fishery. That fishery is worth \$250 million of economic activity to the state, so we're talking tens of millions of dollars of lost effort and production.

This demonstrates the government's lack of appreciation of the contribution this fishery makes, not just to the finances of the state, but to the valuable employment opportunities in regional areas. I can guarantee the current marine park sanctuary zone plan will cost jobs and it

will cost money. Slowly but surely, this Labor government is shutting this state down. We are propping up industries that are in decline and constraining or reducing those that are making a real contribution to the state, and it is no wonder we find ourselves in a dire financial situation.

Time expired.

GM HOLDEN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:20): Today I want to briefly add my voice to those who have expressed disappointment and even anger at Holden's plan to lay off 400 workers in the coming months. I do not want to say too much about it. I think the issues have been pretty well canvassed over the last couple of days. The Premier has been at pains to tell the house exactly what is going on as it happens. There have been many other contributions, some of them more useful than others.

I note that yesterday the member for Taylor made a particularly valuable and, at times, quite passionate contribution. We all know Holden's and its subsidiary industries are major manufacturers in the northern suburbs. I grew up there, my Dad worked at Holden's, my two brothers-in-law worked at Holden's, and many of my friends and family work at Holden's. This is what we have to remember in this debate—

The Hon. S.W. Key: It's real people.

Mr ODENWALDER: That is right. It is real people, it is not a political football, and it is not something for us to come in here and score points off each other. These are real people, these are people with families, and they are people who contribute to the local economy of the area that I live in, so to me it is quite personal, and we will be doing what we can to make the best of it and to make sure that these people are looked after.

I do not want to say too much about Holden. I do want to take the opportunity to remind members of the broader range of manufacturers that are located in the northern suburbs, those that are largely unrelated to the automotive sector. There are some significant success stories, with varying levels of success, but there is a lot of manufacturing going on in the north, and I want to draw the house's attention to some of those today.

Despite the high Australian dollar and the other challenges that we have canvassed quite a bit this week facing the manufacturing sector, and facing the northern suburbs too, there are some success stories, and I would like to go through a few of them. There is Clipsal Schneider, which is in the Port Adelaide electorate, but it is broadly in the northern suburbs. Some of my constituents work down that way.

Clipsal is Australia's number one brand of electrical accessories. It produces electrical accessories and data communications products for industrial and residential applications. Clipsal manufactures much of its product at its plant at Gepps Cross. The \$50 million move to Gepps Cross from Clipsal's traditional home at Bowden consolidates the company's South Australian operation. I understand Clipsal has regional satellite factories in Wingfield and also in Bayswater, Victoria. Combined, these factories create employment for over 1,500 Australia-wide.

I should note at this point that my electorate, because of its distinctive shape, is largely dormitory; there is not much large industry in the electorate of Little Para itself, so I will be referring to the northern suburbs, and I will be referring largely to the electorates of Ramsay and Taylor as representative of industry in the northern suburbs.

There is Bickfords in Salisbury South. This is an iconic South Australian drinks manufacturer. We are all familiar with Bickfords. It was established in 1839 and, as I said, it is located in Salisbury South. It is well known for its traditional cordials and its fruit flavoured drinks, and we are well stocked and well served here in the Blue Room with Bickfords products. I am sure we enjoy their sarsaparilla and ginger beer. I know that the member for Florey does.

Ms Bedford: I don't drink sarsaparilla or ginger beer.

Mr ODENWALDER: Am I misleading the house now? I beg your pardon. I withdraw that. I withdraw the accusation that the member for Florey drinks sarsaparilla or ginger beer. There is also the Weeks Group which is located in Edinburgh Parks in Taylor. The Weeks Group has its factory in Edinburgh Parks and it has for more than 20 years been building residential homes and manufacturing steel framing products for the residential and commercial construction industry. Members would be aware of the Supaloc products that they construct for the construction industry. They are probably best known for Supaloc.

Ms Bedford: White ants don't like that.

Mr ODENWALDER: That's right. Finally, I want to mention the Keyhole Tungsten Inert Gas company, K-TIG—

Ms Bedford: Say that fast!

Mr ODENWALDER: Keyhole Tungsten Inert Gas—in Salisbury South. It is a world-leading innovator of welding products in Salisbury South. It has established a kind of technology—a world-leading welding technology—that enables thick gauge materials, including stainless steel and titanium, to be welded in one-tenth of the time that is possible with standard welding processes.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr Griffiths: Let him finish.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, thank you very much. It was originally developed by our own CSIRO and now is wholly owned by K-TIG.

DRIVING AGE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:26): I wish to talk today about quite an important issue—the driving age for young people. I have in front of me a petition signed by 188 people that has been arranged by a young lady who lives in my electorate. The great regret for me is that it does not meet the requirements for it to be presented to the house, so the opportunity is therefore to speak briefly about it today. I want to put some of her words on the record because—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, well—188. One is my niece. I noted that on the first page that she had signed it and she is not quite old enough to drive yet, but it is important to her. These words are from the younger generation and these 188 names reflect a much larger cohort of younger people who live across South Australia.

I am advised by others that a petition is available online for this and there are 28,000 signatures on that. That is an enormous effort by a lot of people who are worried about the future and, in the first two days alone, 20,000 people attached their name to that online petition. That shows the level of anxiety that exists across younger generations about the ability to be able to drive and for them the concerns they have about any suggestion of the increase in the driving age. I am pleased that it has not occurred as part of the latest changes that have been announced for review, and they will be subject to debate in this house later on. I quote this lady directly:

Being a youth myself, I believe that the government's plan to increase the legal age that youths can obtain their Provisional Licence 1(P1) from 17 to 18 will create many issues nationwide, but rural area in particular. If you share this opinion with me, please sign the below petition.

That is why I say she got 188 signatures. She went on to give me some additional words, which I think are relevant, because they also state some concerns:

Teenagers wishing to complete apprenticeships will struggle to do so, as they will not have a licence, which most trades require...Young people will be obtaining their provisional licenses at the same time as receiving the rights to drink alcohol. This will potentially increase the amount of road fatalities cause by drink driving. Tax payers will be further burdened by the increase of unemployment rates, as the basic competency of most careers, is P1 licence. Industries such as construction and transportation will be greatly affected. Regional and rural areas generally do not have public transport. This means that young people will have no modes of transport apart from their parents—

or, indeed, I add their siblings or friends—

Often, parents are unable/unwilling to transport their children around, so this will cause the issue of social isolation for youths—

that is a very important point for kids in country areas—

Many parents refuse or are unable to transport their children to weekly sports. Due to this, there will be no way that children can access these sports, which will increase obesity rates nationwide. Reduce participation in voluntary activities, such as junior sporting coaches/umpires, as these people will be unable to access the places they need to fulfil their commitments. People that have a disrespectful mentality to the roads and its rules will always be that way. A year is not going to change that—

that is quite a profound statement, I think—

Increase in unlicensed drivers. Will create a lack of country students completing higher education, such as university or TAFE, as they will not have transportation available to access the institutions that provide these services.

Since this was first mooted, I think predominantly as a thought bubble from the previous minister, about the intention to look at the age for which driving will be applicable, I have been contacted continuously by people in my electorate. I know other members in this place have also. The member for Flinders has given me permission to shamelessly plagiarise a saying that he has come up with, which is that country kids—I emphasise this—want to drive, they can drive and they need to drive—and that is true. For those of us—

Mr Treloar: Four teenagers.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Four teenagers, the member for Flinders confirms. Mine have gone beyond that now, but it is really important to give them that level of responsibility. I am advised by another member that, in the first three months of this year—and this is a great statistic—there were no deaths at all in South Australia from P-plate drivers.

Ms Chapman: Of P-plate drivers.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Of P-plate drivers—that is wonderful. It shows that a level of responsibility exists. I know from a parent of a younger person that, even when they are going out, there is a greater level of responsibility now. If they are part of a group, one will ensure that they are capable of driving the rest all the time and there is a self-discipline that occurs around that.

I think that it has to be very carefully considered. I am pleased that the minister has not chosen to pursue that line at this stage because it would be something that would be objected to quite strongly across all regional South Australia. When you have an online petition that has 28,000 signatures in it, it really does emphasise that it cannot be allowed to occur. Let us hope that our young kids are brought up to respect their ability to drive, respect the fact that they have to be safe and sure when they do it and are rightfully given the opportunity to keep doing it in the future.

TORRENS ISLAND

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:31): I wish first to note my sorrow at the prospect of the loss of 400 jobs at Holden. My sympathy is with the families caught up in this as they are working through their options and how they manage it. When we first worked through a support package for Holden—a co-investment with them—I spoke in this place about the importance of government partnership with the manufacturing sector to support its transition to advance manufacturing and to maintain our capacity to build and create things that Australians and the global markets want to buy.

It is no secret that manufacturing in a first-world country is challenging, but it is equally clear that we need to maintain a diverse economy and labour market and that means a healthy manufacturing sector as part of the mix. I have every confidence that this government and this Premier will do all he can and we can to support the workers caught up in this proposed reduction and will work through our relationship with the company after this very disappointing decision.

The other topic I wish to address today is Torrens Island, which is a teardrop-shaped island located in the Port River estuary between the Lefevre Peninsula and the Barker Inlet. It is about 15 kilometres north-west of the Adelaide city centre and sits within the Port Adelaide electorate. I have visited it many times over the years.

Torrens Island was named for the father of Sir Robert Torrens, premier of SA for one month in 1857. I would note that many erroneously believe that Torrens Island, Torrens titles and Mount Torrens were named for Sir Robert, but they were, in fact, named for his father, who was chairman of the South Australian colonial commissioners. However, I understand that the name of the whip member's (the member for Torrens) seat, Torrensville and Torrens Park are named after Sir Robert, the short-lived ex-premier.

Since European settlement in Adelaide in 1836, parts of Torrens Island have been used for a number of purposes but much of the island remains in remarkably good condition from an environmental perspective, particularly given its close proximity to the city of Adelaide, with much of its ecological values remaining intact.

For example, the soon-to-be expanded Torrens Island Conservation Park contains one of the very few remaining areas of coastal woodland that once covered the entire Lefevre Peninsula. I am very pleased that the government is in the process of extending the park and that I can, along with many community advocates, probably take some credit for the government's consideration of extending the boundary, given my own advocacy for it.

Much of the so-called island is, in fact, a complex of mangrove forest, creeks and samphire meadows that are subject to tidal inundation during high spring tides. Three main areas of the island—the northern end and the southern and middle of the island on the western side—are the only areas that are permanently dry and their current disposition points to the complexity of the island's land use arrangements.

The southern end hosts the heavy industry of Adelaide's main power station, owned by AGL, and once housed the Torrens Island Internment Camp—a World War I detention camp which held up to 400 men of German or Austro-Hungarian background between 9 October 1914 and 16 August 1915.

There is no doubt that the island is contested space. It forms the centrepiece of two important ecological protected zones—the Barker Inlet aquatic reserve and the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary—and is arguably one of Adelaide's most important ecological assets, albeit an island that has had parts of its land area given over to vital economic assets.

The middle section bordering the Port River houses the iconic Torrens Island quarantine station and some industry in the form of an Origin Energy peaking power station and AQIS facilities. The future management of the quarantine station is one that engages many people in the area and, in fact, across South Australia so many families have some kind of connection back to that quarantine station.

I assure the house that I am working hard to ensure the environmental and cultural heritage values of the island are protected for future generations and that only passive, carefully controlled activities, such as tourism and education, are pursued in the vicinity of the quarantine station. I am delighted that the Maritime Museum is running visits to the station, and get on to the museum if you want to book a trip, because that means that people are having a chance to get to the station and understand its part in our history.

I pay tribute to the recently-formed Friends of Torrens Island, a group of dedicated people from across Adelaide who want to see the natural and cultural values of the island preserved and protected, and work towards their better appreciation by the public. The formation of this group marks a very constructive step forward in bringing the community together with the government in working out how best to manage the more sensitive parts of Torrens Island. The group is positive in how it operates and gives thoughtful and considered advice to government, which I think is enormously valuable. I thank them for their time, expertise and commitment to the island and the station.

ADELAIDE WORKERS' HOMES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 March 2013.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:36): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for this piece of legislation on behalf of the opposition; however, it won't take very long at all. The opposition will be supporting the changes to the Adelaide Workmen's Homes Incorporated Amendment Act 1966, which replaced the private act of parliament, the Adelaide Workmen's Homes Incorporated Act 1933.

Adelaide Workmen's Homes Incorporated was established on 30 September 1898. A private act of parliament in 1933 and again in 1966 ensured that the trust deed was appropriate to modern-day development and business practices. In keeping with the progressive nature of the organisation's establishment in 1898 and subsequent acts of parliament in 1933 and 1966, this bill seeks to ensure that this organisation maintains a contemporary appearance and substance, whilst continuing its commitment to those in need of affordable and suitable housing.

In summary, the bill seeks to: establish a new constitution for the organisation, which can only occur by legislative amendment; change the name of the organisation from the 'Adelaide Workmen's Homes' to 'Adelaide Workers' Homes', as they have always housed people regardless of their gender; remove the limit which prevents property ownership more than 100 miles from the Adelaide GPO; and provide additional flexibility to the trustees to manage the organisation, to change their name, enter into development partnerships, etc. It is expected that the changes contained in this bill will allow Adelaide Workers' Homes to serve more South Australians in a wider range of areas.

I have some background on the trust. The trust has grown substantially since 1898 and now owns more than 200 properties throughout Richmond, Mile End and Norwood. The variety and location of dwellings owned by Adelaide Workers' Homes has responded to changing demographics and market requirements. The preponderance of near-city homes equates not only to the requirements of the original trust deed but also to the need for workers to be in ready proximity to their employment.

Today, Adelaide Workers' Homes owns property and/or houses in Richmond, Mile End and Norwood, as I have said. The stock includes: one-bedroom units for the aged; houses constructed during the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, 1960s and the 1980s. They also have a maintenance workshop, unit-style accommodation, cluster homes and they are building or own new medium-density two and three-storey three-bedroom townhouses and homes. The current value of the portfolio is approximately \$35 million and capital reserves have been utilised over the years to improve and extend the housing stock held by the group.

Reviews are conducted on a regular basis to ensure the best use of the group's resources. Updating of the constitution will ensure the organisation's purpose of providing housing for workers, former workers and their associates and that, in the event of AWH ceasing operations, any surplus assets will be provided to another benevolent institution with a similar purpose.

The day-to-day management and administration of AWH, together with the bookkeeping and accounting functions, are conducted by Mr Grant Stephens from MJS Management Services Pty Ltd. Management functions include rental, maintenance and portfolio reviews. I thank the minister and his staff for their cooperation in giving me briefings on this and providing some of these notes. The opposition looks forward to a rapid progression of this bill.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:40): I would just like to thank the honourable member for his support for this bill.

Bill read a second time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (15:41): This bill seeks to vary the trust by applying provisions to Adelaide Workmen's Homes Incorporated in addition to the indenture deed of trust and the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 to provide a legislative constitution and to clarify that the association may exercise the powers and functions to give effect to its purpose. The parliament has been requested to enable the trustees (board) to borrow money, acquire and dispose of real property to enter into joint venture and receive donations and testamentary dispositions to the benefit of those trustees and not all trustees generally.

Two previous private acts of parliament have amended the deed of trust of Adelaide Workmen's Homes Incorporated. While the current bill by its nature is a private bill, it has been introduced by the government and therefore the application of the joint standing orders as they apply to private bills is not relevant. This leaves the provisions of the joint standing orders as they apply to hybrid bills.

The joint standing orders provide for two forms of hybrid bill. The first is a bill introduced by the government whose object is to promote the interests of one or more municipal corporations or local bodies and not those of municipal corporations of local bodies generally. The second is a bill introduced by the government authorising the granting of crown or wastelands to an individual person, a company, a corporation or a local body.

Clearly, the bill does not fit the second category, but it does fit the first because, by virtue of the principal act's status as a private act, the Adelaide Workmen's Homes Incorporated (the current trustees) is a local body. Based on the precedence established by this house and the consistent application of the joint standing orders and the principles that guide the consideration of such bills, I rule the bill to be hybrid.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:42): In view of your ruling, I move:

That this bill be referred to a select committee pursuant to joint standing order (private bills) No. 2.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

That a committee be appointed consisting of Ms Bettison, Mr Odenwalder, Ms Chapman, Dr McFetridge and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

That the committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place and that it report later today.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

That standing order 339 be and remain so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is not an absolute majority. Ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

That the select committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

MARINE SAFETY (DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL VESSEL) NATIONAL LAW (APPLICATION) BILL

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 20 passed.

Schedule 1.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, under this new bill, how many vessels will be captured by this legislation? We have had a briefing and were told that around 2,000 are already under the umbrella, and there would be another 230-odd that would come under crown vessels, but how many in total do you anticipate will be captured under this new legislation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised the 2,000 includes the extra vessels. I think, for river communities, which would probably be what you are most concerned about—and I am not trying to be presumptuous—I understand the advice I have received is that commercial riverboats, like houseboats, will just be required to maintain a certified driver's licence. I think that should alleviate your community's concerns; this bill is designed for other purposes.

Mr WHETSTONE: Of those 2,000 how many new vessels will be captured under this legislation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised around 50 industry operation vessels, and around 200 to 230 crown vessels.

Mr WHETSTONE: Again, schedule 1, part 1, section 7: what will be the impact on government and privately owned vessels under scheme O under this new legislation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that concerns were raised about scheme O vessels which include permanently moored vessels, volunteer marine rescue vessels, waterskis, wakeboard-towing vessels with inboard engines, ferries in chains and unpowered barges. Scheme O is a category of new and existing vessels for which there is currently no national agreed standard or regulatory treatment. I am advised that it has been agreed that in the three-year transition period from commencement of the national system, work on nationally agreed standards for the treatment of these vessel types will commence.

I am advised that in the interim period these vessels will continue to be subject to the applicable pre-existing South Australian requirements—that is, where they are subject to recreational requirements, they will continue to be required to comply with those. If they currently have no requirements, that will continue on until a standard has been agreed.

I am advised that the proposals regarding treatment of scheme O vessels will be subject to unanimous ministerial council agreement, that is, every state and territory must agree, following

appropriate public consultation. It is recognised that for some of these vessel types there are longstanding local approaches that cannot be easily reconciled nationally.

Where the number of vessels involved is small and the local solutions are operating effectively, it may be that the national solutions will not be agreed and the current regulatory treatment will continue beyond that three year transition period. The national system for commercial vessels applies a risk-based approach where a vessel's operations are low risk, the intention is not to subject them to unnecessary regulatory burden. So common sense will apply.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, minister. Just some clarification—under 'the vessels subject to scheme O', dot point 2 does say, 'waterskis, wakeboard-towing vessels with inboard engines'. Could you please tell me what the difference is between a waterski boat or wakeboard-towing vessel with an outboard engine, as opposed to an inboard engine?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that inboard engines on these types of vessels are usually petrol engines and therefore there is a higher risk of explosion. The inboard petrol engine is more prone to fire an explosion than outboard because the ignition source on an outboard is away from any potential fuel leaks. I am advised the difference is risk. This is why waterski or wakeboard-towing boat with an inboard engine are separated from the ones with outboard engines in scheme O and why they would be looked at with a view to developing a national approach to their regulation.

Mr WHETSTONE: In saying that, the explanation seems to be based around issues with fuel.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Ignition.

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes. Minister, both outboards and inboards have their fuel tanks inside the cockpit of the boat. I am looking for some direction as to what is the difference between an inboard and an outboard, particularly with where the fuel cell is kept.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is all about proximity to the ignition source, I am advised. I am not a marine engineer and I suspect that you are not, either. That is not to say that your concerns are not valid. However, I think the appropriate risk-based approach is that when the ignition source is further away from the fuel source there is less likelihood of an explosion. When you are in a confined space and that fuel source is close to the ignition source there is probably a greater risk of explosion, and that is the reason for the regulatory difference. I can understand why some people may think it is over-burdensome regulation, but I can assure you that it is all based on minimising risk to the those users.

Mr WHETSTONE: If we are talking about fuel and ignition, obviously the ignition is driven by a battery. No matter whether it is an inboard or an outboard, the battery is still inside the cockpit of the boat. Inboard or outboard, the fuel is still on the inside, or underneath the floor—inboard or outboard. I am just trying to get some clarity around why an inboard has been classified as a less safe boat than an outboard.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that senior engineers from across the country, who have expertise in this field, have considered this on a risk-based approach. I am assuming that inboard engines, where there are risks of fumes and greater leakage within a confined space, can create a circumstance where there could be an explosion. Again, I am not an engineer; I am taking advice from the department on this.

It seems reasonable and prudent. However, I can see your point that some people who may run both types of machinery may not see any greater risk. I can assure the honourable member this is not government gone mad or regulation gone mad; it is simply taking the advice of engineers who know what they are talking about. I am also advised that the standard has not been finalised. It is going through a three-year consultation period, so that standard is not finalised as yet, but it is prudent to look at it.

Ms CHAPMAN: On schedule 1, part 1 of the bill, clause 2, is it still proposed that this will commence on 1 July 2013?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: God willing, yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Other than divine intervention, I will take it that as an assumption that it will be. A marine incident, which is going to be the subject of obligations to report and have investigations and the like, is defined in clause 6 on page 17 of the bill. I will just set the scene here

with what I will call 'usual', of course—where there is a death or injury to a person associated with the operation or navigation of a vehicle, collisions and the like.

Included in that is a collision by a domestic commercial vessel with an object. I do not imagine that happens a lot, but I am aware of one in South Australia that occurred in January 2011 (it may have been 2012) of which the minister may be aware; although, he may not, because he is only the new, freshly minted Minister for Transport in covering this responsibility. On this occasion a barge in the Port River collided with the bridge. On this occasion, for the purposes of this a barge is a domestic commercial vehicle.

Notwithstanding apparent reports at the time that the collision had occurred as a result of the barge hitting the bridge, it actually became clear that the bridge had hit the barge. How would that happen, the minister might inquire? Somebody, somewhere, let the bridge come down after it had been opened and it collided with the barge which was at that time attempting to go through the opening quite legitimately.

On that occasion, I am told, on subsequent inquiry, it appeared that there were a number of things that had not been done. I will summarise them and I hope I am giving a correct reflection of what occurred. The situation went something like this: before the relevant proposed transfer of the barge through this passageway, the appropriate notification was given to those in the department for transport who operate the bridge that this would be required and that there would be a traversing of that passage by the barge.

I do not know a lot about barges, minister, but I understand that they do not self-propel and that they need to be towed, and that the usual way of doing that is to have tugs or some other similar type of vessel which pulls them along. For the purposes of this exercise, to go through the bridge, of course, it had to open, so that it could safely traverse that area, and it was pulled along for that purpose and, of course, relevant notice had been given. The operator of the barge duly was sitting there early one morning being pulled along, the bridge was opened and it then closed on top of his vessel.

It appears that, thankfully, nobody was injured. There was some property damage. Certainly nobody was killed, and those who were operating the tugs apparently escaped without any incident, thankfully. Subsequently there were inquiries and negotiations and the usual reporting and I am going to be asking you, minister, some questions about how the process of investigation of an incident like that changes from the current system that we have to the new system because, obviously under this definition, it is still going to apply.

Firstly, as I understand it, because safety is such an important component of this new responsibility of the national regulator, my understanding is that, there had been some identified error—if I could describe it as broadly as that—on the part of the operator of the bridge in not having adequately recognised that the booking for the traversing involved three vessels and when two had gone through, they thought the job was completed and whacked down the bridge.

In any event, I am not here to discuss who was negligent or who was contributorily negligent or otherwise, but I am sure the minister will appreciate that there are some very serious penalties in here. I would like to know firstly: if that was to occur under the new regime that is proposed, firstly, who would that be reported to and who would be required to report it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that, for the purposes of the bill, AMSA, the national regulator, will be the receiving body of the reports. Obviously the operators, which would be the traffic authority, would make a report, as would the operators of the barge, and the national regulator would investigate.

Ms CHAPMAN: I take it from that that both the traffic authority and the operator of the barge have obligations to report it. How does the traffic authority have an obligation under this proposed bill to do that? Where do I find that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that for the purposes of this act, deputy leader, the department has delegates assigned to them from the national regulator, so that would be a reporting body. Also, the owner of the vessel would be required as well. In terms of, is there a direct requirement within the act for the department, and that that is the entity that runs the public piece of infrastructure, obviously, as a government, we would avail ourselves of the national regulator, but we are also provided with a process of delegates through the legislation and they would make these reports.

Ms CHAPMAN: I want to be clear about this. I know the operator of the barge has to report it because that is clear in this bill. Whilst the traffic authority was involved because it was the operator of the bridge in the incident, I do not know anywhere in the bill where its obligation is to report it to the national regulator, irrespective of whether the national regulator is actually a person sitting next to them in the department as a delegated thing or not.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will be clearer. The advice I have received is that the entity that owns the object that has been collided with—the permanent piece of infrastructure—has no obligation to make the report; however, the vessel owner does.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, I will cross off the traffic authority, that is fine. You see, minister, one of the things that happens with motor vehicle accidents is that all parties who are involved in the accident have obligations in the first instance under our road traffic laws to report it to the nearest police station, or words to that effect. So, even if you think it was not your fault, or you might have only had minor damage and so on, after a certain threshold, everyone has to report.

In this particular incident, which is an unusual one, I will grant it, it appears there is no obligation on the other party to report the incident. It may be that, as a result of a statement made by the barge owner in this instance, it seems important to the national regulator that he or she conducts an investigation and summons the other parties under their powers and so on, and they will pull them in, obviously, to ask questions, and they have certain powers to inquire, etc. But there is no obligation for them to report?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suppose the analogy that I can give the deputy leader—the one that she gave was a very good one, because it was, basically, from the description she gave, a bridge hitting a barge rather than the other way around. However, if a dislodged buoy or a log or debris in a waterway collides with a vessel, I am not sure what regulatory onus we could put on the debris to make a report.

So, given that the practical commonsense solution to this is that the owner of the infrastructure that has been collided with is generally a government entity or a private corporation who owns a piece of infrastructure, even though they do not have a direct requirement, the Department for Planning, Infrastructure and Transport has delegates within the department who would make these reports, and the owner of the vessel that collides with the piece of infrastructure has a reporting requirement.

So, I suppose, to take your analogy a step further, if a boat collides with a log, the log has no requirement to make an application to the national regulator that they have collided with a vessel, the vessel does.

Ms CHAPMAN: As long as you appreciate, minister, that we are not talking about a floating container in the ocean or a log or something else that may not have an identified owner, but there are plenty of situations where there are. In this instance, one is the bridge which happened to be owned by a department that is familiar with the processes and so on, but what if it was a piece of equipment (a pontoon or something) that was owned by a school that was carelessly or recklessly left unattended in a waterway which it collided with.

There can be other situations. It may not have been a government school. Do you understand my point? Those who might be responsible—even negligent or reckless or criminally liable—for leaving equipment deliberately, recklessly or negligently in the course of their operating a domestic commercial vehicle, may be equally culpable and ought to have some obligation on them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No doubt, but I am not sure how someone who has negligently left an obstacle in a waterway could then report a collision because they would not be aware of it. It is not to say that there are not penalties in place. I am assuming you are looking for almost a legislative trap for people who are negligent, so if you do lodge debris or something is not moored properly or something drifts off into the water, the ocean or an oceanway and they collide, there is another offence of not having reported it to the national regulator. I do not see the need for it but I understand your raising the point.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to page 21 under clause 7 which is the definition of 'domestic commercial vessel'. As you have explained in some earlier questions, the definition is fairly comprehensive but there are a number of exemptions under 7(3). The usual suspects are there. Clauses 7 and 8 cover the exemption for a domestic commercial vessel while it is in the course of its construction and, for obvious reasons, while it is still sitting there on the slipway it does not have

to comply with all these things, but it seems to become covered by definition as soon as it has been delivered under the relevant building contract which is in clause 8.

When Holden's finish building their car and they deliver it to a wholesaler as a product, it usually does not have to be registered until someone comes along and buys it and then wishes to use it. My question here is: is there some obligation here that all of these registration obligations commence even if the recipient at the conclusion of the building contract is not intending to use it straight away? Do you have to actually start paying the fees straight away?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that while the boat or the vessel is not in the water, registration is not required. So when transporting it on a trailer or in a slipway, for example, it is not required. When the vessel is in use, registration is required. There are rare circumstances when an exemption can be granted by the department, I am advised.

Ms CHAPMAN: Not until use.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not until use.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, the purpose of the national regulator is to investigate, monitor and enforce activities under/or for the purposes of the legislation. Will this result in extra costs for South Australians and will further resources be provided to cover these extra costs?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just seek a point of clarification from the honourable member. Are you talking about its powers to investigate incidents, or are you talking about its general operation as a new piece of legislative framework?

Mr WHETSTONE: Both. Obviously, this is going to encumber more vessels, with more regulation being on those vessels. So, will further resources be provided to cover those costs?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we are working within current resources and there is no fee increase subject to this legislative change.

Mr WHETSTONE: So, if there are more vessels that will come under this new legislation, there will be increased surveillance of vessels that will increase the need to put more resources into monitoring the vessels. I guess, essentially, we will need to provide more resources to cover more vessels.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that that will be a matter for the national regulator but, obviously, there are delegations in place and we will use our existing resources to implement it.

Ms CHAPMAN: On schedule 2—which, of course, my learned leader here in this debate has identified—the national marine safety regulator will have certain powers and obligations. I just want to be clear. The new national regulator is going to be based in Canberra, is that correct? Has he or she been identified yet as the person who is going to be appointed to this position?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the structure of AMSA will have a governing board with a chief executive, who will be answerable to the board, and it will be based in our nation's capital, Canberra.

Ms CHAPMAN: That fills me with confidence but, in any event, how many people are going to be on the board and how many people will be employed in Canberra for this job?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised it is a corporate structure that is already in existence. As to how many board members it has, I do not have that answer for you here now; I can get that for you. They already regulate large vessels.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, this is a contingent that is already based in Canberra but will just have a board attached to it. Will the board be paid and, if so, can you give me an estimate of the cost for the first year of operation of the new structure in Canberra which, I note, incorporates some already existing structure?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the national regulator will be funded by the states, the Northern Territory and the commonwealth until 2016, in accordance with arrangements set out in the intergovernmental agreement signed on 19 August 2011. For South Australia, this is 7 per cent of the national cost—an increase of \$77,700 in 2013 over the state's annual contribution to the National Marine Safety Committee, which is to be discharged upon commencement of the national system, as the national regulator will take over this role.

Ms CHAPMAN: So we have an annual contribution. I am not sure what that is, but we are going to be paying \$77,700 more than whatever our annual contribution is. Do you have an estimate there of what our annual contribution is, minister?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will take it on notice and give it to you between the houses.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the course of setting up the new structure, is South Australia expected to be transferring any personnel to this body? If not, could the minister tell us how many currently in South Australia are undertaking the enforcement responsibility, which will continue even under this model, in managing marine safety—how many do we have now and how many are we going to have?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised there will be no transfers to the national body.

Ms CHAPMAN: How many do we currently have?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that there are currently 17 officers at DPTI who would be authorised.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think this is clear from what you have previously said, minister, but if you could clarify it: even with the expansion of some 200-plus vessels which will now be caught under the new system in South Australia, are you saying that the current 17 officers will be able to absorb that responsibility within that existing workforce?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised there will be a three-year period while we are calculating and understanding how—obviously there will be a three-year consultation period. The risk-based approach being adopted by the new national regulations do not necessarily mean that the new vessels coming online will have a greater risk and therefore require greater regulation in terms of manpower, for lack of a better word. While we are still calculating and trying to understand exactly what their new roles will be, the department does not anticipate the requirement of any more resources.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you for that, minister, because, of course, they have had a few years to work it out. I am sure you will be surprised, as I will be, if you receive a submission as we approach the budget for extra funding for these things, if in fact you have been told one thing and something else occurs. But let's hope that is the case and that that can be accommodated in the resources that are currently there.

Mr WHETSTONE: My question is on Schedule 1, part 3, division 3, which is on page 26 of the bill. What will be the impact on recreational vehicles using rivers and waterways under this new legislation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised none.

Mr WHETSTONE: When you say 'none', the impact on those recreational vehicles—will they come under schedule O, which is still being sorted out?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To clarify, are you talking about the hire and drive vessels or are you talking about all recreational vessels?

Mr WHETSTONE: I guess I could differentiate the different recreational vessels. Hire and drive, yes, but we could also differentiate recreational vessels as a vessel that is being used for recreation in a competitive sport. So, if we are talking about scheme O or a vessel under scheme O that would be used in a waterway that would be used for a competitive waterski event or wakeboard event or the like.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that competitive sport vessels are not captured by the regulations.

Mr WHETSTONE: If competitive vessels are not captured, then under scheme O you have waterski wakeboard towing vessels with inboard engines. Now, those vessels are used for recreation and competitive sport.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have received from the department is for that purpose it is only hire and drive vessels that are captured.

Ms CHAPMAN: Part 3—general safety duties relating to domestic commercial vessels. This is the section that imposes all the obligations and offences, minister, on a number of different

categories of persons, including the owners, the designers, the builders, the suppliers, obviously masters, the crew, passengers, et al. I do have some questions about these. Firstly, I want to go to the duties of the owners, which is in clause 12 on page 23. This includes liability by way of prosecutions, and the offences are then laid out in clause 17 as to their penalties, I should say. It includes failing to implement or maintain a safety management system.

I am going to ask these questions and it may well relate to obligations that the master of a vessel also has—I don't know, which may be responsible, but I will ask this. As you know, there are strict obligations in relation to someone who has responsibility of a vessel when they are driving it to not be under the influence of any drug or alcohol. As I understand it, in South Australia it is still the situation that, if someone is found to be drink driving a sea vessel, then the police administer the enforcement of that. They board the vessel, they might require breath testing, they arrest persons, prosecute them, etc., as we would normally expect in road traffic offences.

Here, we are talking about a domestic commercial vessel, which, of course, has a responsibility out on the ocean to do whatever task it is doing and that may employ crew and the like. If I were to identify an analogy of a train driver, who in South Australia is required to not have any alcohol in their system, there are opportunities under their regulatory regime, which has also recently moved to a national scheme, for them to be required to provide breath tests and the like to be able to identify if they are having any alcohol in their system. The testing in relation to that—I am sure the minister is following this with interest.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I am.

Ms CHAPMAN: The results of that, as I understand it, if the train driver is found to have alcohol in their bloodstream, are that they may face suspension and/or a removal from office, but there is no obligation to report that to the police.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: There's the regulator.

Ms CHAPMAN: Either for the regulator or the police.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So if the regulator does the breath test.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, the driver of the train I'm talking about. They have a national regulation scheme. So, it is a way of keeping a check on to make sure—spot tests and so on—that people are not breaching not just the road rules but their obligation in relation to their employment, which of course has a high standard because they are carrying passengers. Similarly, I think, it is fair to say, if you are a bus driver or if you are operating a domestic vessel here on the high seas and you are responsible for crew and others, there are certain obligations.

There is an obligation on the owner of the vessel to have a safety management plan, and various similar provisions for others who are supervising on the ship. I just want to ask you: what is the situation in relation to the opportunity, the regularity, and the spot auditing of the operators? I will come back to who is responsible and who can be liable if this is found to be wanting in some way, but who—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's a criminal offence.

Ms CHAPMAN: For the criminal—there are imprisonment terms here, of course. Who is responsible for the security of ensuring that the operators of vessels or anyone in a supervisory position is not under the influence of alcohol or drugs that would in any way impair their capacity to operate on these commercial vessels?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised by the department that, in the operation for the purposes of this bill, the enforcement provisions remain as they are now. However, talking of the examples you raised, the safety management plans to be derived are the responsibility of the company or the master. For example, if the safety management plan of the individual company is for random alcohol or drug testing before or after a shift, that is their opportunity to have their safety management plan in place.

The current law as it is now will apply after the commencement of this act, so it will still be the current law enforcement principles. I think what you are asking me, just to clarify for the department, is: is there any change from what happens now to what happens under the management of the new system? I am advised that the answer to that is no.

Ms CHAPMAN: Let's be clear: I am not talking about those where the police are involved—we talked about that process; it is a different matter. We are talking about obligations

here under this act, which include doing a management plan for all of the different parties that are referred to in here.

You have told us that there are 17 people in the department who are managing this at the moment. Are you then saying that the obligations that are now here for the new duties under all these categories—I will come to the penalties in a minute—are exactly the same as those that apply under the current state marine safety obligations?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I was talking about the criminal—

Ms CHAPMAN: No, forget the criminal; I left that aside initially. I am not talking about police going out there and jumping on and taking a breath test; they are out of the category. I am talking about the marine safety obligations here.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the marine officers who we have in place and who implement current safety marine procedures and laws now will still be operating and will have the ability to implement the national regulations. If you are looking for a more particular example, I am assuming you are talking about boarding powers.

Ms CHAPMAN: Sorry, we are at cross purposes. Under part 3, there are general safety duties, and at present we have a law in South Australia, in relation to the current vehicles that are registered, covering certain things that owners, crew and masters have to do already, and 17 people in the department handle that. We have a new set now, which is going to be channelled and supervised through a national regulator.

It seems to me on reading this that we have got a new level of obligation for some of these categories, including the maintenance of a safety management system which does not apply under the current system. Now, I may be wrong, so I am really asking you: what is the difference in the obligation of these categories of persons—owner, master, crew, passenger etc.—under the new system than it currently applies under our state system?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the national law sets out the general safety duties required of owners, masters, crew and passengers to ensure the safety of all vessels, marine safety equipment and operations. The national law sets out the duties relating to design, construction, manufacture, repairs, modifications required, vessel designers, builders and suppliers.

The GSDs are not different to the similar obligations that apply currently for commercial vessel operators under the South Australian work, health and safety law. I am advised it is an extension of that. The penalties for failing to meet general safety duties and for doing something that results in the loss, destruction or serious damage to commercial vessels are detailed in the act. I will give you an example.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, in essence, things have changed, but they are now to be consistent with the duties that are under the state health and safety legislation, right? So, they have improved. What you have also said to us is that, even though there is now a new set of duties and clearly expanded because obviously the state occupational, health and safety legislation is much more onerous than previously applied, you are assuring us in the house that the 17 personnel in the department will be able to undertake those duties adequately, notwithstanding the extra obligation of what to inspect, etc., and not to mention the extra number of vessels?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the national regulator is drafting and consulting on the type and nature of audits to be conducted and their frequency, but I have complete confidence in the 17 men and women in the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to carry out their duties with vigour and in the usual pursuit of excellence and the safety of the people of South Australia.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am sure, minister, that you have every reason to be confident in the workmanship and the indications of commitment of loyal members of the department, but it seems hard for me to imagine how they can actually identify that they are able to undertake this and give you that assurance when the national regulator has not even been appointed, he has not even set out the audit arrangement that he expects them to deliver, for example, and there is a whole new regime of obligation.

So, I would be taking that with a pinch of salt if I were you. Nevertheless, I am not saying they are attempting to convince you that they will be able to cover all that, but we will see. Are there

duties under the current state law that impose obligations and criminal sanctions for designers, builders and suppliers?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Sorry, could you repeat that?

Ms CHAPMAN: In the current state safety duties, as distinct from the occupational health and safety laws, are there duties for designers, builders and suppliers, or is that a new category that has come into the state regime for the purposes of going into this federal system?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the general safety duties for vessel designers, builders and suppliers are that they must ensure that work carried out for maintenance and extraction complies with the safety requirements, and that any equipment supply is appropriate and safe for design and purpose of the vessel.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think I heard that already, minister. I have read that; that is in the bill. What I am asking you is: was this a category of group of having duties in the current state safety provisions, or is it newly added because it happens to be in the occupational health and safety? There is a new group; not just more boats, but more people.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Welcome back, Mr Deputy Speaker. The debate continues.

Ms Chapman: You're most helpful.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes I am. I am from the government; I am here to help. I understand that the work safety act that you have been referring to applies, but this is a risk-based approach. I suspect—but I could be wrong—your questioning is leading towards: given all the extra onerous responsibilities surely 17 people is not sufficient to conduct and implement the new regulations being imposed upon us through this new national body. That is not necessarily the case, I am advised.

Ms CHAPMAN: You have been given that assurance.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, if you have that assurance, then we are completed.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, you have been given that assurance.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, I thought you said you'd been given that assurance. Given that the methodology being used is changing and it is more of a risk-based approach and we are putting more onus upon individual owners and operators of vessels to conduct general safety duties, to have plans in place, I do not necessarily believe, and nor does the department believe, that the requirements will be much more onerous, but it will be more harmonised, and that is the approach.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, minister, that does not fill me with confidence, I might say. It is not just a question of whether we are just moving one set of rules over to a national group who are going to have control. That is one thing; that is the whole 'quicker, cheaper, more simple, more harmonious' and all that other piffle that we get fed every time we have a national proposal. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't.

What I want to know is what extra obligation is on the current group of people, the expanded group of people, and if 'designers, builders and suppliers' is a new category of people who fall under the marine safety regulation (as distinct from whatever state obligation they have—different group of people, a different set of people who supervise that) then I would like to know, because in coming into this model, they are also attracting very significant penalties of up to two years' imprisonment.

In between all of your answers, it seems that what you are saying is that, even though the national regulator has not been appointed yet and he or she has not set out the obligations for audit, inspection and spot audits and all those sorts of things, you expect this whole new system to be kept modest in cost or, even if it is expanded, to be a lesser cost because you are going to put the responsibility back on the masters, the crew, the passengers, the owners, the designers etc., to come up with their own master plans.

I have seen all that before. We have seen it in lots of situations. We have seen it in the public transport system. We have seen it with bus operators and the obligation of the contractors to provide for safety management plans and the obligation to have accredited bus drivers and we still have people driving around reading iPads. It does not fill me with confidence that we are going to transfer the responsibility of the enforcement of these new obligations back to the people who are

doing it. It is a bit like the marine parks proposal. We are just going to hope all the fishing people comply with it.

I want to be sure that if we are going to go to this national model, or even if we keep it the same here, we are actually going to have a system that works. That is the purpose of my questioning this, so I would like to know whether, under the current structure, designers, builders and suppliers are already caught under our state marine safety legislation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Many of the vessels you are talking about are currently operating as businesses; they are workplaces now. As we speak, there are commercial fishing vessels off our shore and other vessels that are operating that have these plans in place already because they are required to offer their workforce a safe place to work. The national regulation simply brings that under a national standard.

It is not as if we are saying, 'Currently there are no standards and we have 17 people enforcing those lax standards, so therefore a national standard—we can still do it with the same number.' That is not what we are saying. What we are saying is that a lot of the work already being done is going to give us the ability to have the transferability through jurisdictions which is going to add to competitiveness for a lot of these vessels. These workplaces will have standards that will be harmonised across the country, so you will not have to have different training packages throughout different jurisdictions.

I think if we were speaking at Federation in 1901, you may have been right, but we are not speaking at Federation. It is 2013 and these workplaces have been operating for a long period of time and they have practices in place. The national standards for commercial vessels already apply in South Australia and that extends to designers and builders.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is what I asked—hooray. I am not sure that going back to Federation helps. I remember that in the history of Federation, we of course went into a Federation and Aboriginal men and women had the vote in South Australia and it was taken away from them when we went to Federation, so I cannot say that going national is always a good thing to do—but we will come back to the penalties on these, thank you, minister.

What are the current penalties for each of these offences? Duties of owners, for example, is in clause 13(1). The penalty is now two years for committing an offence. This is for the most senior offences. For designers and builders, it is two years' imprisonment or 1,800 penalty points. For masters, in clause 18 I think, there is a two-year imprisonment or 1,800 penalty points or both. Similarly for the crew, there is a two year imprisonment or 1,800 penalty points or both.

Passengers get 12 months imprisonment or 200 penalty points and, presumably, the worst thing they could do would be to interfere with the lawful activity of crew or somebody on a vessel, causing a safety risk. My question is: what are the current penalties for each of these under part 3, I think it is divisions 3 to 8?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we do not have the current regime with us. We have the proposed regime, not the current regime, and that would be under the workplace penalties, so I will get those for you between the houses if that is appropriate.

Ms CHAPMAN: Just so that it is clear, it is divisions 1 to 7 of the principal offences. I do not need all the lower level offences which are under those, thank you, minister.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, I have an easy one for you. Could you please outline the coxswain's certificate requirement for those newly captured vessels under this new legislation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the cost of training for a coxswain's certificate is free for South Australian students who are eligible through Skills for All. The cost of issue of a coxswain's certificate is currently \$463 and is valid for five years, after which it is subject to renewal at the current cost of \$32 and requires a self-declaration of medical fitness.

I am advised that, for the newly captured industry operations small hire and drive businesses, the hirees of these vessels do not need to have a coxswain's certificate; they will just need to comply with current requirements, for example, either a boat operator's licence, a car driver's licence for houseboats or no qualifications for certain small hire and drive vessels operating in limited areas.

For newly captured government vessels, some agencies already have qualified coxswains as part of meeting their workplace health and safety obligations. For example, SAPOL has 13 staff with marine qualifications; the MFS has nine staff with marine qualifications, with another two

expected to have qualifications by the end of the year; DPTI has 15 staff with marine qualifications; SA Water has 70 staff with restricted coxswain's certificates; and SARDI has about 30 to 35 commercially qualified staff, largely drivers.

It should be noted, I am advised, that of the newly captured government vessels, approximately 100 of these vessels are human powered, for example, kayaks used by TAFE for their outdoor recreation course at Regency Park, and they would not require a coxswain's certificate to operate. DPTI, I am advised, has been working for some time with these agencies to have them meet commercial standards in terms of both survey and marine qualifications.

Mr WHETSTONE: Regarding a commercial houseboat operator who does a hire and drive operation, there are two parts to it. The operator will hire his houseboat to a customer who has to have either a boat licence or a car licence to be able to operate that vessel. If he supplies a ski boat as an extra to that houseboat and the owner drives the ski boat as a service or as part of the hire, what requirements does he have to have to be able to supply that extra craft for the hire of that houseboat?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am assuming your question is about the owner of the houseboat who has hired out the vehicle to a customer.

Mr WHETSTONE: No, not the houseboat but the houseboat operator. There are services where a houseboat operator will hire his houseboat but he will also hire and drive his ski boat for the people who have hired the houseboat, so there are two vessels in the transaction. The customer will hire the houseboat and they will drive it, but the owner of the houseboat will supply a ski boat and drive that ski boat for his customers. What onus is on that owner of the ski boat?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suppose what you are saying is: is the ski boat exempt? The advice I have is that they are unsure but the assumption would be that a ski boat is a commercial vessel. I am advised that it depends on the size of the ski boat. I am advised that there are certain requirements for a boat licence, so it would depend on the size and nature of the boat. Do you want to give me an example about the size of the boat?

Mr WHETSTONE: I will start off with some of the smaller fish—a standard tinny of 4.2 metres with a 50 horsepower outboard.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: That is a no?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is a no.

Mr WHETSTONE: Well, we will move up to a—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How about, rather than doing this, I give you between the houses some written advice about what the outcomes are and you can raise it when it returns to the House of Assembly?

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, minister. In relation to surveying and capturing more vessels, particularly on the River Murray we note that there are limited slipways. Are there currently enough slipways along the River Murray to accommodate any requirements imposed by the national regulator about the frequency with which the vessels must be surveyed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that nothing changes. The requirements that are in place now will be required in the future.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis]

Mr WHETSTONE: Just for clarification, I obviously have a little involvement with slipways on the river, and I have noted that there are limited slipways on the river. With increased vessels that will have to be surveyed, are there currently enough slipways along the River Murray to accommodate those requirements under this new national regulator?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the current practice will remain and there are adequate slipways. If you wish to have a more in-depth briefing, I will move heaven and earth to get you that briefing.

Ms CHAPMAN: We are on part 4—Vessel identifiers and certificates for vessels and seafarers. This covers a number of categories, including the obligation to have a unique identifier

certificate or label or something. Firstly, I want to ask what it actually is. I note that, under the definitions clause, it says whatever it says in clause 31, but clause 31 does not actually tell me what it is. Can you just tell me exactly what it is? I notice that various different parties have to have one of these things. Is it some sort of registration disc or what is it? Has it not yet been prepared? Secondly, is this a new obligation that is needed, separate to what we have previously had?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that they already have a number allocated, but they are not required to display it. By 2016, they will be required to display it.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question then is: assuming it is some sort of display document, why is it necessary for these things to be required to be displayed when we have just passed laws to not have to have them displayed as registration stickers on motor vehicles?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suppose the analogy I could give the member for Bragg is numberplates, as opposed to registration labels. Numberplates are required to be displayed in South Australia and that requirement has not been lifted. Registration renewal stickers are the ones that have been revoked. So, you can consider these basically as registration plates.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am advised by my learned leader in the management of this debate that boats already have to have a registration sticker on them. This is distinct from this unique identifier document, so I am just trying to understand why we need to have this added as well. If you are going to insist that this be put on, are you going to relieve the obligation to have the current registration sticker, as cars—as I have pointed out—have recently been relieved of that obligation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think there is some confusion, member for Bragg. Recreational vessels are required to have these numbers; commercial vessels are not, as they usually have names—names like *Glenys* or *Public Enemy*.

Ms Chapman: *She Got the House.*

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: *She Got the House, yes.*

Ms Chapman: I have seen that one moored down at Glenelg.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, there you go. This would require commercial vessels to have that identification on there. I suppose when you want to be able to transfer requirements through the jurisdictions, having a recognisable number that is consistent around the country would be something a commercial vessel would have for the first time, I am advised.

Ms CHAPMAN: There are penalties for not displaying and using a vessel without one, etc.—the usual. The penalties seem to be 60 penalty points, largely, for each of these offences. I assume you are going to tell me that the regulations have not been written yet, but do you have any idea about what a penalty point is going to be equivalent to in dollar terms?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many penalty points?

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, there are 60 penalty points referred to throughout here. How much is a penalty point going to be equivalent to?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that one penalty point will be equivalent to \$170. Sixty penalty units is \$10,200; 160 is \$27,200; 120 penalty units is \$20,400; 200 penalty units is \$34,000; and 1,800 penalty units is \$306,000. I am advised that these penalty unit amounts are set by the commonwealth.

Ms CHAPMAN: That may be so, but what are they currently?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that \$170 is the current value.

Ms CHAPMAN: Exactly the same?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is the first time I have ever come in here to pass a bill where the fees are going to be the same, but anyway, we will see.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's a new morning in South Australia.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it? A new dawn under your stewardship, minister; that's excellent. I refer to certificates of survey, which are under part 4. I assume that this really just conveys what are current obligations, but perhaps you can identify if there are any new aspects of the surveying obligations under the new regime.

I notice there is a lot of reference here to offences with strict liability, so it may well be that this is because a certificates of survey regime is already in operation, but we now have a much greater threshold of obligation under the new set. I may be wrong, but can you tell me what the difference is between what we have now for certificates of survey and what we are about to receive?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that existing vessels currently under sale will be subject to the same survey regime. New vessels will be subject to the national standards for the administration of marine safety, section 4, Survey of Vessels. This standard was agreed to by the ministerial council of 6 November 2009 and will take effect upon commencement of the national law.

In addition to an initial survey of a vessel, this standard provides for a five-year periodic cycle survey regime based on a risk assessment of the vessel. I am also advised that the current round is a two-year survey and the new round will be either one year, three years or five years, based on the risk.

Ms CHAPMAN: So I've got this clear, at present, all commercial vehicles that are currently captured are obliged to have a survey—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's the new vessels, not existing vessels. All existing vessels are still under the same survey that they are now.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, I understand that there's a transition obligation for them, and we've been briefed on that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, it's not transitional: it's grandfathered. That will be in place.

Ms CHAPMAN: Right, okay, so all the new ones that have been captured, for example, under this act, will go onto a system where they will be told, based on risk, whether they have to do a one, three or five. At present, the existing ones do one every three years, is that right?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Two.

Ms CHAPMAN: Every two years, right. I assume, minister, that is on the basis that those who are supervising this—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, to correct myself, one or two years.

Ms CHAPMAN: —will be able to say, 'Well, look, we think this is a much more high risk activity, for example, and therefore we want you to a survey. You are carrying more passengers. There is a higher level of risk, and therefore we want to be sure about it.' Whereas a fishing boat where fewer people are likely to be exposed to any safety risk may not have the same obligation. Am I correct in that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's safe to assume safety comes first.

Ms CHAPMAN: The certificate of survey I have been provided with, minister, is quite an extensive list of what our current Harbors and Navigation Regulations are, which set out some fairly extensive costs for surveys already, so I am assuming that they are obviously not going to change. There are fees to be paid for the people who provide the survey, and if they need new equipment, boilers, engines or paddles—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It will stay the same.

Ms CHAPMAN: —all of that will stay the same. I am particularly interested to know about what is going to happen with the surveying obligations for historic vessels. During the briefing, we were advised that there were I think half a dozen of these in South Australia. I might be wrong; there might be more. They still had not really sorted out how they were going to manage those. The ones I am interested in are the *One and All* and the *Fallie*, which are ships I am sure you are familiar with and which are a very important part of maritime history for South Australia.

I am pleased to note that I read recently that the *One and All*, whilst it is still waiting to have a new manager, is at least being used by someone I think in the education department who has some school children utilising it. I am pleased to hear that at least it is doing that.

I might mention for the minister's benefit that when I sat on the board of the trust for this vessel, we sent it to the Geelong Grammar School once a year and it earned very good income, actually, from students in Victoria. It helped to provide for its support, and I have been very

disappointed in the time I have been here in the parliament in its lack of use and its lack of production of revenue for the state so that it might be reinvested for the benefit of children in training.

However, I would like to know, given that this ship has been surveyed in recent years (I am hoping you will tell me is in very good order and, given that has already started taking out some schoolchildren again, I am assuming that it is in good order), what is the anticipated annual cost of the surveying and certification obligations for each of these two vessels over the forthcoming, say, two years? How is that going to be paid for, and will they be kept in survey?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Much to the distress of the member for Bragg, the *One and All* and the *Falie* are not historic vessels. They may be, in the hearts and minds of South Australians, but not for the purposes of this bill. Heritage vessels that we have are the PS *Oscar W*, the MV *Archie Badenoch*, ST *Yelta*, FV *Tacoma*, PS *Industry*, PS *Marion* and the Morgan paddle steamer, which is the PS *Canally*, which is going through a full restoration and which has applied for heritage listing.

The *One and All* is not listed as a heritage vessel and is already captured as a commercial vessel under the survey. The current allocated recurrent funding is half a million per annum. The *Falie* is not in survey. If it is opened up for business as a tourist attraction and is a permanently moored vessel, it would fall under scheme O. Any proposed standard for it will be developed during the three-year transition period which will be subject to public consultation and a unanimous ministerial council agreement.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not think that I was asserting that either of these vessels were in the heritage category, but that they are historic; however, you have covered for the purposes of that. There is a heritage category, which I think my learned leader has asked questions about for the paddle steamers. I think, with that information and what we were provided at the briefing, it seems you are going through a transition period as to how you are going to manage those in the future.

I notice that you listed the *Tacoma*, which of course is a very important fishing vessel in South Australia. In fact, there was a recent television program on the *Tacoma* recently, on the weekend, I think—

Mr Whetstone: Saturday.

Ms CHAPMAN: —about its history, its building and development, and its magnificent contribution to the fishing industry, particularly out at Port Lincoln. I am pleased to see, at least on the television program, that it is apparently still afloat and much loved in its current state as a historic vessel. I would certainly be hoping, minister, that the government are doing everything possible to ensure that these vessels are properly looked after and kept in a fit and proper state, and that funding is assuredly given to provide for them.

I think I heard you say some figures for the current commercial surveying costs for the *One and All*, and I think you have explained that the *Falie* has moored—probably for good reason; I do not think it will ever be safely presented again unless a lot of work is done it, sadly. Nevertheless, is the provision of costs currently budgeted for the *One and All*?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised there is an ongoing, recurrent amount budgeted for of half a million dollars.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have concluded part 4 and I am sure, Mr Chairman, you will be delighted to hear I am moving to part 8, and I think my learned leader has a question first.

Mr WHETSTONE: Schedule 1, part 8, division 2: what will be the impact on volunteers using their private vessels for data collection for a government department?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: None, I am advised.

Mr WHETSTONE: If that private vessel is used to collect data for a government department for doing bird counts, tree count, that type of thing, it will be exempt?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is not captured, that is the advice I have.

Mr WHETSTONE: Just a final question regarding the impact on a community vessel. If we are looking at surf lifesavers, they have three different types of vessels—powerboats, jetskis and paddle-driven canoe types—will they be affected? Will they have to have a coxswain's certificate to be able to operate those boats and do they have to be surveyed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As long as they do not exceed the two nautical miles of the watermark then they are not captured, and the advice I have received is that they generally do not go further than two nautical miles anyway.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under division 2, as I understand it, are the opportunities for parties to be exempt, and it may be from bird counting and all sorts of other things that might be obliged to be done. Under clause 146 it says, 'Offence of breaching a condition of exemption (all persons)' and it carries a 60 unit penalty, and on the figures you have just announced that is thousands of dollars by the sound of it, so I would just like to know what that relates to because it seems to me that that is covering not just the owner and master and so on who have separate obligations, but would capture volunteers?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is not that they are exempted. The advice I have received is that they are not captured by the act deliberately.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did you say 'all persons' doesn't—

Ms Chapman: So 'all persons' doesn't include volunteers?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If they are privately owned or surf lifesaving, then they are not captured, is the advice I have received. That is correct. However, I want to clarify a point. Volunteer marine rescue vessels, I am advised, which are under section O not owned by individuals, are captured as commercial vessels under the national law. This includes the Australian Volunteer Coast Guard, the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, the Royal Volunteer Coastal Patrol, Cowell Sea Rescue Squadron, Victor Harbor and Goolwa Sea Rescue Squadron and the Whyalla Sea Rescue Squadron.

Volunteer marine rescue vessels operate in adverse weather conditions and undertake high risk search and rescue operations. Their activities include rescuing a person overboard and could include towing other vessels, which creates a greater risk of capsizing. Because of this, I am advised the vessels should be inspected for stability and seaworthiness and that they are fit for purpose, and their crew needs to be competent. As scheme O vessels, the intention is to develop a nationally consistent regulatory treatment for the standard of these vessels. There are two distinctions, and I think the two nautical mile barrier is the distinction.

Ms CHAPMAN: So if I volunteered as a friend of the *One and All* and went out on that ship as a volunteer, would I be captured in any way under these obligations?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised no.

Ms CHAPMAN: Not that I think I would be a useful addition, although I have actually been in that category before. My question relates to clause 158 under division 8 of this part. It is on page 90 and it refers to adverse publicity orders. Are these something that judges can issue under our current state regime for marine safety? If not, where does this new thing come from, which is an opportunity for judges to require offenders to have particulars published, I presume in a newspaper? It says here, 'publicise, in the way specified in the order', and notify certain classes. You have to tell all the various people that the judge says you have to, assuming that you have actually been guilty of an offence.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that it is not currently in the Harbors and Navigation Act, but it is a commonwealth law and it will apply when they regulate.

Ms CHAPMAN: So Minister, I assume you have been happy to sign up to this name and shame type approach? I have not seen it in any other legislation; I might have missed it, but I do not recall it being in the national rail legislation; I am not sure whether it is coming in the heavy transport legislation. It just seems to me that this is setting a new era of penalty in this whole obligation to publish.

If it were to make provision for some obligation to notify if there has been a guilty finding of a particular offender—some obligation that that be notified to the national regulator, for example—the way I am reading it (I might be wrong) is that this is an entitlement for a judge to be able to convict the offender and to require that there be a publication—it could be in a newspaper or on television—of the event. Subparagraph 2 makes provision to notify the national regulator, and I perfectly understand that that would occur, because that is the statutory body. Can you just explain why we are agreeing to that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Whether I support it or not is immaterial, because the commonwealth will legislate regardless of what the state does, and if we do not apply it there will be two regimes within our waters and we are doing as much as we can to harmonise them. This is a commonwealth decision. If we do not pass this, there will be two regimes. Within our waters this part will not apply, and in every other state and for commonwealth waters it will apply, so we will still have two regimes. On the philosophical point of whether I support this, it is a national form, and state and territory leaders have signed up to it—Labor and Liberal—so, yes, I do. If you have a particular opposition to it, then that is your right as an opposition.

Ms CHAPMAN: I raised the point because this legislation comes to us not because it is commonwealth law but because persons, including your predecessor, went off to meetings in 2009 and signed up to a commitment, put in each other's identification about what they had agreed to to achieve the objectives you say and beefed up what we currently have. I say that respectfully, that there has been beefing up—there have been extra obligations go in, and there have bit more people captured by it, etc., all in the name of safety, etc., etc.

That does not mean that when ministers go off to these meetings they say, 'We'll just do what the national representative or the national minister tells us to.' That is the whole idea of COAG. It may be something that is not being used a lot, I do not know. Perhaps that is something that the minister could inquire about, as to whether there have been orders for publication and, if so, what identified benefit is achieved by doing that, separate to the obligation to notify the regulator, which I think is perfectly reasonable. Perhaps that indication can be given between houses.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes; I am advised that these sorts of orders apply within the trade practices legislation now. I am also advised that Consumer Affairs has that power now in terms of, for the lack of a better term, dodgy traders. So, that principle has been adopted by this parliament, but, as I said, we are seeking agreements. A ministerial agreement is simply that; it is still an agreement. We are a sovereign state and we are entitled to pass any legislation we see fit as long as it is constitutional.

If we as parliament decide against adopting this measure, then so be it; we will have two regimes. So you will have vessels which are captured under the Corporations Act where you will have this policy apply, and you will have vessels within our waters that are not captured by the Corporations Act, I am advised, not applying. So you will have two regimes. So it is for the parliament to resolve this.

The minister on behalf the government has accepted the commonwealth's proposal, and we have done so. I take your point. It was not the deal at Federation but it is how it is turning out, and both political parties in Canberra have been extending their power more and more, and it is simply about harmonising. We can make a decision. There is no-one in here compelling you to vote a certain way. Every member regardless of party is not recognised by the parliament as a member of a political party. You are recognised by the nature of your electorates, so you can vote any way you see fit.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank the minister for his little lecture on that. As the minister would be aware, there are a number of models for the uniformity of legislation across the country. This is one which involves the commonwealth passing law and us adopting it as though it were law in our own jurisdiction. It is one of a number of different types of models. In the 11 years that I have been here there have been various models used to produce the harmonisation of legislation. As I say, this is one of them.

I cannot recall seeing publication orders in any other legislation. We have done health professionals, we have done all sorts of harmonisation. It does seem to me that the Trade Practices Act is very different situation. There is an obligation for publication so that potential consumers of trading entities have some notice about misconduct. We can all think of major retailers, for example, where it would be an important punitive and consumer protection benefit in having a publication order. It just seems to me a little unusual in these circumstances.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, tourism operators—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I make the point that I do not think it is justified. To conclude on the matters I would like to raise, minister, we have operated under a state regime for some time,

obviously. I would like to have provided, at least between the houses because I accept it would not be at the minister's fingertips, the number and nature of prosecutions and the penalties imposed over the last five years in respect of marine safety. I assume most of these are matters that have been dealt with in the Magistrates Court or District Court unless, for example, it was a murder on a fishing boat, or something of that nature. If that information could be obtained and provided between houses, I would appreciate it.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 2 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (17:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADELAIDE WORKERS' HOMES BILL

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (17:37): I bring up the final report of the select committee on the bill and move that it be received.

Report received.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:37): I should just say, minister, that I commend you on your excellent chairmanship of the committee; and I just confirm that those on this side of the house were unanimous in their support.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (17:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO. 2) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:41): I am happy to indicate on behalf of the opposition that we welcome the return of the bill without amendment, and I think we should place on the record our appreciation to the Legislative Council for progressing that bill today to facilitate the important business that will flow as a result—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make it brief, because you are not meant to be speaking.

Ms CHAPMAN: —and I am sure that the Attorney-General will join with me in appreciating that.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (17:41): On behalf of the Attorney-General, I would just like to advise that the bill was passed, as the member said, by the Legislative Council on Tuesday 9 April and the only matters to report from the Legislative Council were—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make it brief, because you are not meant to be speaking.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I will make it brief.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Very brief. You are actually out of order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am out of order, am I?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Minister, would you like to move that the house do now adjourn?

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of clarification, Mr Deputy Speaker. My understanding is that there is another item on the agenda for consideration and I think the minister wishes to speak on it, because there is a bill in respect of security agents that has been returned from the Legislative Council, with a minor amendment, that I think the parliament is happy to accommodate.

SECURITY AND INVESTIGATION AGENTS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

(Continued from 9 April 2013.)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The bill was passed by the Legislative Council on Tuesday 9 April. The only matter to report from the Legislative Council is an explanation by the minister that some measures, notably temporary licensing, would be delayed, while other jurisdictions with less probity require fully implemented agreed minimum probity standards.

The passing of one minor drafting amendment, the amended section, relates to the cancelling of a licensee's ability to perform duties without a requirement to carry a firearm if their related firearm licence is cancelled. The amendment ensures that the reference to the security agent's licence is consistent through the subsection and is applied as intended. I commend the amendment to the committee.

Ms CHAPMAN: Prepare to be delighted: we support the amendment.

Motion carried.

At 17:46 the house adjourned until Tuesday 30 April 2013 at 11:00.