LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 20 March 2013

The PRESIDENT (Hon. J.M. Gazzola) took the chair at 14:19 and read prayers.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (TAFE SA CONSEQUENTIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:20): I have to report that the managers for the two houses conferred together and that no agreement was reached. I move:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

The PRESIDENT: As no recommendation from the conference has been made, the council, pursuant to standing order 338, must either resolve not to further insist on its requirements or lay the bill aside.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:21): I thank the member for his passionate defence of the Legislative Council's position in the conference of managers. He defended the rights and the position of the Legislative Council. It must have been difficult for him, given his union background, to have adopted that position in the conference of managers. He and the other representatives of the Legislative Council outlined their continuing opposition to the intransigent position being adopted by the House of Assembly in relation to this important matter and it is very pleasing to see the minister supporting the position of the Legislative Council in the conference of managers.

The Liberal Party position as outlined by the shadow minister, the member for Unley, Mr Pisoni, throughout the latter part of last year—I cannot remember now, it is so long ago, when this issue was last debated in the Legislative Council; the conference of managers has been delayed for many months.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Since November.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It has been delayed since November, my colleague Mr Dawkins indicates. It was scheduled to meet on a number of occasions, but the former minister cancelled a number of meetings of the conference of managers and we eventually met at lunchtime today. The position of the Liberal Party, as I said, as outlined by the member for Unley, remains the same. The reasons for that have been outlined by the member for Unley in the debates in the House of Assembly, and I on his behalf have outlined the position of the Liberal Party in this chamber.

We take the view that all teachers, for example, in relation to those ballots which relate to all teachers, should have the opportunity to be elected and represent teachers, not just those who happen to choose to be a member of a union. We hasten to debunk the view that this in some way prevents union representation, because if, as the union outlines and the House of Assembly outlines, the overwhelming majority of teachers, for example, are members of the union, if they so choose to select a member of the union to represent them, then they are of course entitled to do so.

Ultimately it should be a decision for the workers to elect their representative and if they choose to elect a union representative, good on them. If they choose to represent a worker—or in this case a teacher—who does not happen to be a union member but who is happy to be a representative of the workers and has the support of the majority, well then good luck to them as well.

We support that particular democratic principle. The majority of the Legislative Council has adopted that position previously and I do not intend to repeat ad nauseam that debate. We adopt the position that, if the motion is that we no longer insist, we will be, of course, opposing that and we will be asking that the council insist on maintaining its position.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:26): I was also at the deadlock conference and I certainly have not changed my position on the bill. I endorse everything that the Hon. Rob Lucas has mentioned and I will certainly be opposing the Hon. Russell Wortley's motion.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:26): Family First's position is unchanged, that is, that we will also be opposing the motion.

The council divided on the motion:

AYES (9)

Finnigan, B.V.	Franks, T.A.	Gago, G.E.
Hunter, I.K.	Kandelaars, G.A.	Maher, K.J.
Parnell, M.	Wortley, R.P. (teller)	Zollo, C.

NOES (12)

Bressington, A.	Brokenshire, R.L.	Darley, J.A.
Dawkins, J.S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Lucas, R.I. (teller)	Ridgway, D.W.
Stephens, T.J.	Vincent, K.L.	Wade, S.G.

Majority of 3 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Bill laid aside.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! We are usually well behaved in this chamber.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:30): I bring up the 23rd report of the committee.

Report received.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:30): I bring up the briefing report of the committee on South Australia's Ageing Workforce: Implications for Work, Health and Safety Rehabilitation and Compensation.

Report received.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee—Report, 2011-12

By the Minister for Water and the River Murray (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Access to Water and Sewerage Infrastructure—Report, dated February 2013

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:31): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in the other place today by the Minister for Health and Ageing on the topic of evaluation of changes to mental health services.

QUESTION TIME

POTATO INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about foreign competition and disease.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yesterday the potato processing company Mondello Farms was put into receivership. As reported by Cameron England in *The Advertiser*, Mondello Farms is a large wholesaler of processed potatoes and employs 140 staff in South Australia and Victoria.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: They are good people.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: And, as my colleague the Hon. John Dawkins interjects, they are very good people. Mondello Farms buys potatoes from private growers, as well as processing potatoes grown on owned and leased land. The receivers today are contacting contract growers, employees, customers and suppliers, but there is widespread concern in the industry that foreign competition is a worse threat to potato production than are the financial troubles of one processor. It concerns potatoes from New Zealand. The New Zealand potato industry is affected by pests and diseases not present in Australia, including the devastating zebra chip disease, which reduces yield and downgrades quality.

For the information of the city-living, Labor members opposite, for whom primary production means picking up a packet of frozen chips or hash browns from the supermarket freezer, the zebra disease is not an issue that is all black and white. South Australia is the country's largest potato producer. Potatoes represent the largest horticultural contribution to the gross food revenue. We have more to lose from importing New Zealand potatoes.

The zebra chip disease has caused more than $120 million damage to the New Zealand industry, and our industry says that we face catastrophic yield losses—as much as 50 per cent—if the federal government approves market access for the New Zealand potatoes. My questions are:

1. Has the minister today spoken with Mondello Farms' receiver, staff, employees or suppliers, and what arrangements, if any, are there to ensure a market for Mondello's previous suppliers?

2. What is the minister doing to protect the South Australian potato industry, worth $206 million at the farm gate, from this nasty imported disease?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed our potato industry here in South Australia is a very important industry to us. It makes a significant contribution to potato growth and production right around the nation. There are many challenges for our primary producers, and the issue of importing diseases into our very clean industry is something that is very important to us.

We pride ourselves on being a very clean primary producer. We have good quality air, soil and water, and we have very well developed biosecurity measures and other standards in place to ensure that we remain clean. In relation to the importation of disease, particularly in relation to zebra chip disease, the commonwealth government in July last year released a report. That report was for the review of import conditions for fresh potatoes for processing from New Zealand.

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry draft report proposed that the importation of fresh potatoes for processing from New Zealand be permitted, subject to strict quarantine conditions. The quarantine conditions recommended are that the potatoes have been washed or brushed to remove soil and trash, and that they have been subjected to quarantine inspection by both New Zealand and Australian officers. The potatoes must only come from farms free from potato cyst nematode and potato black wart.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Nasty, that black wart.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, there are a number of diseases, not just the zebra chip, so we ensure that we have quarantine conditions and processes in place to ensure that our primary producers remain protected. Transport in Australia will be in secure containers and all potatoes must be sent for processing under quarantine control. All waste must be disposed of under quarantine approved treatment—incineration or deep burial. Fresh whole potatoes from New Zealand will not be available for retail sale in Australia. I think that is important to note.

Zebra chip infected potatoes are not commercially acceptable and traded as the processed product tastes burnt and is discoloured; thus, there is a commercial imperative to source zebra chip free potatoes for processing. Zebra chip can only be spread by a very small insect—the tomato potato psyllid. This insect lives and feeds on the leaves and stems of the potato, not actually on the potato tuber so, given the proposed zero tolerance for trash, there is no viable pathway for this insect to enter Australia.

A second safety net exists because the only New Zealand potato available to Australian consumers will be processed into fries and chips. This measure removes the pathway for the actual

zebra chip bacteria to enter Australia in any viable state. SARDI scientists have examined the DAFF biosecurity risk assessment process and support the proposed risk management procedures and systems, so they have been looked at.

The importation of potatoes into Australia is a commonwealth government responsibility. The final decision will be based on the best available science and be consistent with international trade rules. The potato industry, as I said, is a very important industry to us, with a farm gate value, I have been advised, of about $102 million in 2010-11. South Australia is the nation's largest potato producing state. A 60-day stakeholder consultation period that closed, I understand, in September 2012, provided stakeholders with an opportunity to identify any deficiencies in that risk assessment process.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: This was what was read out here months ago when I asked you about it.

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Dawkins!

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: You are so lazy.

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The opposition is so lazy, they keep coming back into this place—

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —with the same question. So, I've already answered this question before. He is absolutely quite right.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: They are lazy. They keep coming back into this place with the same old tired questions. So, the honourable member wants to know how we manage these risks; I'm outlining how we manage them. He asked the question again, so I'm going to give the answer again—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister will ignore the interjections.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —and I am going to give it in more detail—

The PRESIDENT: You will ignore the interjections.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —because he obviously didn't hear it the first time.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: I certainly did.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, I am very pleased that you didn't ask the same question. It's a shame the Hon. David Ridgway—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you will ignore the interjection.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —wasn't listening at the time.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: You haven't answered my first question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: So, the 60-day stakeholder consultation period—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Oh, you can't, sorry—that's right. You don't know the answer.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —that closed on 3 September—

The PRESIDENT: And you are out of order, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. You are not helping.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —provided stakeholders with an opportunity to identify the deficiencies.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: She needs all the help she can get.

The PRESIDENT: And you should keep chipping away.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: All submissions received will be analysed and taken into account. The final policy, I am advised, will be reported on in June this year—that is what they are planning to do. So, you can see that a great deal of effort and analysis has gone into this—the risk

assessment and rigorous analysis of the potential for risk—and that measures have been put in place to eliminate any disease of this type entering our primary production.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway has a supplementary.

POTATO INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): It's a repeat of my first question.

The PRESIDENT: It's not a supplementary then.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Has the minister spoken to Mondello Farms, the receiver's staff, employers or suppliers—

The PRESIDENT: The minister has answered your first question.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: She did not.

The PRESIDENT: Well, how is it a supplementary?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: She didn't. It is arising out of the non-answer, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: If it's a non-answer, it can't be a supplementary.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You are getting grumpy today.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementaries have to arise out of an answer. The minister has answered it.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Have you spoken to Mondello Farms? Now she is on the phone to Mondello Farms, by the looks.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, help the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:42): I apologise, Mr President, for not addressing it. I have, in fact, met with potato producers and I have, in fact, visited potato producers. So, I have, in fact, on a number of occasions met with producers.

QANTAS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation regarding Qantas domestic catering recycling.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I didn't hear too much of that; there was a bit of chatter.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Qantas domestic recycling program.

The PRESIDENT: Are you asking leave?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, to ask the Minister for—

The PRESIDENT: Which minister?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. The Qantas domestic catering division, Q Catering, has been recycling cans and bottles and utilising our container deposit legislation in South Australia, and their moneys have then been collected and donated to a local South Australian charity. Unknown to Adelaide staff, the cans and bottles were purchased interstate and travelled back on Qantas aircraft to Adelaide.

In accordance with legislation, cans and bottles purchased under these circumstances are not permitted to receive the 10 per cent refund. This was detected by the recycling company after the barcodes were scanned and a warning was given. It must be noted, however, that Q Catering also purchases cans and bottles from South Australia and these goods generally travel interstate.

Q Catering contacted the EPA to seek a solution; however, their understanding is that there was no response or resolution and it is in the too-hard basket. Recycling ceased at the start of 2012. So, as it remains, Q Catering continues to pay the 10 per cent container deposit but is unable to receive any refund. My questions to the minister are: is he aware of this situation and, under the circumstances, would he consider an exemption to allow them to recycle interstate-purchased goods up to the same amount that is purchased in South Australia?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her most important question and ongoing support for our recycling initiatives in this state. I was not aware of the allegation that Qantas was trafficking in cans and recyclable bottles. That is a new one on me, but I will, of course, ask for a response from my agency and see whether there is anything we can do. I am wondering whether the cans that were brought back to South Australia to be trafficked were in fact branded as recyclable under our container deposit legislation. I do not have that information but I will look it up with some interest.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question with respect to fruit fly protection.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Riverland's fruit fly free status is vital in providing Riverland producers access to key international markets. It has been estimated that a single fruit fly outbreak in the Riverland could cost $2 million to contain and eradicate and could deny the Riverland fruit industry access to vital export markets.

Long weekends see the Riverland inundated with thousands of visitors. Typically, a roadblock at Blanchetown is active on long weekends. Over the Adelaide Cup long weekend in March 2012, 180 kilograms of fruit was seized at the Blanchetown roadblock. At the Australia Day long weekend in January 2013, 231 vehicles were found to be illegally carrying fruit when stopped at Blanchetown, of which 13 were referred for further action, that being either a formal warning or a fine. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given the significant number of drivers caught illegally bringing fruit into the Riverland over the long weekends in 2012 and 2013, why wasn't a random fruit fly roadblock established over the recent long weekend, on 9 to 11 March 2013?

2. Are there plans to open more random fruit fly roadblocks across South Australia this year with a focus around times of high traffic for tourists coming to the region?

3. Of the 13 people referred for further action following the Australia Day long weekend roadblock, how many fines will be pursued?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. Indeed, South Australia is very proud of its fruit fly free status. We are one of the few jurisdictions that can boast of such a clean record, and we work very hard to ensure that we maintain that fruit fly free status. There are a number of things that we do to ensure that we remain free of fruit fly, and one of those measures is the instigation of roadblocks, including random roadblocks. Random roadblocks are generally conducted during times of very high traffic, at peak periods.

I have had this same question asked before in this place, about providing assurances about where they are going to be in future and suchlike, so it is disappointing to see an almost identical question wheeled out again. Two out of three questions this afternoon have in fact been rehashes of previous questions.

I have made it quite clear in this place before that assessments are made about roadblocks. It is a demand system. Assessments are made on where officers believe the resources are best located, and they are moved and located according to what is needed. That practice will continue because it is a very sound practice and it has served us very well in the past. That is what we will continue to do.

In terms of the 13 warnings, I was informed of the number that were likely to go through to prosecution but I do not have that number with me.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: And we know how lazy the opposition are. There are a number of those 13 that have been put through for further investigation and are likely to end in prosecution. There were 13 formal warnings and expiations out of that. I remind honourable members that one of the main purposes of this roadblock program is education, rather than punishment. The inspectors use this opportunity to engage with members of the general public to inform them of the importance of these roadblocks and how important it is not to bring fruit in. Their view is that a lot of the time it is a genuine oversight and so by increasing public awareness and attention this will improve compliance. In terms of how many people the inspectors stop, I will take that on notice and bring back an answer to the council on how many of those may be going through to prosecution.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Regional Development a question about regional development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: Regional businesses are an important component of making South Australia's success. Can the minister advise the chamber of a recent grant to assist one of these businesses?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:52): I have previously spoken of the economic prospects of the Upper Spencer Gulf area and how this combination of population centres and geographic features have been recognised. The South Australian government commissioned KPMG to help local businesses position themselves to take advantage of opportunities in the area. The government has entered an historic three-party MOU with the Australian government and local government to support a place-based approach to this area.

The purpose of the place-based approach to the Upper Spencer Gulf is to facilitate the development of coordinated, strategic, placed-based investment strategies for the USG and associated regions. We recognise that we have a mutual interest in developing placed-based investment strategies, particularly in the Upper Spencer Gulf, and that these will focus on a holistic view of the region's economic, social and community wellbeing and current and planned significant state, federal, local government and private sector investments in the USG.

We have also committed $4 million over four years towards an Enterprise Zone Fund and the outback. I am pleased to announce today that I have recently approved a grant of just under $200,000 to Cowell Electric Supply from the Enterprise Zone Fund to help that business service the growing mining, oil and gas industries. The funding win supports Cowell Electric to purchase new equipment to construct high voltage lines in the Upper Spencer Gulf—covering the areas between Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie—Eyre Peninsula and the outback of SA.

The company's core business is the design and construction of powerlines, primarily for the mining, oil and gas industries. It is a local company which has built up expertise and experience in the mining industry from its beginning in January 2001 with 13 workers based in Cowell (on the Eyre Peninsula), to being a company which employs 35 people, with 18 based at Olympic Dam and Woomera, a core at the head office in Cowell, as well as those dedicated to projects in regional and remote areas as needed.

The company has experience working in places such as Innamincka in South Australia, Gove in the Northern Territory and Broken Hill in New South Wales. It is a successful regional company, led by Sue Chase, a former Telstra businesswoman of the year (2009), and it was awarded the title of Telstra's South Australian regional business of the year in 2011.

The grant will help the company obtain tension-stringing equipment so that it can undertake work on high-voltage lines of up to 275 kilovolt, not just the 66 kilovolt lines it had previously worked on. The project, which is just over $350,000, will see the purchase of a hydraulic tensioner and puller and a roller sheave, in addition to related fittings and training of staff.

Having this new equipment is expected to help the company position itself to win bids for projects on a competitive and ongoing basis and to build local capacity to support economic development and jobs growth. For example, it has recently tendered to install a 275 kilovolt powerline for the Snowtown wind farm, and I understand that will commence shortly. The project is

consistent with our priority of Mining Benefits for All. The funds come from the Enterprise Zone Fund, which is aimed at capturing the benefits of growing industries to further strengthen outback communities.

FARM WATER STORAGE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions regarding taxing rainfall captured in dams and rainwater tanks.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am seeking clarification from the minister because it is a matter that keeps buzzing around the farming community, particularly in the Mount Lofty Ranges. I will start with what the former premier, Mike Rann, tweeted on this topic on 18 January 2011. He tweeted:

> Farmers know we will not be charging them for their entitlements. Nor will we be charging people for the water in their rainwater tanks.

On 18 January (the same day), he also tweeted:

> And no, just in case anyone believed it, we won't be charging farmers for water that falls from the sky onto their land into their dams!

I am hearing that farmers with dams having a capacity of over five megalitres will in the future be required to pay for their water extractions. My questions are:

1. Will the minister confirm the former premier's tweet commitment that people will not be charged for water in their rainwater tanks?

2. Will the minister confirm the former premier's tweet commitment that farmers will not be charged for their entitlements?

3. If that is so, can the minister explain why some farmers, such as groundwater irrigators in the South-East and the River Murray irrigators, together with those in the Eastern and Mount Lofty Ranges, when the water allocation plan is finished, will have to pay a water levy for water which begins sometimes as rainfall, yet other irrigators do not?

4. What happened to the Natural Resources Management (Review) Bill, to which honourable members, including me, had moved amendments clarifying these issues after the minister's predecessor (Hon. Russell Wortley), who was handling the bill, abandoned it because it all got too hard?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:59): Mr President, sometimes you get a question in this place that just makes you want to laugh out loud. The honourable member was not even paying attention, Mr President, when you gave him the call to ask this question, and he had to be reminded.

In question No. 4, he asked what happened to our NRM bill, when I had got up in this place just 10 minutes ago and asked for it to be moved back onto the agenda in three weeks' time. Where was he then? Was he in the chamber? I think he might have been, but he certainly was not paying attention—as is his wont.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: He wasn't listening yesterday either.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: He never does. And he leads off—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Don't you come and defend him, David. You are a big city slicker yourself these days. You are not out there milking the cows with him, I understand.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: But if I had to, I would know what to do.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, you probably would. He leads off with comments saying, 'I'm hearing out in the community,' or 'There is buzzing around the farming community.' The only person buzzing around with this sort of information is the Hon. Mr Brokenshire himself, busy on radio, busy out in the community, telling people half-truths, stirring up issues he knows are not true and based on misleading information, but of course that is his wont and that is how he does his job.

Let me assist the honourable member. Presumably after that little warm up he may be paying attention this time.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: I don't reckon you will ever warm him up.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The Hon. Mr Ridgway may be absolutely correct in that totally out of order interjection.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The gallery is filling.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President, for your support. The government does not, nor does it intend to, tax rainwater—or water at all. In prescribed water resource areas, a water licence is generally only required for irrigation, industrial or commercial purposes. Let me make that quite clear. In prescribed water resource areas, a water licence is generally only required for irrigation, industrial or commercial purposes.

Where a water licence is required, the landholder pays a once-off licence application fee which does not need to be renewed annually. The application fee is currently set at $206. In addition to this, a natural resources management board has an option to introduce a management levy in prescribed water resource areas for water taken for irrigation and commercial purposes only—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Isn't a levy a tax?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: For irrigation and commercial purposes only. Any levy established is used to help manage natural resources in that region. A tax is money collected for the government's general revenue, whereas a levy is for a specific purpose, to assist the honourable member in his out of order interjection. Let me be clear. There is no levy for household water, water from household rainwater tanks or water licensed for stock and domestic use. The Natural Resources Management Act 2004 specifically disallows the raising of a levy on water taken for stock and domestic purposes, regardless of whether that water comes from roof runoff, a dam or a bore.

In addition, the government has no intention of asking people to put meters on household or domestic rainwater tanks, or rainwater tanks used to supply water to free ranging stock. Meters will not be required for dams or bores solely for stock and domestic purposes. However, meters will be required for dams and bores used for licensed commercial purposes. I invite the honourable member to go back on the radio and out into the farming community and tell people the truth this time.

FARM WATER STORAGE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:02): I have a supplementary question. Is the minister saying that a levy is not a tax? Is that what the minister is saying, that this government can levy people but it is not a tax?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. I invite him to go back and read *Hansard* and read what I just said. He will find the answer to his question minutes ago.

PURPLE SPOTTED GUDGEON

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister update the chamber on the recovery of the native species the purple spotted gudgeon, which I note is a fish and not a bird as was speculated about a decade ago in this chamber.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Maher, will you start your question again?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Will the minister update the chamber on the recovery of the purple spotted gudgeon in the Coorong, the Lower Lakes and the Murray Mouth region?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are we settled? The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:04): I am very pleased that the honourable member did repeat his question, because I could not hear him initially over the anguished cries from those opposite.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: What a surprise!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: And it comes as no surprise to me, the Hon. Mr Ridgway or anyone else in this chamber that the restoration and conservation of our unique river and wetland habitats of the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth is a major priority of the Jay Weatherill government.

I have spoken about aspects of the $187 million Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth (CLLMM) recovery project funded as part of the $610 million federal government Murray Futures program at length before in this place—the former minister for the environment, the Hon. Paul Caica, has also done this in the other place, I understand—and today I am pleased to advise that efforts to recover native stocks in the region are continuing with today's release of 200 purple spotted gudgeon in the Lower Finniss River—and yes, the Hon. Mr Maher, they are indeed fish.

The purple spotted gudgeon is a small fish that commonly grows between six and 12 centimetres. The body is yellowish to golden brown colour overlayed with dark brown to red-and-white spots that are interspersed, I am told, with areas of iridescent bluish-purple which is more notable towards the tail. The fish is listed as critically endangered in South Australia, threatened or originally extinct in Victoria and endangered in New South Wales. In fact, the fish was believed to be extinct in the wild within South Australia from the 1970s due to the destructive prevalence of carp, but in 2004 it was rediscovered at one wetland location between Blanchetown and Wellington, I am advised.

With deteriorating conditions and low flows threatening the population of fish, however, decisive action was required and the fish were bred in captivity to ensure the survival of the species before the site where they were found completely dried out. This find was fortunate because it has enabled officers in the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources to re-establish populations of the purple spotted gudgeon. This process has also taken place with other fish including the Yarra pygmy perch, the southern pygmy perch, and one of your favourites, Mr President, the Murray hardyhead at various sites along the river.

The 200 fish being released today follows the release of another 900 purple spotted gudgeon in the past year at this site. I am pleased to advise the chamber that a number of these reintroduced fish have been caught and identified using harmless luminous dyes. I can report they are larger in size and are in good health, and this is, of course, a good indicator that the population is surviving and thriving at this site and the program is succeeding. This is fantastic news for that fish—fantastic news both for the individuals and the organisations involved in this effort and they all deserve our special thanks.

I am reminded and, in fact, I think last year when I was down visiting the Milang Old School House Community Centre, I was taken through that place and shown the turtle shed which is part of the curriculum for students at the Eastern Fleurieu School, Milang campus. If I can take a moment to share with the house some of the wonderful things that this school does:

> The [turtle] shed is home to a significant number of native fish—Murray Cod, Cat Fish, Golden Perch, Flat Head, Gudgeon, Purple Spotted Gudgeon, Murray Darling Rainbow Fish, Silver Perch, Bony Bream, some of which are threatened species; as well as a Common Carp, Redfin, Mosquito Fish, and yabbies, not to mention short and long necked turtles both in the shed and the outdoor enclosure.
>
> Through the education and support of the Milang community, DENR [then] and Murray Darling Native Fish Strategy, we have established the 'Turtle Shed', Murray Darling Basin Native Fish & Lower Lakes Environmental Awareness Programme. The shed retains the name given when the need for a shed to run the rescue programme was identified; even though the turtles no longer need our help as fresh water has removed the impact of tube worm infestation upon the turtles...see the full story below.

It goes on for another few pages but I will not belabour the chamber with any more of that. SARDI, the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin NRM Board, the South Australian Museum, Flinders University, Aquasave Consultants and Native Fish Australia have all assisted the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources in this conservation effort. I commend their efforts to this place and I look forward to learning of their future successes in the important work they are engaged in.

PRISONERS, HOSPITAL CARE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Correctional Services questions regarding the use of restraint on prisoners receiving medical care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: In July last year the Ombudsman released a report regarding the number of instances in which restraints, including handcuffs, shackles and chains, had been applied to six prisoners receiving medical care in the state's public health system. In each of these cases the use of restraint seems questionable, to say the least. The Ombudsman's report indicates that restraints were used with little or no regard paid to the patients' individual circumstance, contrary to national and international standards and the provisions of the Correctional Services Act.

In one case a patient was physically restrained, despite having limited mobility due to motor neurone disease, and even after restraints were removed was guarded until his death. In another, a patient developed further health complications, identified by professionals involved in their care, as being a likely result of the restriction of movement and injury caused by restraints used.

In a number of other cases pregnant women were shackled while in the early stages of labour and forced to go through childbirth. These prisoners were also forced to endure a number of other invasive pre and postnatal medical appointments, with male guards in the room while they were being examined. The report also details the cases of a number of patients affected by mental illness who were restrained, despite being cooperative and compliant with hospital and corrections staff, and who were assessed as presenting a low to moderate risk of flight or harm to themselves or others.

It is clear from the accounts of medical practitioners that heavy handed or entirely unwarranted use of restraints impacted on patient comfort, exacerbated patient symptoms and prevented hospital staff from providing complete and effective care. In a number of cases hospital staff advocating for appropriate use of restraints were forced into lengthy negotiations with the Department for Correctional Services that diverted hospital resources away from patients.

Concerningly, information in the report also indicates that corrections staff were unable to locate documentation used to justify the use of these restraints, did not communicate information about changes to the restraints effectively, did not act on information about changes to restraints promptly (and in some cases failed to act on it), did not keep accurate records on the use of restraints and apparently were unaware of the role of public officials responsible for the oversight of the health system, such as the Community Visitor, and acted to obstruct their efforts.

The Ombudsman made 10 recommendations covering issues ranging from the need for greater consideration of individual circumstance when using restraints and other restrictive practices to specific directions regarding the treatment of pregnant women in particular. My questions are:

1. Does the minister think it is appropriate for a woman in labour to be shackled?

2. Does the minister think it is appropriate for male guards to be present while a women is giving birth or undergoing vaginal examination?

3. Does the minister think it is appropriate or necessary for a prisoner with extremely limited mobility, who is receiving palliative care for a terminal illness, to be shackled?

4. Has the minister made any official response to the Ombudsman's report, which was published some eight months ago?

5. Have any of the Ombudsman's 10 recommendations been acted upon by the Department for Correctional Services?

6. Has the minister sought any advice on the Ombudsman's opinion that the current practice regarding restraints is contrary to not only national and international standards but also appears to be contrary to section 86 of our own Correctional Services Act?

7. Has the minister taken any action to ensure staff are appropriately trained around the role and powers of public officials, such as the Community Visitor?

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Government in answering will ignore the opinion expressed in some of the question or seeking the opinion, and the debate.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for her questions and will refer them to the Minister for Correctional Services in another place and bring back a response.

CHOWILLA FLOODPLAIN

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question about the drought-proofing regulator at Chowilla Station.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: On Monday 18 March *The Advertiser* published an article on the state government's drought-proofing regulator at Chowilla Station. The article states that the state government's drought-proofing regulator at Chowilla Station could become a $60 million white elephant because of a dispute with the station's leaseholders. The Robertson family is threatening legal action to stop the regulator being switched on and flooding 10,000 hectares of their land. They believe the environment department never licensed SA Water and contractors York Civil to begin construction of the project, which is now more than half finished. The project costs have already blown out from an initial construction cost estimate of $40.13 million to a total project cost of $54.43 million. My questions are:

1. Were rights to the land obtained before work began on the regulator?

2. Can the minister confirm whether the environment department licensed SA Water and contractors York Civil to begin construction on the project?

3. Does the minister expect the cost to further increase from the now expected budget of $54.43 million?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. The Chowilla Floodplain is a national parks and wildlife game reserve located, I am told, about 30 kilometres north-east of Renmark. Its significance is recognised by its status as a Living Murray icon site and the fact that it is part of the Riverland Ramsar wetland of international importance.

The reserve is also the subject of a lease agreement with Robertson-Chowilla Pty Ltd which allows the company to graze selected areas of the game reserve and the adjoining regional reserve, I am advised. To address the long-term decline in the health of the flood plain and wetlands, a large environmental regulator and associated infrastructure have been constructed on the Chowilla Floodplain. The project forms part of the Living Murray initiative.

The positive environmental outcomes of the regulator are consistent with the management plan for the reserve. The Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources approved the construction of the Chowilla regulator on the basis that it is consistent with the reserve's management plan. I understand that construction of the regulator commenced in early 2010. The return of high flows to the River Murray during that year resulted in significant delays which resulted in increased costs for the project.

I am advised that Robertson-Chowilla Pty Ltd has been consulted throughout the development of the Chowilla regulator concept and investment proposal and that the company has been supportive of the proposal and other related activities on Chowilla. The department is in negotiation, as I understand it, with Robertson-Chowilla Pty Ltd and their legal representatives, Iles Selley Lawyers, on matters relating to the lease and the operation of the regulator. As the matter is the subject of ongoing negotiation, I do not propose to add anything more to my answer at this point in time.

SEA RANGER FORUM

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:17): I seek leave to ask the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the South Australian Sea Ranger Forum.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: I understand that the Sea Ranger Forum is being held this month. Can the minister inform the chamber about the purpose of the forum?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. A forum to discuss the development of a model for the management of South Australian sea country by Aboriginal coastal nations and develop a sea ranger program is being held at West Beach.

The concept of the forum is to engage the coastal Aboriginal community and raise the level of understanding to allow for an informed discussion. The participants will have a chance to meet and listen to existing sea rangers who are actively involved in managing their sea country in the northern parts of Australia and learn how they have gone about their work with government to create partnerships and opportunities. Participants will also hear from PIRSA fisheries and their managers on how the state currently supports the Fisheries Management Act and then, in a collaborative approach, discuss and debate a model that can be supported here in South Australia.

The long-term aim of sea country rangers is to ensure that Aboriginal people are actively involved in the management of their land and sea at strategic, operational and delivery levels. Successful programs are currently being delivered in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the northern and remote communities of Australia. There are varying approaches and models that exist and functions performed by Aboriginal people.

The forum will involve participants from those existing programs coming to South Australia to pass on their knowledge and experience to the South Australian Aboriginal community in order to assist them in putting a model together. As the member indicated, the forum is indeed being held this month on 19 and 20 March at the SARDI Aquatic Sciences Centre. The forum sponsors are Fisheries Research and Development Corporation, PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture, DMITRE and SARDI Aquatic Sciences.

A project team has been established to build the engagement, participation and collaboration between the state's Aboriginal nations and state and commonwealth agencies needed to develop a sea ranger program suitable for South Australia. The program team has a principal investigator who leads a research team with staff from PIRSA, consultants with expertise in Indigenous affairs and marine resource management, and the former commissioner for Aboriginal engagement, Mr Klynton Wanganeen, as co-investigator. The forum will bring together representatives from the coastal Aboriginal nations of South Australia, Aboriginal people working in sea country management around Australia, PIRSA and observers from stakeholders who share an interest in the management of sea country.

Aboriginal people along the coastline of South Australia have a cultural association and relationship to the sea and particular areas to the sea, in the same manner as they do with land. The management of sea country and the sustainable management of fishery resources is vital in continuing the important role that Aboriginal people have in South Australia.

The first day of the forum is about an opportunity to hear from Aboriginal people from around the nation currently participating in the programs. Day 2 will provide attendees with the opportunity to consider and discuss the best way forward for Aboriginal participation in sea country here in South Australia. I am delighted to advise that both the South Australian Fisheries Research Advisory Board and PIRSA have supported the staging of the forum to accomplish the work that is needed in order to achieve the necessary engagement, participation and collaboration between Aboriginal nations and state and commonwealth agencies.

I am sure all involved share the same goal, which is to develop a suitable model to manage sea country for South Australia-based sea rangers. The project is a very good example of a joint enterprise. The state's role is to project manage the initiative, engage with Aboriginal people and ensure effective participation and outcomes for the state recommendations for the forum. These will be used to inform the minister and provide the proposed framework for endorsement by the state government. I obviously look forward to seeing the development of this important work to identify a well-informed plan and strategic approach to building lasting relationships with coastal Aboriginal communities.

GOVERNMENT STATIONERY CONTRACT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Premier, questions regarding the whole of government stationery contract.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I have recently been advised that KW Wholesale Stationers has had to make two of their staff redundant due to the 30 per cent reduction in sales. Further to this, full-time employees only continue to be employed as they have agreed to a 35 per cent reduction to their wages, which will result in some people receiving less than what they would normally receive on a Newstart allowance. This is in addition to other cost saving measures which have been implemented, such as reduced hours. My questions are:

1. Is the Premier aware of the negative effect the whole of government contract has had on KW Wholesale Stationers, their 110 employees and their families?

2. Is the Premier aware that there could be further job losses from the 380 newsagents across the state as a result of this contract?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:24): I thank the honourable member for his questions and will refer them to the relevant minister from another place and bring back a response.

EYRE PENINSULA GRAIN GROWERS RAIL FUND

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the Eyre Peninsula Grain Growers Rail Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: The Eyre Peninsula Grain Growers Rail Fund was established in 2006 to raise a $2 million grain grower contribution for a joint industry and government grains logistics infrastructure upgrade program. This fund was raised with a levy to PIRSA of 50¢ per tonne from all Eyre Peninsula grain growers up until 2011.

The member for Flinders in another place, Mr Peter Treloar, who was a member of the South Australian Farmers Federation grains committee at the time of the agreement to raise this fund, has advised me that there is an excess figure of around $230,000 remaining in the fund following the completion of the rail upgrade. I understand that grain grower contributors to the fund have been invited to participate in an online PIRSA survey to assist in determining the best way to use the excess funds. My questions are: firstly, when will the minister make a decision about the use of the excess money held in this fund; and, secondly, has consultation taken place regarding the use of this money with other groups and individuals across and beyond Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for his important question. Indeed, there are excess funds available from that former levy contribution that are excess to the upgrade of the rail, which was the purpose of the fund. The view was that the money belonged to the grain growers from that region, that it would be extremely difficult to give it back to individual grain growers and that it should be spent on a project that grain growers believe would be worthwhile and useful to their industry.

I am happy to gain the details of the process that was involved and bring that back to the chamber. However, I understand that there has been a process of engagement with the industry to determine the best way forward. My understanding is that the view was that this was an appropriate way to proceed with identifying the best way to spend and utilise these excess funds and that a process has been put in place to engage with the sector to identify priorities and then give the industry an opportunity to identify which of those priorities they believe is the most worthwhile. That process is in place. I am not sure of the deadline, but a fairly extensive period was given for consultation. As I said, I am happy to bring those other details back to the chamber and to provide that information to the honourable member.

EYRE PENINSULA GRAIN GROWERS RAIL FUND

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:27): Given the strong grain growing base of just about all the councils on Eyre Peninsula, has there been any consultation with the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association or individual councils in the region?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:28): Again, I will check this and make sure that the answer I bring back reflects the details, but my understanding is that the funds belonged to grain growers themselves and that we have primarily focused our consultation efforts on the needs of grain growers, given that they are their funds. As I said, I am happy to provide information for those other details.

OZHARVEST VAN

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:29): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister inform the chamber about the launch of the second OzHarvest van earlier this month?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:29): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his ongoing interest in recycling. On 9 March I had the pleasure of taking part in the launch of OzHarvest's second van in Adelaide, to be named Buttercup. The addition of Buttercup to the fleet will greatly improve OzHarvest's capacity to collect and deliver unwanted food to organisations preparing meals for those less fortunate in our community.

For those people who do not know, OzHarvest commenced operation originally in Sydney in 2004 as a result of a partnership between entities from the welfare and restaurant sectors. These people realised that something needed to be done about the large amount of food heading into bins whilst people were going hungry. After a number of successful years and support from well known identities like Matt Moran and Bill Granger, OzHarvest was able to expand its operations into Adelaide in 2010. After it received funding from this Labor government of about $60,000, OzHarvest launched its first van, Primrose.

Over the last two years, OzHarvest has been operating in Adelaide. I am advised that 25,000 kilograms of food that was otherwise destined for landfill or compost has been recovered and that 747,000 meals have been provided to people in Adelaide—that is 747,000 meals. I am told that every week around 680 kilograms of food is collected just from the Central Market and the Showground Farmers Market alone.

The Jay Weatherill government has been pleased to support the work of OzHarvest because it provides food and support to those vulnerable members of our community and it also reduces food waste and waste going to landfill. As I said on 9 March, we heard that 54 charitable agencies have been the recipients of OzHarvest food and over 270 donors now provide produce to OzHarvest on a regular basis. These donors range from fine dining restaurants to family-run fruit and vegetable grocers.

It is clear to me that the breadth of support for OzHarvest amongst South Australia's food community is wide and is growing day by day. It also demonstrates their acceptance of the need for healthy, nutritious meals to be provided for those in the community who are not as well off as others such as ourselves. It is also evidence that the food and restaurant community acknowledges that food waste must be reduced. The National Waste Report 2010 estimated that 35 per cent of waste that goes into household bins is food and 21.5 per cent of commercial and industrial waste is food. This means that Australia discards in excess of four million tonnes of food every year.

Whilst OzHarvest will not be able to solve this problem on their own, they are leading the way for other like-minded groups to come up with innovative ways to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. In light of this success over the last two years, Jay Weatherill's government has committed another $67,500 for a second food collection vehicle (as I indicated earlier), named Buttercup. This means another team of volunteers will be able to hit the roads with Primrose and Buttercup and more food and meals will be provided to those less fortunate members of our community.

On behalf of the government, I want to commend everyone at OzHarvest, their staff and their volunteers, and of course everyone from the restaurant and food community who have come on board on this excellent adventure.

MATTERS OF INTEREST

SCIENCE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (15:33): As members of parliament, we have a great privilege in shaping the policy and laws that guide our state, but with that, I believe, comes a responsibility to base what we do on the best available evidence and on scientific consensus. Science is central to our understanding of the world. Good, accepted science is testable, can be replicated, peer reviewed, unpicked, examined and reconstructed, but it is also open to new ideas and is self-correcting when better evidence is presented and properly tested.

However, science regularly finds itself under attack. As Ian Chubb, Chief Scientist for Australia, recently noted:

> As a society, we should be challenging those who, regardless of reason or factual basis, mock science and scientists for their spurious ends, whether it's a headline or avoiding an inconvenient truth.

And he is right. The Hon. Ann Bressington has been making quite a name for herself recently in her assaults on accepted science. From her Agenda 21 conspiracy, which seems to hold that scientists and policy makers across the world are secretly involved in an elaborate conspiracy to control all aspects of our lives, to supporting the chemtrail conspiracy, which claims aeroplanes deliberately drop chemicals on the population for some reason. Apparently, it happens right here in Adelaide. To quote the Hon. Ann Bressington, 'from two unmarked plain white small aircraft that often land at Parafield Airport after a morning spray'.

Many such conspiracy assaults on science can be mildly amusing and, apart from encouraging others to abandon reason and critical thinking, do not necessarily do much external harm. However, some anti-science irrationality actually causes harm—potentially, great harm. The Hon. Ann Bressington is a well-known and vocal opponent of the fluoridation of water. I am not an expert in this area of science, so I rely on the overwhelming scientific consensus. Australia's National Health and Medical Research Council and the World Health Organisation are strong supporters, and the US Centre for Disease Control and Prevention have called fluoridation of public water supplies one of the 10 most important public health achievements of the 20th century.

It is suggested that fluoride is dangerous because it is toxic. This falsehood comes from a very fundamental misunderstanding of the idea of toxicity. Toxicity is dose dependent; it depends literally on how much you have. The water to which fluoride is added is toxic in high enough doses; when consumed in large quantities, people die from water intoxication. Respected scientists, experts in their field, those whose research is properly peer reviewed, overwhelmingly agree that the levels of fluoride added to public water supplies are safe and have a very positive dental health effect.

Then there are some anti-scientific pursuits that can actually lead to deaths, such as the anti-vaccination movement. The Hon. Ann Bressington commented on Twitter as recently as last month that vaccines are about population reduction. Nothing could be further removed from reality. Vaccines save the life of an estimated three million people every year.

As with the fluoridation of water, over time individuals, groups and researchers dwelling at the fringes of science have criticised the efficacy of vaccinations, or they have falsified or overstated potential side effects of vaccinations. Perhaps the best known example is that of Dr Andrew Wakefield, whose claim against the scientific consensus that the MMR vaccine might be linked to autism saw vaccination rates in England drop considerably. The dangers of relying on bad, not accepted science were highlighted when this particular doctor, who was found to have falsified his results, was struck off as a medical practitioner and massive conflicts of interest in his research were revealed.

The Australian Vaccination Network is a fearmongering anti-vaccination group pushing this life-threatening nonsense in this country. They have been the subject of various adverse findings and orders by health authorities, government departments and Liberal government ministers in their home base of New South Wales. I congratulate the New South Wales authorities for tackling this dangerous group.

The risks posed by the anti-vaccination movement are real. Millions die unnecessarily. Children too young to have their full course of vaccinations and the herd immunity that prevents the uncontrolled spread of horrible disease are put at risk. On vaccination the science is clear; the debate is over. The benefits of vaccines are so immense that the morality of advocating against them without very good evidence needs to be questioned. When bad science is promoted such that it can cause great harm, we have an obligation to call it out. We cannot stand idly by and let such claims go unchecked.

I note that the Hon. Rob Lucas is down to speak after me, and I invite the shadow health minister, who sits in this chamber, to join with me in condemning dangerous anti-scientific approaches to public health that can endanger lives and cause death.

LABOR PARTY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:38): I want to talk about the open division and disunity, sadly, within the state Labor Party and the state Labor government that we have seen over recent weeks, in particular, this last week. In the last 24 hours, we have seen a calculated and vindictive leak from within cabinet with the deliberate intention of seeking to undermine whatever authority Premier Weatherill has at the moment, and this was of his $7 million wellbeing initiative, to make us an Asian leader in wellbeing, to have retreats on Kangaroo Island, looking at the science of imagination and to do a number of wonderful other things that Premier Weatherill took to cabinet, or is taking to cabinet, for support, and that is his priority.

Mr President, as you would be well aware, we have seen open public warfare between yourself and the Premier in relation to issues of freedom of speech and media coverage of the parliament. We have seen open warfare between the Premier and finance minister O'Brien, where they have embarrassingly contradicted each other over the issue of the underwriting of construction insurance following QBE's decision to vacate the market. That comes hot on the heels, of course, of public conflict between those two in relation to cuts to the police budget and another cabinet leak in relation to further funding required to reverse some of those cuts.

We have seen today two Labor caucus members, Ms Vlahos and Ms Bedford, outside together with Liberal leader Steven Marshall condemning the Weatherill government's handling of the school stationery contracts, another show of open rebellion by Labor caucus members of a decision that Premier Weatherill and his cabinet have taken. Of course, we have seen the recent experience, novel to us all, of a former key adviser to former premier Rann, Ms Bottrall, spearheading a campaign against Labor's car park tax.

What we are seeing on a daily basis is a government of division and disunity, a government leaking against itself, and cabinet leaks on a weekly basis. Mr President, as you would well know, if a party or a government cannot govern itself, then how on earth can it govern the state? That is the situation that we have, sadly, at the moment. Whilst we have these massive priorities that should be considered by the government, we are seeing massive cuts in health and education, in hospitals and schools. At the same time we have a premier, deluded as he might be, going off with a proposal that he is championing for a $7 million wellbeing initiative, a centre for wellbeing here in South Australia, as what he sees as the major priority confronting this state whilst at the same time critical health and hospital programs are being cut left, right and centre.

The intriguing thing about this is the ongoing conflict between two key members of the cabinet, the Premier himself and the Minister for Finance, Mr O'Brien. It is well known that Mr O'Brien, who is unflatteringly referred to by some of his Labor colleagues as POTUS, believes that he should have been the Treasurer, rather than the Premier taking on the part-time Treasurer's role in the recent cabinet reshuffle. There was the public conflict in relation to the police budget cuts. There is the public conflict and contradictions in relation to the QBE decision, and then of course, interestingly, after that we see this leak from someone within cabinet seeking to embarrass the Premier over a $7 million wellbeing initiative.

There are some Labor people, cynics I know, who believe that that leak possibly came from someone very close to minister O'Brien. Only minister O'Brien will be able to put on the public record whether or not he agrees with the view some of his Labor colleagues are whispering in the corridors at the moment, that that is where people should be looking in relation to some of these particular issues—as I said, someone perhaps close to minister O'Brien. Sadly for the people of South Australia, whilst this government should be governing, all it is interested in at the moment is division and disunity.

MINING IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:43): In the 1840s, just a few years after proclamation in 1836, mining was a major industry in South Australia. Reports in London newspapers and journals were making names such as Kapunda and Burra familiar to their English readership. Then in 1851 many miners abruptly left for goldfields at Bathurst in New South Wales and then soon after for the very rich goldfields at the time of Victoria. Prior to that there were hardly any mines outside of South Australia at all.

In 1850 South Australia had 49 mines, 38 being for copper alone. Many people are unaware that South Australia led the country in mining prior to the gold rushes of 1851. In 1840 two Cornishmen discovered silver and lead ore at Glen Osmond on property owned by Oswald Gilles, the colonial treasurer. In 1841 a mining association was formed to mine this. Mining commenced and later a smelter was established just in time to smelt a few tonnes of ore before the 1851 gold rush, which resulted in an almost complete loss of mine workers. Operations then ceased, of course. The smelter chimney, the oldest in Australia, remains directly uphill from the tollgate today. Woodley Wines now stores wine in a cellar that connects to the mine tunnel itself.

Because of ore finds, the population of South Australia increased rapidly from about 15,000 to some 64,000 by 1851. Cornish, Welsh and German migrants came in their numbers. Discoveries were often kept hidden—I guess that is not surprising—and there are reports of outcrops being buried or covered with bushes, and on at least one occasion a shepherd's hut was erected over a copper outcrop.

The discovery of copper at Kapunda in 1842 by two men, Francis Dutton and Charles Bagot, was kept secret. They did not own the land, so they had the 80-acre section surveyed and offered the government the set price of £1 per acre. The land was advertised for a month and since they were the only bidders, they received the land. The discovery was then announced and much ore was sought.

In 1844, Australia's first copper mine was established. Soon after that, South Australia became known as 'the copper state'. The mining was so successful that soon afterwards, there were five mines operating in the area. Wheat planted and harvested in 1844 declined seriously due to lack of labour. By 1851, Kapunda had 350 houses and nearly 2,000 people, with chapels, stores, two inns and a post office. But then miners left in large numbers for interstate goldfields. By the end of 1852, there were only four men left at the mine. It was not until 1856 that one of the mines achieved full production again. The other four mines remained abandoned.

In mid-1845, two shepherds in the Burra area, William Streair and Thomas Pickett, found copper deposits on separate properties where they each worked. Streair rode to Adelaide with his specimens and showed them to merchants. They offered him £8 for information as to the location and he accepted. On the trip to investigate the location, the merchants became aware of Pickett's discovery and agreed to pay him £10. This turned out to be the major copper lode at Burra.

Within a few years, the £5 shares in the company were worth something like £200 and annual dividends by 1847 were 800 per cent. Until 1849, copper ore from Burra was shipped to Wales for smelting. It has been estimated that prior to that, at least 1,200 bullock carts, each carrying around 2½ tons of ore would have been on the road at one time between Burra and Port Adelaide. By 1949 a smelter was established at Burra and the lack of trees due to this is still evident to this day.

By 1851, 5,000 people were living in the five townships of Burra. This included 1,500 living in dugouts in the banks of the Burra Creek. Some of these can still be seen on the Heritage Passport Trail. I personally recommend taking this trail to see the 49 historical sites, including mine workings, a gaol, churches and brewery. Local residents have done a magnificent job of preserving these sites for tourists and I wholeheartedly recommend it to those interested.

Picket only ever received the £10 for his discovery, and in 1852 he was found burnt to death in an abandoned hut with an empty bottle beside him. Mining made a huge contribution to the wealth of the colony in the 1840s, but the good times were cut short by the rush to interstate goldfields.

I mention this today as it is somewhat of an interesting tale about one of our more interesting regions in South Australia. I think we often forget what rich heritage we have in this state. It is a wonderful region through there—close to the Clare Valley which is well known for the excellent wines that the region produces. This is an attempt to draw attention to it because it is a

great tourist region that has seen difficult times in attracting tourists, but there should be no reason for that. There is a rich heritage for people to explore, wonderful wine in the region and I believe it is a place that South Australia can be truly proud of.

AFRICAN FESTIVAL

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:48): I rise today to speak about the African Cultural Festival which was held on 9 March at Hindmarsh Square, Adelaide. The African community in South Australia is diverse and made up of many different ethnic and religious groups. The African Communities Council of South Australia is an umbrella organisation consisting of 35 member organisations from 18 African countries. It is truly remarkable that diverse African communities combined their resources and passion for their cultures in organising yet another fantastic African cultural festival.

This annual African festival allows the communities to showcase the vibrant culture and traditions to the South Australian public. This event attracts huge crowds every year, eager to experience exotic cuisines, spectacular and colourful costumes and highly entertaining performance through songs, music and dance. The festival is also a bridge to greater understanding as Africans and non-Africans come together in friendship to celebrate our state's cultural diversity.

It was a pleasure and privilege to attend the colourful and highly entertaining African festival this year with David Pisoni, member for Unley, and shadow minister for education, training, families and multicultural affairs. It was good to see the Lieutenant Governor, Hieu Van Le, and the Hon. Jack Snelling amongst the VIP guests at the event. In addition, I was very pleased to see so many Liberal candidates on the day: Carmen Garcia, Terina Monteagle, Scott Roberts and Joe Barry were showing their support and engaging with African communities on the day. I pay special tribute to Dr Joseph Masika, OAM, Chairperson of the African Communities Council of South Australia. On 26 January this year Dr Masika was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia for his 27 years of voluntary service to the community in Australia and overseas.

Dr Masika's passion has been particularly in migrants, senior citizens, refugees, disability, mental health and multiculturalism. His outstanding contribution to the community has resulted in considerable community development, and his volunteering and advocacy roles have been instrumental in the strengthening of communities and individuals to ensure that all enjoy a good quality of life in Australia. Dr Masika was a manager of multicultural health, advocacy, counselling and education at the Migrant Resource Centre of SA. He has very impressive credentials.

In addition to thanking Dr Masika, I also extend special thanks to the elders, leaders, committee members and volunteers working tirelessly to put together the African festival and to further the interests of their communities, to build bridges with the broader South Australian community and actively promote the achievements and contributions of the African community.

On this note I also say that I am very proud of the strong track record and support by the Liberal Party to build a vibrant and harmonious multicultural South Australia. Last night David Pisoni, member for Unley, and I had the greatest pleasure in hosting a South Sudanese community forum. We invited 35 leaders from the South Sudanese community to Parliament House. It was a very engaging forum where members share a number of issues and aspirations with the members of the Liberal Party.

It was a very engaging forum, and I thank Michelle Lensink, Isobel Redmond and Dan van Holst Pellekaan for joining us at that forum. We did a tour and the Leader of the Opposition, Steven Marshall, gave us a lot of insights about the House of Assembly, and most of the South Sudanese community groups and leaders really enjoyed the visit. Of course we ran into the group that was hosted by the Hon. John Dawkins, and the Hon. Terry Stephens was also there, so they also enjoyed meeting the other members of the community.

The South Sudanese community shared with us many of the aspirations and visions. They also like to identify and nurture leadership potential within the South Sudanese communities, especially amongst their young people who will be their future ambassadors and decision-makers. They also like to actively engage with politicians to help promote the achievements and contributions of the African community, to further enhance the economic, social and cultural development of our state. It is truly wonderful to see them engaging in the democratic process and also engaging with politicians who would actually help them develop policies that will strengthen their abilities to become better citizens in our state.

I wish to talk about Dr Masika for a second because he is a true promoter in addressing a lot of problems not only for his community but also he is a great white ribbon ambassador—a bit like the honourable President sitting in the chair. He is also the winner of the Australian-African Man of the Year Award 2011. Dr Masika also is a winner of the African-Australian Living Legend Award of 2012, so a very remarkable man. On that note, I would just like to say that it has truly been a highly enjoyable event at the African festival. I look forward to the next one; it will be bigger and better.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:54): This week in ABC news reports and in other media, we have heard about the ongoing crisis in mental health and the lack of acute mental health beds in the state's public hospitals, particularly down at the Flinders public hospital with the closure of beds within the Margaret Tobin Unit. It is absolutely unacceptable that people with mental illness are being held in an emergency department for a number of days, rather than hours, and that in some cases, for both their own safety and that of those around them, this results in the shackling of patients to the bed. This is a complete violation of human rights and not what we should expect to be happening in 2013 in the health system of a First World country.

Unfortunately this government continues to ignore the overall crisis in mental health and the needs of people with borderline personality disorder. I find it somewhat timely that on Monday, when Adelaide's mental health patients were spending their days in an inappropriate environment of emergency departments rather than in mental health beds around Adelaide, the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia released the Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Borderline Personality Disorder.

I am very pleased to see these released, as borderline personality disorder (BPD) is a much maligned disorder and is often difficult to treat. There is also a complete dearth of appropriate treatment facilities in South Australia in metropolitan and rural and regional areas. I would like to highlight some of the issues raised in the stated need for this clinical guideline:

> The care of people with BPD is very challenging for health professionals and for the health system. Australians with BPD experience difficulties gaining access to effective treatment and support services. In 2005, consultation by the Mental Health Council of Australia and the Brain and Mind Research Institute in association with the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, reported that people with BPD, carers and service providers throughout Australian mental health services expressed concern that the availability of BPD therapies is extremely limited, particularly for psychological therapies.
>
> The urgent need for accessible appropriate treatment for people with BPD has been acknowledged by an Australian Parliament Senate Select Committee on Mental Health and an Australian Parliament Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs. These committees identified several areas in which the Australian health system must be improved to provide better care and support options for people with BPD, and reported the following findings:
>
> - BPD is under-recognised.
> - Health professionals are often not aware of the most effective treatments for BPD, and these are not being offered to people who need them.
> - Due to lack of appropriate services, people with BPD often present to emergency departments or are admitted to secure inpatient units. These treatment settings are not therapeutic for people with BPD and can contribute to the cycle of admission, self-destructive and other maladaptive behaviours, and readmission.
> - Consumers and carers have commonly reported discrimination by mental health professionals against people with BPD...
> - Access to BPD services within the criminal justice system is limited, despite the relatively high rates of BPD among prison populations.

Many things that I harp on about in this chamber can both prevent poor outcomes and improve the lives of South Australians if we follow the reports and guidelines regularly presented to us by experts. BPD is one of these issues: a mental health matter with at least a 1 to 2 per cent prevalence rate in the community, and we need to ensure that our state Labor government implements these recommendations with some vigour and purpose.

At present we are a long way off, to say the least. We have no specialist education, information or treatment services. People with BPD are often on long waiting lists for the accepted best outpatient treatment—dialectical behaviour therapy. Our health professionals do not get enough training. Carers of people with BPD find themselves in a quagmire with a lack of support and services. It is a mess. The sooner the government admits we urgently need a specialist facility,

such as the Spectrum service in Victoria, which I have mentioned in this place before, the better off we will all be.

TURNER EXHIBITION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:59): I rise to commend the Art Gallery of South Australia on Turner from the Tate: the Making of a Master, which is at the gallery until 19 May. Adelaide and Canberra are the only two Australian centres to receive this magnificent collection of J.M.W. Turner's work.

Turner's work is familiar to most art lovers through his most famous works, including *Rain, Steam and Speed*, *The Burning of the Houses of Lords and Commons* and *Venice, the Bridge of Sighs*. His enormous body of work continues to be held in high esteem and affection, representing as it does both the preoccupations of the England of the Industrial Revolution and the landscape tradition that Turner himself revolutionised with his experiments in painting light.

Just as an example of the continued resonance of Turner's work, one of his most famous paintings, *The Fighting Temeraire*, appears in the most recent 007 film *Skyfall*. *Skyfall* is the film that has grossed over $1 billion. It is a very well-received film that has probably taken more than, I think, most films. It gives a subtle juxtaposition of Turner's image with the characters and is well worth noting. Bond and the young Q meet in front of the painting, which shows the veteran of the Battle of Waterloo, now superseded, being towed off to the breaker's yard by a steam tug at sunset.

Moving away from the world of cinema spies, it is as a broad survey of Turner's work over his lifetime that this exhibition, comprising a number of oil paintings, sketchbooks, works on paper and watercolours, is of interest to all who visit it. It pays homage to the genius of Turner, who is widely acknowledged as one of the foremost landscapists of the 19th century.

Curiously, it also represents significant points of connection with Australia. Included in the exhibition is *A Disaster at Sea*. Its presence represents a real coup on the part of the Art Gallery because the painting was restored especially to travel to Adelaide. It depicts the foundering of a convict ship bound for the penal colony in New South Wales. There is also the presence in the show, and permanently at the gallery, of South Australia's own Turner masterpiece *Scarborough Town and Castle: Morning: Boys Catching Crabs*.

The generosity and trust of Tate Britain in consigning these precious pieces to Adelaide should be applauded. This consignment also says a lot about the calibre of our gallery and of the director and staff whose hard work and commitment have seen the project come to fruition.

A $2 million grant enabled the exhibition to be commissioned. The government's vision for cultural tourism should be congratulated. Already, well over 15,000 art lovers have attended the exhibition and I hope that, by its close on 19 May, visitor numbers will have broken all former records. I would like to congratulate the Art Gallery of South Australia and recommend this remarkable exhibition.

FORMAT COLLECTIVE INC.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:02): I rise today to speak on why Format always wins. For many of you, Format may be something unknown to you, but for many young people and many artists, musicians, writers and creatives in the city of Adelaide Format is well known. What is Format? According to their website, the 'Format Collective is a group of artists, writers, musicians and party technicians loosely based around the Format Zine Shop in Adelaide's CBD' on Peel Street. A zine is, in fact, a hand-produced magazine, for those of you who have not heard of such a thing.

Aside from the zine shop they have there, they hold monthly or so exhibitions, regular live music gigs, what they call 'random acts of public art', a nifty lo-fi recording studio and the annual Format Festival. At times, they have also housed other artistic enterprises. I have certainly been to craft sort of festivals, if you like, there. I also know that local theatre production companies have housed their officers there and used that space. Radio Adelaide have held their birthday party launch there and many of those who are aware of the arts scene and the creative scene in Adelaide are actually very familiar with the work of Format.

Each member of the collective is autonomous, answerable to nobody and there is nothing but, as they say again on the website, 'a vague sort of consensus'. Everyone does their own thing with the space and, once a week, they meet up and let each other know what they have done and

what they intend to do. They say that if they were to assign Format an ideology it should be anarcho-situationism or techno-libertarianism or even neo-leisure revivalism, perhaps naive post-entertainment-utopianism or, in fact, party-to-survivalism. Format does not get any money; it is completely run by volunteers, and they put on some pretty darn amazing events.

Format has been on Peel Street since 2010. In that time, Format has run five major festivals, hundreds of exhibitions, many live music shows, sold thousands of zines and given the community a place to meet, rehearse, record, perform, read, or just to check emails, all of it on a shoestring budget.

Lately, Format's financial position has become more tenuous because of the renovation of the building in which it is housed. In fact, over the past eight months, the renovations on the floor above have involved cutting utilities, deafening construction noise, a quantity of rubble and dust that has severely impacted Format's capacity to function, let alone retain an income, and, in addition to that, it has recently been notified by its property developer landlord that the rent would be up for market review. It still manages to struggle on.

However, the next bit of news that Format was to receive is the reason for this construction above them in Peel Street: there is to be a new tenant moving in, an offshoot of the Melbourne-based Hub Space. On the new Hub Adelaide website, it is announced:

> The SA government have announced that they will provide up to $1m in initial seed funding for Hub Adelaide. This will be spent on the fit-out of the Peel St property, recruitment and cocreation of the community and the space.

So the state government has given some Victorians $1 million to fit out the space above Format in a building it has occupied since 2010. To cap it all off, it now looks like Format is going to have to close down this month, and it is celebrating with a party called 'Format Always Wins' on the last weekend of this month. However, Format does question why (and I agree) it is being shafted, given the several thousand people who have been in touch to give their support, including, I understand, the live music Thinker in Residence and other members of the government and that we are being told by this state government that we need more creative hubs.

Format makes it clear that it has no grudge against Hub Adelaide. It does not blame Hub Adelaide, but it does question why, when it was assured that this government was sympathetic, it was negotiated with the landlord to acquire the space upstairs from Format for an interstate business which would benefit from a $1 million incentive. Format says on its website that the phrase, 'breathtaking betrayal' sounds a bit dramatic, but that it is not far from the mark, and it challenges this government—and I second that challenge—to 'prove that we lie.' Prove that Format always wins by actually starting with the creatives in this city and in this state and supporting those people first. There is no animosity between Format and Hub Adelaide; it wishes Hub Adelaide the best, but let us support Format.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: MURRAY-DARLING BASIN WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:08): I move:

> That the report of the committee, on Water Resource Management in the Murray Darling Basin: Volume 3—Postscript, be noted.

This postscript report is the fifth report of the Natural Resources Committee on water resource management in the Murray-Darling Basin since the committee first started taking evidence on the topic in November 2007.

The Natural Resources Committee recommended in its fourth report, tabled in March 2012, that additional hydrological modelling should be undertaken to determine the viability of removing some of the operational constraints that prevent greater quantities of water being made available to the River Murray and South Australia.

The Hon. Jay Weatherill MP established a Premier's task force in November 2011 to coordinate South Australia's response to the draft Murray-Darling Basin plan. The Natural Resources Committee's role was independent of this task force.

The Murray-Darling Basin Authority undertook additional modelling of the likely benefits to the river system from both higher volumes and higher flow rates during 2012. Federal minister Tony Burke released the results of the modelling on 9 October 2012. Four scenarios were modelled, returning 2,800 and 3,200 gigalitres per year to the river, with unchanged operational

constraints, and returned 2,800 and 3,200 gigalitres, together with relaxed operational constraints. The modelling showed that by relaxing constraints in the system better environmental outcomes could be achieved for the Lower Lakes, Coorong and Murray Mouth. There are also some benefits to the Riverland-Chowilla Floodplain.

The Premier, the Hon. Jay Weatherill, moved a motion in the House of Assembly on 1 November 2012 supporting the adoption of the basin plan. The Premier emphasised salt export through the mouth, reduced dredging and maintaining water in the Lower Lakes to avoid acidification and riverbank collapse. The Premier's motion was carried on 27 November 2012 after extended debate in the house.

On 22 November 2012, federal water minister, the Hon. Tony Burke MP, signed the basin plan into law. The plan provides for the return of 2,750 gigalitres to the basin, with an additional 450 gigalitres to be delivered by 2024, giving a total of 3,200 gigalitres per year. On 26 October, the Prime Minister had already announced that $1.77 billion would be spent over 10 years to secure additional water through on-farm efficiency measures.

I note that a number of decades ago, irrigators in South Australia spent their own money and took on the job of improving their infrastructure to prevent leakage and the like. It is just a shame that their interstate counterparts did not follow suit and are now relying on taxpayers' money to do that job for them. On 7 February 2013, the federal water minister announced that the Water Amendment (Water for the Environment Special Account) Bill had been passed through parliament, securing the additional 450 gigalitres of water and its associated $1.77 billion in funding.

The adoption of the basin plan is great news, although the delayed targets are disappointing. We can only hope that another major drought does not occur before the extra water begins to flow. We need to recognise that as well as Adelaide, almost every town and region in the state as far west as Ceduna remains dependent on a healthy river for its water supply. Committee member and member for Frome, Mr Geoff Brock MP, is always quick to remind us that cities like Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla would cease to exist without a reliable water source, and at the present time the Murray is the only source.

South Australia will need to stick to its guns on the need for additional water, because Victoria and New South Wales have said they will oppose the proposed 3,200 gigalitres per year water return in the basin plan. It is easy to forget the dire situation the basin faced in 2010 before the drought broke. We do not want to ever experience a return to such conditions. The downside to the proposal is that some riverside shacks in South Australia will be exposed to a high risk of flooding. This is something we need to be aware of and plan for, bearing in mind that in the past shack areas were regularly flooded and it is only in more recent times that this has not occurred.

I wish to thank all those who gave their time to assist the committee with its report. The committee heard evidence from two witnesses from the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources as well as reviewing documentation provided by the department on the Murray-Darling Basin Authority modelling and the South Australian scientific review of the modelling. I commend the members of the committee: presiding member the Hon. Steph Key MP, Mr Geoff Brock MP, Mrs Robyn Geraghty MP, Mr Lee Odenwalder MP, Mr Don Pegler MP, Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan MP, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, and former committee member and great contributor to the inquiry, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC, for their significant contributions to this report.

All members have worked cooperatively on this report, as they always seem to do on this committee. They do work well together and there are some very good outcomes that arise from the reports. I would like to thank the committee—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: It is a well-chaired committee.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It is; always has been since I have known it. The Hon. John Dawkins MLC and all members have worked cooperatively on this report. Finally, I thank the committee staff for their assistance. They do a great job, and without them a report of such calibre would be very difficult to deliver. I commend the report to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

MOUNT BARKER DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. M. PARNELL (16:16): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes—

   (a) the report of the Ombudsman entitled Investigation into the Growth Investigation Areas Report Procurement laid on the table of this council on 5 March 2013;

   (b) the findings of the report in relation to conflict of interest, lack of probity, the integrity of the procurement process and other maladministration;

   (c) the additional reported comments of the Ombudsman to the media that he expected and hoped that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption would investigate matters raised in his report; and

   (d) that the main operative provisions of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 are yet to be proclaimed.

2. Calls on the government to proclaim the commencement of the remainder of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 as soon as possible.

3. On the commencement of the act, refers the Ombudsman's report to the Office for Public Integrity pursuant to section 17 of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012.

4. Calls on the government to immediately release the Growth Investigation Areas Report as recommended by the Ombudsman.

When the Ombudsman's report was handed down and tabled in parliament two weeks ago, the first question I was asked by a journalist was, 'You must feel vindicated,' because, as all members know, I have been talking about this issue in parliamentary motions and in bills and in questions for the last four years or longer.

I have raised the issue of the Mount Barker rezoning and the failure of process at public meetings, I have raised it at meetings of the Development Policy Advisory Committee, I have raised it in the media. Over many years, I have tried to follow the paper trail, and I have been stymied at every turn by the government and the property developers. I have been dragged before the District Court to defend the right of members of the public to access documents held by the planning department.

But now we have this Ombudsman's report. In his 67-page report, the Ombudsman has joined the dots, and he has concluded what I have known for years and what the residents of Mount Barker have known for years, and that is that the planning system has failed. The planning system, which is supposed to focus on the wellbeing and the best interests of all South Australians, has been demeaned, degraded and devalued by the inability of the government to avoid or even manage the most obvious and clear-cut case of conflict of interest.

I will not deny that I do feel vindicated by this report. However, my overwhelming emotions are of frustration and despair that the government clearly intends to tough it out and has no intention of addressing the end results of its flawed planning processes, and that is the flawed planning outcomes that have delivered us the travesty of the Mount Barker urban sprawl.

It is clear to me that the government values the profits of its developer mates ahead of the public interest and, for that, the people of Mount Barker will most certainly maintain their rage—and my prediction is that they will not be alone. As I will outline later, the conflict of interest that was identified at Mount Barker is certain to have been repeated elsewhere in South Australia.

If you look at paragraph 249 of the Ombudsman's report, you can find a list of areas where the consulting firm Connor Holmes has worked prior to its appointment by the government to write the GIA report, and that list of locations is as follows: Buckland Park, Roseworthy, Gawler East, Cheetham salt works, Mount Barker, Victor Harbor, Goolwa North, Playford North, Blakeview, Penfield, Mawson Lakes, Greater Edinburgh Parks, Northfield, Walkley Heights, Seaford, Munno Parra. These are the areas we have to look at next. They are areas that were included in the Growth Investigation Areas, which I will henceforth refer to as the GIA report. So, the conflict of interest findings that the Ombudsman made in relation to Mount Barker are just as likely to be relevant to those areas as well.

The motion invites members to note the Ombudsman's report. As members know, on 5 March 2013 the Ombudsman, Richard Bingham, tabled in parliament his report on the departmental procurement processes associated with the Growth Investigation Areas Report. The issue was referred to the Ombudsman by the Legislative Council on 30 May 2012. In his media release accompanying the report, the Ombudsman said:

The GIA report was a central contributor to the development of the government's 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, and was prepared on behalf of the planning department by consultants Connor Holmes Pty Ltd. However,

the Ombudsman investigation focused on the relevant departmental procurement processes rather than on Connor Holmes' role.

It is important to note that the Ombudsman did not and could not investigate or make any determination on whether or not the government had made good decisions in approving the 30-year plan or even whether Connor Holmes had done a good job, either on behalf of its property developer clients or on behalf of the government. That was not the Ombudsman's role and he made no comment on the merits or otherwise of rezoning land at Mount Barker or anywhere else.

The Ombudsman is not a town planner, as I understand his qualifications. He purely looked at the process, so whether or not the failure of process that was identified by the Ombudsman supports the proposition that the outcome of the planning process is also flawed ultimately will be a judgement for others, including the Legislative Council.

What did the Ombudsman say in his report? He commences his observations in the executive summary as follows:

> The legislated planning system in this state governs where and how the community lives. It can determine the quality of our physical, social, visual and economic environment, and impact on the wellbeing of our daily life. The community entrusts the government to develop and administer the state's planning system in the public interest.
>
> Where the government chooses to engage consultants to assist in achieving its planning objectives, the community is entitled to expect that rigorous and accountable procurement processes will be followed—including ensuring consultant probity and identifying and dealing with conflicts of interest. Where government fails to do this, community confidence is lost.

That is why in his opinion piece in *InDaily* on 6 March, David Washington, who I should note acknowledges at the foot of his piece that he was planning minister John Rau's media adviser from January 2011 to July 2012, says:

> The debacle of the Mount Barker urban expansion is the reason why we cannot have a calm and sensible debate about development in South Australia.
>
> The smell emanating from the government's decision to massively expand Mount Barker's urban boundary overpowers any of the sweeter offerings it has been attempting to make in the area of planning and development.
>
> Protecting McLaren Vale and the Barossa from urban sprawl? Fine—but what about Mount Barker? Improving design input into city buildings? Yeah, yeah—but what about Mount Barker?
>
> Until the Mount Barker issue is dealt with openly—once and for all—the community is quite right to question all motives and processes involved in South Australia's planning and development system.

Back to the Ombudsman's report. The Ombudsman goes to some lengths to identify what went wrong with the procurement process for the GIA consultancy. How was it that something that was so blindingly obvious to the rest of the community was invisible to the government? The Ombudsman identifies three key factors as contributing to compromising the integrity of the GIA procurement process. These were: first, political imperatives and the need for speedy completion of the GIA project; secondly, staffing and agency changes; and, thirdly, a failure to appreciate the significance of conflict of interest in procurement.

As for that last point, it is hard to comprehend how the government could not have been aware of the problem. For example, on 15 September 2008, PIRSA's procurement adviser unit sent an email to the Crown Solicitor's Office seeking advice on conflict of interest in relation to the related 30-year plan tender, a process also involving Connor Holmes and run in parallel with the GIA project. The Ombudsman quotes directly from the response from the Crown Solicitor dated 29 September 2008:

> In any Government procurement process the basic starting point should be that, unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary, a conflict of interest situation whether actual or perceived, should not be permitted...in the context of Government procurement processes the generally accepted principle is that processes must be free, and be seen to be free, of conflict and bias in decision-making. This is essential for maintaining public confidence in the integrity of these processes. Public perception as to the operation of such processes is of the utmost importance.

That is the advice of the Crown Solicitor's Office. It is incomprehensible that the government did not understand what that meant. I would like, however, to touch briefly on the other two factors identified by the Ombudsman: the factor of 'political imperatives and the need for speedy completion of the GIA project'.

Whether or not any of these political imperatives (as the Ombudsman calls them) were corrupt with a capital 'C' or even with a small 'c', or whether some other form of maladministration is involved, will ultimately be a question for the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC).

No doubt, the ICAC commissioner will want to look at the political donation history of the developers. I have raised it before in this place, that is, the Walker Corporation is a big donor to the ALP and has also been the beneficiary of discretionary ministerial decisions, including the approval of the Buckland Park development and this rezoning at Mount Barker.

I note that political imperatives have long been a hallmark of this government, whether it be the planning abomination that is the Buckland Park development, or even the desperate desire for cranes on the skyline that drove the government to allow development approvals to be granted two weeks before the public consultation process had even finished, as we saw with the Capital City Development Plan Amendment. So is it any wonder that in many parts of the community the government's policy is regarded as 'development at any cost'?

The final factor raised by the Ombudsman was the issue of staffing and agency changes. I will quote two paragraphs from the Ombudsman's report. Paragraph 192 reads:

> Turning to government planning, it appears that consultants are often relied upon in planning matters. My investigation took evidence from the president of the Planning Institute of Australia, SA Division (PIA) during the time of the GIA project procurement. It is relevant to note that the president disclosed at the outset to my investigation, that the consulting company for which she works provided a capability statement during the GIA project procurement process.

Paragraph 193 reads:

> The president quoted in her evidence that PIA members do 'a lot of the work that government staff did in the old days'. Further, in her view, resource shortage within government planning is driving a 'closer than usual relationship between consultants and government'.

This is from a government that was going to end privatisation, this move towards a closer relationship with private consultants. This outsourcing, in fact, is actually one of the more insidious forms of privatisation. What the government has done is replaced the frank and fearless advice of public servants with the conflicted and self-serving advice of private consultants. No wonder the public is angry.

Land-use planning is a public interest exercise and it should be conducted by people whose only interest is the public interest. I note from the Deputy Premier's statement to parliament yesterday that he said the following:

> The planning department has significantly increased its capacity to deliver in-depth technical advice since 2008. This has significantly reduced the need to engage consultants and hence the risk of future conflict of interest issues of the nature identified by the Ombudsman.

What the Deputy Premier is acknowledging is that, over a period of years, they have got this terribly wrong, but rather than take comfort from the fact that the Deputy Premier—the planning minister—is going to make sure that there is less outsourced work, the problem is that the damage has been done. The damage was the GIA report. The damage was the 30-year plan.

This approach of the government is the consequence of cuts to essential public services. For the benefit of opposition members of this chamber, take note of what happens when the Public Service is cut in relation to the provision of important public services like planning. This is where those sorts of policies lead. Less public servants is more privatisation, more outsourcing and more conflict of interest.

So, what did the government know about the conflict of interest in relation to Connor Holmes and the Mount Barker project? They certainly knew there was a conflict, but they did nothing about it. To quote from paragraph 286 of the Ombudsman's report:

> It is clear from the documentation that before and during the GIA procurement process, relevant Planning SA officers knew of Connor Holmes representation of the Mount Barker consortium and their advocacy for expansion and development in the area to the minister. However, it was not identified that Connor Holmes were conflicted in relation to GIA project work in the area. In my view this failure infected the integrity of the procurement.

It is clear that the department knew that the people they had entrusted with the job of preparing the GIA report were the same people who were advocating on behalf of the private property developers, who in fact owned or had stakes in the land that was being considered for rezoning.

The outcome of this all was—and it will come as no surprise to members—that the final product produced by Connor Holmes in the GIA report was very close to the position they had taken when lobbying on behalf of their property developer consortium clients. In fact, I do not do it justice: it is far worse than that. What they gave the government as a paid consultant was identical

to what they gave the government as a lobbyist for the developers! I quote from paragraph 329 of the Ombudsman's report:

> It appears that Connor Holmes preliminary report on Mount Barker was completed by 23 December 2008. I note that the chief planning officer [that is, of the department] reported that he had 'a number of misgivings'. One, for example, was that the proposed urban boundary was 'the same as that put to the minister earlier in the year by the consortium of developers'.

So, the bottom line is that when it came time for Connor Holmes to report to the government with the GIA, what Connor Holmes said was, 'Here's one we prepared earlier.' The proposed urban boundary was exactly the same. The same boundary they used to lobby the minister on behalf of private consultants was what they presented to the minister as a result of their consultancy report.

The problem, of course, is that this is not some 1970s cooking show; this is the long-term planning of our state. It is not good enough for Connor Holmes to have been allowed to get away with saying, 'Here's one we prepared earlier,' and to present the government, as a consultant, with exactly the same urban boundary as they had been lobbying for on behalf of their private clients.

Of course you could say that this was simply a happy convergence of interests that was at work here. You might say that it was a happy coincidence that what was good for the consortium of property developers was also good for the people of South Australia. I do not believe that; I do not believe it for one minute. The people of Mount Barker do not believe that. We know that the system is rotten and that the unresolved conflict of interest is at the heart of the stench.

I refer now to the referral of these matters to the Independent Commission Against Corruption. In his statement accompanying the release of his report—a media statement—the Ombudsman said:

> I'd be expecting, and I'd be hoping, that the ICAC will be casting a very serious eye at the sorts of things we found in this report.

Since then we have the minister's statement from yesterday, and I will just refer to it briefly. Planning minister and Deputy Premier, John Rau, in his statement says:

> The Ombudsman has indicated to me that he has written to the Office for Public Integrity establishment team and provided a copy of his report, with a view to their consideration of what might be done about his expressed concerns regarding apparent maladministration. That having been done, there is no need for me to repeat the exercise.

In other words, the matter is already in the hands of the office of public integrity. What an absolute cop-out is that from the Minister for Planning!

He is saying that the Ombudsman has already sent it off—I should say not to the office of public integrity but to the Office for Public Integrity Establishment Team because, as the motion before the council indicates, we have not yet had the formal establishment of the office of public integrity. We do not yet have the establishment of the ICAC.

That is not expected until, I am led to believe, September of this year. Really, that is leaving things too late. We had the announcement of the appointment before Christmas; why on earth do we need to wait until September for this office to be established? But the minister does not get off the hook by saying that the Ombudsman himself has sent it to the Office for Public Integrity Establishment Team and therefore he does not need to.

The other thing that is worth pointing out is that the Mount Barker council has just this week unanimously resolved to refer this same matter to the ICAC, and I would like to acknowledge the work of Mount Barker councillor Ian Grosser, a tireless advocate for his community. It was he who steered that motion through council this week. We have already had two agencies referring it to the ICAC. I will be a third; I will refer it myself. I have had a look at the list of people who can refer—members of parliament can—and I want this chamber to be the fourth.

In passing this resolution, when it comes to a vote—on the next Wednesday of sitting is my expectation, but I will give notice—I expect this chamber will be the fourth body to refer this matter to the ICAC. The statement made by the Deputy Premier yesterday contained a number of interesting observations. One of the things that the Deputy Premier said was:

> The selection of Mount Barker as a growth area, was evidence based and was not criticised by the Ombudsman.

Of course it was not criticised by the Ombudsman because the Ombudsman is not a town planner. It was not in his brief; it was not part of his job. In fact, the Ombudsman would have been out of

order in commenting on the merits of the planning decisions that were made. This is a classic straw man argument.

So let us look at the actual substantive response of the planning minister to the Ombudsman's report and I have to say, it is pathetic. Four things: firstly, he is going to get his department to have a look at it. Of course he is going to get his department to have a look at it but that does not fill anyone with any confidence, especially not the people of Mount Barker, given that it was his department that was responsible for the failings identified in the Ombudsman's report.

Secondly, he is going to get the Procurement Board to have a look at it. Yes, that is fine, but that does not fix the problem either. Thirdly, he is going to get Mr Brian Hayes QC and his expert panel on planning reform to have a look at it. They are reporting at the end of 2014; that is when they are going to have a look at it. Fourthly, he is going to have a look at it himself, if he is still the minister when the 30-year plan comes up for review in February 2015. This is the decisive and firm response of the government. They are going to have a bit of a look at it and, if they can postpone it for several years, all the better.

What the Mount Barker residents wanted to hear was that the minister would take this more seriously and that he would put a freeze on further subdivision and a freeze on building new housing estates for those subdivisions that have already been approved. The minister says that is too hard. He says it is absurd to suggest that property developers be denied their profits that have resulted from what is now clearly a flawed and conflicted planning process. He is trying to do a Pontius Pilate, and it is not even Easter yet; he is trying to wash his hands of the outcome. Yesterday in his statement the minister said:

> In areas already rezoned, legal processes have existed to review or overturn any rezoning decision. This has not occurred in this case.

Who does he think he is fooling? There is no right of appeal against a rezoning under the Development Act. There is no right of appeal, so what opportunity would people have had to use these legal processes that have existed? Sure, you have always got the general right to apply to the court on judicial review if you have evidence that proper processes have not been followed but, again, until the Ombudsman's report came out two weeks ago, most people would not have had the evidence.

As I have said, I have been fighting the government and the developers in court to try to get the evidence. It was those documents that I eventually recovered out of the department, given reluctantly, after the developers lost the court case in the District Court, that formed the basis of the Ombudsman's finding. I have spent years of battling to try to get to the bottom of this and have been stymied at every turn by the government and by the developers.

There is no clear legal process to review or overturn the zoning decision: there is only judicial review. Such cases are notoriously difficult to bring. You just have to look at the instance where the Cheltenham Park residents gave it a go—they did not get very far. In fact, my understanding is there has only been one successful challenge to a ministerial zoning decision like this in 30 years. It is not something about which the minister can simply say, 'There was a process and no-one has used it.' Again, it is another straw man argument.

The question then arises: is the minister's reluctance to take action to remedy the problem at Mount Barker based on a lack of legal powers or is it based on a lack of political will? The answer is that it is certainly the latter because he does have the power and it is not too late. I was in Mount Barker last week. There are still cattle grazing in these fields. There has not been a single house built in these rezoned areas. Most of the subdivisions have not even been lodged yet, let alone approved. It is not too late to revisit these decisions.

The minister well knows that, until works have started, it is not too late for him to call this project in and take personal responsibility for it, and his power to do that lies in section 46 of the Development Act. This is a section that I have talked about a lot in this place, mostly because it has been abused, but here is a chance to put it to good use.

It is the major developments or projects division of the Development Act. Basically, what it says is that, if the minister is of the opinion that a declaration is needed for the proper assessment of developments because of their major environmental, social or economic importance, he can call it in. He can call that in and he can take the decision-making away from the council and away from the Development Assessment Commission. He can call that power in to himself—to the Governor,

technically, but that effectively means the government. The only restriction he faces in this case is where it says:

> (2) A declaration under this section does not extend to—
>
> (a) a development lawfully commenced by substantial work on the site of the development before publication of the notice in the *Gazette*.

There has been no substantial work on the site of the development. There are still cows there; there are not houses there. The minister has the power to call this development in and effectively put a halt to all the future subdivisions that could be lodged and even the existing subdivisions that have been lodged.

I acknowledge that there is no precedent for the minister taking such action. It has not been done before in a sort of remedial way as I am proposing here, but it is certainly possible. We know, because of the privative clause in section 48E, there is no challenge to any decision the minister makes under a major project declaration—no challenge. I encourage members to have a look at section 48E.

If the minister wants to buy time, if the minister wants to see how much of the omelette he can unscramble, then that is what he needs to do. He would declare all residential subdivisions within the rezoned area to be a major project. That has the additional benefits of the lack of appeal rights by developers and there is also no right to compensation. The minister has a virtually unfettered discretion to fix up this mess.

I am suggesting this as a holding measure. If the minister ultimately decides not to take permanent action, he can undo the declaration. He can take it out of the *Government Gazette* just as easily as he can put it in.

This is a desperate situation and I know what I am proposing is a desperate measure. As I say, I have been on the record many times about the abuse of major project status. I have been on the record saying how section 48E—the privative clause—needs to be repealed. It has not been, so let the minister now use it and use it for good.

The minister in his statement yesterday selectively quoted paragraphs from the Ombudsman's finding, but he has had to search very hard to find any conclusions that are positive or even neutral in relation to the government's behaviour. For example, he quotes paragraph 141 of the Ombudsman's report, where the Ombudsman states:

> I accept that Planning SA staff acted in good faith; that there was no intent to undermine the procurement process in seeking the capability statements; and that there was no intent to deceive the [Accredited Purchasing Unit].

That does not get us very far. Saying that the public servants involved did not intend to do the wrong thing, that they did not intend to be deceitful is not the point. They can tell that to the ICAC. They can have that discussion then. The problem is that the conflict of interest was known and it was real and it resulted in a flawed process that led to flawed outcomes, and the most flawed of all those outcomes was the unnecessary urban sprawl of Mount Barker.

The motion before us calls for the government to release the GIA. I note that as well as the Ombudsman releasing his own report on 5 March, he released another document entitled the Freedom of Information Act 1991 and the GIA report. That supplementary report, if you like, sets out the determinations of the government and the Ombudsman in relation to four freedom of information applications that were lodged by me. One of those applications was for the GIA report. The Ombudsman said:

> By determination dated 7 July 2010, the Ombudsman found that the report was exempt from disclosure (under the Cabinet document exemption in the FOI Act). But the Ombudsman suggested that whilst the GIA report was exempt from disclosure, in light of the objects of the FOI Act, there may be good reason why it should nonetheless be released. The GIA report has not been released.

Since the Ombudsman's report came out, there were others in the community who joined the chorus for the government to release the GIA report, people who joined the dots and worked out the importance of those documents. I mentioned before journalist David Washington from *InDaily* who said on 6 March, referring to the planning minister:

> If he wants to clear this up once and for all—and why wouldn't he?—he needs to immediately release the GIA report and then commission a full, public review of the Mt Barker DPA process.

What we saw yesterday is that, some 2½ years after the Ombudsman said that it would be a good idea to release the report, the government has finally done it. It was on the eve of this motion being presented to the Legislative Council. The government finally decided that it could no longer hide and that the veil of secrecy needed to be at least partially lifted.

The documents, including the GIA report and related planning documents, were tabled in both houses of parliament yesterday. They were tabled in hard copy format, as they are, but I note that they have now been uploaded to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure website and also the parliamentary website on the House of Assembly side. For the benefit of *Hansard*, I will give the URL for the departmental location of these documents: http://www.dpti.sa.gov.au/planning/home/technical_reports_greater_adelaide_planning_strategy.

In conclusion, as I said earlier, the Mount Barker conflict of interest findings are just the tip of the iceberg. I read out earlier a list of all the other areas where this conflict of interest is likely to have occurred, areas where Connor Holmes is on the record as having done planning work, some of which may be for local councils but much of which would be for private clients, and those areas overlap very strongly with the Growth Investigation Areas report locations as well.

But there are other areas of conflict of interest that have emerged, even in the last few days, that show that this is just the tip of the iceberg. Someone recently sent me the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee of The Rural City of Murray Bridge, dated 25 February 2013. I should say that they are not the sort of minutes that members necessarily pour over in great detail, but they were sent to me. No doubt the person thought I would have an interest in it. It shows the people who were present at the meeting, the staff who were in attendance, and does touch on the issue of conflict of interest.

Who was present at the meeting? First of all, Stuart Moseley, presiding member. Who were the staff in attendance? First listed, Mr Darren Starr, the acting manager of planning. When you get down to the conflict of interest section it states that:

> The Presiding Member advised that he and the Acting Manager Planning, Darren Starr, work for the same organisation Connor Holmes (A Fyfe Company) but that he did not consider any conflict [of interest] arises given that both roles are advisory to Council.

Let us go back to first principles here. This is a council committee. It is called the Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee. Why does the council have a committee? Because it has to, as stated in the Development Act, section 101A—Councils to establish strategic planning and development policy committees. So, who has The Rural City of Murray Bridge got on theirs? It is chaired by a principal of Connor Holmes and in terms of the chief staff representative, the acting manager of planning, he also works for Connor Holmes.

They say there is no conflict of interest because it is only advisory. Well, goodness gracious. The GIA report that was the subject of the Ombudsman's inquiry, could be argued to be just an advisory report and the government will argue that. It will say, 'We take lots of things into account when making rezoning decisions and the GIA report was only one of them.' I mean, have they learnt nothing? Have we learnt absolutely nothing?

Conflict of interest: it is one thing to declare that you have a conflict, but the Ombudsman agreed with me that declaring it does not make it go away. You actually have to prevent it in the first place, and if it cannot be prevented then you have to manage it, and neither of those things happened in the case of the GIA report. I do feel for the good people of Murray Bridge. It looks like they are facing, I think, a similar type of inquiry to the Ombudsman's inquiry into the GIA report. Conflict of interest: it is at every level of government.

I want to finish with an email I received yesterday from a constituent, someone called Mick, who I have never met. He wrote to me out of the blue. He got my email address off the website. Mick says:

> ...good to see somebody finally doing something in the corruption riddled state.
>
> Mr Parnell, is it at all possible that you could recommend that the ICAC mob look into the Gawler East development as well?

That was the question. I wrote back saying, yes—as I have just told the council, Mount Barker is just the tip of the iceberg. The same issues of conflict of interest arise in Gawler East, Roseworthy, the South and elsewhere. I wrote back to Mick and I told him that and he sent me another email today:

Thanks Mark but it doesn't matter mate. I have closed my business and my wife is wrapping hers up as we speak. We are selling the home we love in Evanston Park as we are threatened with a dual lane road running past our gate carrying 30,000 cars a day and we are leaving this state completely. I moved to South Australia 12 years ago with high hopes and have built a great life but after being ridden roughshod over by state government, councils and the like it seems that regular citizens are not important in this state and neither are our businesses. So we'll take them to where we are appreciated and where we are treated with a bit of respect. Thanks for your time, I'll see you in Tasmania.

I know the government will try to say that the action it is taking to fast-track projects, to get cranes on the skyline, is a pro-business agenda and is good for our state but, clearly, ordinary people do not see it like that. They see themselves being ignored. They see themselves being ridden roughshod over. They see the insincerity of government consultation processes where they put in submissions only to find that the decisions were made two weeks before the process was even finished. That is the impression people are starting to have, if they do not have it already, in relation to planning in South Australia.

This is an important motion. I will send members a note calling it to a vote as quickly as we can but, for now, I would urge all honourable members to read the Ombudsman's report and to have a think about what it means for the integrity of our planning system. I urge all members to support this motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (16:55): I move:

That the report of the committee, 2011-12, be noted.

The committee has an important role in investigating matters relating to the administration of the state's occupational health, safety, rehabilitation and compensation legislation and other legislation affecting these matters, including the performance of SafeWork and WorkCover. The annual report covers two financial years, namely, 2010-11 and 2011-12.

The Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Committee differs substantially in operation to other standing committees. While a number of factors are identical to all other standing committees of parliament, the key difference with this committee is that members are not remunerated, not that the press understand that issue; thus the members' dedication to the work of the committee is noteworthy. The committee tends to be issue-focused, and its level of activity fluctuates, depending on the existence of topical matters.

The members are committed to the important work of the committee, and they have applied themselves diligently in the previous two years. The committee has worked well and collectively, and each member has contributed a significant amount of time for a very important cause and each can feel proud of his or her efforts.

The Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Committee met on 19 occasions between July 2010 and June 2012, undertaking a single in-depth inquiry into vocational rehabilitation and return to work. The committee also invited the Hon. Susan Ryan AO to make a presentation on labour participation of mature-aged workers. While the committee has not undertaken a formal inquiry into this issue, it did undertake research, and it believes that further work is required to address issues associated with an ageing workforce and the resultant change in workforce requirements and skill-retention issues.

The committee notes that South Australian return-to-work rates of injured workers have consistently been lower than the national average for the past 14 years and, in fact, are currently the lowest in the nation, yet the frequency of use and expense of vocational rehabilitation is exceptionally high and on the increase. Such a combination of factors continues to have a negative impact on WorkCover's unfunded liability and the overall performance of the scheme, not to mention on the life of those workers who have not returned to work.

Following the reforms of 2008, this state's workers compensation scheme has constantly been in the spotlight. Several independent reviews have been conducted, and it is clear that the South Australian return-to-work rate is significant to all stakeholders. The committee recognises this significance, and the aim of its inquiry was to discover reasons for the current rate and ways to improve it. The committee noted that there is no consistent method of measuring return to work in Australia, which is a significant cause for concern.

Another problem is that rehabilitation is driven by claims management imperatives, rather than a system that genuinely assists injured workers and employers. Evidence was presented to the committee in relation to claims related costs which it was stated were inappropriately allocated to rehabilitation. Whilst rehabilitation should deliver value for money, the evidence indicated it has not been achieved and the system needs substantial reform.

In May 2012 the Age Discrimination Commissioner, the Hon. Susan Ryan AO, was invited to make a presentation to the committee while she was in Adelaide. The commissioner provided the committee with an overview of what is occurring at a national level to address structural barriers to mature aged workers remaining in the workforce. It may surprise some of my parliamentary colleagues to learn that a mature-aged worker is anyone over the age of 45, of which South Australia has the highest concentration. The commissioner informed the committee that the federal government is working towards removing barriers so that people can continue to work into their 70s and beyond.

The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, there is an increased interest by many mature aged workers in remaining in the workforce for longer, but they may need more flexible working arrangements to allow for those who have caring responsibilities or disabilities. Secondly, research predicts that as baby boomers leave the workforce, there will be a skills shortage that will not be met by new young workers or immigrants. This mass exodus will affect Australia's productivity and economic outcomes. The committee is interested in the health and safety and injury management constraints that may impact on mature aged workers and believes that further work is required to address issues associated with an ageing workforce and the resultant change in workforce requirements and skills retention.

The 14th report of the Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Committee summarises the committee's work for the financial years 2010-11 and 2011-12, and the cost to the taxpayer has been minimal. The total expenditure of the committee over this period was $3,461. I would like to take the opportunity to thank all those people who have contributed to the inquiries undertaken by that committee. I thank all those people who took the time and made the effort to prepare submissions for the committee and to speak to the committee.

I extend my sincere thanks to members of the committee: the Presiding Member, the Hon. Steph Key MP; yourself, Mr President, for your time on the committee; the Hon. John Darley MLC; the Hon. Rob Lucas MLC; Mr Ivan Venning MP; Mrs Leesa Vlahos MP; and Mr Alan Sibbons MP. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the staff of the committee: Mr Rick Crump, Ms Carren Walker, Ms Mia Ciccarello, Dr Leah Skrzypiec and Ms Sue Sedivy.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

SPORTING CLUB FUNDING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:04): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that local sporting clubs bring significant social and health benefits to communities;

2. Notes with concern the reports of the South Australian government's proposal to reduce funding for local sporting clubs by $3.5 million through cuts to the Community Recreation and Sports Facilities Program; and

3. Calls on the Premier to reverse the government's decision by guaranteeing the funding in this year's budget.

I rise today to draw the council's attention to the recent developments regarding our local sporting clubs and to pay tribute to the role that sport plays—not only the social and health benefits that it brings to our state and our communities but also the financial benefits—and, of course, to condemn the recent cuts of funding to local sporting clubs which are due to take effect in the coming budget rounds. I move this motion to urge this government to get its priorities straight.

I have a theme today, and I think the Greens do have a theme, that this Jay Weatherill government is not getting its priorities straight. It is putting the cart before the horse and it is no good having a cart if you do not have a horse. That might be small contracts not being given to local newsagents, as we saw in the rally held today on the Parliament House steps, where local jobs are being lost to multinationals because the government has awarded, erroneously, contracts elsewhere. For many years, quite successfully, schools have worked with local business to fill their stationery needs.

In this case, we are seeing projects such as the Adelaide Oval redevelopment and, indeed, the $40 million footbridge steam ahead while small cuts which have profound impact on local sport are being made. We are also seeing this, of course, in health where many—what are termed—non-hospital base services or preventive health measures are, in fact, facing the potential Weatherill razor gang.

Sport, in fact, makes a massive contribution to the Australian economy. In fact, it is approximately 2 per cent of Australia's GDP and that is larger than the motor vehicle industry. It employs over 220,000 people and it generates $358 million in annual exports and almost $1 billion in taxation revenue in recent years. That is according to the Australian Sports Commission work done in this area. For every 10 per cent of our population that is exercising regularly and moderately, there is a net benefit of about $800 million that is returned to our economy each year in the reduced health costs. This is even when allowing for the annual costs of injuries that result from the physical activity.

Research in WA, in fact, confirms that the benefits derived from sport and recreation are not only well understood by the community (clearly not by this government) but the benefits are regarded as extremely important to both the community and to individuals. The WA research shows that at least 80 per cent or more of the population agree—and in some cases 99 per cent of the population—that those benefits come from increased participation in sport and recreation. The obvious ones are improving physical wellbeing, but there are also others such as teaching fair play and respect, building confidence and self-esteem, developing self-discipline and commitment, and teaching life skills such as respect and tolerance for others. Certainly sport has a great role to play in building respect and tolerance, not only with different ethnicities but also across gender as well.

Sport can provide a great sense of achievement, both individual and community. It builds communication skills; it develops leadership skills; it enhances people's ability to deal with stress; it improves resilience and the ability to learn; and it also provides social opportunities—the opportunity to meet other people, to create friendships, to feel part of a community, to build stronger relationships, to build community pride, to reduce antisocial behaviour in our community, and to make the community safer. It is also recognised as creating life opportunities such as travel, business contacts and career opportunities.

The question is, why would you look to make what in the overall scheme of things are minor cuts but will certainly be significant cuts of some $3.5 million to community sport and recreation programs? As I alluded to before, it is because this government has put the cart before the horse and that cart, of course, is embodied in the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. Members will not be strangers to the controversy surrounding that development in terms of the costs associated with it.

It is no surprise to anyone that South Australians are questioning what is going on with this Weatherill government's priorities. When they hear the rhetoric of 17 cranes on our skyline, they know that rhetoric comes with a cost attached of not $450 million and not a penny more, as per the Foley promise given by the treasurer, now twice removed (obviously not literally, but in political terms), but $535 million. Of course they know it comes now with a $40 million footbridge, and the costs continue to pile up.

When we first were promised the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, it should not be forgotten that that was associated not only with a potential successful bid for that venue to host a World Cup event, and the monies potentially that could come from that, but also with supposed funds from the federal government. We have seen the analysis just this week alone that in fact almost all of what ended up being a fraction of the original moneys provided by the federal government, some $30 million, dwindled away after all was said and done.

Again the AFL has contributed far more in other states to oval redevelopments or developments than we got in South Australia. It was because of the Rann-Foley mission to have monuments to their government that they have invested so much in such a high ticket item. Andrew Demetriou said that costs associated with oval building, and indeed with the Adelaide Oval redevelopment in 2010, are at the beginning ambit claims and things can be pared down. We of course did not pare down the Adelaide Oval redevelopment and in fact, instead of the $450 million and not a penny more, we saw those costs escalate and the associated costs with things such as footbridges and no doubt other costs to come continue to be piled up on top of it.

When you realise that this government is cash strapped—and I certainly do not shy away from that—you must question why they proceed with such projects, where they know that the

bottom line will have to be decisions such as this one, where they cut the grassroots. No more obvious cut at the grassroots was this Sunday's distribution of 6,000 pieces of Adelaide turf which were given away for free by minister Koutsantonis (or Couchantonis, as Matt and Dave dubbed him for that weekend), quite proudly boasting that this was a sign that the people of South Australia supported the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

I think it was a sign that people in this state do love the Adelaide Oval, and in this council, while we may disagree on many things, there is a support for what is the icon of the Adelaide Oval. Whether or not we think it should be developed or redeveloped, or for what purposes it should be used, there is certainly a recognition of the role of that particular institution in our history and in our day-to-day culture. Yet of course those pieces of grass were being given away on that Sunday morning as the *Sunday Mail* headline blazed the announcement of these cuts. The irony was not lost on me. For a start, we were giving away those bits of turf for free, and I am sure every person, in those hundreds of people who lined up from, I believe, 1.30am (but most of whom came after 8.00am), well out past Montefiore Hill, would have been happy to have paid $10 towards grassroots sport in exchange for their piece of grassroots.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Indeed—they would have been happy to pay for their piece of turf to support grassroots sport. However, the Weatherill government either did not think of that in their brilliant marketing strategy which they put together, to give away those pieces of turf which I am not sure were couch, but I will stand corrected if I have the type of grass wrong.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks has the call.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am being encouraged not to let the truth get in the way of a good pun. However, I will persevere and attempt both to make puns and to speak the truth. It could have been a great opportunity but it was not lost on me that that was happening at the same time that we were looking at these cuts, and those cuts are being made because we have blown the budgets.

We have chosen the big monuments in this state and, when I say 'we', I mean the government of the day. Certainly many of us here on the non-government benches have been vocally opposed, but this state, previously led by Rann and Foley and now Weatherill, has chosen to pursue this path that has left us putting the cart before the horse. My warning today is: if there is no horse, there will be no need for the cart.

We know that, without grassroots sport, we will never have elite sport, and we will never have the fans if we never have the participation, and we also know that it is all very well and good having sports fans, but we can actually watch it on TV and we can actually import our athletes but we cannot grow our own unless we actually invest in those grassroots activities.

Again, I have to draw attention to the words of Ms Jan Sutherland who observed that, in fact, the revenue from major sporting events such as the Tour Down Under should also be injected back into grassroots sport and as we know, we still do not know exactly how much money Lance Armstrong received for his participation in the Tour Down Under, but if only a fraction of that could be going back into grassroots sport, we would be seeing the dividends into our future.

The benefits of sport are immense. The benefits are shared by our community and by South Australia. If we get the cart before the horse and if we only focus on the big-ticket items, we will not all be sharing in those benefits and in fact we will be mourning the loss not only of the great community that sport builds, but of course we will be seeing the physical impacts as well. With that, I commend this motion to council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME

The Hon. M. PARNELL (17:19): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes—

   (a) that South Australians have enjoyed the benefits of beverage container deposit legislation (CDL) since 1977;

(b) that the CDL regime is overwhelmingly supported by the community and has resulted in litter reduction and recycling rates that are the envy of other states and territories;

(c) that the South Australian CDL regime is exempt from the Commonwealth Mutual Recognition Act 1992;

(d) that extending a system of CDL to other jurisdictions would be good for the environment and provide exciting opportunities for South Australian business to expand their operations to other parts of Australia;

(e) that in the recent decision of the Federal Court of Australia in the case of Coca-Cola Amatil (Aust) Pty Ltd v Northern Territory of Australia [2013] the Northern Territory container deposit scheme was ruled invalid; and

(f) that some beverage companies have announced that they will cease to provide container deposit refunds under the scheme.

2. Calls on all Australian governments to work together to expedite consideration of any application made by the Northern Territory government for an exemption under the Mutual Recognition Act 1992 to support the continuation of the Northern Territory container deposit scheme.

This motion goes to something that is beyond our borders but is intimately linked with something that South Australians hold very dear; that is, our longstanding container deposit legislation system. The motion is somewhat lengthy and I think it is self-explanatory. It basically points out that South Australians have enjoyed the benefits of beverage container deposit legislation for a considerable period of time and that this scheme has a great deal of support, both within the community and also within the parliament.

The motion also points out that one of the reasons we are able to maintain our unique South Australian scheme is that we have an exemption from the operation of the commonwealth Mutual Recognition Act. We have that exemption because our scheme has been in existence for so long. As it was a pre-existing scheme, South Australia insisted that it be allowed to continue, notwithstanding that it does not apply elsewhere.

Another point made in the motion is that it would be good for the environment and it would be good for business if the South Australian scheme could be extended interstate. The reason that it would be good for business is that it would be South Australian businesses that would be most likely in the best position to set up and operate in other jurisdictions, and that is exactly what has happened in the Northern Territory. The Northern Territory government passed a CDL scheme and South Australian businesses were the first cabs off the rank in terms of taking advantage of those opportunities.

However, the Northern Territory scheme was thrown into disarray by a court case earlier this month brought by Coca-Cola—one of the biggest beverage companies in the world and certainly in Australia. The result of that court case was that the Northern Territory scheme was declared invalid.

There is a way forward for the Northern Territory scheme and that is for the Council of Australian Governments to unanimously agree that they too should be exempt from the Mutual Recognition Act in the same way that South Australia is exempt—that is at the heart of this motion. It is basically calling on the South Australian government to lend its support to what will no doubt be support from other jurisdictions for the Northern Territory scheme to be able to operate as the people of the Northern Territory have decreed in their various elections at local and territory levels.

The motion that I have put forward is based on a motion that was put to the Australian Senate by Tasmanian Senator Peter Whish-Wilson, which was successful in the Senate. It is my understanding that other jurisdictions will similarly be debating motions for all of the state and territory governments to get behind the Northern Territory's initiative and to make sure that their scheme is given every opportunity to proceed.

We do not have unlimited time because the Northern Territory government, having received the body blow of the Coca-Cola decision, has decided to step in and keep the scheme going for eight weeks only, so that is the window of opportunity that we have for the rest of the country to get behind territorians. As the Minister for Lands, Planning and the Environment in the Northern Territory, Peter Chandler, said in his media release two days ago: 'We need time to gain the Council of Australian Governments exemption from the Mutual Recognition Act but we are confident of their support.'

I think that confidence is well founded and I think that, if it is to succeed, then the jurisdiction that has the most to gain by supporting them is South Australia. As the motion says, we

are the ones who have been doing this for nearly 30 years, it has multiparty support, it has broad community support and, in fact, South Australians are proud that our recycling rates are better and our littering rates are lower than other jurisdictions. I think it is going to help get the ball rolling if this parliament can get behind the Northern Territory and support their application for an exemption at COAG and we can see South Australian businesses taking advantage of that opportunity, getting up to the Northern Territory and starting to help them with a worthwhile recycling scheme. I commend the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WIND FARM DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:24): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Select Committee on Wind Farm Developments in South Australia that its terms of reference be extended by inserting after subparagraph I(i) the following new subparagraph:

(ia) An assessment of the impact of wind farm developments on property values.

I am sure that members will have a view as to whether that could be expressed as either a positive or a negative impact on property values, and the select committee will naturally be happy, I am sure, to explore all of the aspects of it.

There is one issue that has come to light which I think deserves further examination by the select committee. As we all know, under the current Labor government, we have seen the massive expansion of wind farms, where we now have 48 per cent of the nation's wind generation capacity installed here. I am led to believe that roughly the same amount have already been approved and are waiting to be installed, so we have quite a backlog of developments waiting to go ahead.

One issue has come to light recently, and I will read an article published in *The Australian*; it is not some sort of obscure publication from some country in the world we have not heard of before. I think it was on Tuesday 12 February this year entitled and it is entitled, Turbines 'tarnish property values'. The article states:

A federal magistrate has accepted that wind farms slash the value of surrounding properties, saying she found it 'hard to imagine' any prospective buyer could ignore such development.

In a decision believed to be the first time an Australian court has recognised the adverse financial impact of wind farms for neighbours, magistrate Kate Hughes ruled a property would be worth 17 per cent less if a 14-turbine facility were erected next door.

For one part of the property, in regional Victoria, she accepted a 33 per cent fall in value was likely.

The ruling came in a family law case published this month amid separation proceedings for the couple who own the property.

Ms Hughes heard two separate valuers had agreed the wind farm would have a negative effect on the adjacent property, which the couple has divided into three blocks. 'The expert value of the three blocks of land varies significantly depending on whether or not it is assumed the proposed wind farm will go ahead,' Ms Hughes said in her judgment.

'The impact of the proposed wind farm is apparent from the valuation report.'

The ruling comes on top of last month's decision by South Gippsland Shire Council to cut rates for one landowner on the basis that his property would lose value because of an adjacent wind farm that is yet to be built.

The resident had his land value reduced by 32 per cent after arguing he would suffer from the 52-turbine Bald Hills wind farm.

Wind farm developers and the renewables industry overall have insisted land values are not affected by wind farms.

The valuers engaged in the Federal Magistrates Court case, Raab and Raab, varied slightly in their estimates of how much the land value would drop, but agreed there would be a detrimental effect if the wind farm went ahead. 'We have agreed there is insufficient sales information currently available from which we could ascertain the level of reduction in value applicable to rural properties in close proximity to wind turbine facilities,' the valuers said in a joint report tendered to the court.

'The matter is therefore largely subjective (but) our opinion in relation to this subject property is not significantly different.'

Ms Hughes said both the husband and wife had opposed the wind farm, which was approved in 2009 under planning legislation that has since been tightened by the Baillieu government.

'Given the planning permit for the wind farm has...been granted, it seems reasonable to assume the wind farm is more likely than not to go ahead,' she said. 'It is hard to imagine any prospective buyer ignoring that issue.'

Outside court, the wife said she wanted the case publicised as evidence of the detrimental effect wind farms could have for neighbouring properties. 'This just went to confirm it,' she told *The Australian*.

'The wind companies have to take notice of it—they deny it all.

'It's going to take this sort of evidence to turn that ship.'

I will quote from the back end of an article in *The Australian* of 1 February:

Real Estate Institute of Victoria policy and public affairs manager Robert Larocca said not enough properties near wind farms changed hands to assess whether the projects had an impact on land values.

'The data doesn't allow us to do that,' he said. 'A professional valuer may have their own individual point of view about a property, but at an overall level we are unable to discern the impact, negative or positive.'

The British Valuation Office Agency, which decides council tax valuations, last year ruled wind turbines built near homes could sharply decrease their value, moving some homes into a lower council tax band.

Mark Burfield, who is awaiting turbine construction within 1km from his property, has already received a verbal knockback from South Gippsland council after asking for a rates adjustment.

He is trying to sell some of his property, receiving one offer for $200,000 less than he advertised.

'The people came over, looked at the house and said "That's fantastic",' Mr Burfield said. 'I said: "That's where the wind farm will go". They went to see the wind farm manager, then came back and roasted the real estate agent.

'They said there is no way they were going to buy here and what a pity it was. I have $2.5m worth of farmland, and right now it's unsellable.'

Recently, in *The Weekly Times* there was an article entitled, 'Rates revolt in the wind'. It states:

Wind farm opponents in southwest Victoria have sparked a rates revolt they expect to sweep the state.

Farmers near wind farms in the Southern Grampians and Moyne shires are being urged to seek valuation reviews.

The action follows a decision by a Federal Magistrates Court judge that a property would be worth 17 per cent less and parts could be devalued by up to 33 per cent, if a neighbouring 14-turbine wind farm was built.

A South Gippsland Shire ratepayer next to the proposed Bald Hills wind farm has also had his lifestyle block's value reduced by 32 per cent to match rates paid on adjoining broadacre land.

Southern Grampians Landscape Guardians president Keith Staff, of Penshurst, said the two decisions would justify legal action on the issue and he had urged ratepayers to seek a revaluation.

Some Southern Grampians ratepayers have already asked for rating reviews and Mr Staff believed land revaluations near wind farms could cost Victorian councils hundreds of thousands of dollars.

However, South Gippsland Shire chief executive Tim Tamlin said the Bald Hills ratepayer had his rates reduced by about 30 per cent because his block was next to the proposed wind farm's concrete batching plant and there would disruption during construction.

'I don't believe it is a precedent because valuation reviews are done on their own merits,' Mr Tamlin said.

Southern Grampians Shire corporate services manager Belinda Johnson said the council did not propose to revalue properties adjacent to or near wind farms 'outside the state-endorsed process'.

The Moyne Shire Council has received revaluation requests from landowners around wind farms, but has said it would follow the current process for valuation reviews.

However, farmer Jan Hetherington, who shares a boundary with the Macarthur wind farm to the west and the Penshurst wind farm to the south, said rates should be cut.

'I am right in the dead centre of the wind farms, you might as well say my land is worthless,' Mr Hetherington said.

So, you can see that there is a divergence of views. Clearly, there are some issues that need to be resolved with this particular threat to neighbouring properties if the properties are to be devalued. I think it is important from two points of view. If we look perhaps at the big proposed wind farm—I point out that those rate reductions and property value reductions in Victoria are next to proposed wind farms, not ones that have actually been built. So that, if you like, the view that could be there one day is a concern.

I guess the area that concerns me the most, and why I would like the select committee to have a closer look at it, would be if you are a young farmer, you have borrowed a fair bit of money to try to expand your business, a wind farm is built on a neighbouring property and suddenly the bank says to you, 'I'm sorry, your land value has reduced by 10, 15, 20, 30 per cent'—whatever the

figure happens to be—'and you don't have the equity, in the bank's eyes, to carry on', then you could lose your farm.

As a former farmer, and as a business person, I have always had the view that you should be able to do whatever you like on your property, it is your property, but if it has a negative impact on the value of your neighbour's property then I think that is a set of circumstances that nobody in this chamber should be prepared to endorse or put up with. That is the first issue I think is very important. We are struggling to get young people back into rural communities. We understand that those who host wind farms do get a financial benefit. That is fine for the ones who host it, but if it has a negative impact on the value of people's property adjacent to those wind farms, I think that is something the committee needs to have a close look at.

Also, with the proposed wind farm on Yorke Peninsula, I would like to hope that the committee would seek some evidence or submissions from the real estate industry in relation to the value of the properties. We know real estate is very popular in the quite expensive Black Point area, but there is a whole range of coastal holiday homes and areas where people go to enjoy not only the beautiful scenery but the coast there.

Hopefully, the committee will seek to get some input from the Real Estate Institute, the local council and the Valuer-General in relation to the impact it may have on those properties. While some of them may be owned and freehold and not encumbered, there may well be some properties there where somebody is working a couple of jobs to try to buy their dream holiday home and, suddenly, that is devalued in the eyes of the bank as well.

I think I have said that I am not opposed to wind farms, and the Liberal Party is certainly not opposed to wind farms. As I have said, we do have half of the nation's capacity here, and we have another 100 per cent more already approved, and the one on Yorke Peninsula will be the biggest wind farm ever built in Australia. I am very keen for the committee to look at that.

I noticed that yesterday there was a debate in the House of Assembly in relation to wind farms and that the Premier had written to the Leader of the Opposition, Steven Marshall, requesting a debate as a matter of urgency. It is interesting to note that the Premier's letter, which is dated 18 March (Monday), requests that the debate be held last week, on 13 March at 11am. It begs the question: if the Premier does not even know what day it is, what sort of a political stunt was this when it was to have a debate earlier on today? The Premier's letter states:

> On Wednesday 13 March at 11 am, I intend to suspend government business to allow debate to proceed on this motion forthwith.

Well, we were not even in parliament that week! It really does the beg question: what was this designed to do? The letter goes on:

> (e) Non-evidence based policies undermine investment and energy projects and damage South Australia's economic and environmental development
>
> (f) Placing any moratorium on wind farm developments would have significant adverse economic consequences for South Australia including the potential loss of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in investment.

I think that 'thousands of jobs' is a stretch, and 'billions of dollars in investment', when most of it comes from overseas, is also a bit of a stretch. However—

The PRESIDENT: I think the Hon. Mr Ridgway should get back to his notice of motion.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —it comes back to evidence-based policy.

The PRESIDENT: Get back to your notice of motion.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, the reason I have referred this to—

The Hon. Carmel Zollo interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They can't help themselves. They don't like the truth. When I told them that the Premier doesn't know what day it is, they arc up. They have been asleep all the time, now they arc up.

The PRESIDENT: And you can't help yourself either, sir. The Hon. Mr Ridgway has the call, and he will return to his notice of motion No. 2.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: What day is it?

The PRESIDENT: Would you like me to remind—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: What I want to come back to is that this is why we proposed a select committee last year, after the government and premier Rann and minister Rau imposed the statewide interim development plan amendment for wind farms. We moved for a select committee so that we could come up with some evidence-based policies, not something that was plucked out of the air by the former premier—or maybe minister Rau was just plucked by premier Rann before he departed.

In the history of this state parliament, this is the first time a select committee has four parties—Labor, Liberal, Greens, Family First and an Independent. So, it is the first one that has total independence, where there are five individuals. We moved for a select committee so that we could come up with some evidence-based policies.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We did struggle, sadly, but we were able to get a quorum towards the end of that meeting. It is the tragedy of this chamber that we have so many select committees that members are often not able to make it. However, we have an opportunity to explore all these issues rather than the Premier wasting an hour of the House of Assembly's time today. He said the other day in a debate that he was asked to govern. Today he was just having a talkfest.

That is why we have decided to have this select committee and that is why I would urge members to support this extra term of reference so we can actually look at the evidence, because this government is not interested. It is worried that 'a moratorium on wind farm developments would have significant adverse economic consequences for South Australia including potential loss of thousands of jobs'. This could also have adverse economic effects on the neighbours of wind farms with potential loss of thousands, if not millions, of dollars of land value. There are also council rates and all the other equity issues in relation to mortgages. It is an important issue, so I urge members of the chamber to support my motion for another term of reference for the select committee.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

NEWSTART

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:42): I move:

That this council notes that—

1. The recent federal amendments to the Social Security Act will further impoverish already struggling single parent families when their youngest child turns eight by moving from the parenting payment and on to Newstart over 100,000 single parents who were previously protected from the Howard government's Welfare to Work reforms;

2. Support for this move was at odds with both the Senate committee and the Joint Parliamentary Human Rights Committee which stated that it could 'deprive' single parent families and their children 'of minimum essential levels of social security'; and

3. This attack on single parents has drawn concern from the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights.

I rise today to talk about an issue which in some ways is a national and federal parliament issue, but it has caught the attention of the United Nations and it certainly will become a state issue as we see the impacts of the federal government amendments to the Social Security Act with regard to those single parents whose children turn eight.

As of this year, when the youngest child of a cohort of single parents in Australia turns eight, over 100,000 of that group will be moved off the parenting payment and on to Newstart. Obviously already many have, for those who have children over eight, and increasingly, as their children grow older, that group, which was originally grandfathered and protected under the Howard government's regressive Welfare to Work reforms, will also be moved to Newstart.

What is the problem with that, one might wonder? Newstart means that those children and those single parent families will be condemned to live in poverty. The move was actually at odds with both the Senate committee and the Joint Parliamentary Human Rights Committee which stated that should such a measure be undertaken by the Gillard federal government it would deprive single parent families and their children of 'minimum essential levels of social security'.

Newstart is in fact 77 per cent of the poverty line. In fact, Newstart is no start for any child. It is touted that this is an effort to move these single parents into work. The reality is that

approximately 68 per cent of those single parents are already in some form of paid employment. They are the ones who are the most financially disadvantaged by these so-called reforms. They are the ones who will be most penalised. There will be no pensioner education supplement under Newstart for those who wish to engage in future or further study. I have spoken to parents in this state who have now dropped out of their studies as of this year and have given up on pursuing educational training as an option for better employment.

I have heard from parents who have been advised by Centrelink that in order to raise their income to levels at which they can continue to pay their bills, pay the rent, feed their children, that they should leave their children at bus stops after school because they cannot afford the after school hours care. These parents are expected, somehow, to find work—mythical work—that would be incredibly flexible around the needs of a single parent, a single parent who has a child or children to care for as well as undertake all the other activities, whether that be education or training.

I observe that it has drawn the attention of the United Nations and, in fact, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights has asked the Gillard government to justify this measure. The only justification I have seen from the Prime Minister so far is that it already applies to a different cohort of parents who are affected adversely under the welfare to work payments. Well two wrongs don't make a right.

I remember the days when the then prime minister actually promised that no child would live in poverty in this country. Now that was a vision to be proud of. Of course, it is well known and much celebrated, I think, that he actually strayed from the script that day and he had, of course, meant to promise that no child need live in poverty. The Gillard government is ensuring that children will live in poverty and that their parents may have little choice about the matter. Should they be unable to get employment which ensures they can afford quality care for their children, they will be forced to make difficult decisions. I have been speaking to many of these parents and I would advise members to check out the single parents action group websites. They are around the country in both rural and regional and metropolitan areas.

These single parents, with the load that they carry, are fighting back. They are wondering what they did on the day the Prime Minister made her now infamous around the world misogyny speech to cop these particular cuts. These cuts did not make worldwide media but they have now drawn the attention of the United Nations. These cuts, I believe, are misogyny in policy and practice of the federal government. These cuts significantly attack women and the most vulnerable women in our country and, of course, they plunge children into poverty. The repercussions for non-government organisations and our state institutions will be felt over coming months and years should these cuts not be reversed.

Over the Christmas/New Year break Greens' member for Melbourne, Adam Bandt, was our acting leader for the party and he challenged the minister responsible for these cuts, Jenny Macklin to live a week on Newstart.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: And she said she could.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: And she said she could, as the Hon. Robert Brokenshire rightly observes. She did say she could, except then apparently, according to the transcript the minister put out to the media later that day, that question and answer were inaudible. I would say the answer to that question was untenable and impossible because it is impossible to raise a child and to live on what equates to—when you pay all of your bills and you meet all of your commitments—$35 a day. I would not do that to my child as a single mother; I would never take that challenge. However, to their credit, both Adam Bandt, the member for Melbourne and, previously, the Greens' senator, Rachel Siewert, have taken that challenge and discovered what I think anyone in this chamber would, that is, it is almost impossible to live on $35 a day, even as a single person let alone when you have kids to support.

One thing goes wrong—somebody's glasses break, somebody has a car accident, your child, as happened in that week to mine, gets head lice and you have to go out and buy some Quit Nits, which costs quite a pretty penny—and that $35 a day is looking completely untenable. This measure is putting those parents under enormous stress, many of whom believe that it will put other parents in a position where they may stay in situations of domestic violence to escape and avoid this poverty. They believe it has also heightened anger and hatred towards single parents in our community.

On this I want to mention a particular single mother who went on *Today Tonight* to put the case of single parents under these cuts, pushing them off parenting payments and onto Newstart. That particular program chose to focus not on the poverty and the struggle she was facing but on the fact that she had had her nails done that day and used that to vilify and, I believe, demonise single parents. The back story to that was that she rarely gets her nails done, and her sister did the nails for free because she is a nail technician and because she was going on television and therefore wanted to look her best. That is just one example of the many stories I have heard from single parents around this country about the backlash they are facing.

I urge members of the opposition and the government to look at the Facebook pages and the hatred that is being spewed forth at these single parents who are trying to stand up for themselves and their kids not to live in poverty. Enabling that vilification to be given credence is the fact that it is getting support in our federal parliament. But, I commend them and I have been inspired by many of the single parents I have been working with, and I look forward to the national day of action on 13 April. They will not let this issue rest; they know it is too important for their children not to live in poverty. They know this is not the Australia where the former prime minister promised that no child shall live in poverty.

They know that it is not only the Prime Minister slipping up on the wording of the script but it is that she is reading from the entirely wrong document on this. They know that this move is wrong, as do the Greens, and the United Nations have called into question what is going on in this country where children are being forced to live in poverty.

On a more positive note, they have creative ways of bringing attention to their cause, and I wish to commend them for the resilience they are showing and the inspiration they provide. They have created a campaign called 'the government do not care bears', and they have basically taken stuffed toys, soft toys, that have been donated through many of the charities that are now having to find extra food parcels, and so on, to help support these families. If you see them, they are often taped to the window of the Prime Minister's office, but increasingly around the country they are being positioned in prime spots near local MPs' offices, and they have a little slip of information. Each bear is different: I have seen Scooby Doos and various Disney characters and also traditional teddy bears, but they are fighting back with their 'government do not care bears' and they are putting them out there and spreading the word.

On that, I had a Twitter altercation with a Labor supporter on this issue. He took me to task because he was a little annoyed that I was advocating for the rights of single parents, and he did not really seem to think that that was necessarily appropriate. He thought that perhaps, as many people seem to think, they should get out there and get a job. Then he had a little look into the issue and we actually had a meeting and a discussion about it, and the more he looked into the issue, the more he realised that these were not Labor values that were being implemented here.

As I say, on the very day that the Prime Minister delivered her now infamous misogyny speech, she stripped the rights of these single parents to live a life with dignity, to live a life above the poverty line. I hope there are more Labor members like him in the party's rank and file who are willing to have a look at these issues, who are willing to look at the real statistics, who are willing to actually acknowledge that many of these parents are in fact working and that it is the ones who are working who will be most punished by the new regime and who are willing to reverse this decision.

I think if members opposite have any faith and commitment to the promise made by Bob Hawke back when he was prime minister, which I believe was an inspirational promise, they will go back to basics and they will go back to their grassroots and they will revisit this decision. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. Carmel Zollo.

REGIONAL TELEVISION SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher:

That this council—

1. Condemns the decision of WIN Television Network to axe its local regional news services in the Riverland and South-East.

2. Condemns—

   (a) the removal of a vital source of information and engagement from these local communities;

(b) the failure to consult with the local communities to ensure that regional television meets community expectations and obligations; and

(c) the manner in which staff was informed of their dismissal and the now reduced opportunity for the development of journalists and news reporting in regional South Australia.

(Continued from 20 February 2013.)

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (17:56): I move to amend the motion by adding the following paragraph:

3. In light of the foregoing, calls upon the South Australian Labor government to urge the federal Labor government to amend section 43A of the commonwealth Broadcasting Services Act 1992 to require the holder of a regional aggregated commercial television broadcasting licence in South Australia to include minimum levels of material of local significance.

When you look at the initial motion, there are key words in there—condemns, failure to consult, manner in which staff was informed—and then I have highlighted to colleagues in the Legislative Council my additional paragraph 3.

I commend the Hon. Kyam Maher for moving this motion. 'Condemns' is a strong word and other news outlets still exist: the ABC in particular and the region's newspapers—*The Border Watch*, *The Murray Pioneer*, *The River News*, *The Loxton News*, the Penola *Pennant*, *The Naracoorte Herald* and *The Border Times*. I note that in the last five years, the Riverland lost its local TV news as it was networked out of Mount Gambier. There is clearly a hole in the federal act identified in Canberra and here is the section:

43A—Material of local significance—regional aggregated commercial television broadcasting licences

(1) The ACMA must ensure that, at all times on and after 1 January 2008, there is in force under section 43 a condition that has the effect of requiring the licensee of a regional aggregated commercial television broadcasting licence to broadcast to each local area, during such periods as are specified in the condition, at least a minimum level of material of local significance.

Subsection (2) provides:

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a *regional aggregated commercial television broadcasting licence* is a commercial television broadcasting licence for any of the following licence areas:

(a) Northern New South Wales;

(b) Southern New South Wales;

(c) Regional Victoria;

(d) Eastern Victoria;

(e) Western Victoria;

(f) Regional Queensland;

(g) Tasmania.

It is interesting to note our new magnificent branding promo the government have just introduced. Tasmania may not be on our logo but there is actually a local content guarantee for Tasmania, but where is South Australia? Without going into all the other sections, it is clear that South Australian MPs of all persuasions—federal members and Senators—were not, I assume, in the chamber when this section was introduced because South Australia was left out—the only state to be left out. Now the chickens have come home to roost. South Australia was left out so it is no wonder that WIN News' first cut to a local news bulletin happens to be in South Australia.

I want to refer to some quotes in the articles attached, and I have good news for the mover of the motion. We see in *The Border Watch* of Tuesday 19 March 2013, a headline 'Mixed signals: WIN TV boss talks up news network weeks after slashing regional service.' Then there are quotes in there from the WIN TV boss and from the honourable Labor MLC Kyam Maher, but I have good news for the mover of the motion. Senator Conroy has a package of bills to change the media laws in parliament this week.

[Sitting suspended from 18:03 to 19:48]

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: For the benefit of *Hansard*, I will go back one dot point. I have good news for the mover of the motion: Senator Conroy has a package of bills to change the

media laws in parliament this week. This motion will be adjourned in light of my amendment, and so I encourage the Hon. Mr Maher in the time he now has available to get on the phone straightaway to Mr Conroy's office, because I understand the crossbench MPs in Canberra are slowly persuading him to reconsider his take it or leave it approach to media law reform, and ensure this omission regarding South Australia is rectified.

I have spoken today so that honourable members have time before the vote on 10 April to consider this amendment and to alert members on my left that there is a time—today and early tomorrow—to get their Canberra colleagues debating changes to the broadcasting legislation to fix this anomaly and force WIN News to deliver a local news service.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. Carmel Zollo.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (DEBT CEILING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March 2013.)

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (19:50): I want to get back to a very important matter and that is the Public Finance and Audit (Debt Ceiling) Amendment Bill 2013, which I have reluctantly introduced to this house following the massive debt crisis that we now have in South Australia. I want to discuss further the reasons for introducing this bill and, for the benefit again of Hansard, I will start with borrowing for infrastructure.

Table 4.10 from Budget Paper 3 sets out this government's track record, and you could argue that on net debt it was a good one up until 2008. This current Labor government inherited a net debt position of only $2.7 billion. They then, through initiatives that were in the pipeline, if I can put it that way, through the transition of the change of government, reduced that debt from $2.7 billion to $1.6 billion by 2008 so, in a six-year period they went from inheriting a manageable debt of $2.7 billion and they did get it back to $1.6 billion.

With hindsight, they might well regret that they did not let it go out a little, as this bill would have allowed, and get on with infrastructure spending that the state then so desperately needed. But, no, instead, when the electoral going has got tough and polls have begun to waver, Labor has knifed its former premier and then got on with a host of projects funded by debt.

I trust that the current Premier/Treasurer will respond to this bill, as when I publicly proposed the initiative previously he was saying that we need to borrow to build infrastructure. I agree that we need the infrastructure. We have in fact needed it for a decade—and now they are getting on with doing it. However, this government has squandered all the rivers of gold that came in through the GST and the windfall on stamp duty and land tax and has not used it to build the South Australia of tomorrow. Now they are getting on with it, but the debate we now have to have is about the net debt and what it leaves our children and our grandchildren.

I want to turn now to what I can unfortunately only describe as the great Labor rip-off. One of the major costs is the crippling cost of living expenses and family budgets and, in turn, retail and other business budgets, due to a reduction of household spending due to an excess of government spending. I just want to highlight the fact that, every time this government brings in a new tax or charge, such as the one we are now dealing with, namely, the car parking tax, that actually takes away disposable income from the family unit and that then means less money spent in retail, less money spent in restaurants and the like, and therefore it means less chances of job growth and opportunity.

Let us have a look at some comparisons from other jurisdictions. The government may point me to comparisons interstate, and I am aware of them. I have comments to make on that, but I want to also say first of all that our analysis reveals that South Australia has some of the weakest financial accountability provisions in the Western world.

In the United States there are a host of initiatives that empower taxpayers to rein in profligate spending by their states. As I have referred to publicly, there is a debt ceiling in the United States federal government—currently $16.4 trillion. As big as that is, the point is that they have to actually go through their parliament, and we have seen that just in recent times when they talked about the fact that they could have fallen off the proverbial cliff. That has to be approved by the United States parliament. It was the subject of extensive debate over the New Year break, but the parliament got a say as the democratic representatives of all people in the nation.

Closer to home, the Commonwealth Inscribed Stock Act 1911 limits the Commonwealth Government Securities, known as the CGS or otherwise net debt, to $300 billion. In 2009, it was $75 billion, but federal parliament agreed to lift it to its $250 billion limit in 2011, and they lifted it again to $300 billion late last year after allegations that the Gillard government was at risk into forward estimates of exceeding the then $250 billion statutory debt limit. So, with a sympathetic parliament the debt limit can be raised.

I reinforce to colleagues that this bill does not stop debt increasing if both houses of the parliament are prepared to support that and clearly put the government of the day under scrutiny. At the moment we do not have that scrutiny and we have gone from $2.7 billion at the change of government to $14 billion of debt in the forward estimates. It has not stopped it happening before, but a majority of both houses is required, and I think that is democratic. What is not democratic is to ramp up public debt, cripple household budgets and in turn the state economy to the detriment of current and future generations.

The Institute of Public Affairs produced a fine paper called 'Next Generation State Budgets: Stronger Fiscal Rules for Better Budgetary Outcomes and More Prosperous States' in April 2011. It is a fine piece of work by Julie Novak and I encourage honourable members to read it. I have not adopted all the fiscal controls they recommend because I feel a debt ceiling is the best approach to this serious issue, but I will quote some important statements from that report as they will pre-empt rebuttals the government might propose in response. I actually look forward to the rebuttals from the government when we put this to a vote in the next few months.

The author writes about the excess revenue overspending, such as the situation I have explained in our present forward estimates, and explains in the executive summary that if, as is the case in some United States jurisdictions—and I have not proposed this today—you had a requirement of a tax rebate if state governments as a whole earned more than they spend then you would have seen nationwide from 2000-01 to 2008-09 cumulative rebates of $146 billion to $260 billion. With an estimated national resident population of approximately 22 million people at the close of 2008-09, that is $11,818 or approximately $1,300 per annum rebated to every taxpayer in the nation.

That is an interesting figure because, if you look at the stimulus after the global financial crisis, figures of around that amount were rebated back to taxpayers by the federal government. By most analysis, that staved off the nation going into what we call double-dip recession. These debates are important discussions because they show how excessive state government spending affects the national economy.

On page 55, Ms Novak goes on to explain that over that same 2001 to 2009 time frame, if a CPI plus population expenditure growth rule had applied on our budgets—that is a rebate to taxpayers for any budget revenue that exceeds expenditure by that amount—South Australians would have received $11.3 billion over that period, or about $900 per man, woman and child per annum.

I will move on to some other important quotes. The author describes the 1980s 'budget deficits as pro-growth policy' as a 'previously disastrous flirtation'. Ms Novak does her own myth busting on pages 10 and 11, quoting state treasurers, including former treasurer Foley, who said that the state had taken 'a massive hit from the fallout on Wall Street'. We would all recall words to that effect in 2009, however the IPA's analysis reveals that:

> ...states did not suffer revenue shortfalls as a result of the global financial crisis and associated economic downturn, contrary to the protestations of certain state government political representatives. The budget shortfalls observed in a number of jurisdictions are instead largely attributable to a continuous pattern of excessive recurrent spending.

I place on the public record that I believe that is code for seven marginal seats, where the focus and so much money has gone at the expense of good management for the state's fiscal situation and the importance of governing for every seat and every South Australian. The author observed that:

> ...relatively high levels of net debt represent a significant call on future revenue flows limiting a government's flexibility to deliver tax cuts or expend on core services.

Julie Novak makes one point I will use to wrap up on quoting from her report where she expounds on the well-known economic term 'moral hazard' which, if I may put it in layman's terms, is the attitude, 'I do not care what this costs. I will not have to pay for it. It is about holding government,

power and glory at all costs and I will have left by then and someone else can manage the situation.' She says:

> In the absence of fiscal rules concerning the management of budgets and the ability to borrow on capital markets, there may be a heightened risk of moral hazard in the form of undisciplined fiscal conduct at the subnational [that is, the state] level.

Ms Novak says:

> The fiscal interests of future generations of taxpayers, including children and the unborn, are also not sufficiently represented in the political system in the present. This provides an incentive for political representatives to borrow to finance government spending, and shift the responsibility for repaying the principal and interest of public debt to future taxpayers who cannot politically consent to the borrowing activity.

If a family behaved that way, they would be condemned by their community. We need to look on a macro scale at how this government is behaving. This is not just a debate about the financial impact of net debt.

The State Bank disaster left a huge hole in the South Australian psyche. If you think BHP Billiton not going ahead with Olympic Dam rained on the party, just wait until the chickens of this current State Bank style disaster come home to roost. The parliament must focus on this issue. There are too many distractions. This is the big debate. Labor has tried to claim small bars will lift us out of our current economic position. Those initiatives are the tweaks of the red tape and economic conditions but $14 billion of net debt is the big issue.

This is not just a debate about net debt: it is about the psychology of the state as a whole. In 1991, the State Bank collapsed under state Labor and the former federal treasurer told us that national economic conditions were the 'recession we had to have' under Labor. In fact, the former federal member for Kingston—now deceased, sadly—who I had quite a lot of respect for, said that the then Labor government could not run a chook raffle. I think you could almost say the same today.

That state/federal Labor pairing drove people away from this state and they never came back. It also saw an exodus of young people leaving our state for what they saw as a greater opportunity interstate or, indeed, overseas. It sent businesses to the wall and families into breakdown. Economic mismanagement can have a dire social and personal consequence. If we do not rein in the State Bank level debt of this government, then we put at risk the very future opportunity of our state.

This is a bill that I ask colleagues to have a very close look at. I think it is time that the parliament had a ceiling on debt. When governments go to elections, they do not tell people just how much difficulty they may be putting future generations and the existing populace in when it comes to the borrowings that they have to make to actually honour commitments to particularly marginal seats.

I said to the Premier that, if he wins the next election, he wants to thank Mike Rann. The reason I said that to the Premier in a discussion some months ago was that Mike Rann was the master of marginal seat campaigns; if this government happens to win the next election, it will be more than anything as a result of how many marginal seats he left the government. But, I ask: at what cost? I do not believe that Mike Rann cared whatsoever about the debt that he might leave to win those seats. It was about winning them at all costs, irrespective of what was best for the state's mid and long-term future.

I put it to members that at the moment we have an absolutely unsustainable core debt. We have a situation whereby in 2016-17 (or maybe in 2015-16), in the out years of the forward estimates of this budget, this government will have an expenditure that is well over $2 billion more than the revenue that will be earned in that year. Surely, the first thing is that there has to be a commitment to ensure that you are responsible in government for the wellbeing of the state today, tomorrow and into the long-term future. It is time that we stopped governments from just willy-nilly committing us to effective bankruptcy so that they can hold a record for 16 years in office, or whatever their goal may be.

I ask honourable members to have a very close look at this bill. I think it only brings us into line with what is fair and reasonable and what the democratic society of our state, namely, the voters we serve, want us to do—that is, to be the watchdog, the check and the balance to ensure that governments do not get out of control. If we do not rein in the State Bank level debt of this government, then we put at risk the very future opportunity of our state. I urge all colleagues not to let that happen. I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M. Parnell:

That this council—

1. Notes:

   (a) the review of non-hospital based services currently underway in the SA Department of Health, including the report prepared by internal consultant, Warren McCann, released on 3 December 2012;

   (b) the recommendations of the report to significantly reduce community health and health promotion programs within SA Health and the wider community;

   (c) the implications, if the recommendations are accepted, to services such as the Shopfront Youth Health Service in Salisbury that has been providing services since 1983;

   (d) that these cuts will inevitably lead to reductions in services and programs targeting the most disadvantaged in our society, as it is these South Australians who make the most use of community-based primary healthcare services;

   (e) that slashing community health and health promotion programs as a means to reduce government health spending is counterproductive because the whole point of these programs is to prevent ill-health and reduce demand in hospital services where the real growth on costs is occurring;

   (f) the risk that these vital services and programs are being caught up in a cost-shifting battle between the state and federal governments; and

2. Calls on the government to reject the recommendations contained in the McCann report into non-hospital based services and ensure continued SA Health funding for vital preventative health and health promotion services and programs.

(Continued from 6 February 2013.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (20:07): I rise to speak to this motion moved by the Hon. Mr Parnell. Can I indicate at the outset that there are some aspects of the motion the Liberal Party would support but that there are some aspects that I believe in the end the Liberal Party cannot support. Just as a matter of background, it is every member's right to call his or her particular motion to a vote. The honourable member has followed due protocol in indicating that he wishes this matter to be voted upon today, and we will certainly respect that.

I do put on the record, however, that I put in a request to the Hon. Mr Parnell as to whether it would be possible to delay a vote until the next sitting week of parliament to allow my and our party's further consideration of some of the matters to which I will refer in my contribution this evening. I respect and accept that the Hon. Mr Parnell took a different view and that he would like to see a vote.

I indicated that, if it did go to a vote tonight, because we had not had the opportunity of further consideration the Liberal Party would not be in a position to support the motion, as he has currently drafted it, this evening. What I did highlight to him was that in our consideration we were looking to see whether, by way of agreement, we might be able to come to some common ground with the Hon. Mr Parnell to indicate those areas of his motion that we support and those areas that at this stage we are not in a position to support. Again, in saying all that I make no criticism of the Hon. Mr Parnell; I just outline the context and background to a consideration of what is a complicated matter.

The Hon. Mr Parnell does the parliament a service by moving this motion and opening it up for public debate because considerable concern has been expressed by a number of the groups and programs impacted by the government's decision on this particular matter. It is appropriate that this debate follows immediately from the debate that the Hon. Mr Brokenshire has promoted in terms of the appalling nature of the state's finances and the mess that this Jay Weatherill government has got South Australia into in terms of big debt—$14 billion—but, just as importantly and just as worryingly, the big annual deficit of $1.2 billion a year that we are looking at at the moment. So we are currently adding to our state debt to the tune of $1.2 billion a year.

I am not going to spend tonight on this particular debate. We will have the opportunity during debates on other issues to go through the appalling financial management of the Jay Weatherill Labor government. Indeed, we know that you are a very strong supporter of the Premier,

Mr President, and we know of the close friendship that you have with him on many issues. You and he sing from the same hymn sheet on many issues, or most issues. I am sure that that is the case and I am sure that it would be the case in relation to this particular issue as well.

However, the appalling management of the Jay Weatherill Labor government has meant, sadly, that the Premier and his ministers are now trying to start the difficult process of trying to sort out the problem. Sadly, as a result of that, many innocent parties will be impacted and affected and programs and projects will be cut. We might be very critical of the Jay Weatherill Labor government's priorities and the fact that the government can find $7 million for a wellbeing initiative—for an institute of wellbeing, for retreats on Kangaroo Island to look at the science of imagination—and money for all sorts of psychobabble that happens to interest it but, at the same time, lots of important programs and projects are being thrown overboard. They are being jettisoned, they are being slashed, they are being cut by the Jay Weatherill Labor government. That is the context in which we are looking at this particular debate.

The Premier asked his internal consultant—someone who is being paid an aggregate of $350,000 or $360,000 a year, half of the time as an internal consultant and half of the time as the Commissioner for Public Employment—to do a hatchet job on this review of non-hospital-based services. So Mr Warren McCann was asked to do the hatchet job on non-hospital-based services.

I will be delighted to hear the government representative's response this evening on this, but my information is that Mr McCann conducted a review of 235 individual services that fell within the review's scope in the space of eight weeks. That is an extraordinary effort. Just imagine—he was able to look at 235 individual services that fell within this particular program and he was able to make judgements about their efficiency and effectiveness and he was able to make judgements as to what should happen to all 235 individual services within his purview.

With the greatest of respect to the Jay Weatherill Labor government and with due respect to Mr McCann, I think that is palpable nonsense. There is no way that anybody, acting as he was with, as I understand it, a very small number of staff, in the eight-week period was able to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of 235 individual services. At the end of it, we have what we have and the government has moved down a path of implementing recommendations. The Hon. Mr Parnell may be in a position to know they did go through what is laughingly called their consultation period or discussion period, but all the information available to me is that decisions have been taken left, right and centre to implement virtually all, if not all, of the recommendations of the McCann review.

One of the dilemmas for someone in my position as an incoming shadow minister for health is that I do not have the background knowledge—at least as at six weeks ago, whenever it was—of any of the 235 individual programs. I am not in a position to make judgements about the efficiency and effectiveness of those 235 individual programs. If I can draw on my experience in government and in parliament, my view would be that a number of those 235 programs would be fantastic—they will be very efficient and effective—and there will be a number of those programs which probably are moderately successful or of average quality and, speaking frankly, there will be some programs which are not worth funding.

It is the harsh reality—and it may not be the view that the Hon. Mr Parnell adopts, because his recommendation is that all the recommendations of McCann be rejected—but it is my experience that some programs that departments and governments fund are unsuccessful. They ain't worth the money that's going into them.

The Hon. Mr Darley, often, in the Budget and Finance Committee says to chief executives, 'Have you actually sat back, gone back to first principles and looked at an efficiency and effectiveness, or a line by line budget review of what it is that you do?' The import of what he is saying to the chief executives is that sometimes you have to go back and look at all your programs and sometimes you have to make difficult decisions; and you continue to fund the ones that are effective but there are some programs that you have to say no to.

My experience is that effective governments and effective ministers have to go through that difficult process. You cannot say yes to everybody. You cannot just assume that every program is the most successful program that has ever been invented. There are some programs that are not.

The problem that I have with this, in terms of the way the government and the minister has handled it, is the process because, as I said, I do not accept that there has been a proper appraisal of the 235 individual services that are going to be impacted by the McCann review and the

government's decisions. The dilemma for me, as one member of this chamber, is that I cannot tell you which of the 235 are the terrific ones and which of the 235 ain't worth funding.

I have received glowing endorsements and I have seen material on a number of the programs. I am sure a lot of the members have. The Community Foodies program and the Start Right Eat Right program certainly have attracted support and there has been media and community criticism of their potential defunding. But there have been some other programs in regional areas which have not attracted metropolitan media coverage which I understand are potentially going to be impacted and which local regional members of the House of Assembly have said to me they believe are effective and efficient programs as well. The reality is simply that this government seems to have adopted a broadbrush approach: 'That's it. McCann has done the hatchet job for us. We are now going to use that as the device to move ahead to defund virtually all (or all) of the programs.'

The dilemma is in some of the clauses of the motion moved the Hon. Mr Parnell. Some of those I agree with 100 per cent; on some of them I am sure with some amendment we could come to some agreement. The problem I have is, in essence, the doing clause (clause 2), the action clause, which reads 'calls on the government to reject the recommendations'. I, and we the Liberal Party, are just not in a position to reject the recommendations contained in the report. As I said before and I will repeat it, my experience is that some of these programs are possibly (or probably) not going to be effective, and the sad reality is they may well have to be defunded at some stage and in some process, and the efficient and effective ones should be allowed to continue.

The current process is not going to allow for that and sadly it would appear that, unless the government listens to the concern being expressed, potentially some excellent programs may well be jettisoned by this government as part of a process to try to correct the budget mess that they have created over 10 or 11 years.

The final general point I make is, as has been outlined to me by some of the stakeholder groups—and I am talking now about the AMA and others that I have spoken to on a range of issues in my initial briefings—that part of the argument the state government and Warren McCann have used in this is that there is a COAG agreement that primary health care is to be the responsibility of the federal government and hospitals and the related issues are to be the responsibility of the state government.

Part of the argument that I understand the government is pushing is that many, if not all, of these programs are clearly primary healthcare programs. The Hon. Mr Parnell rightly makes the point that if you spend money on efficient and effective primary healthcare programs and preventative healthcare programs, you may well save yourself money in the medium to long term. I think that is a statement of fact, it is accepted by most stakeholders, and I certainly do not dispute that. I accept that argument and I suspect the government probably does, too.

However, I think their argument is, 'Well, the agreement is that we have to find our bucks for the hospitals and related matters. The feds said they would fund primary health care.' That may or may not be the case because, again, I am just not in a position—and I will be interested to hear the government's representative on this matter address that issue in his or her contribution this evening. But even if that is the case, and let's assume that it is the case, the concern I have with this process again from the Jay Weatherill Labor government is that the process they have adopted is that, even if that is correct, it is essentially to say, 'This is the situation and, bang, as of 30 June or soon afterwards, we are throwing a particular program out the window, even if it is a good program.'

Even if the federal government has not accepted that it should pick up funding for it, they are going to potentially throw it out the window and say, 'This is a primary healthcare program and the federal government should pick it up,' rather than if it is a good program, negotiating with the federal government a transition over a period of time to allow state government funding to be weaned off and federal government funding to be weaned on and the effective programs being allowed to continue. As to the ineffective programs, the federal government may well say, 'You haven't convinced us this is effective. We are not going to pick it up. It will be defunded and that is it.'

I think that, if the Jay Weatherill Labor government had been prepared to adopt that sort of a process, it would have been a much more defensible process, and it would have been harder for some in the groups to argue and to campaign against. At least they would have been given, first, an opportunity to argue the case of their efficiency and effectiveness, and there would have been

an opportunity for the federal government to consider whether it would be prepared to take up funding. If that did not occur, the program would be closed down eventually anyway.

That to me would have been a more defensible process and one that I think a good government and a good minister would have followed but, sadly, we have neither. We have the Jay Weatherill Labor government, and we have minister Snelling, who has come straight out of Treasury with obviously not much feel for the effectiveness of some of these programs.

For the reasons I have outlined, if the vote was not to have been taken tonight, we would have certainly have moved amendments and, if the Hon. Mr Parnell was happy with those amendments, an amended motion might have passed. If he was unhappy with those amendments, the decision would have then been in the hands of the majority in the chamber. Again, I say that I make no criticism of the Hon. Mr Parnell that he insists on having a vote on this issue tonight. Given that that is the circumstance, we are not in a position to support the motion as he has drafted it and will therefore be voting no.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (20:27): As the other member of the Greens in this chamber, it will come as no surprise to members that I will be supporting the motion put before us by the Hon. Mark Parnell.

I was one of those who attended the McCann of Worms event held at the University of South Australia. I believe that, just a few days into his new role, minister Snelling, to his credit, did turn up to face the music. Certainly, he indicated not only that he was willing to listen to the people who were there that night but also to take seriously the review of these proposals, as suggested by Mr McCann. Of course, the previous minister, John Hill, was the one who instituted the review of the so-called non-hospital services, and it is that I want to focus on first.

The McCann of Worms forum was incredibly well attended, from a diversity of stakeholder groups—the Nursing and Midwifery Federation, the South Australian Council of Social Services, the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia—and dozens of others, including Professor Baum, who emceed that event. Indeed, we saw the work firsthand of the Community Foodies who were inspirational in the work they are doing in preventative and health promotion work.

By assuming that non-hospital services should be reviewed in their totality, and in their diversity, it makes a false assumption that somehow hospital services and non-hospital services are not intertwined in terms of their effectiveness. In terms of looking at cutting costs and trimming budgets, the focus on preventing hospitalisation is, indeed, too narrow in its understanding of preventative health. Prevention is, of course, better than cure, it is much more pleasant than cure and it is often a lot cheaper than cure. When a report that looks into non-hospital services does not actually take into account the costs that these particular services are already making across the health budget, then that report itself is indeed flawed, the assumptions that it is based on, and it is indeed set up to fail its own test.

The review also undermines the state's bid for two of its strategic priorities to be met, that of Safe Communities, Healthy Neighbourhoods and Every Chance For Every Child. The idea of targeting primary health care and health promotion flies in the face of the best wisdom that we have on health in the 21st century. The World Health Organisation has called for more, not less, investment in primary health care and indeed, the World Health Organisation director general has said:

> Decades of experience tell us that primary health care produces better outcomes, at lower costs, and with higher user satisfaction... It can prevent much of the disease burden and it also can prevent people with minor complaints from flooding hospital emergency wards.

Certainly my colleague, the Hon. Mark Parnell, in introducing this motion noted that the intent of this review is to find cost savings; yet, if implemented, the most likely outcome of these recommendations will indeed be an increase in costs. He pointed to renal dialysis in particular and, indeed, just one year of a South Australian not being on renal dialysis would save the health system upwards of $70,000. While HIV is not under the watch of this particular proposal, I understand that the budget for the AIDS Council is dwarfed by the cost of one case of HIV being diagnosed in a year, yet the preventative work being done clearly is saving us substantial amounts into the future and also creating better lives. As I say, prevention is not only better than cure; it is a lot more pleasant.

The Greens understand that the health budget is under pressure. We understand that the state budget is under pressure. We do seriously question, however, this particular review, and the way that it was undertaken. I will not labour the point too much, but the Hon. Rob Lucas touched on

it when he noted that this review was undertaken in eight weeks and involved such a large number and diversity of agencies and services.

In my conversations with those who were subject to the review and indeed are slated for the cuts, they did not even know what the purpose of the review was to be. They informed me that, had they been told, they would have provided different information. They would have provided information that went to show that they were meeting their targets and how they were, in fact, an effective and positive and budget-saving initiative. Yet, they were not informed and adequately appraised of what the purpose of this review was and so they felt they had not been given the true opportunity to have provided that information and quite rightly were angry about that. I can understand their anger.

What we are also missing in this debate and why this motion is indeed quite urgent is that we are losing people in this workforce because of the difficulties and the stresses and the strains that we are putting them under with the razor gang's axe hanging over their head. Who would not be looking for alternative employment if you knew that you were probably going to lose your job? You would be looking to get out while the going was good and that reduces morale and it leads to a talent and an expertise drain in the area. As I say, had the review actually looked at the ways that these programs were operating in terms of whether they were meeting their outcomes and whether the long-term benefits were well outweighed by the short-term costs, then I would have more faith in this review.

Of course, I would agree that not all programs should run forever and certainly there are programs that are effective for a time and then should rightly be ended, replaced or adapted, but that is not what we are talking about here. We are also talking about a suggestion that the federal government will pick up the pieces here, but we are doing it in such a way that we do not know that that is certain, and we are leaving this part of the health sector in the lurch on that and not giving that certainty. We cannot presume to know what the federal government will do here, we cannot presume to know that people will not leave these particular agencies and services and take with them the corporate memory they have and the networks they have built up. We will lose all that, and those costs have certainly not been calculated in this particular review.

I think that the way the review has been undertaken has led to ill will in the community, and will lead to ill health in our community as well. It has been a short-sighted approach, which stands in contrast to the rhetoric of this government.

I spoke earlier this evening about the importance of sport. In the same way that grassroots sport is incredibly important and creates health, it in fact saves the health budget far more than it costs it. Again, we have spent an enormous amount of money on projects such as the South Road Superway—which I call the Superwaste—and I would certainly like to see the 'Superwaste' not proceeded with, as well as the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

It has been pointed out to me that Women's Health Statewide, one of the agencies that has been heavily slashed as part of the budget savings measures over past times, looks out over the construction site that is the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. They can see where the money has gone that used to fund their coworkers and the programs that provided such essential services for the women of South Australia. With that, I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (20:37): I rise to give the government's response to the motion. In November 2012, Mr Warren McCann, from the Office of Public Employment and Review, completed a report entitled, 'Review of Non-Hospital Based Services'. The purpose of the review was to look at the performance and outcomes of 235 individual non-hospital based services across metropolitan local health networks for efficiency and effectiveness opportunities, as well as achieving savings.

The review follows the Hospital Budget Performance and Remediation Review of hospital services within metropolitan local health networks. This is the first review of its kind for non-hospital based services, and is of particular importance, given the ageing population, increasing demand, cost of providing health services and increasing rates of preventable chronic disease. The review is also timely because of the expectation that the commonwealth's role (consistent with the 2011 National Health Reform Agreement) will increase progressively in the funding and provision of non-hospital based services, and because of new initiatives such as Medicare Locals.

The review presents an opportunity for SA Health to shape non-hospital based services in light of modern models of care and clinical practice in the context of the emergent state/commonwealth primary healthcare parameters. The review focuses on the alignment of the

services and service categories to the key policy objectives of SA Health: namely, chronic disease management, hospital avoidance and population health. If these criteria were satisfied, the review also considered whether there were opportunities for reconfiguring services to achieve savings, and whether the services were supported by evidence or performance or outcomes.

SA Health completed a public consultation on 4 February 2013, and consideration is being given to the recommendations and feedback received to determine future services for youth primary health, health promotion, children's primary health, women's primary health and Aboriginal workforce initiatives. Review recommendations and feedback received related to the above services are being considered by SA Health with reference to a range of factors, such as targeted population, site locations in areas of need, access and equity, priority focus of services, transition arrangements, and other providers of services.

SA Health will consider the feedback and present the proposed way forward in relation to these services. It is SA Health's intention to ensure that appropriate services are provided to the vulnerable population groups across metropolitan Adelaide. Primary prevention and the provision of these services will be considered in the context of the development of regional public health plans under the Public Health Act 2011. Review recommendations and feedback received related to the aforementioned services are being considered by SA Health to ensure the provision of safe, high quality and affordable health care now and into the future.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (20:40): I would like to briefly put on the record my strong support for the Hon. Mr Mark Parnell's motion regarding the McCann review of non-hospital based services. Non-hospital based services and primary health care are essential to the wellbeing of all South Australians. Suggestions that cuts be made to this area will have a negative impact on the most vulnerable in our community, including those with disabilities, those on low and fixed incomes, and our elderly citizens and young families, just to name a few.

This Labor government spouts a good deal of rhetoric about being best at this and that in the healthcare system, such as waiting times for some innocuous procedure. However, what experts convey to us time after time is that spending on preventative and primary health care is essential to creating healthy—and even vibrant—members of our communities (and I thought I would just chuck that in there one more time for good measure, in case we have not heard it enough lately). Cutting programs does not help this, to say the least.

The McCann report does not provide recommendations based on evidence from public health professionals; instead, it is about cutting dollars from essential services that keep our citizens healthy. If this government wants to save money, it should perhaps look at all the non-essential items that it splashes cash around for, such as footbridges, ovals and corporate welfare. I have certainly not been the only member in this place vehemently opposed to projects such as those.

Cutting health services that are used by children, young people, women and the elderly is not only bad practice from a social justice perspective, it is unjust and unsound economic practice. Spending $10 million on consultant fees for a footbridge in the context of potentially cutting these services is not just economics; it is not fair economics.

Bells and whistles are not what this state needs, nor what it can afford right now. What we need are basic services: public transport that turns up on time, for example, and is accessible to all; disability support that can guarantee someone living with dying parents, for example, a place to live; and a justice system that can protect our most vulnerable citizens. Since we do not have any of those things, we certainly cannot afford any of the luxury items I have just mentioned.

So, let's quit with the miserly scrimping on health, community, disability, transport and education systems and instead cut the millions being spent—or rather wasted—on luxury items. I commend this motion to the chamber.

The Hon. M. PARNELL (20:43): In summing up, I would like to thank the Hon. Kelly Vincent and my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks for their support, and I also thank the Hon. Rob Lucas and the Hon. Russell Wortley for their contributions. I do acknowledge that the Hon. Rob Lucas canvassed with me whether we could postpone this for a little while but, as I think he acknowledged himself, and certainly my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks did, events are moving rapidly and we are seeing people exiting the sector even now, people who are fearful that their jobs will not last much longer. I think it is something that we need to deal with quickly.

I note that had the Liberal Party had more time, they might have had a more nuanced response, but I do not think it is that difficult. I think we can actually reject the recommendations contained in the McCann report because it was based on such a flawed process. As the Hon. Kelly Vincent has just pointed out, it was not based on an assessment from public health professionals, so I think we can throw out these recommendations. That is not to say that every program that has ever been devised must have a continuous longevity, that it must always be with us. Of course there needs to be room to modify programs but let us do it based on evidence; let us not do it based on a simple, cost-cutting exercise.

I want to make three points in summing up. The first point is that it is, I believe, naive and irresponsible to slash health promotion programs with the expectation that the costs will automatically be picked up by the federal government. A number of speakers have mentioned that there is an expectation that the federal government will increasingly fund primary health care. I think it is naive because I cannot see it happening either at all or to the extent that members appear to be confident that it will.

I am particularly anxious that if the result of the next federal election is that Mr Abbott becomes prime minister, we know from things that the Liberals have been saying at the federal level that they are very likely to withdraw funding from that sector themselves. I draw members' attention to the article in *The Australian* on 14 March this year under the heading 'Coalition will abolish all Medicare Locals'—an article written by Sean Parnell. As far as I know, he is no relation and I have never met him.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins): Order!

The Hon. M. PARNELL: If it turns out that we are related then I will bring a personal explanation back to the chamber, but I do not believe I have ever met Sean Parnell. However, he has written this article and the first sentence reads:

> A coalition government would run the rule over primary healthcare, abolishing Medicare Locals in favour of new links between GPs and public hospitals as part of efforts to redirect hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

Without going through the whole of that article, the Liberal opposition health spokesperson, Peter Dutton, is talking about slashing 3,000 jobs, most of which, of course, are frontline jobs. The government quite rightly points out that these are not 3,000 people sitting at desks doing no work; they are in fact frontline health professionals.

Having found this article from just six days ago, there were similar reports as far back as November last year. I note that crikey.dot.com published an article under the heading 'Coalition plans to hack into Medicare Locals unwinds reform'. So I think it is naive for us to expect that we can simply cut these programs in South Australia and expect the feds to pick them up.

It is also naive to expect that local councils will pick it up. Certainly local councils are keen to do much more in health but they do not have the resources and they do not have the capacity at present to pick up the pieces of what would be left behind if the McCann recommendations were implemented.

The second thing I would say is that the McCann review is simply one part of a larger series of announced and soon-to-be announced cutbacks in community health. I know from people contacting me in the sector that, in some ways, this is the tip of the iceberg. I do not want to rehash all the arguments about the state of the health budget, the fact that it will totally consume the entire state budget if things are not changed, but the way to change it is not to cut these types of programs, especially based on this flawed assessment process.

It has been described to me that the current razor gang that is going through the health department is 'McCann on steroids' and that the razor gang is decimating expertise that has been built up over decades in an area in which South Australia was world renowned and that what are being affected are projects that were designed to reduce long-term health costs.

Also under attack is work that is being done by Country Health, and that will obviously hit country people comparatively harder because they already have lower access to services. There is a hardworking, highly effective network of health workers right across Australia in places such as Mount Barker, Kingscote, Gawler, Clare, Port Pirie, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, the Riverland, Mount Gambier, Victor Harbor and Whyalla. There are many nervous country health

workers and at least 40 people that I am aware of within the health promotion area who are very worried about their futures.

The third thing I would say by way of summing up is that these cuts will hit vulnerable people the hardest because real, genuine and successful projects are being cut now. There are three examples that I would refer to. One of them is a program out of Lonsdale, which is a safe communities project that has been highly successful in reducing industrial eye injuries. Eye injuries occur in significant numbers, they are expensive to treat, they have an enormous impact on skilled workers, and they are also preventable. It seems ludicrous to argue that there is any sense in slashing a preventative program like this because of hospital blowouts. Saving eye injuries, and preventing them from occurring in the first place, is far cheaper than cure, as my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks pointed out.

Another program out of Playford Council is a community outreach diabetes program, working with those who are reluctant to engage with health services. There is out of Seaford a project which links vulnerable, old and lonely people in the southern suburbs. There is a number of other projects as well—and I will just give you a few more—that are recommended for cutting. There are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health services, such as the Aboriginal Family Clinic, and the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, and these are set to receive cutbacks or to be defunded when their COAG funding ceases in June this year.

There are also non-government organisations that provide important primary health and preventative services such as SHine SA, which have already had budget cuts. The South Australian Community Health Research Unit's contract is set to be cut, and there is an imminent loss of positions in the central SA Health primary health and health promotion area. So, it is real and it is happening now and, therefore, I was keen, notwithstanding that some members might have appreciated a bit more time, if members want to bring back alternative motions, we can debate this again. It is too important to just let go for now.

The final thing I would say is to invite all members to the steps of parliament tomorrow morning, Thursday 21 March at 11am, where there will be a rally in support of the Community Foodies program, and this rally is designed to send a clear message to the government that, in the words of the flyer, we say 'No' to de-funding Community Foodies. That is at 11am tomorrow. I will certainly be there, and I would urge all other honourable members to come along as well and hear firsthand what the impacts will be, of what are fairly miserly penny-pinching moves, on real projects that help real people in the community. So, with those words I commend the motion to the house.

Motion negatived.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MARINE PARKS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood:

That the interim report of the select committee be noted.

(Continued form 28 November 2012.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (20:53): I rise to make some remarks in favour of this motion. At the outset, I acknowledge all the people who have thus far put in evidence to this inquiry, both as groups and as individuals, and representing various organisations, and from the government of course, both in written form and appearing before the committee. I think a number of people probably did appear before a parliamentary committee for the first time in their lives and some were obviously quite nervous. I think it goes to show the level of concern that arose in relation to the draft sanctuary zones that were published, and the concern that it has caused in those communities. I would also like to acknowledge the staff of the committee, Guy Dickson, Leslie Guy and researcher Geraldine Sladden because there have been many hours of evidence and witnesses and it is clearly a large amount of work to have pulled this report together.

I will just make some brief remarks in relation to the marine parks process. There is overwhelming support for the concept of marine parks and for sanctuary zones, and that is something that we heard consistently from witnesses. Of course, the devil is always in the detail as to what the impact will be and where those zones should be located. The feeling was often that the draft sanctuary zones were an ambit plan on behalf of the department, and one has to wonder what on earth they were thinking to have caused such an uproar.

Local communities certainly felt disenfranchised, and I think that this committee has served to provide a voice to a lot of people who felt railroaded and fairly helpless, I think, at what they saw

as a foregone conclusion. The revised zones will be the subject of our next round of inquiry, and we will be meeting to discuss those. The committee was established in May 2011, so that is getting close to two years ago, and we have made some recommendations which members can clearly read for themselves.

The evidence focused on a range of issues about the future of particular communities and, for those who make their livelihood from fishing, the effect that that will have on regional economies, the consultation process, the local advisory group process and the doctoring of minutes and so forth. Those were things that we heard quite consistently, and I think it is worth members and members of the public reflecting on those and having a look.

There are three sets of evidence that I would like to perhaps highlight a little, because I think they probably paint a fairly clear picture of the process that took place. One is from the D'Estrees Action Group located on Kangaroo Island, and the three people who came to give evidence to our committee were Greg and Sharon Simons and Cherie Tyley. I think they put the issues quite succinctly and probably summed up a lot of things that a lot of people felt. I will quote from their evidence, because I think it speaks for itself; this is Sharon Simons speaking:

> Our group has raised concerns about the science being used when speaking with DENR staff. For example, I asked a DENR rep where the information for the data maps in the Marine Park 17 came from. This led me to discover that the map for 'benthic habitat and endangered macroalgae' was an exaggeration, as the macroalgae was a little-known species and potentially endangered. This was an example of our group losing faith in the accuracy of the maps being used.
>
> One of the first claims made by proponents of sanctuary zones is that 90 per cent of our marine life can be found nowhere else in the world. Unfortunately this claim can be made in almost any other part of the world and highlights another problem with the science behind MPAs. Much of the supporting science is from everywhere else in the world with little scientific study done on our existing aquatic reserves [under the Fisheries Act] that are sanctuary zones to get an idea of how well they are working. The SA public wants to know this local science.
>
> Much of the supporting science behind MPAs comes from other countries with no fisheries management in place at all so of course when we look at these studies there is a resounding success rate in the implementation of marine parks. The first thing done in such areas is to introduce fisheries management rules and regulations like we have in SA already. I won't say that our rules are perfect but they are amongst the world's best standard and ongoing monitoring needs to be kept up in order to ensure that select species are not over exploited.
>
> Proponents of Sanctuary Zones refer to studies that point out that fishing catches peaked in the late 1980s. While this may be true, they fail to realise or mention that these fish stocks would have been in a state of man induced inflation. This is due to the fact that ever since white man arrived in Australia we have systematically hunted the apex predators such as seals, sharks and whales. Commercial fishing as we know it today has really only flourished in the last 50 or 60 years. You don't need to be a scientist to realise that once the higher order predators are removed from the food chain prey species will breed up unabated. The point is that we have been drastically altering the ocean's food chain since white settlement, and claiming large areas as sanctuary zones isn't really going to solve any issues here.

I think that demonstrates that a lot of people were mystified and disenfranchised, and the science has caused a number of concerns. There has also been concern that sanctuary zones are going to displace effort into areas, which means that those areas which will be able to be fished will become depleted of stock, and that there is a difference between pelagic species—that is, those that move—and those which have a high site fidelity. So, in areas where pelagic species may be prevalent in one year and not in another. In this regard, in response to a question from me about declines in particular populations—referring to rock lobster in this case—Ms Tyley says:

> I think it fluctuates from year to year because of things we have no control of; it is the way that the tide moves, the way that the currents come in. The fish are pelagic. There are upwellings in the sea that don't bring the baby crayfish through one year, and then another year there will be a brilliant take-up of them. There are lots at the moment of very small fish and provided other predators don't get them—and seals are a huge predator of crayfish. The seal population needs controlling more than anything else does—

I note that seal populations on Kangaroo Island are a concern for other species as well—

> because they are eating each other out of house and home. There are all sorts of variables. It is like Greg says, you can go fishing one day and there are lots of fish about, and you can go another day and there is not, because they have things that control what they are doing, the same as crayfish do. Over the years, there probably have been crests and troughs with the way the catch has been going. At the moment, we are in an uprising.

A lot of these people have a lot of experience in these areas and a lot of common sense. For them, I think it was an insult to be told that things were a certain way and for them not to be able to feel like they were influencing that process. I will quote again Sharon Simons where she is referring to the science and the design principles. She says:

The way that the plans came out—the environmental goals for the marine parks are so high. There are 14 design principles and they are actually already being met by the outer boundaries of the parks and, to make a representative model of each park, like a mini park inside a park, you cannot tick all 14 design principles because half of them are environmental and half of them are social and economic. You can't please all of those design principles. Every time we are told it is okay, that there is going to be compensation, that makes me think that the fishermen are going to be compensated. This is going to happen.

One of the other witnesses I would like to refer to is a fellow by the name of Christian Pike, who was very involved in industry through the sardine association. He was a member of the Marine Parks Council, which was established under the Marine Parks Act, for its first three years. He was also on the Displaced Effort Working Group and was involved with the Eyre Regional Development Board and a fishery and aquaculture target team. That is going back to 2007, so not long after the act was gazetted.

In relation to the scientific evidence, he says that there has been a misuse of science and scientific principles throughout this process by DENR and the scientific working group. 'Where does it start and where does it stop? I will attempt to explain that.' He referred to a document that has been produced by DENR called, 'A Technical Report on the Outer Boundaries of South Australia's Marine Parks Network'. Anybody who has researched this issue would be quite familiar with that report. He refers to it as a 'key document for DENR', and he quotes, from under the heading, 'The benefits of marine protected areas', the following:

...in places that are protected from extractive uses, the biomass of plants and animals within no-take areas typically increases by almost 450% globally, and by over 550% in temperate areas...Worldwide analyses...suggest that approximately 61% of fish species studied respond positively to protection, and that 39% of the species studied also became more abundant outside of protected places.

He then goes on to talk about what that reference is, that is, a document called 'PISCO, 2007', and PISCO (Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans) is a collaboration headed by author Lester, S. He stated that this was being misused in a South Australian setting. I will continue to quote Mr Pike:

The PISCO results from 2007 are drawn from the introduction of marine-protected areas in reef environments in Third World Asia, environments that have been heavily impacted by dynamite and cyanide fishing. Two examples of this are Apo Island in the Philippines and reefs in PNG. The omission of this key detail highlighted that examples being utilised to exemplify the benefits of marine parks in SA do not actually apply to SA. This point was made very clear at the release of this document to DENR, and it was a point that became very hotly contested in the public domain.

He then said that another reference—McCook et al (2010)—is used in DENR's paper where the science shows marine park benefits. Under the heading, 'Increases in abundance, size and diversity of overall biomass', this document states the following:

Monitoring of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park has revealed a two-fold increase in both numbers and size of fish, in particular coral trout, red emperor and redthroat emperor on many of the no-take reefs.

This, obviously, is referring to tropical waters. Mr Pike goes on to point out that the recreational species in South Australia that are targeted are mulloway, tuna, sardines, King George whiting, snapper, tommies, redfish and silver trevally, which are not like coral trout and emperor species, which he says have 'high site fidelity and can actually benefit from a closed area'. Mr Pike gave his evidence at Port Lincoln on 16 November 2011. He went on to talk about how DENR had leapfrogged to use the Lester evidence and said that one of DENR's papers:

...compared the effects of temperate and tropical marine sanctuaries and found that effects in temperate waters were at least as strong as in tropical waters.

Temperate waters being like those in South Australia.

In fact, they found a 446% mean increase in biomass within marine sanctuaries. However, this study incorporated some examples from countries with relatively poor fisheries management practices.

I think that might actually be what the Lester document itself was stating rather than the DENR document. Mr Pike talked about further references DENR referred to, including a paper authored by Fairweather et al (2009) which found:

...an even stronger effect than Lester *et al* found, with a mean biomass increase of 975% in sanctuaries.

Mr Pike pointed out to us that this Fairweather reference relates to a report entitled 'Marine parks science in New South Wales, an independent review' and that the chair of the review was 'Professor Fairweather, who is employed or has been employed by DENR in SA and is a member of the scientific working group'. Further in his evidence, Mr Pike said:

Professor Fairweather clearly states that the work in appendix 3 of this report is purely his calculations and conclusions and is not the work of the collective review panel. The work in appendix 3 does not appear to be peer reviewed and the author states that the calculations are simplistic and in a spirit of empirical discovery.

Mr Pike concluded that a lot of this evidence was being used in a very deceptive way to overinflate the impact of sanctuary zones. He then talked about the process, and he said that if you were to grade the process on face time with the community you would give DENR 10 out of 10. He then says:

However, when it became apparent early in the process that the information being utilised by DENR was flawed, and people began to believe that DENR were presenting the facts in a skewed manner, a high level of dissatisfaction with this process started to be observed.

I think he is talking about the LAG process and people being outraged. He goes on:

From my vantage point as a member of the Marine Parks Council, I continually informed DENR that their misleading presentation of the facts was creating a lot of resentment in the community [re] this process...I was reminded on such occasions that it was beyond the charter of the Marine Parks Council to provide such advice and that advice went unheard. Also, it was very apparent that there was far greater weight given to outcomes of the Scientific Working Group than the Marine Parks Council, in my view. This would be okay if the results of the Scientific Working Group were balanced, but they always seemed to be in conflict with commitments made to the public by the minister, and this served to heighten levels of dissatisfaction.

It is my view that the Scientific Working Group is subjective in their analysis and findings. Almost anything from a community perspective that was put to them was howled down or discredited by the Scientific Working Group...and DENR would use this advice to push on against significant public concerns that have mounted without being addressed.

The other set of evidence that I would like to refer to is that of the final presentation by the government departments prior to us writing our interim report. As is customary, the government departments get the first word and the last word, so we first heard from the government on 20 July 2011. We subsequently heard from them on 10 May 2012. A lot of the subject of the second appearance was trying to find out from the government what the costs were, whether estimates had been done, and so forth. I think that the department deliberately obfuscated in giving us any information. We asked some fairly specific questions, trying to drill down to management costs, displacement effort and so forth, and we were never actually provided with any sort of detail.

One of the questions I asked of the CEO of the environment department, Mr Holmes, was about costs of monitoring and so forth, whether there was some sort of figure. His reply was:

We've not done any detailed analysis of the costs of managing the parks.

I find that somewhat extraordinary given that in an FOI document obtained by Stephen Marshall, the member for Norwood, now our parliamentary leader, found that there were documents relating to very specific information particularly about the displaced effort, and this information was available at the time of our committee and it was not made available to us.

There is a document which is dated and which must have been received in the minister's office on 1 November 2011, some six months before the department appeared before the committee. It is entitled 'Marine parks—cost reduction options related to management of displaced commercial fishing effect *working document* development of position for cabinet'. Essentially the document is about trying to find ways of reducing how much needs to be paid out to industry that has been displaced by the implementation of these marine parks. We should have been provided with this, and I think it is an absolute disgrace that the committee was not provided with that sort of information when clearly it was well within its terms of reference.

Another document that appeared through the member for Norwood's inquiry through freedom of information—which seems to be the only way you can get information on these sorts of issues at times—is what we all know now because we see all the bus packs and TV ads featuring areas like the Port Noarlunga jetty, where people cannot fish for crabs anyway, never mind the detail. The draft communication strategy is exhorting that the campaign should be 'to sell sanctuary zones...through a pathos heavy battle for hearts and minds'. This is in light of the postcards that had been sent out to householders last year saying mistruths that an agreement had been reached with the conservation, recreation and commercial fishing sectors on zoning, which was complete news to the commercial fishing industry at least.

The government has tried all sorts of tactics. We have just had a motion relating to cuts to community health, yet this government seems to be able to spend hard-earned taxpayers' money on its marine park advertising. It reminds me of one of those sayings: 'The people must be wrong so we must convince them through propaganda.'

I turn now to what our future inquiry will be. The new sanctuary zones, I believe, deserve examination. There are still a number of communities but they are fewer in number because I think politically it makes it easier for the government to try to sell it if there are not as many people who are outraged as there were two years ago. However, as recently as January this year, an article in *The Advertiser* reported on Kangaroo Island net fisherman, Michael Fooks. His conclusion (and it is not necessarily just his opinion) is that visitors and locals on Kangaroo Island will not have access to fresh seafood—which is somewhat incomprehensible based on the current sanctuary zones—and that if fish is to be consumed on the island it is going to have to be imported from elsewhere. How is that consistent with reducing our carbon footprint?

I look forward to further inquiries by the select committee. I think it has been a very worthwhile exercise. A lot of people did say to us when they appeared before the committee that this was the first time they had actually felt like people were listening to them, because they had been through the LAG process and they felt like it was a foregone conclusion, that the die was cast and they were going to be forced to put up with what the environment department had clearly determined for their fate. So, with those words I indicate support for the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (HARBOURING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March 2013.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (21:20): I rise today to speak on behalf of the Liberal opposition in relation to the Hon. Ann Bressington's Children's Protection (Harbouring) Amendment Bill 2012. The opposition acknowledges the ongoing advocacy by the Hon. Ann Bressington in relation to child protection and her passion for challenging the government to have a deep reflection about how they manage their agencies and questioning why the government is not addressing the important issues.

The bill titled Children's Protection (Harbouring) Amendment Bill 2012 seeks to address the concerns raised by the Hon. Ann Bressington with regard to the power being held by the Chief Executive of Families SA in section 52AAB of the Children's Protection Act 1993. Section 52AAB of the Children's Protection Act states that the chief executive of Families SA has the authority to issue a directive to an adult not to harbour, conceal or communicate with a child under the guardianship of the minister. The Hon. Ann Bressington proposes to remove the final decision from Families SA and instead place the responsibility on the South Australia Police. The bill will replace the words 'chief executive' with the words 'senior police officer', defined to mean an officer at or above the rank of inspector.

Additionally, the Hon. Ann Bressington stated in her second reading speech of this bill that she would like to provide consistency with other harbouring offences introduced by the Statutes Amendment (Children's Protection) Act 2009. She has also included a provision that would require a breach of a directive to be prosecuted by SAPOL rather than the crown on behalf of Families SA. This particular provision, according to the Hon. Ann Bressington, will allow SAPOL to determine whether they have evidence for a prosecution for a breach of this order rather than give Families SA the opportunity to use it as a case management tool.

In the Hon. Ann Bressington's argument, making the police responsible for the prosecution of a breach of direction will also act as a further safeguard against the inappropriate use of these powers. The opposition has sent the proposed bill to all the major and smaller stakeholders and providers within the sector seeking their input. I would like to outline some of our findings.

The majority of the stakeholders that we consulted believe that the current provisions already allow the exercise of section 52AAB to be tested in a court of law if the exercise of that power is in dispute. All the facts and issues can be presented and thoroughly examined in a court of law. The Law Society in their submission stated that the power presently vested in the CE of Families SA exists for a number of reasons. It outlines that the statutory powers and functions of the chief executive in the act in respect of a child protection are to use their expertise in respect of child protection where the department monitors, investigates and gathers information and evidence about a particular child at risk and, thereby, has the mechanism and protocols for initiating child protection action in specific cases, including the giving of such notices. Due to privacy, sensitivity and confidentiality issues, they may not permit dissemination of information about a child by Families SA to SA Police.

There were many questions around operational issues. For instance, under the Children's Protection Act 1993, Families SA is likely to have confidential information about affected children at risk. There are no provisions in the act to permit disclosure of such information to SA Police. Many stakeholders concur with the Hon. Ann Bressington's concerns with regard to the professionalism of some Families SA staff decision-making. There may be poor decisions made from time to time by individual staff but there is nothing to suggest that this is any more prevalent in Families SA than any other large organisation, including the police department. Many believe that there is no reason to suggest that decisions reached by police in relation to the risk of harm from harbouring would be any better or worse on average than those reached by Families SA.

Stakeholders within the sector believe that when dealing with clients under the guardianship of the minister that the best outcomes are achieved when there is a clear and open communication channel between the client's case manager and Families SA. Collectively, all the stakeholders we have consulted believe that the amendments suggested by the Hon. Ann Bressington will not solve the problem. They believe that there would be more benefit in fixing the procedures and rectifying the conducts within Families SA in the way they have handled these issues, rather than attempting to do it through legislation.

Based on the reasons outlined in my contribution today, the opposition indicates that we do not support the bill. However, we would like to acknowledge the longstanding advocacy of the Hon. Ann Bressington in child protection by tabling the bill in this chamber. We acknowledge that she continues to challenge the government as well as honourable members in this place to review practices and legislation with the intention of creating a safer environment to legally protect vulnerable children in this state.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (21:26): I rise on behalf of the Greens tonight to support the bill before us put here by the Hon. Ann Bressington, the Children's Protection (Harbouring) Amendment Bill 2012. I do so noting not only the opposition's contribution just now but also the contribution of the Hon. Russell Wortley previously on behalf of the government. In that contribution, the government's position was that this current incarnation of the practice of the chief executive of Families SA's department, DECD, being able to exercise this power in terms of issuing directions with regard to harbouring was right and proper because it was indeed as recommended by Commissioner Mullighan with regard to child protection.

On review, the matters where Commissioner Mullighan addressed areas of child protection with regard to harbouring were those of quite a serious nature and quite rightly so would continue to be addressed under the Hon. Ms Bressington's bill should it pass this chamber, and they were very real issues. But what I would point out to the government is that you have amended what Commissioner Mullighan first recommended with regard to harbouring.

Under the original definitions, the standard was 'serious danger'. Should serious danger be able to be proved, then it probably was fit and proper that a Families SA staff member as well as South Australia Police could act in that case. However, in 2009 the minister recommended that that definition be downgraded to also include the category of a risk to the wellbeing of the child. So, now we have a situation where a Families SA member can, under the definition of a risk to the wellbeing of a child, put often family members and others under the jurisdiction of the harbouring provisions. Indeed, they could be facing up to four years' imprisonment for this.

People have ended up in courts and have been able to have the crown prosecute those cases rather than the police and, indeed, what we are looking at is a proposal here from the Hon. Ann Bressington to simply put the power where we have expanded the definition of harbouring to a much lesser standard only in the hands of the police and, indeed, senior police. The Greens think that is fit and proper. We are quite convinced that there have been enough cases and, while they are only a handful of cases, that is enough to convince us that perhaps we should either look at redefining the standard that we are applying here or, in short, restricting the ability of a social worker who a family probably goes to looking for support to be able to apply this provision.

Families SA social workers and staff should be in the position of supporting these families and families should not be in fear that this harbouring provision will come down on their heads. I think it is actually detrimental to the work of Families SA to have that ability there within the realms of their power because it will lessen trust that families might place in them if they know that this provision could be provided. Should there, in fact, be a proven risk to the wellbeing of the child, surely that should be the jurisdiction of the police and for the police to prosecute in that case, not only to issue and direct but to ensure that the direction is taken seriously.

Certainly, there have been cases where, because it has come from the Families SA staff, the seriousness of the direction has not been realised at first, and that has been remarked upon in our courts when these matters have ended up in the courts. The magistrates have said that is why they have not punished those who have had to go through that horrific process of getting all the way to the courts.

I think the government needs to take a long, hard look at its original position and realise that it has lessened the standard under the definition; perhaps the government should tighten up who gets to implement it.

The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON (21:31): I thank all members for their contribution to this bill. Along with the Hon. Tammy Franks, I note with interest the second reading contribution from the Hon. Russell Wortley about the idyllic way in which this current law operates. I, too, concur that, in theory, this process should work. However, my issue is, and has been for a very long time, that information is fabricated on a frequent basis by some social workers to further an agenda which is not in the best interests of the child.

I have had numerous presentations to my office, as members in here know, from parents and also from children in state care, who frequently run away from those care facilities simply because they want nothing more than to be with their family. Those parents do run the risk of being charged under this harbouring law as it stands for doing nothing more than doing what comes naturally, which is trying to protect their children from harm on the street and letting their children know that, regardless of what state workers tell those children, their family stills loves them and still wants them and that their family will never give up fighting for them.

This is a very sad state of affairs, which has existed in this state now for some decades. There have been numerous inquiries into this department under its various names, going back, I think, as far as the 1970s. It is quite ironic to read back over those inquiries and those reports to see that absolutely nothing really has changed. We may have changed it in the world of paper policy, but in action on the ground, nothing has changed.

We do have a department which has far more power than our police have and, according to professionals in the last inquiry into Families SA, it frequently abuses those powers. It is obvious, after the number of bills I have put forward in this place on child protection, this government has absolutely no intention at all of fixing a systemic and generational problem within the department and to rein in workers who abuse their power, who destroy families and who destroy children's lives.

The council divided on the second reading:

AYES (7)

Bressington, A. (teller)	Brokenshire, R.L.	Darley, J.A.
Franks, T.A.	Hood, D.G.E.	Parnell, M.
Vincent, K.L.		

NOES (13)

Dawkins, J.S.L.	Finnigan, B.V.	Gago, G.E.
Hunter, I.K.	Kandelaars, G.A.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Lucas, R.I.	Ridgway, D.W.
Stephens, T.J.	Wade, S.G.	Wortley, R.P.
Zollo, C. (teller)		

Majority of 6 for the noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

DEVELOPMENT (INTERIM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 September 2012.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (21:41): I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak to the Hon. Mark Parnell's Development (Interim Development Control) Amendment Bill 2012. As members would be aware, this is a reaction from the Hon. Mark Parnell to the abuse of the interim DPA powers that we have seen under this current government—of course, the government that he and the Greens preferenced back into power at the last election.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Get used to it; it is going to be thrown in every time I can throw it in. People need to understand that you cannot have it both ways: you cannot criticise them and then say, 'Oh, here, have our preferences and get back into government.'

Nonetheless, I am delighted to be able to speak on behalf of the opposition on something that has been concerning the opposition for some time, the way that the powers of the interim development control have been exercised. I will come back to that shortly, but one that sticks in my mind, in particular, was the interim statewide development plan for wind farms. That took away third-party appeal rights and changed the rules totally, which was not in the spirit with which the legislation was put in place. I do not recall, in any of the years that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was planning minister, this provision being abused in the way it has been by this current government.

Of course, everybody points the finger at one of our former members here, the Hon. Paul Holloway, as being the minister who was the most likely to use, or abuse, this power, but I remind members that it was the Deputy Premier, the member for Enfield, the Hon. John Rau, Minister for Planning, who unloaded upon the state the statewide wind farm DPA, which took away third-party appeal rights, as well as a number of other provisions in relation to wind farm developments.

However, I think it is also important to have balance in these debates because often some of the other stakeholders are overlooked, in this case the opposition, saying, 'Yes, we think it has been abused.' I am sure the government will come back and say that it has not been abused, but we would expect that from this government, the mob that were preferenced by the Hon. Mark Parnell back into power at the last election.

I want to read into the record—the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars may do it, but I am beating him to the punch—a letter received from the Urban Development Institute, which is probably the group that some would say benefits most from these changes if they change the rules to allow development to happen. This spirit of this was for there to be a freeze on the existing provisions, and then you would consult on what the changes might be. After a period of time, no longer than 12 months, the new development plan amendment would be brought into place.

The Urban Development Institute has written to a number of people, and this is a copy of a letter written to the minister, the Hon. John Rau. I will read it into the *Hansard* because I think it is important that their point of view goes into the record. It states:

> The Urban Development Institute of Australia (SA) [UDIA] is aware that the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC introduced the Development (Interim Development Control) Amendment Bill 2012 in the Legislative Council yesterday, 19 December 2012.

I am not sure, but I think they are a little like the Premier; sometimes they do not know what day it is. We saw earlier that the Premier wanted to have a debate in the House of Assembly last week when parliament was not sitting. It was September. The letter continues:

> The Hon member explained this Bill was to 'amend the "interim development control" provisions of Section 28 of the *Development Act 1993*.'
>
> Members of the urban development industry, and no doubt citizens of South Australia, would be aware that s.28 of the *Development Act 1993* allows a Development Plan Amendment (DPA) to be introduced on 'Interim Development Control', meaning that the policies proposed by the DPA take immediate effect.
>
> This is an important provision of the Act because it allows zoning changes to be introduced where time is of the essence. While most often used to prevent development occurring during DPA consultation that would be hostile to the intent of the DPA (for example, to prevent buildings proposed for heritage listing being demolished during consultation), it is also a very important avenue for avoiding unnecessary and costly red-tape delays in relation to urgent and important investment proposals.
>
> Our industry believes this current arrangement is working well. Ministers have a track record of using this provision responsibly, even when they do so with the aim of facilitating (rather than stopping) development.
>
> The suggested amendments proposed by the Hon Mark Parnell will do nothing more than remove one of the few remaining options that the Government has to fast-track investment and development. While infrequently used for this purpose—and wisely so—it is nevertheless critically important that the option remains open to this and future Governments.

The Development Act is an instrument for promoting and facilitating quality investment and development to underpin the future of the State. To fulfil this role, it must continue to offer options to consider urgent development proposals through streamlined assessment pathways. To deprive this and future Governments of this option will only serve to tie up good proposals in red tape and bureaucracy.

They strongly oppose the amendment and urge all members of the parliament to accordingly vote against it.

As I mentioned earlier, we saw the statewide wind farm interim DPA. It covered the whole state and it was in relation to wind farms, but it took immediate effect and of course as members, if they are not aware, should be aware, any development application that is lodged when an interim development plan is in place is assessed at that time against those provisions. We have, as we said, 48 per cent of the nation's wind farms in South Australia. We had just about as many already approved before this measure was put in place, and for some reason—and nobody has yet been able to work out why—premier Rann and minister Rau (Deputy Premier Rau) decided that it was important to take away people's rights and it was important to have an interim measure when there was a backlog of projects waiting to happen.

As the Urban Development Institute talks about it being a tool to facilitate development and to fast track it and move red tape and bureaucracy, in this particular example we had almost 1,200 megawatts of wind farm generator capacity waiting to be developed that had already been approved. It flies in the face of anything that the UDIA has said and it flies in the face of most things that the government has said in relation to the use of this particular provision.

It is particularly alarming when it is used in that particular way. As I said earlier, when the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was minister, my recollection is that it was never used to take away people's existing rights; it was to freeze what was the existing norm at the time. I think the Hon. Mark Parnell has read the Hon. Don Hopgood's briefing note or planning circular—I forget the number, but whatever it was he will know it; it is about 31 or something.

The Hon. M. Parnell: 1980.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It was a long time ago—1980. I think everybody accepts that the intention was that it would put a freeze on it so that people could not be opportunistic or knock down a heritage building or do something that gave them an advantage because they knew the government was consulting and likely to change. I think everybody has accepted it was a sensible provision. Under Liberal governments it has never been abused and now of course we see ourselves confronted with a piece of legislation because this has been abused in a number of examples—some more so than others. As I said, the one that I think sticks out the most has been the statewide wind farm DPA, although it is interesting to note that when the Capital City DPA was implemented on an interim basis I think there were seven development applications lodged within a week. That is interesting because it takes a fair while to develop a $20 million or $30 million project.

It is interesting that minister Rau, the Deputy Premier of this state, imposed an interim development amendment on this Capital City and, within a week, we have development applications for seven developments in the millions of dollars. It is not like one of us saying we are going to build a carport or something pretty simple: these are multimillion dollar developments that just happen to be ready to go a week after the minister had declared an interim development plan.

It is interesting that that same minister—after he became minister and after some of the early stages of Mount Barker started to unravel—said it would never happen again on his watch. Yet on his watch we have had seven development applications lodged within a week of him declaring the interim DPA. We had him declare the whole state an interim DPA in relation to wind farms and yet he would say on his watch that Mount Barker would not happen again.

I know that the Hon. Mark Parnell and others are pursuing the Ombudsman's report and there are some ICAC discussions going on. Maybe there is a whole range of things that should be looked at in a lot more detail because it seems just too much of a coincidence that we would have seven applications lodged within a week of the minister declaring the Capital City DPA as an interim DPA. I do not want to prolong the evening—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Everybody is very happy with that.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Keep going.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you; my colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink asked me to keep going. If I had those notes written down I would repeat them but I do not have them all written down; they are in my head.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: We can tell; you're rambling.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Finally, the minister has something to interject about. I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Mark Parnell, although I always put the caveat that we do not necessarily think that this is something that we would necessarily do in government. The Liberal Party has a track record of never abusing—people laugh. Tell me when the Liberal Party abused this provision? Never; it has never ever happened. I do not want to be rolled into the same category as this lot—

The Hon. A. Bressington: No, I wouldn't either.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I would like to be judged on our performance. When the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was planning this when we were last in government this provision was not abused. We are very happy to support the Hon. Mark Parnell tonight. It is an indication that we are not happy with what has happened and we think it deserves a lot more scrutiny because some of the decisions, quite frankly, do need closer inspection. With those few words I am very happy to support the Hon. Mark Parnell's amendment and look forward to further debate.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (21:53): I rise to give the government's response. Through this bill, the Hon. Mark Parnell proposes suggested changes to the use of interim powers under the current planning system. The suggested changes are thoughtful and the government accepts that they are brought forward by Mr Parnell in good faith based on concerns about how powers have been used on occasion.

However, the government cannot agree to an amendment of this nature without also solving the issue of delays in the rezoning process which bedevil the planning system. These delays in the rezoning process are among the reasons why ministers from time to time use the interim development control powers in the way which Mr Parnell seeks to prevent through this bill.

The government is happy to discuss this issue further with the Hon. Mark Parnell and other interested members, to look at how these issues could be taken forward in the context of a more holistic solution to the rezoning delays and the issue of better zoning policy consistency. We are also working with the Expert Panel on Planning Reform announced by the Minister for Planning recently to explore these issues further. While the Hon. Mark Parnell's concerns are appreciated, the government believes this bill is premature. We would, however, be happy to return to discuss this issue if further conversations can produce a package of integrated measures to address rezoning issues generally. Accordingly, the government opposes this bill.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (21:55): I will not hold up the progress of this bill or the procedures of the chamber for long, but I would like to put on record Dignity for Disability's support for the Hon. Mr Parnell's bill. Development and urban planning matters are not the areas that constituents and the community are in regular habit of contacting my office about. In fact, I am sure many of them would love to have the luxury of the time and energy not to be so wrapped up in matters of, I suppose, pure survival and to be able to discuss these things more. In any event, they are not things that are discussed too often with my office.

However, I have to say we have received a vast array of correspondence on this particular bill before us and, to the best of my recollection, not one person who has contacted my office on this bill has been opposed to it. So, clearly, there is a lot of community support for it and, therefore, I am very happy to put our support behind it also. I would like to thank all the individuals, community organisations and residents' groups that have taken the time to contact me with submissions seeking my support for the bill. Some of the residents' associations and surrounding areas include, but, of course, are not restricted to those from Kensington, Norwood, Mount Barker, Callington, Dulwich, Rose Park, Western Adelaide Coastal Residents Association, Goolwa and Prospect. Community Alliance SA is also a ferocious supporter of these reforms, as an umbrella organisation that represents a broad range of community and resident groups.

So, clearly, again, I reiterate that the community is very unhappy about what has been occurring in relation to development and, therefore, so should this parliament be very unhappy. Since recent and past experience shows very clearly that we cannot rely on this Weatherill government to live up to its own promise of consult and decide, we do, therefore, rely on non-government members to raise issues such as this and, so, I commend the Hon. Mr Mark Parnell on

doing just that. I see this bill as an opportunity to start correcting at least one area of the government's wrongs in this portfolio and, therefore, I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON (21:57): I also rise to indicate my support for the Hon. Mark Parnell's bill and, like the Hon. Kelly Vincent, I have had numerous representations to my office about this. Again, like the Hon. Kelly Vincent, this is not an issue which normally comes across my desk very often. I think, given the vast array of letters, submissions and requests to support this bill, it is a very clear indication from the community that all is not well. I think we get this now more and more, where we are seeing community activism starting to rise because of the absolute dissatisfaction with a government that is tired and arrogant and, I believe, at the end of its days.

They have stopped listening and they stopped listening a long time ago, and now they are more deaf than they were 12 months ago. Of course, the dividend of that is that people are actually starting to take an interest in what is going on in their community, they are starting to get active about it, and they are starting to speak their mind, which is the sign of a very healthy democracy.

So, with those very short words, I congratulate the Hon. Mark Parnell for putting this forward, and I also acknowledge his life prior to politics, being involved in planning and development and, I believe, some cases fought out in court over such issues. I acknowledge that he does have some background and some level of expertise in this area, and that he is acting on what he knows rather than what the government is doing, which is acting on what they think they know. I will leave that with the house and, again, commend the Hon. Mark Parnell for the bill.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (22:00): I am unable to support the bill of the Hon. Mark Parnell because I believe that, until such time as we have canvassed all the options available to speed up the zoning process, this bill is premature.

The Hon. M. PARNELL (22:00): I would like to begin by thanking the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Ann Bressington and the Hon. David Ridgway for their support and I also thank the Hon. John Darley for putting his views on the record. I would like to say that I am sure we can address some of those issues and I understand where he is coming from. I also thank the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars for his contribution.

I am delighted that this bill clearly has the numbers in the Legislative Council to pass tonight. I want to make a couple of brief observations about the contributions from the Hon. David Ridgway and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars. Then I want to very briefly explain an amendment that I have filed. If I explain it now I will not need to explain it again in committee, so it will save us time. Then I want to quickly put on the record some of the contributions that have been received since this bill was introduced.

In terms of the Hon. David Ridgway's contribution, I am delighted that he is supporting the bill now. He referred to the Urban Development Institute of Australia; they provided a letter, to which I think the best response is, 'They would say that, wouldn't they?' because one person's red tape and bureaucracy is another person's rights to public participation and engagement in the planning system.

They make the point that it is a slower system where you actually have to consult the community and you have to talk to the community. It is much faster if you can, in dictatorial fashion, impose a rezoning and have it brought into effect immediately. Of course that is quicker, but I appreciate that the Hon. David Ridgway has put that on the record and it can just sit there.

The Hon. Gerry Kandelaars raises the point, and it is a point I will come to again in a second, that the government uses—I say, abuses—interim operation because it is too slow to get a rezoning through in the normal fashion, to which my response is, 'You're the government; you've got control of the legislative agenda. If there are efficiencies that can be introduced in the rezoning system, the DPA system, let's debate those in parliament.' It seems a bit rich for the government to say that it is somehow the Greens' problem to fix up the delays that they have ignored for years and years and that until I can come up with a complete package of reforms to address delays, they are not prepared to address abuse. That is just an illogical position to take.

I just need to quickly put on the record the amendment that I have foreshadowed; it has been filed. It comes from the period of the last six months while I have been consulting on this bill and it did become apparent that the bill would not necessarily work in every case to prevent misuse of interim operation. The Planning Institute pointed out to me that some of the controversial developments that have been approved under interim operation might slip through the net if they

are regarded by the minister as reasonable, notwithstanding the clear intent of the legislation. They say to me in correspondence:

> While a practice circular on interim authorisation dating from the 1980s stated that interim operation would be introduced only to avoid inappropriate development contrary to the intent of the amendment to a Development Plan, the use of interim effect to encourage high rise or other types of development appears consistent with what the minister regards as 'reasonable' given current state planning policy and objectives in 2013.

So, I have added a subsection that refers to how applications for development approval should be treated under interim operation and the amendment works like this: where an application for development approval is lodged during the period of interim operation, it must be assessed against both the development plan as it existed prior to the interim DPA and also against the development plan as amended by the DPA.

If the outcome—be it approval, refusal or approval subject to conditions—would be different under both those assessments, the development approval must not be granted or refused or conditions attached until the interim operation period has ended and the DPA has been finalised. If the outcome would have been the same, approval can be given. This ensures that routine developments that might be within an area affected by an interim operation provision can still be approved if they are not directly affected. However, any development where the result would be different is effectively put on hold.

This provision has no work to do if the minister stops abusing the interim DPA process. This amendment would also put pressure on the minister not to drag his or her feet and to finalise the DPA sooner rather than later because, if the process is abused, some development applications will still be languishing.

The other change I have introduced in the amendment I have tabled is to make sure that the minister cannot downgrade public participation rights using an interim DPA. Where the effect of an interim DPA is to alter the public notice category for a particular type of development, any application for development approval considered during the interim operation period shall be regarded as being the higher of the two categories. In other words, if it is a change from category 2 to category 1, then it remains a category 2 during the interim operation.

Lastly, I have included a provision that requires the minister to consult the Development Policy Advisory Committee (DPAC) before declaring interim operation. This provides an extra check on the appropriate use of this power. This was a specific recommendation of the Planning Institute, and I thank them for that feedback. In relation to the bill, the President of the Planning Institute had the following to say:

> The Planning Institute of Australia supports legislative reform that would make the planning process transparent, consultative and effective. The amendments you have suggested...would enable a higher level of community engagement, identify resident and neighbour issues related to proposed planning polices and enable comment on interim amendments consistent with the intent of wide consultation during the exhibition period originally provided by the legislation.

I should point out that the Planning Institute's division committee does not meet until April and, in the absence of their formal position, Dr Iris Iwanicki has offered that submission as her personal comment, which she says is consistent with the Planning Institute's policies relating to achieving better communities through planning and the PIA code of conduct. In earlier communications from the Planning Institute, they acknowledged that the harm that is sought to be overcome by my bill is real harm. They say:

> PIA (SA) acknowledges the inherent contradiction in seeking public submissions during the interim period whilst consenting to developments enabled by interim policies—prior to consideration of the wider business and community's inputs on the interim arrangements. The situation is confusing to the public. The process suggests to the community that public comment on the policies introduced under interim effect is unlikely to result in significant review of the amendments to the Development Plan unless planning consents issued under interim authorisation are contingent upon final authorisation of the amendment. This is because of the perception that any submissions that raise reconsideration of the interim policies stand to compromise approvals that have been granted during the interim authorisation period. Given the lack of appeal or representation rights because of Category 1 notification, developments encouraged by interim planning policies are unlikely to be subject to reversal given the significant investment made by applicants in seeking (and obtaining) planning consent under the provisions of the Development Act and Regulations.

I acknowledge to members that this is highly technical and possibly washing over the heads of many people, but it is important to put on the record the effect of the bill and the amendments to it that I have tabled. I will also refer briefly to the submission of the Local Government Association of South Australia. They say:

The use of Interim Operation for several recent Development Plan Amendments...has been of concern to Local Government. In particular, the Statewide Wind Farm, Capital City and Adelaide Oval Footbridge DPAs, in our view have been released on Interim Operation for the purpose of 'fast-tracking' favoured developments by distancing the community from important policy decisions.

The use of Interim Operation provisions provide an important safeguard against inappropriate development in relation to DPAs that propose more stringent development controls such as heritage or environment conservation. However, the use of this provision to expedite the approval of certain types of development for the economic benefit of a particular industry is considered to be inappropriate and at odds with the historical intent of Interim Operation controls.

I will not read the whole of their submission, but they basically say that they hope that my efforts are rewarded with a successful outcome. They are supporting the bill.

The final thing that I want to do is acknowledge, as other members have, the important contribution of the Community Alliance. This, as members must now know, given the amount of correspondence you have certainly received, is an umbrella group of most of the active local residents associations that have been working in the planning field, the environment field and the community development field right across the state over many years. I am delighted that members of the Community Alliance have come to the parliament today to see democracy in action.

I specifically want to make mention of a number of the groups that I know have gone out of their way to make their views known to members of parliament. I would like to acknowledge the Adelaide Showground Area Residents Group, the Cheltenham Park Residents Association, the Gawler Environment and Heritage Association, the Gawler Region Community Forum, the Kensington Residents' Association, the Mt Barker & District Residents' Association, the No Dam in Brownhill Creek Community Action Group, the Norwood Residents Association, the Prospect Residents Association, the South-West City Residents Association and the Western Adelaide Coastal Residents Association.

On top of that, there are many, many individuals from all over Adelaide and the rest of South Australia who have taken the trouble to contact members of parliament with their concerns. I am delighted that this bill will have the support of the council tonight and I look forward to its speedy passage tonight through the remaining stages.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. M. PARNELL: I move:

Page 2, after line 22—Insert:

(1b) The Minister must consult with the Advisory Committee before the Minister acts under subsection (1).

I have already explained this amendment; I do not need to explain it again.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. M. PARNELL: I move:

Page 2, after line 22—Insert:

(3) Section 28—after subsection (6) insert:

(7) Despite any other provision of this Act, while an amendment to a Development Plan is in interim operation under this section—

(a) any application for a development plan consent in respect of which the amendment is relevant must be assessed against the provisions of the Development Plan immediately before the amendment was made and the provisions of the Development Plan after the amendment was made and if the decision on the application would be different depending on which version of the Development Plan applies (including with respect to any condition that would apply in relation to the development)—

(i) development plan consent must not be given until the amendment is no longer in interim operation; and

(ii) the application must then be assessed at the end of the period of interim operation against the provisions of the Development Plan as in force immediately after the end of that period (and section 53(2) will not apply); and

(iii) any period that applies under section 41 will be suspended while the application is subject to the operation of this paragraph; and

(b) if the amendment changes the category of any development so as to reduce the level of consultation under section 38, any application for a development plan consent in respect of which this aspect of the amendment is relevant must be considered under section 38 as if the amendment to the Development Plan had not been made (unless or until the amendment is no longer in interim operation).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. M. PARNELL (22:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (EMERGENCY VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (22:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I had a half-hour presentation organised, but the Leader of the Government has asked me to keep it brief, and as I am always respectful, I will keep it to a very brief contribution. This bill is a common-sense policy, and I applaud the efforts of the members for Stuart and Kavel in the other place to ensure that this becomes law as soon as possible. This bill reduces the speed limit of vehicles passing emergency services vehicles—namely, police, ambulance, fire and SES—from the current 40 km/h to 25 km/h, which aligns the limit with school zones and roadwork areas. This makes a lot of sense. The lives of those officers attending an emergency situation as well as the affected individuals are just as important and just as at risk as schoolchildren and road workers.

This bill was referred to a select committee by the government in the other place, and as I understand it the police expressed concerns around the enforcement of this new speed limit, and that is totally reasonable. For example, in country areas, where the speed limits are significantly higher, the impracticality of an abrupt reduction in speed is obvious. However, I would hope that in these cases common sense would prevail, as it usually does where there are extremely capable country police officers. This change was a part of the election platform of both major parties at the 2010 election, and this bill has had the support of both major parties in the other place. It is a shame that it has taken this long to implement. I am pleased to move the second reading in this place, and I encourage the support of all members and its speedy passage.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

At 22:19 the council adjourned until Thursday 21 March 2013 at 14:15.