

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 18 September 2014

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

#### *Bills*

#### **MARINE PARKS (SANCTUARY ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (10:31):** The day has arrived. I do not know how else to describe it, other than the fact that after months, and indeed years, of discussions—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Goyder, to be effective you need to move that the bill be now read a second time.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

**The SPEAKER:** You now speak to it.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I am grateful for the invitation and the opportunity to do so. I think all of us in this chamber have had the opportunity to speak to people about marine parks and the sanctuary zones that are attached to them, the habitat protection zones and the opportunities for recreational and professional fishers, as well as the community at large, to make use of what is a wonderful part of South Australia's environment, its marine habitat.

I am like probably hundreds of people who have continually talked to people around their communities across the wider part of South Australia about whether they support marine parks and, overwhelmingly, the feedback to me is that they do. If they have any concerns, it is fair to say that a lot have been put about where we can strike some form of balance between an environmental vision and what the economic reality is for communities.

There are many people in the gallery today, Mr Speaker. All those people have come here voluntarily to be in a position to hear—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Goyder, it is highly disorderly to make reference to the gallery.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** There are people who have travelled to be able to witness the debate that is occurring, because they want to hear people speak and they want to know their positions. They want to ensure that, in the fullness of time, when the result of this is known, they will know who to look at and who to talk to.

I have tried to be a person who considers the merits of legislation. I have supported marine parks, and I remember in 2007, when the debate about them first occurred in the House of Assembly, it was part of an environmental vision that the Liberal Party and government had had from the late 1990s. The legislation is before us, it has come through. We did not have any direct say on the outer boundaries of the 19 marine parks that were established. We have had select committees in the upper house that looked at the issues attached to that, and, as I understand it, that report was not listened to. Certainly it is not reflected in any of the proclamations of the sanctuary zones that were announced.

It is here that we find ourselves today, with the opportunity to debate a bill that has passed the upper house, the other place; a bill that was voted 10 to 9, a bill that gave the opportunity for all sides of the argument to be put, a bill that gave people the opportunity to be listened to, and I am proud that the Hon. Michelle Lensink from the other place did this. She did it not from a political opportunism reason; she did it because of the people that she had spoken to, the people from the wide cross-section of the community she had spoken to, where seemingly a coalition has come together of recreational fishers, professional fishers and community at large for government, be it opposition, government or Independent members, to listen to the argument they put.

There was a rally out the front of this building earlier this morning, and there were hundreds of people there who are passionate about it. They listened to a variety of speakers. They spoke themselves; it was not only politicians who stood up there and espoused the wisdom that they hold it to be, but it was real people whose lives are to be impacted by the introduction of 84 sanctuary zones and the real desire they have for changes to occur to 12 of those. That is what we are looking at. We are looking for the sanctuary zones in those 12 areas to become habitat protection zones. It still allows activities to occur and it still allows communities to have a vibrant economic future.

The opposition will not have a lot of speakers here today. All of us could stand up. We all have a particular position on this, and a very strong one, in supporting the Hon. Michelle Lensink's bill, but we want to hear from government and we want to hear from Independent members of the government also, because in the reality of the numbers world you are the people who control this.

I was lucky enough to be invited to a meeting held two weeks before the election at Port Wakefield, and the member for Frome, who has now been returned as a minister of the Crown, as the Minister for Regional Development and Local Government, was there also. He had the opportunity to watch a video about the impact of marine parks across wider Australia and he had the opportunity to put some words on the record too.

My reflection of those words is that the minister spoke in support of that community and wanted to ensure that the right balance was struck between an environmental vision and what a community needs for its future. I know that the minister intends to speak. I hope that the Minister for Investment and Trade intends to also put his position formally on the record, because people who are listening today, physically seeing it or will read the *Hansard* about it will want to know what those people's positions truly are.

In the early part of the marine parks debate—and this to me is a great example of poor performance when it comes to community engagement and making a community aware of what an intention is—when marine parks were first announced, as a local member I had a telephone call from a visitor to my electorate, who said to me, 'Can I still walk on the beach?' When you have that sort of question posed to you, an argument is lost. I said to that person, 'Yes, you can still do that. There will be a range of controls put in place in different areas.'

Minister Caica at that stage, I think, was the person who was going to hopefully listen to a sound argument on it. The community was engaged and the local advisory groups were appointed, based on nominations that were submitted. I know I have four of the 19 marine parks in my electorate. I know the majority of those people who are in the LAG group; they are good people. They discussed it seriously, looked at the 14 key scientific areas and environmental management areas that had to be addressed as part of this, and they came to not always a unanimous position, but a majority position, on what size these different zones should be.

It was with great frustration that seemingly the ability to influence that decision was taken away from them, was put in a higher level meeting opportunity, and then these radical decisions came out that have just gutted people. I think that is the only way to say it. There are people who will probably listen to this debate whom I know have worked hours and hours for months on this, because they are passionate about what they believe in. They are not people who normally fight, kick and scream; they are people who just want to do their work, raise their families and be part of their communities, but they are fearful that their future is being taken away.

It is not until we in this place have a chance to recognise that, and a chance to legislatively create some changes that will give those people a future, that I can look them honestly in the face. It is not about what we want to do; it is about what the community needs. Government is clearly here to make decisions—yes, I understand that—but also to reflect what the people's needs are. I have to say that in this example we have reached a situation where the people's needs are not being met.

That is a sad indictment upon a government process that just cannot react to people; instead of making decisions it just decides what to do. It consults after the fact, it draws lines on a map at a first meeting of the LAG group and says, 'This is what you're going to meet.' That is not good enough.

**Mr Pengilly:** Lies.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** So, today is our last chance. It is a chance for those who are interested in it and those who hold the balance in it—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Finniss will rise and immediately apologise for the interjection he made.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I withdraw and apologise, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Member for Goyder.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Today is an opportunity for those who truly can make a difference here to actually show, by their hearts, their hands and their vote, who they are going to support. We will not speak for a long time. The argument has been put passionately. All those who need to be involved in this have been involved for a long time and we have had a lot of decisions put; but, please, when you stand up to vote, consider the needs of all South Australians and the needs of regions.

Government's own research indicates that 124 full-time equivalent jobs are going to be lost, and \$12.4 million will be lost in regional communities. At a time of such exceptionally high unemployment in regional communities and so many communities struggling for a vibrant economic future, we cannot afford to do this. It cannot happen because, if it does happen, it is an absolute disgrace. It is a disgrace to the way in which this parliament should act, and it is a disgrace to the responsibility that we have to all South Australians.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (10:40):** I rise on behalf of the government to indicate that we will be opposing this bill. The bill would destroy the marine parks network, which has been established—

**Mr Marshall:** What absolute rubbish!

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —which has been established—

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —on the best available science and involved in one of the most extensive consultation periods ever undertaken in this state. The bill proposes to remove 12—

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —of the 83 sanctuary zones, including five of the seven largest zones. This would reduce the total area of the state's waters given the highest level of protection from 6 per cent to 4 per cent. In addition, the bill proposes that there be rolling reviews of marine parks management plans to be conducted every two years. This would be a huge and unnecessary administrative burden and create uncertainty for all users of our marine environment.

South Australians support marine parks with sanctuary zones. A recent poll conducted by UMR-ReachTEL polling from Thursday 11 September to Sunday 14 September 2014 surveyed 2,007 South Australian residents on the issue of marine park sanctuaries. Seventy-five per cent of respondents thought marine sanctuaries were a good idea compared with just 13 per cent who did not, and 66 per cent of fishers said they—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —also felt that marine sanctuaries were a good idea, compared with 25 per cent who did not.

**Mr Marshall:** We're all for marine parks.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** South Australia's marine parks have been developed based on the best local, national and international science and were developed with the input of some of our state's most respected marine scientists. The scientific working group comprised 12 independent highly regarded scientists who have expertise in a range of scientific fields, such as marine ecology, marine biology and biological oceanography.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** In addition, South Australia's 19 marine parks have—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Finniss is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —been established following an unprecedented consultation process. In fact, 83 per cent—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Finniss is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —of the final sanctuary zones were derived from local advisory group advice. Where local advisory group advice was not applied, it was because the advice would result in an outcome—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the second time. If he moves his lips out of order again, he will be leaving the chamber.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Where local advisory group advice was not applied, it was because the advice would result in an outcome that did not meet the basic requirements of the Marine Parks Act or the 14 design principles for the parks.

The government was committed to consulting widely because we understand that our native marine species and their marine habitats belong to all South Australians, both present and future. More than 8,600 written submissions were received during the final round of community consultation and, as a result, more than 50 amendments were made to the draft zones. Of particular note is that 85 per cent of respondents supported increasing the number or size of sanctuary zones to strengthen conservation outcomes. As a result of the consultation process, the marine parks boundaries were revised to deliver the best outcomes that balance the environmental benefit with the impact on people and industries who use the marine environment, like commercial and recreational fishers.

Economic impact assessments conducted in August 2012 estimated that the total impact on commercial fishing would be 124 direct and indirect jobs. Of course, this is a number that we have heard again and again by those who oppose our marine parks network. What we have not heard from those using these figures is that these assessments were based on the original management plans and did not take into account over 50 amendments made to the draft zoning in response to comments received from the public.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order. The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** In August of this year, the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources commissioned EconSearch to revise its marine park impact estimates. These updated estimates were able to take into account the final marine park management plans. This report identified a significant reduction in the projected impact, with a reduction of 80 direct or indirect jobs projected.

Of course, neither of these assessments has been able to take into account the approximately \$18 million spent by the government in the voluntary buyout process nor the potential but unquantified long-term benefit that we expect the marine parks network to have. This long-term benefit has been experienced in places like New Zealand and New South Wales, where marine parks networks with sanctuary zones have created economic activity and jobs. We know from these experiences that the tourism sector, which employs 30,000 South Australians, stands to benefit

significantly from sanctuary zones. We know that commercial fishers will benefit from the ability to brand their produce—

**Mr Pederick:** The tourists come to fish.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** We know that commercial fishers will benefit from the ability to brand their produce as coming from a well-managed fishery with a marine parks network.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** However, what is clear from ongoing public debate is there continues to be—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —concern within the community regarding the possible impact on our marine parks network. To provide reassurance to regional communities who continue to have concerns relating to the implementation of the sanctuary zones, the government has a number of new measures it will implement if the bill is defeated. First, the government will complete formal regional assessment statement processes for Port Wakefield, Ceduna and Kangaroo Island by 1 October 2015.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** The sky hasn't caved in.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The government will also commence a program—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is called to order.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The government will also commence a program for the review of the marine park management plans, pursuant to section 14(2) of the Marine Parks Act 2007, within this term of government. Commercial fishers have asked the government for these regulations to help provide the industry certainty regarding the process for compensation and compulsory acquisition under the Marine Parks Act 2007.

Once the debate on the amendment bill is completed, draft marine parks statutory authorisation compensation regulations 2014 will be released for targeted public consultation. The government hopes that the implementation of these measures will help to ensure South Australia's marine parks program continues to deliver environmental, economic and social benefits for all South Australians. It is an oldie but a goodie: we do not inherit the earth from our parents; we borrow it from our children.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the deputy leader for the first time.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Our marine parks network will help to ensure we return a healthy and prosperous earth to future generations.

**Mr Pederick:** We've already got the best management in the world.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I urge all members to oppose this bill in its entirety.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Hammond.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (10:48):** In the absence of anyone standing, I will—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton, who has already been called to order but nevertheless gets the call.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I am fully aware of that, sir, and I promise not to digress again. I oppose this bill, as you would expect. The bill ignores years of proper community consultation—probably the most consulted bill in the history of this parliament. It started back when the member for Davenport, the then environment minister issued a discussion paper, under the auspices of the then premier Rob Kerin, saying that they would introduce marine parks, and within those would be sanctuary zones. My, how that position has changed.

This bill will jeopardise some of our state's most iconic sites and unique marine life. This bill has no scientific basis, as the experts themselves have expressed. As reported on 23 August in *The Advertiser*, it appears that the proposed amendments have not undergone any community or scientific consultation and they are not supported by any scientific rationale or justification. South Australia's 19 marine parks cover about 44 per cent of the state's waters.

We have also ensured that recreational fishing will be largely unaffected, and that was a deliberate approach. Six per cent, or roughly 3,600 square kilometres, has been assigned the highest level of protection. It has been, as I said, over 10 years in the planning, and the member for Davenport was there at its birth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes; your position has changed because it suits you. It was right before; it's not now. Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton will be seated. It is not in order to refer to the opposition in the second person, because under parliamentary convention it would be taken that the member for Colton is referring to me, and I am sure he is not; so I warn him for the first time.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Mr Speaker, I would never, ever say anything adverse about you. Mr Speaker, the sanctuary zones, the areas this bill is attempting to change, are critical to the marine parks network. They are much more than no fishing areas. They have been established because the expert advice is that they are integral to protecting our native marine species and their marine habitats.

It is very important to point out what the opposition ignores, when they argue that marine parks should be designed based on threats and damage that arise, because it completely misses the point, because by then it might be too late. We cannot afford the opposition's wait until it is broken to fix it approach. It would put our environment at risk and is completely at odds with the overwhelming scientific evidence available on marine parks. Recently, Valerie Taylor, a prominent shark expert and environmentalist, heard about the opposition bill. She expressed her dismay. In her own words she said:

South Australia has so much to offer underwater—the range of biodiversity is just incredible.

The opposition wants to undermine Sanctuary Zones—

which they once supported—

and destroy it all.

Once they are gone we will never get them back—South Australia will just have a dead ocean, and that would be a great loss.

As I said before, the defined sanctuary zones are critical to the marine parks network. They play an integral role in ensuring against the emerging impacts of climate change. They are also, contrary to the opinion of many, good for fishing and fishing tourism. They underpin the health of the sea and protect the places where fish breed and grow. It seems to me to be almost criminally negligent, if you like, that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, you'll be able to be—sorry, sir, it's not you, of course. The opposition will be able to justify how it is that \$18 million of taxpayers' funds can be spent in buying back from willing sellers those areas that are designated and to be designated sanctuary zones. This bill, if it proceeds, will allow fishing in those 12 targeted zones, the majority of which was encompassed by the buyback. It will affect 29 per cent of total waters, given this highest level of protection. Also, the government's commitment throughout this process has been to have less than 5 per cent displacement, and we have come in at 1.7 per cent displacement. This bill does not provide for genuine conservation outcomes, nor is it economically sound.

The opposition talk about their support for marine parks. If we go back: when the Bannon government was tossed out, back in 1993, there were, I think, 70,000 hectares of land-based protection under the wilderness act given at that time. How much more did we get during the next

nine years of Liberal government? Not one square metre—not one square metre, such is their commitment to the environment. What have we got today? Two million, I think, or thereabouts, hectares of land under this highest level of protection. That is the commitment that this party gives to our environment, a commitment that is supported by the majority of the people of South Australia. What do you give? You give nothing. You take away.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Sir, not you, sir, the opposition takes away. People ask, 'Where are the threats?' Well, go and look in the mirror. The threat is us as a species. The precautionary principle is aimed at making sure that area that is—and we will not say completely pristine—in the best—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —possible condition will remain in that condition for future generations to enjoy. It is said that 84 per cent, or thereabouts, of species found in our temperate waters are unique to these waters along South Australia. They also say that 90 per cent of the future advances in life sciences are going to be found from natural products and resources.

I can see great opportunity for South Australia in the area of biosciences with the protection of these waters, and it is a no-brainer. Sir, I commend, if you like—if that is the right word—or urge the house to defeat this bill, and emphatically defeat it.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (10:54):** The government strongly opposes this bill and, on a very personal note coming from a family of keen recreational anglers, I also strongly oppose this bill. It has purely been designed to address the economic concerns of a select few individuals from the commercial fisheries industries choosing to completely ignore the wider economic and environmental benefits of marine parks for the entire state. Our state's marine environment is an asset that belongs to all South Australians today and into the future, and it astounds me that the opposition is willing to risk this vital asset just to score a few political points in the short term—pure opportunism.

*Mr Speirs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Bright is called to order.

**Mr HUGHES:** That is just simply irresponsible. Marine parks present a wealth of opportunities for our state.

**Mr Pengilly:** That's the first speech you've made since you got here, Eddie.

**Mr HUGHES:** Well, that's not actually true. They complement our existing measures to manage our fisheries and boost our state's reputation as a source of clean healthy seafood. The parks are designed to build additional resistance and resilience for fish stocks, protect fragile and critical habitats, and conserve the wealth of marine biodiversity in this state.

They will also be an important source of tourism activity and, importantly, they will ensure that our oceans are protected for current and future generations, especially given the massive significant global impacts that are occurring at the moment. There is no denying that marine parks and the current sanctuary zones have wide support in Whyalla.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader! Would the member for Giles be seated. The deputy leader is highly disorderly. I allowed her to get away with much yesterday in question time. If the deputy leader moves her lips out of order at any time for the rest of the day she will be leaving the chamber forthwith. Member for Giles.

**Mr HUGHES:** The initial economic impact assessments conducted by EconSearch were based on draft zoning back in August 2012. According to the calculations by—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Finniss now has his second and final warning.

**Mr HUGHES:** According to the calculations by SARDI, the South Australian Research and Development Institute, the total estimated impact on commercial fishing from the 83 sanctuary zones is 1.7 per cent of the gross value of production. This is significantly less than the maximum 5 per cent impact guaranteed by the government at the outset of the program. In addition, the government has introduced the voluntary buyback program to re-purchase licences and quota entitlements to further offset the economic impact.

The voluntary buyback program has now been completed by five of the six fisheries involved. In August 2014, we commissioned EconSearch to revise its marine park assessments given the changes that were introduced. The purpose was to take into account the revised zones in the final marine park management plans as well as the impact of the voluntary catch effort reduction program.

The revised estimates demonstrate just how much the government listened to and acted on the feedback received. Initially the impact on gross state product was estimated to be \$12.6 million of gross state product, representing 0.02 per cent of gross state product. The figure was revised down to approximately \$8.2 million, which represents 0.01 per cent of gross state product. Look at the impact of the Warburton report at the moment on the renewable energy providers in this state: it dwarfs the impact of what is being proposed here.

The total impact on employment, including commercial fishing; jobs downstream, such as processing and transport; and flow-on jobs, was revised from 124, as estimated in 2012, to 80 in 2014. In my community of Whyalla, we have nearly lost 80 jobs just because of the Warburton report and the uncertainty that the federal government have deliberately caused in the renewable energy sector, but nobody opposite talks about those jobs.

**Ms REDMOND:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the point of order going to be relevance?

**Ms REDMOND:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I am waiting for the member for Giles to join up his remarks to the bill. If he fails to do that within the next half minute I will have to sit him down.

**Mr HUGHES:** Jobs are jobs. In addition, the impact on gross value production for the commercial fishing industry was revised down from 2.14 per cent to an estimated 1.98 per cent, so the sky is not going to fall in. The marine parks will create opportunities and the marine parks will protect incredibly important habitats in this state. The state's marine environment belongs to all South Australians and it is our job to protect it for future generations.

For all the reasons presented here today, the government opposes this bill in its entirety and condemns the Liberal Party's ongoing campaign to erode environmental protection law in this state. In coming years, the real test of leadership is going to be reconciling the demands of the environment with the demands of the economy; it is going to be the major global challenge we face, not just in this country. We are moving to a population of nine billion people and you have failed on this test of leadership.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Giles, I may have failed in many things, but I have not failed in that. Your remark is disorderly and I call you to order. Have you finished?

**Mr HUGHES:** I have finished.

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is also called to order. The member for Waite.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:02):** Marine parks were first proposed under a Liberal government and, following extensive consultation and consideration, the Marine Parks Act was passed in 2007. The act is brief and not overly prescriptive; it gives extraordinary powers to the Minister for Environment to determine a management plan, including zoning regulations and boundaries.

In providing the Minister for Environment with such powers, it is incumbent on the minister and the government of the day to consult, consider and implement a management plan that meets



the act's objectives and best serves the interests of the state. I acknowledge that this task is complex and the Minister for Environment and his predecessors have sought to arrive at a sound conclusion. What is apparent is that the consensus sought has not been reached on either side of this debate.

What is proposed in the bill is the reversion of 12 of the 84 sanctuary zones to habitat protection zones. There is agreement on broad consensus in relation to this bill and the Marine Parks Act. There is consensus over the establishment of a network of marine parks, comprising general managed use zones, habitat protection zones, sanctuary and restricted access zones. There is consensus that, from an ecological perspective, there is a need for a network of marine parks to achieve that end.

There is no dispute over 72 of the 84 sanctuary zones. Of the 12 identified in the bill, there is some recognition by the proponents of the bill that abolition of these sanctuary zones altogether is not a wholly ideal outcome. What is required is an amendment that realistically reflects the views of the community while meeting the stated objectives of the Marine Parks Act: that is to say, as a parliament and a government, we must strive to protect and conserve marine biological diversity and marine habitats, whilst respecting the existing local communities across South Australia.

The question proposed by the bill is simple: where should the boundaries lie for the 12 sanctuary zones in question? Under the act, there is a range of impactful activities that are restricted, depending on the classification of the zone. Sanctuary zones differ from habitat zones in a range of ways, but most substantial is the restriction on fishing.

The bill would maintain habitat protection for these crucial areas. The primary question that this bill raises, therefore, is whether fishing should be immediately and altogether excluded in the 12 nominated sanctuary zones. Since May, I have made every effort to fully consult and consider all of the viewpoints on this bill—

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** —and I must say there is no wholly right or wrong answer on either side of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** I have been flooded with many hundreds of letters and emails, and I thank all of those people who have sent them to me, not to mention petitions and automated emails. I thank the community for their interest in this issue and their patience in my effort to follow due process.

I have met personally with the Minister for Environment and his staff, and I must commend them for the wonderful job they have done arguing their case. Allan Holmes, CEO of DEWNR, and the staff at DEWNR passionately believe in their cause. I have met with Professor Mehdi Doroudi, executive director of PIRSA. I have also met with the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the member for Goyder, and I thank them for their very convincing and passionate contribution on behalf of their side of the argument and for the consultation.

I have met with Jonas Woolford, Wildcatch Fisheries SA chairman; Jeff Sutton, recreational fisher; Kyrý Toumazos, South Australian Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishermen's Association; Craig Wilkins, chief executive of the Conservation Council; Brenton Schahinger, chairman of RecFish SA; Greg James, local recreational fishing commentator; Peter Riseley, District Council of Robe; Allan Suter, District Council of Ceduna; Justin Phillips; David Hall; Professor Anthony Cheshire; and the list goes on. I have not mentioned everybody—only a small number—but I thank them all.

There is a case for the bill. Proponents of marine parks argue that only 6 per cent of South Australia's waters will be off limits to fishing. What no-one has been able to substantiate to me is what percentage of fishery stock will be impacted come 1 October. This impact is particularly acute for the abalone sector, with an inert species located in only a few select zones.

More importantly, there is a fundamental question about the efficacy of fisheries management through the blunt tool of exclusionary zones. As an independent liberal conservative, I believe that change should be gradual, incremental and, most importantly, be respectful to existing

communities. The current situation apparently does not have the fulsome support of the community, particularly in the regions.

In order for these marine parks to work, they need a high degree of self-enforcement and self-management. We are considering large tracts of isolated ocean beyond the immediate reach of government. Without community support, the successful implementation of marine park networks may be doomed to fail. If the correspondence that I have received in my office is any barometer, the regional community's support for the measure is weak.

The state is in a precarious economic position. Now is not the time for government to make it harder for businesses and sole operators to stay in business, to employ South Australians and to create exports. The economic situation reinforces my view that the advocates of new regulation need to provide compelling evidence to support their proposal.

There is a case, of course, against the bill. From an environmental point of view, the scientific literature demonstrates that, for the marine park system to work, the network requires comprehensive and substantial coverage. If the marine park system is to achieve the objective that the act has set for itself, then, as a parliament, we must be mindful of that evidence.

The removal of 12 of the largest and most effective sanctuary zones would undermine the process altogether. In the view of the government and the environmental movement, the current sanctuary zone coverage is barely adequate. I have been advised that the original proposal sought to provide sanctuary zone coverage for 12.5 per cent of South Australian waters, and this has been negotiated down to 6 per cent. I have seen in my own lifetime—my grandfather was a professional fisherman, and I still have extended family in that business—the impact on the marine environment of poor environmental and fisheries management processes, particularly in Gulf St Vincent.

Industry requires sound regulation. The fishing sector recognises that regulation is required to maintain a sustainable marine environment and to sustain their jobs. On the whole, there is widespread support for marine parks, including habitat protection zones and sanctuary zones, because there are genuine concerns about the fragility of the marine life off our coasts.

There was also a compromise possible and, on consideration, my preference would have been for sanctuary zones to better reflect the sentiment of the communities expressed through the local advisory groups (LAGs), as opposed to complete abolition. In some instances, the final advice of the LAGs was impractical and unrealistic, but the information provided deserved to be taken into serious consideration. In addition, the practice of amending regulations through legislation is not preferable and can create needless complication. I sought a compromise that would have seen some of these zones—perhaps six of them—reduced but, for a range of reasons, that was not possible.

There are a range of considerations in this matter. I support marine parks and our environment. There can be no greater task for us than to protect that environment, but I also support small business, communities and economic growth in the regions. I have strong views on regulatory fairness and competitive neutrality. When you change the rules on a business, you move the goalposts and you run the risk of sending that family business broke through the flick of a pen.

The proponents of change must always make their case. In this case, they failed to adequately make the case, in my view, to justify all of the 84 sanctuary zones with the boundaries set to come into effect on 1 October. The proponents of the current marine parks networks have also failed to make the case that there needs to be a degree of urgency in this. Once the damage has been done to these regional communities, there will be no turning back.

As a government and as a state, there is always the option in the future of increasing the size and the scope of sanctuary zones within our marine environment, and in my view habitat protection zones are a sound interim measure. The bill is a blunt instrument, but it is the only instrument that is before the house and, as a consequence, on balance I will be siding with country communities and family business and I will be supporting the bill.

*There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:*

**The SPEAKER:** The gallery will stop the applause or I will clear it immediately.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** At the same time, I will be supporting marine parks, the minister's management plans, habitat zones and maintenance of 72 sanctuary zones. I am deeply committed to our environment, but I am also deeply committed to family businesses and to our country folk whose livelihoods depend on parliament making the right decision in this instance. I would have strongly preferred to have seen a compromise on the 12 sanctuary zones identified in this bill, but for a range of reasons that could not be negotiated. I look forward to supporting the measure.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I am not having the house's deliberations interrupted or obstructed by people in the galleries. This is not the French revolutionary convention of the 1790s. This house should have the dignity of a court. The Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Mark Parnell from another place have reserved places in the galleries today. If the people they have placed in the galleries disrupt the business of the house again, I will hold either or both of them in contempt of parliament, and if I hear another noise from the galleries I will clear them. The member for Frome.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (11:13):** I want to make it clear from the outset that this issue is not a debate about whether or not we need marine parks. There is a broad agreement on the need to secure long-term benefits for our state by creating marine parks to protect our pristine coastal environment for generations to come. What we are debating in this bill today is the role of the sanctuary zones within those marine parks with restrictions on fishing in those zones which are set down to be regulated from 1 October this year.

This issue has been raised with me by many people covering a wide range of viewpoints through correspondence I have received, delegations I have received and in the course of my many visits to various parts of regional South Australia. As the member for Frome, I was largely comfortable with the way that consultation about sanctuary zones proceeded in my area during the last term of government. Since becoming Minister for Regional Development, people outside my own electorate have raised concerns about potential localised impacts in some other areas.

I have given it a lot of thought and I have used the time leading up to this debate to consult widely across the state with many people, including individuals, councils, commercial and recreational fishers and the conservation movement. I have travelled extensively across the regions to hear both sides of the sanctuary zones debate—and I thank mayor Suter for sending me the information—where I listened to the concerns of the Ceduna council and others.

I also sat at a table with fishing and community representatives on Kangaroo Island to hear their views with the member for Finnis. These many discussions have given me a real insight into the volume of work that has been carried out over the last 10 years and more, as well as the high level of consultation and the compromises that have been reached to get where we are today.

In my many visits to the regions I have stressed that my primary concern is the strength of our regions, both as a local member in a regional electorate and as the Minister for Regional Development. It is critical that we strike the right balance between the economic impact on local businesses in those regions and the need to protect our marine environment, and that includes looking to support businesses and communities to take up new and diversifying opportunities. I am all about supporting our regional communities and I want to see growth in those economies, building on the optimistic and positive mood I am seeing in my visits and in discussions with locals across the whole of the state.

There is one aspect of the debate that has become very clear to me in my discussions and through my attendance at many meetings with local groups and individuals. There are still perceptions and concerns out there in some regional communities about the economic impact of sanctuary zones, in communities such as those on Kangaroo Island, Ceduna on the West Coast and at Port Wakefield.

During the recent election campaign the opposition stated that it believed a sensible and sustainable approach to marine parks was critical. They has also committed to a review of marine park plans, but the bill seeks to wipe out 12 of the 83 sanctuary zones ahead of any review. Why are only 12 of the 83 sanctuary zones picked on? To me, this is heavy-handed and I do not believe it is

a sensible and sustainable approach. The opposition's approach appears to be more about politics than a real regard for the complex environmental and economic issues involved. The proposals in this bill have the potential to seriously undermine the effectiveness of the marine parks network and undo much of the good work that has been done over a decade.

I therefore cannot support the bill in its format because it seeks to eliminate 12 sanctuary zones across the state, seemingly without a solid foundation. That is not a sensible or workable solution. I have met with the opposition as part of my consultations, and I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the member for Goyder. I had a meeting with the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I have asked them to show me the economic evidence as to why they chose those 12—

**Mr Marshall:** We did not.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Sorry, I take that back. I did not ask the Leader of the Opposition, but I asked the other two above all the others. Beyond making assertions, they have failed to convince me. The 12 sanctuary zones—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —they seek to remove represent a significant proportion of total sanctuary zones within marine parks, and by taking them out you considerably lower the levels of protection. Following my discussions, I have formed the view that a lot of the economic concerns appear to be based on perceptions and uncertainty about change, and I understand that. I am very sympathetic about that. This is on what might happen, rather than what will happen when the restrictions commence on 1 October.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** The August 2012 EconSearch report was prepared when the proposed sanctuary zones made up 12 per cent of state waters. As a result of consultation and compromise among stakeholders, that 12 per cent was halved to 6 per cent of state waters. So the EconSearch study was carried out on different sanctuary zone boundaries to those that will come into effect on 1 October.

In my meetings and discussions on this issue, I asked for local feedback, for fresh evidence—and I have made that request in this house before—regarding the likely impacts of sanctuary zones on our regions. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions examined material sent to me from the Ceduna council, for instance, but I was advised that that material contained no credible evidence that had not already been considered.

I had a constructive meeting with a group of concerned fishers on Kangaroo Island, with the member for Finnis, and I have met with people with fishing connections in the Port Wakefield area. In recent weeks an updated EconSearch report into the possible economic impacts on sanctuary zones has been issued, but it is not as comprehensive as its initial 2012 report.

I have also seen a final report issued this month by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies into the economic benefits of marine parks. It has always been accepted that there would be some impact on commercial fishing once the marine parks came into effect. That is why there was a government commitment to a voluntary buyback program to offset those impacts. I understand those buybacks have been very successful to date, although I am advised that negotiations are continuing with one other sector.

I am also advised that 21 licences across five fisheries have been bought back, costing a significant amount of taxpayers' money, going into the millions of dollars. As well, I am advised there are provisions for a holder of a statutory authorisation to lodge a claim for compensation where they are of the view that their rights have been negatively impacted on zoning. I am advised that no claims have been made at this stage. However, I have made clear that I want to see more investigation into the economic and social impacts of sanctuary zones over the next 12 months, and for that I have asked work to start immediately on preparing comprehensive regional impact assessment

statements, which will assess in detail the economic, social, community and environmental impacts with specific focus on the Kangaroo Island, Ceduna and Port Wakefield areas.

These regional impact assessment statements will also investigate the possible opportunities that could arise through marine parks, including marine-related business opportunities and other land-based/regional initiatives. If these assessments identify areas of—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned for the second time.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —immediate economic concern, then these will be addressed as soon as they are identified, rather than waiting for the completion of the review. I reiterate, any areas identified as being of immediate economic concern will be addressed as soon as they are identified.

Also, we are looking at the management plans for the whole lot which, under the act, could be done within 10 years, but will begin within the term of this government. I have listened and learned over the past four months, and it has been taking up a lot of my time. I realise that my decision will not be supported in some quarters.

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is warned.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** The opponents of sanctuary zones have made their feelings quite clear to me when I have met them. The supporters also have been as insistent on lobbying. I believe the time has come when you weigh up the options. This bill is nowhere near the best option. We now need to focus more clearly on exploring the potential out there in our regions, and the possible regional economic opportunities that can be developed, and this is not a decision I have taken very lightly.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:22):** I thank those who have made contributions on this bill, but all I can say is that what you have said will be known by all. For some people who have said some things here today, the repercussions will be quite significant.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** What 'you' say is always known by all—it is recorded in the *Hansard*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** The point of order is that he should be referring through the Speaker, not directly to the member for Frome.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Goyder used the second person; I uphold the point of order.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Can I change tack then and say that I actually have in my hand an electronic petition, signed by 5,888 people as at 6am this morning. I have received letters from local government in the communities affected by these sanctuary zones—all against it. That is the level of representation for which the minister has direct responsibility. So, no doubt they have been in contact with him also. I have heard words here today about ecotourism opportunities. What a load of poppycock! It is just ridiculous! It will not occur.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is warned for the second and final time.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** It will not occur. I have heard one minister talk about the fact that revised figures come from 124 down to 80. They are real people, real families and real communities that they represent, and these people will be lost to those who live in the area, and we love the area. I am so disappointed by what I have heard today. It is fair to say that we just cannot believe it.

We thought there was a great opportunity here, a real chance for an improvement for people in regional South Australia. Instead—and I have to highlight this fact—the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Local Government has, I believe, gone against what the people in these communities say very strongly, and the repercussions will be significant.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel is called to order!

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** There will certainly be a vote on it, and I enforce again that people will know what is said today. We will make sure, indeed, that people know what is said today and you will stand by it for a long time and you will be held to account for a long time.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Point of order. Again sir, he is using the second person.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. If the member for Bragg's lips move again she will be leaving the chamber. In fact, she will be named, which will have different consequences from the sessional order; and the member for Goyder is called to order for repeatedly using the second person. The proposition is that the bill be now read a second time.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes .....	20
Noes .....	21
Majority.....	1

#### AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P. (teller)	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.
Pengilly, M.R.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Williams, M.R.	Wingard, C.	

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.
Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)	Key, S.W.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.
Snelling, J.J.	Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.

#### PAIRS

Evans, I.F.	Wortley, D.	McFetridge, D.
Koutsantonis, A.		

Second reading thus negatived.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will leave the chamber for an hour.

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for Mawson.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Mr Speaker, as the vote was announced and people moved back to their seats, the member for Finniss physically pushed the minister for regions.

**The SPEAKER:** If the point of order is to be made it should be made by the Minister for Regional Development.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** This is a very emotional time. I indicated before it is not going to suit everybody. I have made a decision and some of the members on the other side are not happy with it as some of the public will not be happy with it, and whilst there may have been a slip, I am not taking it any further.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order.

#### *Motions*

### **FIREFIGHTERS CANCER AWARENESS DAY**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:33):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises Firefighters Cancer Awareness Day; and
- (b) calls on the government to guarantee that all firefighters, both professionals and volunteers, have the exact same access to the support if they contract cancer.

Firefighters Cancer Awareness Day is on 15 September 2014, so that was Monday of this week. This day was established to raise awareness and support for firefighters and their families to assist them through the challenges they may face with their illness. This day is supported by the Firefighter Cancer Foundation Australia and is a nationwide awareness day. I do not believe that there is anybody in this house who would not fully support the validity of such a worthy cause and that that cause is recognised by a national awareness day.

Firefighters, in the work of their duty, do face risks which may well expose them to carcinogens, which may well lead directly to them unfortunately contracting cancer as a direct result of their work. In South Australia, firefighters' work on behalf of the community is done by professionals and volunteers. Both those groups of people are exposed to the risks, so they should both be able to avail themselves of whatever support the state government is able to give them to deal with those risks if they actually do turn into genuine illnesses. Again, I just cannot accept that any member of this parliament, in either house, would distinguish between professionals and volunteers who face the same risks and so face the same outcomes.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Point of order, ma'am: there are in fact two bills before the house that deal with this subject, and I am wondering whether or not this motion strays into debate on those two bills that are already before the house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I appreciate what you are saying, member for Newland, and I know the member for Stuart will be careful, but I think that if it were out of order it would have been removed from the *Notice Paper*.

It has been drawn to my attention that it could have been on the *Notice Paper* before the bills were brought around, in which case we just remind you to be very careful that you do not stray into the areas where you should not be straying.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I will not refer to those bills, but I will certainly fulsomely discuss point (b), which is on the *Notice Paper*, which is that this house:

- (b) calls on the government to guarantee that all firefighters, both professionals and volunteers, have exactly the same access to the support if they contract cancer.

I am confident that all members, in their hearts, would think that that is a very fair principle to pursue. I am aware that the government successfully pursued legislation many months ago, before the last election, which was led by the member for Colton (a former MFS firefighter) which gave this support

to professional firefighters. I commend him for that; I think it is absolutely outstanding that professional firefighters have a strong advocate in the government ranks.

What I am incredibly disappointed in is that there is nobody else in the government ranks—not one other person—who is prepared to stick up for the volunteers. The risks they face are the same, particularly in country areas, and so the protection they receive from the government should be exactly the same. Good on the member for Colton for trying to support an interest group that he is deeply connected with, but shame on the rest of the government that nobody was prepared to stick up for the volunteers.

We also have much public discussion at the moment about the emergency services levy and the removal of remissions. That is an issue which is of course deeply embroiled in the budget. I will not discuss the budget bill, but I will comment on public comments that have been out and about from both sides of parliament. I think it is a great shame that at a time when the government says it cannot afford to provide medical support to volunteer firefighters if they contract cancer, the government is also trying to bring in additional tens of millions of dollars—\$90 million, I believe—from the public into the government coffers by removing remissions to the emergency services levy.

They are taking money from the public into Treasury, but still, none of that money will be used to support emergency services workers if they contract cancer. None of that money will give them the same level of care that professional firefighters would have if they contracted cancer. Of course nobody wants any of that to happen, of course not, but if it does happen then they deserve the same level of support. None of that money whatsoever is going into emergency services support.

It is a huge blow to the emergency services workers out there, both professional and volunteer, because, one, they are all getting these extra bills and, two, the rest of the public who are not actively involved in emergency services are also getting these bills and so they assume that the emergency services sector is getting the extra money. It is a pretty fair thing to assume that if you get your household bill, or your commercial property bill, whatever it might be, and it has gone up two, three or four times what it was for the last year, whatever your personal circumstances are, and it says 'emergency services levy', then you would be quite within your rights to believe that that increase was going to the emergency services sector, but of course we all know that it is not going to the emergency services sector.

Another very unfortunate and detrimental impact of this is that the public are then less inclined to support the emergency services sector because they believe the emergency services sector now has so much more money. They think, 'Well, why do I need to volunteer? Why do I need to help?' I was contacted by a very senior volunteer from the CFS in my electorate who said to me that he is exceptionally concerned because now farm firefighters, who are a really important part of emergency services—and we saw this recently with the fire near Truro in the southern end of my electorate and with the Bangor fire in the mid section of my electorate last summer where the CFS was wonderfully well supported by private farmers with their private farm fighting units—are all getting extra bills as well.

Earlier this week, the members for Goyder and Flinders and, I think, the member for Hammond gave examples of constituents in their areas having their bills go up by 400, 500, 600 and 700 per cent in some cases. So, of course, those people are thinking, 'Well, why do I go out and risk my personal safety and my equipment to support the emergency services sector?' because they think the emergency services sector is getting all of that extra money when, unfortunately, it is not.

There is a lot going on at the moment which is penalising the emergency services sector and it is completely unfair. The government is proposing a restructure of the emergency services sector at the moment. Professionals and non-professionals from the different sectors are coming forward regularly with enormous concerns about this. I think it reflects incredibly poorly on the government and I think it reflects incredibly poorly over the last several months, probably a little bit over a year, because this all started when the government wanted to provide extra care for professionals but not for volunteers.

In my electorate, and I know in most electorates throughout country South Australia, they do the same work and they are exposed to the same risks. I can understand that there would be differences in Adelaide and particularly metropolitan Adelaide. If one of our CBD buildings was on



fire it is unlikely, it is not out of the question but it is unlikely that the CFS would be so closely involved that they would be likely to contract cancer, but in the rest of the state it happens every day: they both turn up to the same events. In fact, across country South Australia where there is no MFS, where there is no professional firefighting service, which is the majority of country South Australia, only the CFS turns up.

We have hundreds of towns across regional South Australia and I stand to be corrected but I think it is either 17 or 19 rural MFS stations that we have in country South Australia. They do a fantastic job, and we are pleased to have them. There are three of them in my electorate, and that is wonderful. But the reality is that, when there is a fire anywhere else across any of the hundreds of towns, only the CFS turn up.

Where there is MFS and CFS, they both face the same risks, so they should both have access to the same support from the government. Where there is only the CFS, only the CFS turn up, so they are fully exposed, on their own, to all the risks. So, for the government to say that there is a distinction is, in my view, completely inappropriate and it outrageously devalues the contribution of our volunteer firefighters across the length and breadth of our state.

Something like this would never be accepted in any other workplace. Can you imagine somebody turning up to an office building in Adelaide to do work experience or to volunteer in some way or another and, if they happened, unfortunately, to contract some illness or to have an accident in that workplace, somebody saying, 'Oh, you're just a volunteer, we won't protect you. Only the people who turn up here and get paid have protection.' That would never happen. It would never be accepted, nor should it be accepted. In a workplace, whether you are a highly-paid person, a lowly-paid person or not paid at all, you should be entitled to exactly the same health and safety benefits that workplace would offer to anybody else. Every single person should be able to access identical safety and health support at work.

When the government says, as it has, 'We just can't afford it. We would like to do this, but we just can't afford it,' I think that is also a disgrace. If the government says, 'We have a certain maximum amount of money we are prepared to apply to these risks,' then everybody should get access. It is completely wrong to say, 'The maximum amount of money we have allows us to give the paid staff 100 per cent cover and the unpaid staff no cover.'

If it is truly a budgetary constraint, and there is a maximum amount of money that is able to be contributed towards this risk, it should be applied equally to professionals and to volunteers. If that maximum were insufficient to give everybody the cover they deserve, everybody should get a little bit less. As unfortunate as that would be, everyone in that workplace, professionals and volunteers, should all get a little bit less, but they should all be able to access the same health support, whether or not they are professionals, and it is completely disgraceful that the government would say, 'We will give full cover to the professionals and zero cover to the volunteers.'

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:47):** I rise to support the member for Stuart's motion:

That this house—

- (a) recognises Firefighters Cancer Awareness Day; and
- (b) calls on the government to guarantee that all firefighters, both professionals and volunteers, have the exact same access to the support if they contract cancer.

I declare that I am a CFS volunteer and also that, when I am not on a CFS truck, if there is an incident, I have the capability of deploying my farm firefighting unit, which has a reasonable capacity. I have it mounted on a four-wheel trailer, and I have 4,600 litres of water readily available if there is an incident. Farm firefighters across the board are extremely helpful in all incidents. Certainly, we need to acknowledge all our firefighters, whether they be MFS, CFS or people who operate their farm units.

In relation to the cancer cover, it has specifically been put in place for MFS personnel, and then CFS personnel have to come up with the onus of proof. What discrimination! We are already seeing problems now with the outrageous rise in the emergency services levy, where some farmers are saying, 'Perhaps we won't help out the government. Perhaps we just won't turn up,' and that would be a real tragedy. If it was not for those farmers, whether they be members of the Country Fire

Service or the blokes and women who get out with their farm firefighting units, as well as the people in the background who provide the support on those days by bringing in supplies, whether it be food or water, to people putting out those fires and working with those incidents, this government might find out that it comes at a far bigger cost to the state. There are many hundreds of thousands of volunteers across this state—I note that a figure of 600,000 is put around at times, but I think it would be a lot more than that in all the various fields of volunteering right across South Australia—and this state would be worse than penniless, in a far worse position than it is with the current deficit of this state Labor government, if it had to fund these people to leave their workplaces and assist with emergencies.

I have been to many fires over my time, and at times people give up many days and sometimes weeks. We had a fire at my own farm in the last eight or nine years, and the local units and local people were exhausted. I got up the next morning to see who was in charge, and there was a captain from Avenue Range who had been brought up with a strike team from the South-East. That is to be commended, that people travel hundreds of kilometres to help out their fellow man. They know that if it happens to them we will do exactly the same thing; head down the road and help put out their incident.

In the last couple of years I happened to be visiting the member for Finniss on Kangaroo Island. The Hon. John Dawkins was in attendance as well. There were many lightning strikes throughout the Murraylands and the South-East and hundreds of fires had taken off. I got a phone call saying there was one on my place. That is pretty handy when you are hundreds of kilometres away and with the barrier of the water, and you are wondering what is going on with your home property. I contacted one of my neighbours and asked him what he was doing. He said, 'I'm out at so and so's place.' He was so nonchalant about it. He did not say he was out at so and so's place fighting a fire with the rest of the CFS, but that was exactly what he was doing. That is how comfortable these people get in protecting lives and properties.

However, because all the local CFS units were tied up at another incident about 15 or 20 kilometres from my own property, thankfully a couple of farm fire units from my neighbours tore over. Not only did they put it out with their own units, but a lad who lives behind our property turned up and grabbed my unit, and tore out and helped to put it out and mop up.

If we do not look after our firefighters right across the board there will be a real problem in this state. I have seen what has happened with the recent fires in the Billiatt Conversation Park, the whole of which is now in the member for Chaffey's electorate; virtually all the park burnt. There are quite a lot of sandy areas adjacent to the park as well as in the park, and a lot of private fire units went in there. There were blown motors, blown differentials and a whole lot of vehicle damage, and I pointed people in the right direction to get some recompense through the government. I know that it caused a great deal of angst to those people that not only did they put their lives on the line but they have also basically blown up vehicles along the way and had significant repair bills to get them back on track.

I just fear where this government is going. The emergency services levy, which is raising another \$90 million, will impact, and is already impacting, on local CFS firefighters. There is also the reform that is going on with the management of all our emergency services. I have had people from the agencies that could be affected come to me saying, 'How are we going to go when we are all responsible to an MFS commander and we are members of the CFS or the SES?' I think that is a very real argument.

The Minister for Emergency Services (the member for Light) thinks it is a great thing to have this reform, but I do not think he understands that there is a reason that the different levels of emergency service have differing levels of command for the slightly different tasks, and sometimes more than slightly different tasks, that they do when they are out at emergency incidents. I raise that as another issue which is more than just bubbling along; it is fermenting along quite heavily in the emergency sectors, and especially in the volunteer sectors in all the communities across the state.

I think, in the light of all these actions, the simple fact is that the state Labor government will not recognise our Country Fire Service volunteers. They say they are going through all these reviews and all this kind of thing. It was mentioned in the 'Brockument' that the member for Frome has with Premier Weatherill, but it has gone nowhere. We heard in the parliament only yesterday that

members involved were supposed to have a meeting the day before and that was supposedly the pointy end of the debate.

I think the pointy end of the debate has been long ago, when the government had the opportunity to move on this serious factor, to make sure that everyone has access to legal compensation. This government runs a real risk of alienating all our emergency service workers with everything that is going on: the cancer compensation, the emergency services levy and the reform. I think the government needs to have a real good look, because this could come back to bite them and cost this state far more than they think they are going to make out of the rise in the emergency services levy.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:56):** I greatly thank the member for Hammond for his contribution and I also thank my colleagues on this side of the house who have spoken on this issue many other times in many other forms. I know that all my colleagues believe in this principle very strongly, that is, professionals and volunteers in the workplace—whether that workplace is an office or whether that workplace is out in a forest, in the bush, in a paddock or anywhere else; in the main street of a country town, the main street of Adelaide, wherever that might be—are entitled to exactly the same support.

As I have advised this house many times, I am a member of the CFS, so I do have some understanding of this sort of thing. I was dreadfully disappointed to hear the Treasurer make public comments a few days ago when somebody was asking him about volunteers dropping off, as they are saying they will do, because of the increase in the emergency services levy. The Treasurer responded, 'Look, there will be thousands of others to replace them. There will be thousands of others who will just step in and fill the void.' He clearly does not understand. He clearly does not understand this issue; he does not get it in the slightest.

As the member for Hammond quite rightly points out, if the number of volunteers who provide freely of their own time, ability and skills diminish, it will only cost the state government money. It will only cost the government money in the long run, because there will have to be more professionals to do exactly the same job. It is a real shame.

This provision of medical support to firefighters, whether they be volunteers or professionals, is absolutely vital. If you had professionals and volunteers working in a school, you would give them exactly the same cover. If you had professionals and volunteers working in a hospital, you would give them exactly the same cover. Why is it that the government so correctly and so eagerly will address that principle in a Public Service workplace like a school or hospital, but they will not address and accept this principle in a Public Service workplace like an emergency services scene and here particularly, where we are talking about fires and firefighters?

Let us keep in mind, of course, that firefighters do a lot more than just fight fires. It is not only at fires that professional and volunteer firefighters could contract cancer. They deal with motor accidents and spills all time; they deal with hazardous material spills all the time. They deal with a very wide range of workplace risks whereby they could primarily breathe in or inhale toxins which could lead to cancer.

There are other ways in which they face these risks, of course, but it is not just fires. It is a very wide range. The government would never, ever allow this principle anywhere else. I cannot accept that they would allow this principle when it comes to firefighters. Both professionals and volunteers deserve exactly the same support.

I challenge any member of the government, any member of cabinet, to contemplate what it would be like to be trying to give support to a member of the MFS and that person's family if he or she contracted cancer and you are able to walk up and say, 'This is dreadful. This is terrible. I am sorry I can't reverse this disease, but what I can do is offer you the fact that the government has provided insurance for you and the government will give you the support that is necessary—everything humanly possible that medical science has to offer to support you with this cancer.'

I challenge that same person to contemplate going off to a CFS member and his or her family and saying, 'I'm really sorry you've contracted this disease. Thank you for being such a wonderful volunteer and, I'm really sorry, I voted against giving you the support. If you were a professional, I

could give you great news. I could give you fantastic news that we will do everything humanly and medically possible to help you but, because you are a volunteer, I can't tell you that and I voted, as a government member, against giving it to you.'

I ask everybody opposite to hypothetically think about putting themselves in that situation. I ask them, after they have thought about that, to support this motion.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....	19
Noes .....	22
Majority .....	3

#### AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.	Knoll, S.K.
Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.
Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C. (teller)	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.
Wingard, C.		

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Picton, C.J.	Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.
Snelling, J.J.	Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.
Wortley, D.		

#### PAIRS

Evans, I.F.	Piccolo, A.	McFetridge, D.
Koutsantonis, A.		

Motion thus negatived.

### REGIONAL SCHOOLS, ASSET DISPOSAL

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:08):** I move:

That this house urges the state government to review the process of putting the disposal of closed regional schools to public tender with a view to making this process faster and more efficient.

Regional South Australian schools are some of the smallest in the state, with some having less than 20 students in total. Currently, a number of small schools in regional South Australia have closed, but it is taking up to two years and longer for those buildings and grounds to be put to public tender. The lengthy process could be made much simpler, faster and more efficient.

An example of how the process is hampering future development in the regions, and particularly small regional towns, is at Lyrup. One of the small towns in my electorate, Lyrup, had a school closure back in 2012. It was a beautiful little school, with great gardens, trees and a 100-year-old building and outhouses. It had a playground that was supported by money raised at community fetes. It was a significant \$45,000 playground.

The school was a picture. It was close to the river and it had history, and all of a sudden it was decided by the governing council and the parents that it would close. Sadly, it was an unsustainable school for the six students who attended, but it was a small school that had huge history and significance. It was the fabric of a small river village and is part of Lyrup's history.

Along the way, a phone call was made, and one of the outraged community people said that there were builders in the school grounds cutting down the school playground and that another builder was cutting the legs off the sheds and taking them away. I went down there, and to my surprise I found that one of the government departments had given a contract to a maintenance person to remove the playground and the sheds, and they had the salvage rights as well.

The department had given salvage rights to a contractor to take away the playground and sheds—a \$45,000 community playground. By the time we chased it up and followed it, it was too late: it was gone. Some weeks later, I got another phone call to say that there were maintenance people at the school who were stripping it. They were not just taking the air conditioners or any of the furniture: they were pulling out the carpet, they were pulling out anything they could get their hands on to take away.

That school was, again, a great asset to the Lyrup community. It was part of the Lyrup community. It had significance and it also posed an opportunity for a business to come in to set up an accommodation facility, particularly for horticulture harvesters and workers, something that region sadly lacked. I consulted with ministers, and it was not just the education minister I had to deal with. I had to deal with the Minister for Infrastructure, and then I had to deal with Renewal SA. This was all over a process of having offered back to a community a school which had been there for over 100 years. But, no, the government was not happy with that. They had to strip the school bare and make it almost worthless and unviable.

What they did do was leave the asbestos. They left that there, but they took anything that was worth taking and left the asbestos. They left the community with a shell of a school and a toilet block that had asbestos in the roof. Why could we not have considered it as a community asset and sold it off then and there while there was still interest in it and while it was a viable property? It had great grounds, with magnificent trees and gardens and a little oval. It was in pristine condition. A lot of the work that was done around that school was done by the community. It was not a paid education person or a public servant who came in to do all the work: the community got in there and did the work. That is just one of the many examples, and sadly I have had a number of schools close in the electorate.

Browns Well Area School was in a similar situation. Browns Well was a great school out in the Mallee where the same thing happened. It was a great school, and the idea was that it would be used for seasonal accommodation, particularly out in the Mallee when the grain harvest season came on. People were always looking for accommodation. The school was right next to the footy oval.

Some of the seasonal workers would have a kick of footy at the local club, and some of them would be a part of that community, even if it was for a short part of the time. But, again, the government in its wisdom took all the pieces away from the school and eventually it was bulldozed. It was a magnificent old stone building pushed over and let go.

One of the other concerns has been the Loveday Primary School. The Loveday school closed last year; its declining student numbers were a concern to the parents and the governing council, so they decided that they would close it. But, again, the students were lucky enough to have schools in a reasonably close vicinity, and they could be picked up by bus and taken to Cobdogla.

The wisdom of both the previous federal government and this state government was that with the Building the Education Revolution program they were told that they had to spend the money or they just would not get it, so they put a big outdoor COLA there and, of course, the school closed less than two years later, so we have a stranded asset: a \$340,000 outdoor COLA that was sitting at a school that was closed.

In the government's wisdom it was either, 'Put it there or you will lose it,' so through negotiation, and I commend the government, they did see fit to allow that COLA to be relocated at

the Cobdogla Primary School, where the students were relocated. It did come at a cost, of course, for erecting it and moving the artificial turf, but that was just part of what could have been.

The Loveday school has history, the internment camp, and I know the member for Light has great interest in the area with his family history. The Loveday school and the internment camp would make a great community museum. We also have the water museum through SA Water down that way. Why can the government not see some community benefit from a school that is going to close? If they have to hand it over, if they have to put a peppercorn lease on it, do it and keep it as a community asset so that it can still be a part of those small irrigation early settler communities and be of value. Today, these schools will be let go, they will be run down, they will become a ghost town, and in a moment they will be pushed over into a heap and lost forever.

I will move on to the Renmark High School. The old Renmark High was built in 1929 and it closed in the 1980s. Again, it is an asset of the education department, I think, or it might be infrastructure today or Renewal SA that has the guardianship of it. We cannot get the boundaries sorted out there. We have a woodworkers' group and a quilting group who use part of the school. This woodworkers' group is a community organisation building wood products for a charity, building wood products to make a few dollars to pay the rates.

They are looking at extending that facility and putting up a shed, but all of a sudden restrictions and government regulations say that they cannot put a shed up and expand their woodworking facility because it does not meet the regulations. The Renmark High School has been sitting there unused for some 30 years. The woodworkers' group, to their credit, have gone in there and voluntarily put that school back together. There is another part to the school that is still sitting there in rack and ruin, but we have had private enterprise come along and say that they would be prepared to look at it and turn it into a backpackers.

Renmark High is a different scenario, as it closed quite some time ago, but with the Browns Well school, the Lyrup school and the Loveday school, if the government in its wisdom were able to quickly put them into a public tender while they were still warm, it would give an opportunity, whether it is a business opportunity, a backpacker accommodation opportunity or something that would keep them as a productive asset in a small community.

The reason I have brought this motion to the house today is that these are small schools in small communities, but they are communities that are held together with fabric, and the fabric is the school. These communities need every bit of help they can get. They need the support of the government to say, 'The school has closed; let's get it out to public tender,' yet we have this longwinded, bureaucratic process that takes forever and the schools all of a sudden become bird-ridden, vandalised and unloved. The community lose interest and walk away, and the next minute we get in the bulldozer. I ask the government to look at how they can speed up the tender process and keep those assets part of a regional community.

The Riverland Special School recently closed, at the end of last year. They were very lucky. That school was replaced with a brand new school, and the minister was up there to open it. What I can say is that the original special school for children with special needs was on the side of a hill. It was very much in an inappropriate position for handicapped students and students with special needs and high needs.

The special school moved, but now the old school is sitting there vacant. As I understand it, there are bits disappearing away from the school. Again, that will be a community asset that will be whittled away and all of a sudden have no value, no significance and will be of no real benefit to the community. So, again, the bulldozers will inevitably come in and push that school over, whereas if that tender process was sped up it could be a valuable asset to the community. The process really has been quite alarming.

Community members have put so much hard work into all these schools. I am sure many members here, if they have children, have gone and volunteered their time at school working bees, fetes, raffling, taking their kids to sport—all types of things. They have all been a part of the school and all of a sudden, sadly, if these small schools do close, it leaves a hole in the community. Being able to speed up that tender process gives that school an opportunity to remain a part of a small community.

In my case, in Chaffey, it is a small river community, and most of these schools were underpinned by returned servicemen. They were soldier settlement properties that were set up, and in yesteryear the schools were full. They had hundreds of students attending, but over time, sadly, with areas becoming less viable and people moving away for different reasons, numbers in these schools have declined and they are becoming unviable. If they are an asset to a regional economy, speed up that tender process and keep them a part of a regional community.

Regional communities have a unique gelling, that is, normally it comes around a sporting oval, a sporting precinct or a school, and that is something that remains part of that town or small community's history. Keeping that school alive in one way, shape, form or another is crucial to keeping a vital piece of infrastructure alive and well, and providing an opportunity for another day. Whether it be a backpackers, a wildlife retreat school, a caravan park, a community hub or provides a centre for a service group, it needs to be provided to those small communities.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:24):** I rise to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out all words after 'That this house' and replace with:

notes the state government's current review of the process of disposal of all surplus state government real property, including closed regional schools, seeking to make the process faster and more efficient for all properties across the state.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I just seek clarification. I understand that motions can be amended, and I have been the victim of government amendments before. I understand that, if you have the numbers, you can pretty well amend anything you like so long as it does not go directly contrary to—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is there a point of order?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No, there is a question. I said I was seeking clarification.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Alright, what is the question?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I understand that you can amend a motion, so long as it is not directly contradictory to the motion, but I want to know, please, Deputy Speaker, is it actually an amendment to the motion when you are—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will have to see it, but it sounds like it is alright to me.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Sorry, Deputy Speaker, I have not quite finished. Is it an amendment when you actually remove the entire motion?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are you being frivolous?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It sounds like it.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The amendment seeks to remove everything after 'that this house'. That is not an amendment: that is a replacement.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It depends on the context of the rest of the amendment.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That is what I am seeking clarification on. There is not one word—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It sounded okay to me.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** There is not one word left of the original—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We are waiting for the printed form.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It sounded alright to me, so continue with your speech.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Thank you. The disposal of surplus state government real property, including closed regional schools, is managed in accordance with the policy contained in Premier

and Cabinet Circular 114 (PC 114). Our government has, indeed, recognised the need for this policy to be updated.

Whilst I am not a regional member, I do understand from experiences both in my electorate and electorates close by the need for land which becomes available due to the closure of schools or other institutions to be expeditiously released. I certainly hear and appreciate a number of the comments made by the member for Chaffey in that regard.

Renewal SA and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure are currently reviewing the processes contained in PC 114 with a view to refocusing the strategic assessment of surplus land and reducing the time allowed for the processes that precede the release of the property to the market. The government is looking to make these changes to ensure that, when there is divestment in government real property assets, the best strategic and financial results are achieved in a timely manner.

To the specific matter of regional schools, I am advised that many have been developed on crown land. In such instances, extensive and complex research is often required to ensure that appropriate actions are undertaken in accordance with the Crown Land Management Act 2009 to convert the tenure on any land to fee simple, which enables the sale and transfer of the land in accordance with the Real Property Act 1886. In order to facilitate the best whole-of-government outcome from properties that become surplus to requirements, the PC 114 process includes the following steps:

- strategic assessment against a range of criteria, including the state's strategic objectives and planning policy, to determine whether the property should be retained to contribute to government objectives, or whether the property should be prepared for disposal, which is undertaken by the owning agency and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure;
- the owning minister is required to declare the property to be surplus to requirements;
- following these steps, Renewal SA offers government agencies and the relevant local government authority an opportunity to express interest in purchasing the property; and
- if there is no interest, Renewal SA then undertakes market preparation, including due diligence, and ultimately the release of land to the market under a public sale process.

I am advised that, over recent years, there has been very little demand for properties that have been declared surplus to requirements in rural and regional areas. The government will ensure that it communicates with all members about the changes to be made to the Premier and Cabinet Circular 114: Government Real Property Management, in the near future. Again, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and Renewal SA are reviewing the current processes with a view to refocusing the strategic assessment of surplus land and reducing the time allowed to move through the processes that precede the release of the property to the market.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:29):** As I begin, I pick up on some of the comments made by the member for Reynell. One part of the process that I am interested in, because it has some significant relevance for Schubert currently, is the part after which the surplus assets are put out for sale by the market, and there is limited interest shown by the market. What happens then? I think that is the part of the process that the member for Chaffey has been talking about as well, with regard to significant assets in small communities which are eyesores and are sitting there idle to the detriment of the amenity of those small communities. They sit there idle because of this government process.

I would like to talk about two parcels of land in my electorate that I have been campaigning pretty hard for and which I understand are currently under review by the Minister for Education. The first of those is the Mannum primary school. The Mannum primary school has been on the market, so it has gone through this process that the member for Reynell talked about. It has been up for sale to the public for seven years. There are three parcels of land that have been lying idle.

The council has in the recent past purchased the school itself at a cost of about \$270,000, I believe, and has done significant work to turn it into a community hub. That community hub is fantastic for the people of Mannum. It offers a men's shed as a place for men to come together and



IT services for older Mannum residents to be able to update their skills when it comes to iPads and so forth. It is a meeting place and it is a community hall. I was lucky enough to go to the opening of the community centre with the member for Frome—who, I believe, did sell out the people of Mannum as a regional community today, but we will move on.

It is a fantastic local community asset and it was only with the foresight of the Mid Murray Council that that was able to go ahead, but the land that sits around that reclaimed primary school sits idle and has sat idle for seven years. There are three titles that exist, with one of the three titles having had some market interest. The department, as I understand it, is exploring whether or not we could separate the three titles, so that the one that does have interest in it can be sold as a separate title and, on the same basis, the two remaining titles can be gifted back to the Mid Murray Council and the people of Mannum.

The second surplus government asset that I would like to talk about is the Moculta primary school. At this point, I would like to point out the hard work of a Moculta resident by the name of Fiona Koch who has been on the case for a long time. She did lobby the Barossa Council to buy the Moculta primary school when it came up for sale but, because of other assets within the area, the council decided not to buy it. This is a primary school that closed down three years ago. It has, over that time, become a derelict eyesore in the middle of what is otherwise a proud, small rural community just north of the Barossa.

In a town of approximately 100 to 150 people with about 70 to 100 homes, this building stands in the middle of this community as a blight and a testament to how this government has failed to look after regional communities in South Australia. It was a proud school in a proud town that now sits there as a derelict building with smashed windows, with bits and pieces ripped off it and with surrounding grass areas overgrown. It is, quite frankly, an occupational health and safety risk. It is a real blight on what is otherwise a proud community.

It speaks, I think, very much to the member for Chaffey's comments about what it is that we can do with these surplus assets, and that the government needs to undertake these processes a lot more quickly. For three years, the community has had to drive past this blight every single day. I understand there is some reticence about gifting things back to the community because once you start somewhere, where does it end? Indeed, I have had people talk to me about surplus government assets in Mount Pleasant that could be gifted to the community.

I understand there is reluctance around that and I think that is quite valid. I do think that the government's balance sheet looks bad enough as it is, and giving away assets, even though those assets are not that saleable, would make the balance sheet look a lot worse. However, these two cases, apart from all other cases that I have been able to explore throughout the electorate, come with the highest levels of merit.

What the people of Moculta want to do with this asset is turn it into a post office, a community café, an art gallery, a place for its historical society to meet. They want to take this derelict building and turn it into the focus of its community. In this small little town of Moculta, which really does not get too much focus from anyone, it would be a great thing for the state government to be able to give this back to the community.

The truth is that in both of these cases it will not cost the state government a cent, apart from preparing the sale agreement and managing that side of it, because these assets are technically worthless. As the member for Reynell talked about, there has been little market demand for many of these regional assets. This is a zero cost measure. This state government could turn around and show some compassion for and understanding of small regional communities and say, 'This is cost neutral, this is entirely practical, it is common sense, it has an element of compassion about it.' I have heard members opposite speak about compassion quite often in this place and here is something practical that they could do in that regard.

I would say that for the communities of Mannum and Moculta, this motion is extremely worthy. I believe that the aforementioned amended motion may be more worthy than the current one but, having said that, we will use the structures that we have. This is an entirely worthy motion, an entirely worthy sentiment, and it is something that I believe the government should pick up on and remedy at its earliest possible convenience.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would like to acknowledge our visitors in the gallery today. This morning we have a group of year 11 and 12 students from Wirreanda High School, who are guests of the member for Reynell. We hope you enjoy your time here in parliament and that you get the *Hansard*, because your visit is now recorded for posterity.

*Motions***REGIONAL SCHOOLS, ASSET DISPOSAL**

Debate resumed.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:36):** It is my pleasure to rise to support the member for Chaffey on this motion. I just want to clarify my earlier question. I certainly was not having a go at the member for Reynell in any way; I was genuinely questioning. If I hear an amendment that says, 'Replace everything after "that this house"' I think it is fair to wonder. That is what I was doing.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You do not need to recap.

**Mr Gardner:** It's cogent to the motion at hand.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is not. We have heard this go on with your contribution.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The reason it is important for me to mention that is that I am comfortable with the amendment and I am comfortable with the change to the motion, because what it really does is highlight the fact that the member for Chaffey has said to the government, 'Please review this process which is so important to regional towns,' and the government has come back and said, 'Yes, member for Chaffey, we will.' I think that is outstanding. I think the member for Chaffey is to be commended for the hard work he is doing on behalf of his electorate and also the rest of country South Australia, which of course is very important to me.

It is a tragedy when any school in the country closes. It is a great tragedy because it is often a reflection of a diminishing population. It is certainly a reflection of diminishing service, diminishing flexibility and diminishing educational opportunities for kids. Very importantly, it also flows on to the local economy. If you lose your local school, you lose one of the most important focal points in a country town and you lose the requirement for children and their families to come into that town every day, or every weekday at least, so that they can have their children in school. It is incredibly important. You lose that traffic flow and that connection to the town. Of course, if the kids are not going to school in town A, by default they will be going to school in town B. If you lose the connection with that town, one town shrinks and one town grows.

I understand all of the realities of competition that exist in the world. There are some things you just cannot get away from, but for me it is a great tragedy any time a school in a country town closes. It is the start of further diminishment of that town because, following the school closing, it is very likely that the service station or the hotel or the general store, or any of the other businesses, will close because you do not have people going into that town every day, and that is a great sadness. That goes straight to the heart of regional South Australia. Small regional towns are critical to regional South Australia and to our economy. Agriculture is the strongest, biggest, by far the most vital industry in South Australia.

Many others are very important, but it will be decades before any other industry contributes to our state's wealth what agriculture does. If you do not have people living and working in small country towns, you cannot sustain an agricultural industry, and you will not be able to sustain our state's economy. So, it is very important.

It breaks my heart when a small school closes. When it does, we need to do something with that school ground, the buildings and all the other assets that go with it as quickly as possible, and that is what the member for Chaffey has successfully encouraged the government to do more efficiently, more thoroughly and more quickly. There are certainly other opportunities. It is difficult, really hard, because if the school has closed then obviously the business opportunities are going

with it, as I outlined before, but it does not mean it is impossible for somebody else to come up with a good idea that does not exist in that town already.

I would want anybody who was inclined to do so to have the opportunity to gain access, whether through a lease, a purchase or any other format, to the closed school buildings to use them for child care, a retail outlet, a bed and breakfast, a cafe, a restaurant or a hotel, potentially, or even a private residence. It is very difficult because, if the school has closed, the customers are not flowing in that direction, but if you happen to have a niche business, a really smart, really good opportunity, you deserve the right to give it a go as quickly as possible, and the government is obliged to allow that to happen because, if it does not, it is not helping or contributing, it is just being a blocker.

If government contributes and says yes, as the member for Chaffey has asked, we will do everything within our power to as speedily and efficiently as possible put that publicly-owned asset (remember, it does not belong to the government, it belongs to the public and, in the context of a small country school, it belongs to that town and to that surrounding community) to its very best purpose and to do so speedily, as quickly as possible after the school has closed.

I wholeheartedly support the member for Chaffey in his motion, and I thank the government for acknowledging that they will address that process, as he has asked them to do.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:42):** This has been a concern to my communities for quite some time. The reason I have brought this motion to the house is that, as the members for Stuart and Schubert have so eloquently put it, along with the member for Reynell: these schools are not just a building, and once they are closed they are gone. They are part of a small regional community, and potentially they are there to create another opportunity. Yes, it is sad when a school closes because, as the member for Stuart said, it is generally due to a declining population and a declining student base. It is about giving that site, that piece of real estate, another life, another opportunity, so that we can keep some fabric going in some of those small communities.

Those schools are not just being closed down; the government is walking away from them. They are still costing the government to maintain them: it is still paying rates, and in some instances still supporting some form of maintenance program. I know that at Lyrup there are still irrigation systems working, community members are still going in there and mowing the lawns, keeping the place alive, keeping the trees and gardens there, albeit that the school building has been stripped. The opportunity was there, when that school was closed, for it to be part of a community. If the government had put it out to the community for tender immediately, it could still be there as a solid piece of real estate, a community asset, and that goes for all schools in regional South Australia. Again, I am calling on the government to speed up the process of bringing the public tender with a view to making the process faster, more efficient, and keeping those schools that have been closed viable.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### **MYPOLONGA FRUIT FLY EXCLUSION ZONE**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:45):** I move:

That this house calls on the state government to establish Mypolonga as a fruit fly exclusion zone and commit extra funding to biosecurity measures to protect against fruit fly threats and outbreaks in South Australia.

I rise today to speak about Mypolonga being included in the Riverland fruit fly exclusion zone. In early June I gave notice to move a private member's motion and called on the state government to improve protection for the Mypolonga horticulture area.

Mypolonga locals are very proactive and have a long history of pre-emptive hands-on solutions. The Mypolonga trapping grid was established in 1991. Traps are situated on a one-kilometre grid in the horticultural production areas and on a 400-metre grid within the township. There are 17 sites, with each site having three traps deployed: one to detect Queensland fruit fly, one to detect Mediterranean fruit fly, and one to detect exotic fruit fly.

Traps are monitored on a weekly basis during the period of November to May and fortnightly during the period June to October. A single male Queensland fruit fly was detected on Friday 26 July 2013. This detection does not constitute an outbreak as such. An outbreak is defined

when one of three scenarios is observed: one gravid female fly is detected, one or more larvae are detected in locally-grown fruit, or five male flies are trapped within one kilometre, within a two-week period.

PIRSA actioned and ensured that additional traps were set up within 200 metres of the detection zone. The quick action of PIRSA and locals ensured monitoring of the incursions, and no other fruit flies were found. PIRSA worked with producers to manage market access implications to ensure that growers meet requirements and eliminated any potential for the fruit fly infestation to spread further.

During the last few years the Lower Murray Horticulture Action Committee has been assisted with a grant from Horticulture Australia Ltd to fund the Mypolonga fruit fly trapping grid as part of an industry research and development project. Due to the proactive locals, they have fortunately gained funding for a further three years.

The estimated annual cost of servicing the trapping grid is in the order of \$15,000 to \$20,000. The residents of Mypolonga have never received funding for fruit fly trapping from the government but have had an in-kind contribution. If there were a cessation of the Mypolonga fruit fly trapping grid, this would pose a number of associated risks, including:

- marketing implications for local growers, particularly in accessing, processing and packaging facilities in the Riverland fruit fly exclusion zone;
- exposure to host produce travelling along main arterial highways passing within 10 kilometres of the Mypolonga growing area;
- increased tourist activities, including houseboats, river sports, paddleboats and general tourists;
- bringing infested produce into the area;
- prevailing winds potentially carrying fruit fly into the Mypolonga trapping grid, thus protecting the back door of the Riverland;
- Mypolonga's itinerant population, plus approximately 70 students who travel daily from the Murray Bridge area into Mypolonga to attend the local primary school; and
- some possible implications for accessing export markets.

The Queensland male fruit fly that was detected in July 2013 highlighted the impact this pest has on local growers, with many growers having issues accessing local and interstate markets following the detection. The Mypolonga fruit fly trapping grid and the in-kind PIRSA support are currently the only protective measures afforded to the area. This protection is vital, as it ensures access to processing and packing facilities in the Riverland and market accessibility.

At a community meeting, the local growers unanimously endorsed the continuation of the current trapping grid. The Mypolonga horticulture production area has diminished considerably over recent years due to drought, irrigation restrictions and lower than cost of production commodity returns.

Despite this, in the past a small group of owners have committed to a voluntary per hectare contribution in an attempt to maintain the grid. However, the required cost to fully fund the trapping grid to its current levels of protection is beyond the resources of growers who have been committed to the voluntary contribution. The Mypolonga horticulture industry will receive no funding from the Weatherill Labor government in its fight against fruit fly which was stated by the former minister for agriculture, food and fisheries (Hon. Gail Gago).

Additionally, the Mypolonga fruit growing area is seen as the back door to the Riverland and it is extremely important to protect the South Australian Riverland fruit fly exclusion zone. A fruit fly outbreak in South Australia could devastate the \$675 million fresh fruit and vegetable industry. The Mypolonga region currently does have access to all domestic Australian markets due to South Australia's fruit fly free status. However, as Mypolonga is not included in the Riverland fruit fly exclusion zone this means that the area may be excluded from export markets that place special

recognition on the Riverland fruit fly free exclusion zone and that access to overseas markets for this production area is restricted due to not being in the fruit fly free exclusion zone.

I acknowledge PIRSA's in kind support for technical advice and assistance. Mypolonga is geographically important to the Riverland horticulture industry and metropolitan growers, yet the government continues to leave the local Mypolonga horticulture industry hanging. I wish to remind the parliament that we had our first outbreak of fruit fly in the Riverland in 23 years only in January this year. There was a declaration of Queensland fruit fly outbreaks at Loxton and nearby Pyap after discovering 11 male Queensland fruit flies. This caused around 60 PIRSA staff to mount a comprehensive eradication and hygiene program in the two quarantines areas.

A 1.5 kilometre quarantine area and a 15 kilometre restricted area were imposed around both outbreaks and an extensive eradication program was conducted over 12 weeks. Organic fruit fly bait was applied to all properties where isolated fruit fly had been found in traps and comprehensive spraying and fruit stripping were carried out. PIRSA coordinated field teams in both the Loxton and Pyap quarantine areas following declaration of the outbreaks. This eradication and hygiene work continued until April and was successful in controlling the outbreak.

It has been stated by many that South Australia can be proud that we are the only state or territory on mainland Australia that remains fruit fly free. If fruit fly were to break out in Mypolonga it would not only decimate the community, but it is only a short distance away from entering the fruit fly exclusion zone—one might say a short flight.

The government invests about \$5 million a year to make sure that we can maintain that fruit fly status in the fruit fly exclusion zone, and it is a status that South Australia enjoys. To clean up the Riverland outbreak cost about \$1 million of public money. Around \$500,000 was spent at Sellicks. We all know that prevention is better than cure, so the message must be told to all South Australians travelling into the Riverland and those travelling from interstate not to bring any fruit with them.

It has been announced by Plant Health Australia that there will be a national fruit fly advisory committee established. South Australia will be committing \$65,000 to that over two years. The government has put up \$3 million to build a sterile insect technology facility at Port Augusta, as well as come up with millions of dollars of research money over five years once the plant is up and running. I continue to speak regularly with local growers who seek increased support from the state government, so I urge the government to extend the fruit fly zone and offer the same protection to the growers in Mypolonga that is extended to their near neighbours in the Riverland.

Furthermore, we request that the Lower Murray Horticulture Action Committee be recognised as a representative body and is provided the same ongoing support as the South Australian Fruit Fly Action Group. Geographically, Mypolonga is important to the Riverland fruit fly exclusion zone; however, it is only regarded as a fruit fly free area. As stated in the past, Mypolonga growers have not received the same support as that provided to Riverland growers. Local growers believe the fruit fly exclusion zone status and level of protection is important for marketing and export reasons. Recently, a pomegranate grower exporting overseas was asked to supply a fruit fly free certificate; had they been in a fruit fly-free exclusion zone, this would be automatic.

I propose that the government makes necessary legislative changes to upgrade the Mypolonga area from fruit fly free to a fruit fly exclusion zone, and provide support similar to that afforded to Riverland growers. If an outbreak happens, the entire state's horticultural industry is at risk, and the government will have no-one else to blame except themselves.

**Mr GEE (Napier) (12:55):** I would like to move an amendment to this motion by the member for Hammond, as follows:

Leave out all words after 'this house' and replace with:

this house recognises the importance of the Mypolonga fruit fly tracking grid and the other important biosecurity measures the government uses to protect against fruit fly threats and outbreaks in South Australia.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is that seconded? We need a copy of the amendment up here, please.

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, ma'am: this amendment is out of order. Unlike the last one—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We just have to have a look at it, member for Morialta; please have a seat.

**Mr GARDNER:** Actually, it has been moved and you are suggesting it be accepted, so it is read as if we have received it—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I haven't said anything, I just asked—

**Mr GARDNER:** —and I was listening—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down! I have asked for it to be seconded, and we have asked to have a look at it. I am advised by the table that it is not negative and it is okay to continue. Member for Napier.

**Mr GEE:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Fruit fly is the world's most economically significant horticultural pest. Both Mediterranean fruit fly and Queensland fruit fly are present in Australia. South Australia remains the only mainland state or territory which is free of fruit fly. This fruit fly area freedom provides our horticultural industries with significant benefits. It means growers do not have to treat produce during production; it also provides access to fruit fly sensitive markets without the cost of pre and/or post-harvest chemicals or cold storage treatments.

The cost of maintaining area freedom is significant, and the South Australian government invests around \$5 million annually to keep out fruit fly. The Victorian and New South Wales governments have both deregulated Queensland fruit fly in those states, apart from within the Sunraysia pest-free area. This places additional pest pressure on South Australia.

The government invests in a ring of protection around our state and around the Riverland to stop fruit fly from impacting on our rich production areas and backyard gardens. This includes static quarantine stations, random roadblocks, a statewide trapping grid, fruit fly hotline, community awareness programs, signage and fruit disposal.

The South Australian government is also investing \$3 million in a sterile insect technology facility and research initiative at Port Augusta. This has support from research partners for a further \$21 million in research investment over five years. Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA) also maintains a fruit fly trapping grid across much of South Australia, comprising of around 3,200 trap sites in metropolitan Adelaide, the Riverland, Ceduna and Port Augusta. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

#### *Petitions*

### **WAIKERIE CARAVAN PARK**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey):** Presented a petition signed by 1,862 residents of Waikerie and South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to support the proposed Waikerie Caravan Park and consider the negative impact of the financial impediments placed on the project through the strict enforcement of state government regulation.

### **TOD RESERVOIR**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders):** Presented a petition signed by 556 residents of Port Lincoln and Eyre Peninsula requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to save and repair the Tod Reservoir and the Tod Reservoir water catchment area for future expected water supply demand on Eyre Peninsula.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today students of Wirreanda High School, who are guests of the member for Reynell and who have presented her with a lovely Aboriginal dot painting, which I have had the privilege to see. I also welcome students of St Ignatius College, who are guests of the member for Morialta.

I take the view that, on Grand Final eve, there is nothing whatsoever wrong with wearing a scarf into the chamber because it is not a display. A preliminary final might be an entirely different matter.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Social Housing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Government Response to Recommendations of the 2009-10 to 2012-13 Triennial Review  
of the South Australian Housing Trust  
South Australian Housing Trust Triennial Review 2009-10 to 2012-13

### Members

### MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call on questions, I indicate that there were many warnings issued in the debate this morning and, accordingly, these members have no scope to offend further: the member for Colton, the leader and the deputy leader, and the members for Morialta, Hammond, Heysen and Finniss. The member for Unley purged his contempt by being evicted at the end of the division and therefore starts with a clean slate.

I notice the Hon. Rob Lucas in another place has published that he does not believe this house has jurisdiction over members of the other place when they are misconducting themselves in the galleries of the house. I can assure him he is wrong.

### Ministerial Statement

### HOUSING TRUST TRIENNIAL REVIEW

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:04):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** The South Australian Housing Trust Act 1995 requires the responsible minister to have a report prepared on the operations and administration of the South Australian Housing Trust in every three-year period. This report must be prepared by a person who is independent to the trust.

Elton Consulting were appointed in August 2013 to conduct the review for the period 2009-10 to 2012-13. The terms of reference were focused on reviewing the performance of the South Australian Housing Trust in the national context and looking at options and approaches for the trust into the future. The review process was conducted in a number of stages, including consultation with the South Australian Housing Trust Board, a variety of social housing providers, and officers of the Department of Treasury and Finance and Housing SA, to come to an independent view about the South Australian Housing Trust and its operations.

The review shows that the overall performance of the trust in the review period 2009-10 to 2012-13 is positive and compares favourably to other state housing authorities. The review also provides some useful options on future directions for reform and is not simply a report card detailing the achievements of the trust in the review period. It describes four main areas of reform relating to public housing operations, enhancing private rental assistance, transitioning to a multi-provider housing system and, importantly, recognising the importance of commonwealth government support for housing and service delivery.

The triennial review reaffirms this government's view that housing affordability has become one of the major challenges facing contemporary Australia. The South Australian government is acutely aware of the challenges facing the trust and other public housing authorities, which include issues of long-term sustainability in an environment of uncertain commonwealth government funding alongside an increasing demand for the services provided to those most vulnerable and at risk.

The triennial review report is provided at a time of considerable national change in housing and homelessness funding and coincides with the release of a number of national reviews initiated by the commonwealth government in the last 12 months, including the National Commission of Audit, released in May 2014; the McClure Review of Australia's Welfare System (interim report released on 29 June 2014); the White Paper on Reform of the Federation (which includes issues papers on health, housing and education) announced on 28 June 2014; the white paper on the reform of the taxation system to be announced in 2015; and the Forrest review, the review of Indigenous training and employment programs publicly released on 1 August 2014.

In addition, the 2014-15 federal budget handed down in May 2014 will lead to a number of changes in the housing and homelessness sector over the next 12 months. In South Australia and other jurisdictions, growing budget pressures will necessitate an examination of housing and homelessness services and programs. A review of housing and homelessness funding was indicated in the federal budget papers and will occur in 2014-15, and substantial changes are being telegraphed by the commonwealth government for the provision of housing and services under the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing.

Individually or collectively, the recommendations contained in these four national reviews are likely to have a significant impact on how housing assistance and housing programs are to be funded in the future. This will directly influence the housing reform agenda in South Australia and the ability to develop and implement many of the recommendations proposed in the triennial review. The South Australian government welcomes the triennial review and intends to carefully consider and work through the recommendations, especially as they relate to providing effective and efficient housing services to people who are impacted by declining housing affordability.

We do not intend at this time to rule recommendations in or out, as we believe this would be premature in the context of the considerable commonwealth-led reviews underway. We do note, though, some concerns with recommendations 3 and 8, regarding requiring housing assistance agreements and social contracts. While government absolutely supports the outcomes envisaged through mechanisms such as social contracts, we would need to investigate further whether such approaches are the best method by which to achieve these outcomes.

More broadly, the triennial review recommendations provide an opportunity for South Australia to advocate for financial and economic models that could achieve a more sustainable funding approach by the commonwealth, states and territories to address the ever-increasing challenges of housing affordability, housing supply and homelessness that are facing contemporary Australia.

#### *Question Time*

### **EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** My question is to the Premier. Why did the government increase the prescribed levy rate for the emergency services levy by 8 per cent this year, given that he has also removed the remission?

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Premier. The member for Hartley is called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:10):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, but it probably is a question better directed at the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Tony Abbott. This is not a levy that we were keen to remove the remission on. The way in which the levy is calculated, much the same way as the council rates are calculated, is that the corpus of funds that are necessary to fund emergency services are established and then the levy rate is struck having regard to property values, and that throws up a particular rate that then leads to the sum that is necessary to be raised.

The fundamental difference this year, apart from the overall increase in the budget for the emergency services levy, has been the removal of the remissions. That is the fundamental change in what has been charged to individual customers who have been charged the emergency services levy.

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*



**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is called to order. Supplementary, member for Unley.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:11):** To the Premier: a constituent of mine has shown me their emergency services levy bill which has increased from \$131.10 last year to \$431.75 this year, an increase of 229 per cent. Why didn't the Premier come clean with the public before the election that he was going to slug households with a land tax on the family home?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The question contained argument and I ask that either you rule the question out of order or, alternatively, give the Premier plenty of latitude in his answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the expression, 'why didn't the Premier come clean' is comment, so the Premier has scope.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:11):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. There is one rich fact that was not known before the election, and that was the fact that the Prime Minister of Australia was going to break his solemn promise to the people of Australia when he said that there would be no cuts to healthcare funding.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Of course, we couldn't have known that that was going to happen but we wanted to maintain our commitments. We were not going to let his broken promises have the effect of us breaking our promises to the South Australian people, so we had to find a way of grappling with these very deep cuts.

Rather than the member for Unley coming in here and advancing these constituent concerns to me, he should be sending them to the Prime Minister. While he is at it, he might also, on behalf of his own electorate of Unley—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is called to order and the member for Hartley is warned.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** While he is at it, on behalf of his own electorate of Unley, he might want to, as the shadow minister in the education area, say to the Prime Minister that his electorate will lose \$4.2 million in lost education funding through the commonwealth cuts, and Glenunga International High School, which I understand services his electorate, has, in fact, lost \$1.95 million. These are cruel and deep cuts to his own electorate and, rather than questioning me, he should be questioning the person who was the perpetrator of the cuts, the Prime Minister.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is warned a second and final time. Supplementary, leader.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My supplementary is to the Premier. How can he continue to refer to the federal government cuts as cruel and deep cuts when his own cuts here in South Australia are four times larger? How can he use the federal government cuts as the justification for remission removal?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I think we've got it. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:14):** This furphy does need to be put down. Every single dollar of savings that we make in the sensible running of our healthcare system is reinvested in new and additional services. So, our healthcare funding increases, whereas

the commonwealth funding is a cut straight off the top of the funding that was provided to us. Commonwealth funding—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is warned.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The simple truth of the matter is that you cannot rip \$655 million out of the state funding system over the next four years, and then an even greater amount into the future, without there being a massive impact on the healthcare system. If the member for Dunstan was, in fact, doing his job, he would be advocating to the Prime Minister that the \$4.97 million that's been ripped out of his schools in his electorate should be a matter of concern and grievance by him to the Prime Minister of Australia. So, rather than coming in here and asking—

**Mr Marshall:** Your cuts are four times higher.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The South Australian government will run a sensible and prudent healthcare system and reinvest every last dollar that we save in improving services.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's just the work that governments and health ministers are obliged to do just to actually meet the present levels of demand. This is a system that has extraordinary demands, and just to meet the demands of an ageing population, the demands of new technology, the demands of ensuring the wonderful technologies that actually exist to treat and deal with disease and disability in our community, just to keep pace with ensuring that we meet all of the needs of people who come through the doors of our hospitals, we need to keep changing the things that we have been doing in the past and reinvesting what we save to meet those needs. That's the daily work.

That savings exercise and the reinvesting of that, that's business as usual. What we had from the commonwealth though was a cut off the top of what we were promised: a signed, solemn agreement between the South Australian government and the commonwealth government.

When we raised concerns about the possibility of these cuts being imposed on us during the state election campaign, and when we said that these are things that would emerge and these were concerns we were raising, we were all told by the commonwealth government that these cuts by the state opposition seeking to be the government wouldn't emerge. Solemn promises were given that they would abide by the agreement. Safely past the state election though, the real measure of these cuts is then revealed—the very things that we warned about.

So, don't come in here complaining about your mates in the federal government cutting deeply into South Australia. Instead of issuing your grievances against us, raise your voice against the perpetrators of these cuts.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: I believe that the Premier was speaking about your mates in the federal government, sir. Do you have mates in the federal government? Who are they? Please share, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I have several mates in the federal government, but—

**Mr Gardner:** Just waiting for that appointment.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I believe Kiev is vacant. The Premier should not refer to the opposition in that way. Is the Premier finished? The member for Little Para.

#### RIVERBANK AUTHORITY

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:18):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier update the house about the membership of the Riverbank Authority?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:18):** I am pleased to advise of the appointment of the board of the Riverbank Authority by the Governor today. As members are no doubt aware, the Chair of the Riverbank Authority is former Tourism Australia chief executive Andrew McEvoy. Mr McEvoy was appointed by the government earlier this year. Today, I can announce the appointment of the remaining members of the—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir: this information is publicly available. It was actually published on the *InDaily* website just a couple of hours ago.

**The SPEAKER:** I am more interested in whether it was published by the government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** They saw the member for Schubert diving for his—

**Mr Knoll:** It was indeed released by the government two hours ago.

**The SPEAKER:** Perhaps the Deputy Premier could relate this to the member for Kavel, and thus introduce new material.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will indeed. I make this concession to the intrepid member for Schubert, who is able to do amazing things with that newfangled machine he has got. It is true, Mr Speaker, that the names I am about to relate to the parliament have already been published in the *Government Gazette*, but I would have thought that my saying a little bit more about them and sprinkling it with amusing anecdotes about the member for Schubert would be sufficiently original to enable me to finish my remarks.

**The SPEAKER:** I am all ears.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you. The four new members are, firstly, Mr Malcolm Snow, an award-winning urban planner and landscape architect. Mr Snow is the chief executive of Canberra's National Capital Authority and was the former chief executive officer of Brisbane's South Bank precinct. Member for Schubert, google him: he's very impressive.

**Mr Knoll:** So, next is John Hanlon.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Mr John Hanlon—he reads my mind. Mr Speaker, he is a Jedi.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I'll go to you on the next one, okay. John Hanlon is the chief executive of Renewal SA. Mr Hanlon has played—

**Mr PISONI:** I move that the deputy's answer be inserted into *Hansard* without his reading it.

**The SPEAKER:** Alas, the member for Unley is out of order.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you very much—an integral role in the vibrant city agenda and will continue to do so through his work as head of Renewal. Next is Professor Tanya Munro, an award-winning Australian physicist, known for her work in photonics. From November 2014, Professor Munro will be Deputy Vice Chancellor, Research and Innovation at the University of South Australia. The fourth is Karyn Kent, chief executive of Education Adelaide with more than 18 years' experience in the tourism industry, including a significant period as the regional general manager for Tourism Australia for the South-East Asia and Gulf region.

These high-calibre board members have a great range of skills and experience in a diverse range of areas, including urban design, tourism and research. The board will work together with the state government to ensure that our significant investment in the Riverbank Precinct, through the expansion of the Adelaide Convention Centre, the Riverbank footbridge and the Adelaide Oval, is capitalised to its full potential. The authority will provide advice to government on attracting investment to the precinct and will act as a curator to ensure the precinct is used to its full potential. I look forward to working closely with the Riverbank Authority to keep building Adelaide as the heart of our vibrant state.

### REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has the minister been briefed on how many jobs we lost in regional South Australia as a result of ForestrySA job cuts, emergency services levy hikes, emergency services body mergers and now the government's marine park policy?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:22):** I represent the Minister for Employment in this chamber. What I can say is that the government has undertaken a number of initiatives to improve opportunities for people for employment not only in regional areas but also across the state with a whole range of things, such as changes to payroll tax, for example, the proposed changes to WorkCover—a whole range of initiatives to improve the opportunity for employers to increase job opportunities. They are some of the things we have done, but I will get a full answer for the member from the minister responsible.

### MARINE PARKS

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister name one fishing industry group or regional community group that has supported the government's marine park policy?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is warned for the second and final time, and the member for Chaffey is warned.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:23):** As the Minister for Fisheries, I have spoken to a lot of fishing groups around the state and some have shown more concern than others about possible impacts, but what we have agreed to do is keep a watching brief on the impacts of marine parks and sanctuary zones over the next few months once these are introduced. I think what everyone is sick and tired of is that this debate and discussion has been going on for 14 years. The time has come—

**An honourable member:** Who was the minister who introduced it?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The member for Davenport was the minister at the time. It was a great idea, but there has been a lot of consultation done. I get around the regions quite a bit and there are a lot of people in the regions who support these sanctuary zones and the marine parks. As I said as recently as last week to the rural media at the annual breakfast at the Show, the time has come to introduce these and we will work with the fishing sectors—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I understand that one minister can answer a question on behalf of the other minister but the question was: 'Can the Minister for Regional Development name one organisation which has supported this?' That is what this minister should answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, we will see if the minister gets to the substance of the question. Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I thought I answered that in the first few lines where I said that I have spoken to a number of fishing groups throughout this state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Some might not have come to see me because they are quite happy with it. The southern rock lobster people I have spoken with are a little bit concerned about an area between Port MacDonnell and the border and a little bit closer to shore near Southend. But there are other fishing groups out there who may not have come to see me, so I can't presume whether they are for or against—

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is warned!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** As the Minister for Fisheries I have responsibility to the house to answer questions about fisheries. The people who work in the fishing industry, who have business in the fishing industry, are likely to come and talk to me about concerns that they have with any government policy. So, it is quite appropriate for me to give the answer and that is the answer, sir.

#### **MARINE PARKS**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Given that the government's marine park boundaries have been condemned by regional communities right across South Australia, why does the minister support these boundaries?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:26):** I travel widely around this state and I have heard positive feedback from people in the regions about these marine parks and sanctuary zones as well. As I said before, we will be working hand in hand with the industry to make sure that, if they have any issues after the marine parks and sanctuary zones are introduced, then we will deal with them. A lot of times there is a lot of scaremongering done; the Henny Pennys of the world run around saying that the sky will fall in on a certain date because something is going to change in their lives—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Please, after 14 years of discussion and of consultation can we just give them a go?

**The SPEAKER:** I would say to the leader who was interjecting during that answer: I don't want any Norwood supporter off the field!

#### **MARINE PARKS**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Given that the local government sectors affected by the marine park boundary changes discussed in this morning's vote unanimously supported the amendments, why is it that the Minister for Local Government chose not to support it?

**The SPEAKER:** The question is out of order because it reflects on a decision of the house. The member for Elder.

#### **AGED-CARE BEDS**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:27):** My question is for the Minister for Health. Can you inform the house what impact the availability of appropriate aged-care beds has on patients and their families in our health system?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:28):** I thank the member for Elder for her question. She is a great advocate for our health system, being a nurse in a previous occupation. Our hospitals, and in particular our emergency departments—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time. He surely doesn't want to be the first person under sessional orders ejected twice in the same day.

**Mr Pisoni:** I don't think you know what I want, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Accordingly, the member for Unley will leave us for 15 minutes.

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber.*

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I don't think anyone would know what the member for Unley wants, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health is called to order.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Our hospitals and, in particular, our emergency departments have been under intense pressure over the past month as our state deals with one of the worst flu seasons on record. The massive demand has increased the focus on what we can then do to improve the flow in our emergency departments.

Doctors and nurses in our health system tell me that a barrier preventing our hospitals from working better is a lack of appropriate aged-care beds in our community. This results in patients who have received an aged-care assessment and who have no clinical need to remain in hospital remaining in limbo while they wait for a commonwealth subsidised aged-care bed. While this has a negative impact on our hospital system, more importantly it adds to the stress of patients and their families.

I am told as of Wednesday last week there were 127 patients across South Australian metropolitan hospitals who had received an aged-care assessment and are no longer to be in an acute care bed. To put that in perspective, at the moment we have increased the total number of beds in our hospital system by roughly 150 to deal with the present crisis of 127 beds being taken up with elderly people waiting for a place in a residential care facility who have already received an ACAT assessment, so this is a massive impact on our public hospitals.

Long stay older patients represent a cost shift by the commonwealth to the states due to delays in patients being able to be moved into appropriate residential aged-care places. This is expensive to our—

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** What were Rudd and Gillard doing for six years?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Sorry, the father of marine parks is interjecting. I can't quite hear him.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** What were Rudd and Gillard doing for six years?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Sorry, the father of marine parks keeps carrying on. I can't quite hear him. He's saying something, mumbling away in his dotage. Marine parks will be the great legacy of the member for Davenport.

This is expensive to our public hospital system and a poor outcome for the wellbeing of older people and their families. The Premier and I have both recently raised concerns about long stay older patients with the commonwealth. The 2014-15 federal budget announced that the national partnership agreement on long stay older patients would not be renewed; it ceased on 30 June. This agreement had provided funding of around \$42 million over three years from 2011-12 in recognition of the costs incurred by state and territory governments in caring for long stay older patients. It is disappointing that this decision was taken by the commonwealth without even undertaking a review as was agreed to in the national partnership agreement.

Without having an understanding of continuing need, and without taking into account South Australia's concern about the impact of long stay older patients, it is not clear how the commonwealth determined that there was no need for further funding to be built into their budget. This is just another example in small part of the \$655 million in cuts to our health system that Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey have made to our hospitals over the next four years. Around the country Liberal premiers and Liberal treasurers have been protesting to the commonwealth government about these cuts. The only Liberal Party members in Australia who are prepared to acquiesce in these cuts are those sitting opposite.

**MARINE PARKS**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has the minister seen any modelling or any analysis that proves the government's marine parks will not cost jobs in regional communities?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:33):** As the house would be aware—

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is warned.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** As the house would be aware, I am responsible in this house for the Minister for Employment in the other place and in relation to what we are doing as a government to help with jobs in the regions I can advise as follows. I can advise the house that this government does have a jobs and skills policy which seeks to support job creation and new initiatives in the regions and particularly emerging job opportunities in local communities. As I have previously mentioned, we have a number of measures that actually help employers to grow jobs in the regions and across the state, including payroll tax concessions, reform of WorkCover, providing help for businesses, providing—

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** My question was very specific in relation to the marine parks policy and any analysis or modelling that related to job outcomes from that policy.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I would ask the minister to return to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Alright, Mr Speaker, I will get the advice from the minister in the other place.

**MARINE PARKS**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:34):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister for Regional Development. Given the minister's statement to the house in June that 'If there are bills that I believe are not in the best interests of the regions, then I will vacate from cabinet,' did the minister vacate from cabinet during any marine parks discussions in his time as a minister?

**The SPEAKER:** That is a breach of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister may want to answer it, but it is a breach of convention to seek to penetrate cabinet confidentiality. I am afraid I have to withdraw that from the minister.

**MARINE PARKS**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:35):** I have a question, Mr Speaker. How is that any different to the cabinet confidentiality breaches you allege for then minister Jane Lomax-Smith, who was openly against the cabinet decision in relation to her electorate and told the house and the public about it? What is the point of difference?

**The SPEAKER (14:35):** That is because she chose to do so.

**MARINE PARKS**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:35):** I will accept that ruling, Mr Speaker, but it frustrates the life out of me. I do have a supplementary question for the Minister for Regional Development. To prove that the minister is an independent member of the parliament, can the minister name one government policy that he has opposed as minister?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:36):** Without divulging cabinet confidentiality—

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I have debated in the cabinet. I will leave it at that.

### GRANT PROGRAMS

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:36):** My question is directed to the Minister for the Public Sector. What improvements are being undertaken to assist communities, clubs and individuals to obtain up-to-date information on state government grant programs, along with assistance in applying for those grants?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:37):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I am pleased to inform the chamber that this government is always looking for better ways to keep communities informed about decisions that affect them, but also ways in which we can support their work.

A new way of keeping South Australian community groups, clubs and volunteer organisations better informed is an innovative single gateway that provides online access to information about state government grants. For some time the government has provided the GRANTassist tool, which has allowed businesses to search for assistance programs across government departments, but until now the wider community has not had the same opportunity. GRANTassist has successfully connected South Australian businesses to a broad range of funding and support services on offer from both the state and federal governments.

A similar, single portal was not available to community groups, who were looking for similar support to achieve their aims. These community groups often had a sense that there was assistance available out there but were daunted by the difficulties of tracking down exactly what assistance could be provided. If a grant program were identified that may have assisted, the application process sometimes proved perplexing.

I know, from personal experience in my electorate office in Port Adelaide, how crucial a grant can be for a community organisation. Whether it is a few hundred dollars for some uniforms or many thousands of dollars to kickstart a whole new community complex, these grants are of great significance to the community. However, all too often there were clubs and community organisations missing out on these opportunities simply because they were not aware of what was available or on which doors they should be knocking.

That was until now. This simple initiative will greatly enhance the ability of community organisations to access grants. It was an idea inspired by the community itself through the government's red tape reduction initiative program, Simplify. So here we have a wonderful example of the government listening and responding to the community.

Through Simplify the state government engaged community groups who voiced that they were having trouble finding information on the various grants available across different agencies. Within 90 days, representatives from agencies that offered grants came together and looked at ways of making this information more accessible. Community stakeholders were further consulted through the Your Say website, and this consolidated feedback helped to identify a solution.

The project identified the existing GRANTassist website and then broadened its reach beyond business to list community and individual government grants. The single gateway now provides tips and suggestions for the various grant guidelines, application forms, frequently asked questions and also provides links to key contacts listed on agency websites. The site will make it easier not only for businesses that have, for some time, enjoyed the service but for communities and individuals to quickly and easily access information on government grants thus streamlining the process for individuals and community members wishing to obtain grant information.

GRANTassist now includes a simple online guide as to what is available to community groups for a variety of purposes, such as upgrades to sporting facilities or clubrooms. The website also provides tips on navigating the application and assessment process. The site is available at [grantassist.sa.gov.au](http://grantassist.sa.gov.au). This important online resource is the result of government agencies working collaboratively to ensure they put the community at the heart of their work. It is also timely to remind businesses that GRANTassist will continue to provide similar access and information about the grants available to assist them in meeting today's challenging economic environment.



South Australia has always achieved its best outcomes when strong government, strong business and strong community work together. GRANTassist is an online embodiment of how we can come together, government, business and the community, to strive to make South Australia an even better place to live and work.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** My supplementary to the minister is whether any state government grants through this GRANTassist program are going to be available to clubs and volunteer organisations to pay their ESL bills.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:41):** No.

#### ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the government intends to move public servants into a commercial office building as part of the Walker Corporation development of the Festival Plaza precinct?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:41):** There is no plan presently, no agreement presently, no proposal presently to do anything of the sort.

#### ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42):** Supplementary. Will the government commit to allowing the Riverbank Authority and its members announced today time to assess the proposals from the Walker Corporation regarding the Festival Plaza precinct before entering into an agreement with the Walker Corporation?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:42):** There are a couple of things to be said about this. First of all, one needs to understand what the actual function of the Riverbank Authority is. The Riverbank Authority is the curator, if I can put it that way, of the space around and in between the various institutions that will occupy the riverbank. So, if you were to have a map of the riverbank and you were to cut out the Convention Centre, cut out the Casino, the Festival Theatre, universities and so on, you would be left with what is the common realm, if I can put it that way, of the riverbank.

It is the purpose and function of the Riverbank Authority to curate, to manage and to basically activate and vitalise that common shared place. So, of course, they will be involved in conversations with all of the players who are involved in any development around that place. I can say that since Mr McEvoy has been chair it has been my policy, since I have been minister, to make sure that we have regular communications with Mr McEvoy so that he is—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Beg your pardon?

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Well, that was 100 per cent consultation, wasn't it? So, we have been consulting with Mr McEvoy. He is completely aware of what is going on. Of course, if the member for Bragg is asking is it the government's intention that the Riverbank Authority personnel, once they have settled into their roles, be involved in conversations with all of the players, of course they will be, but their role is not the decision-making role with respect to contractual arrangements between the state government and any potential developer of projects in the vicinity of the car park or the plaza, or however you wish to describe it, nor is it their role to negotiate arrangements between, for example, the Adelaide Casino, which everyone knows has been foreshadowing the probability of development there. Again, it is not their role to do that. I am very pleased that the Riverbank Authority

is now in a position where it can get on with that sort of negotiated public-realm curation and management. I am absolutely positive that it will do an excellent job

I think that members opposite will be very pleased, over the course of the next year or so, to see how things evolve in that very important precinct, and I am absolutely positive that the Riverbank Authority will make a fantastic contribution to that. Let's be fair about this: at the present time already we are seeing ongoing development there in the form of the Convention Centre phase 2 development. It is a very exciting part of the city. Over the next year or so, I think that people are going to be absolutely delighted with the way the Riverbank Authority works with the other institutional and private sector players in the area.

### AUTISM

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:45):** My question is to the Minister for Disability. What initiatives are the state government supporting to help people with autism and their families?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:46):** I thank the member for her question, and I also acknowledge the enormous contribution she makes to the sector. As members present would be aware, autism is a lifelong developmental disability, characterised by marked difficulties in social interaction, impaired communication, restricted and repetitive interest, and behavioural and sensory sensitivities.

People with autism, their families and carers face many daily challenges. The help of qualified and knowledgeable health professionals and community service providers is essential in providing expert advice, support and encouragement, which will enable people with autism to fulfil their potential. In 2012, an ABS survey showed that an estimated 115,400 Australians had autism, an increase of 79 per cent from—

**Mr KNOLL:** Point of order, Mr Speaker. This relates directly to a press release put out by DCSI on 1 September.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen to the minister and wait until the member for Schubert can give me a duplicate paragraph. Minister.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I am sure that the stats are published, and they have not changed since 2012; you are quite right—an estimated increase of 79 per cent from—

**Mr Knoll:** A 79 per cent increase—

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's right, since 2009.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's the latest available figures, that's correct. These figures are alarming and show that we cannot rely on one service sector to meet the needs of autism. Is that the same? I am waiting.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Right. More specialised services are needed.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the Minister for Disabilities for goading the member for Schubert, who is only doing the house a service.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Also, more community health professionals need to be trained to recognise and work with people with autism. This is why, in the 2010-11 state budget, an additional \$4.2 million was committed by the state government over four years to support children with autism spectrum disorder. As part of this budget commitment, the statewide autism project was funded by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion to develop a South Australian autism service improvement framework. I was very pleased to open a new PsychMed statewide autism clinic on 1 September in Netley.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's correct; that's a fact. The state government helped fund, in collaboration with Autism SA and PsychMed SA, a new clinic for the provision of services specialising in support for children with an ASD diagnosis.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No. The clinic will give families and clients who are receiving Autism SA services access to psychological services and enhanced referral pathways in one location. The new venture will also provide training accreditation for up to 60 health professionals every year and promote engagement between the tertiary sector, Autism SA, key stakeholders and consumers, enabling evaluation of research and approaches to the treatment of ASD.

I am pleased to inform the house that currently there are two practitioners working at the clinic and a further two will join in October this year. The clinic has already seen around 20 new clients since its opening, with many more to come as more practitioners join the facility.

**An honourable member:** Boring.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, it wasn't Hartley. I don't think providing services for people with autism is boring. I think it is quite embarrassing that the member should say that; it's disgraceful, actually. This new clinic is a great example of the government, the not-for-profit sector and the private sectors working together to help improve the lives of children with autism, their families and carers. Importantly, this partnership fulfils the priorities identified in the plan, as detailed in the final report, 'A Plan of Action for Improving the Autism Service System in South Australia'. The opening of the clinic is a landmark for people with autism and their families. I am pleased that the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the minister's time has expired. The deputy leader.

#### RIVERBANK AUTHORITY

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Planning. If it was the government's intention that the Riverbank Authority would only be a curator of space or a party to attract investment to the precinct that is outlined in his announcement today, why did it promulgate regulations in February, two days before caretaker mode this year, that it would have a role in the planning of the precinct of the area?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:51):** It will, in the sense that they will be consulted about the progress of any project going on in the area. If the member for Bragg is concerned that the actual wording of the regulation is unsatisfactory and doesn't enable them to do what I've said they're going to do, I am happy to hear what her complaint about that it is.

The fact is that if you have a contracting agency for and on behalf of government in relation to the delivery of project management, it is self-evident if you have a look at the constitution of the Riverbank Authority that they are not, by reason of their method of formation, equipped in the same way, for example, as the project management team in DPTI, who are expert people in building project management to do that sort of role. Clearly, the government in making any decision about who was going to be doing particular jobs in particular contexts would be looking to the people who could best deliver.

The other point I think I should make too is that everybody seems entirely preoccupied, perhaps understandably, with the small piece of the Riverbank Precinct which is immediately adjacent to this building, that is between here and the footbridge and King William Street, but of course that is not the whole Riverbank Precinct. Mr Speaker, the Riverbank Precinct actually commences at Gilberton and terminates in your electorate, I believe, at Clipsal. It is a very large piece of real estate that this organisation is supposed to be curating and managing.

In the context of parts of that, there may be bits and pieces that are managed in a different way and that is a matter for the future, but the questions that have been asked of me today have been about this area immediately adjacent to Parliament House.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, it is falling apart and the reason is, it—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Did somebody—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** There are many things, Mr Speaker, that one—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** There are many things that we can say are some of the achievements of 12 years of Labor government. One of them is not concrete cancer in the car park adjacent to Parliament House. That was managed all by itself and it is something that, irrespective of whether there was a Labor or a Liberal government, there would have to be something done about it and we are going to be doing something about it. That car park cannot stay as it is, will not stay as it is and has to be redeveloped.

#### RIVERBANK AUTHORITY

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54):** I have a supplementary question. Will the minister confirm then that the planning role that the authority will have is that it will be told about the planning decisions that have been made by the government after the government has determined what is to happen within this precinct; that is, their role in planning will just be to be kept informed of what the government has decided, and that you will not be consulting with them before you sign the Walker agreement?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:54):** No, I am happy to say that all of the direct and implied matters contained in that question are incorrect. The position is this, and let me make this clear again. Mr McEvoy has been the subject of—

**Mr Marshall:** They are very important, these words.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I hope so. I don't want to waste your time. Mr McEvoy has been appointed to be the head of this authority. He has been involved in conversations both with me and with officers of Renewal SA about the progress in this matter. He and the rest of his board will be involved in ongoing discussions.

Can I say that, in the context of the public realm there, their input as curators of that public realm is going to be absolutely essential. I will give an example. At the moment, the surface of the plaza behind us, in the winter time, is a rather uninviting, wet, cold place and, in the summer time, except for Barrio, is a rather hot, unpleasant, uninviting place, remarkable only for its lack of human visitation. One of the important jobs that the authority will have will be to curate those areas in such a way as to make them interesting and attractive.

They will be involved in, for example, if there are activated spaces there, considering what those activated spaces will look like, where those activated spaces will be and how they will be activated. For instance, do we want Hungry Jack's next to McDonald's next to Krispy Kreme and Wokinabox just lined up? No: we want to have attractive, high quality operators in this space because this is going to be a premium part of Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** You might laugh, but one day—sorry, Mr Speaker, I know you won't laugh. Those opposite may laugh but, one day, when this place has been completed, in the not too distant future—

**Mr Marshall:** When?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** You just wait—and I am walking through there and I see their smiling faces having a coffee, a latte or a cucumber sandwich under an umbrella, I will say to them, 'You sceptics.' I will remind them of this day when they were sceptical in front of you, Mr Speaker, and they will feel embarrassed. They will hang their heads in shame.

**The SPEAKER:** You might have added that they may have arrived there via the footbridge.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I apologise for barracking. The member for Stuart.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Will regional MFS stations with low call-out rates, such as Peterborough, be converted to CFS stations to provide savings under the minister's new model?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:58):** Some of those members opposite actually attended some of the round tables and forums I held and I gave an assurance that the existing stations on the ground would carry the same identity and retain those identities on the ground.

I made it very clear, and a discussion paper (which is actually in print) reaffirms the position that the reform process is about bringing together those administration, management, training and corporate roles to obtain efficiencies and reinvesting all those savings into the front-line services. The aim of this proposal is to actually increase our presence on the ground, to support our volunteers and paid emergency services workers right across the sector, and I can reassure people that savings will be reinvested because of the way it is funded.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59):** Supplementary, sir, to the same minister: does the minister support the amalgamation of the CFS and the SES?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:59):** That proposition was put to me by a number of people actually on the ground—volunteers of both the SES and some CFS volunteers on the ground. Again, at the forum, I gave the assurance that that would be a decision made by those communities.

I have no intention as minister to require the merger of the SES or CFS on the ground. Again, that is made very clear in the discussion paper. What I am saying here is what I said across 16 forums across the state, where over 1,500 people attended. Members from your side of the chamber were there, so they can confirm what I said or didn't say.

I have also spoken to SAFECOM officers, CFS staff and MFS staff. The position is quite clearly that any merger or integration or otherwise on the ground would be a decision to be made by those local communities and not me because I have the utmost respect for the volunteers on the ground, and I am happy to make that a decision for them to make.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:00):** Supplementary, to the same minister: how much will it cost taxpayers to pay out the contracts of the three chief officers of the MFS, CFS and SES if they are not retained as part of the amalgamation?

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Education will not audibly assist the minister, and she is called to order. Minister.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:01):** That's not a question I have actually turned my mind to because this part—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Well, because with this part of the process, I am not assuming anything. At this stage of the process, there is a discussion paper. The proposal has yet to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It is quite clear, and I have actually been quite open about it. Clearly, if we have four people who are the equivalent of CEOs in the sector now, and there is only one position, some will have to go. Having said that, they are paid at different rates, so I am not sure which one will get the job, or whether any will get the job. That is for a future process to determine, so I am not going to pre-empt either the outcome of this process of discussions—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I am not going to pre-empt either this process, which goes for the next six weeks, nor pre-empt a government decision, nor pre-empt a selection process which will be held in the future—it would be quite inappropriate.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:02):** My question is again for the Minister for Emergency Services. Are current CFS regional officers included in the minister's new model of emergency service delivery, and will they be paid at the much higher rate of their equivalent rank in the MFS?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:02):** As I have indicated very clearly in all the forums—and, again, it's reflected in the discussion paper—what I envisage, subject to confirmation through this process, is that the state administrative regions will be the basic administrative unit for a new organisation. Given that none of these organisations are exactly the same at the moment, there are the MFS regions—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I am getting to the question. The MFS region, the SES regions and the CFS regions don't overlap—don't actually match up. So, until we have actually done the detailed design work once the proposal goes ahead, I cannot actually—

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Will they be paid the same rates?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Let me finish. The reality is the detailed design work will also design, if you like, the jobs themselves because different regions have different responsibilities. So, I am not at that point of time to actually give that information; that's some work we have to do. Having said that, that's something which I have actually made very clear at the forums. It's not something which I am saying for the first time today. Firstly, I have said that at the forums very publicly and, secondly, it is reflected in the discussion paper.

**The SPEAKER:** Alright; thank you, minister.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:03):** Supplementary, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you very much. Minister, will salaried employees of the CFS and SES be required to negotiate their future workplace agreements with the firefighters union?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:03):** Actually, I have turned my mind to that. Clearly, you haven't read the discussion paper before you made any comment, because the discussion paper and also the forums—

**Ms Redmond:** Fora.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Whatever.

**The SPEAKER:** A Latin plural or an English plural are of equal validity.

**Mr Whetstone:** He needs all the help he can get.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's right. That's why I am on this side and you are on that side—I need your help. Sorry, now I have lost track. What was the question again?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Well, you had to read it out. The answer is that, once the proposal is approved to go ahead, there will be a workplace agreement between the four parties involved, which are the two voluntary associations and the two unions—both the PSA and the UFU.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** If you let me finish the answer, it would help because that workplace agreement—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is really going for some sort of record. Minister.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The workplace flexibility agreement has to be negotiated between those four parties and that process will not start until the model is actually finally approved, if it is approved. I have made the point on a number of occasions at the forums and also at the stakeholder discussions—and all the parties are aware of this—that, at that point, that workplace flexibility agreement will outline a whole range of proposals including how we match up jobs, how we match up the wages, how we deal with grievances and a whole range of things. That flexibility agreement will be in place before any transition to a new organisation occurs.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:06):** Second supplementary, sir, for the minister. Will retained MFS and paid CFS personnel have prior learning recognised to allow them to qualify for rank in the minister's new model or will they have to be put through an MFS recruit course as insisted on by the firefighters' union?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:06):** The question is not actually correct, because—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I will explain, because we actually have a number of awards and the CFS people, the volunteers, are not on an award, for example. SES people are not on an award. The CFS people are on a PSA award. There is a whole range of awards and what this workplace flexibility agreement is designed to do is to work through all those issues to make sure there is fairness. One thing I have said very publicly at the forums is that, from my point of view, if we have one organisation, then it does not matter which part of the organisation you are in, you should have equal opportunity to apply for positions based on merit.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:07):** Third supplementary, sir. Will CFS volunteer training be carried out by paid MFS trainers, and will all CFS volunteers have access to the same level of training as the MFS paid firefighters?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:07):** I thank the member for the question. As the member would be aware, and hopefully he has read the discussion paper that I have put out, issues like that have to be worked through, but my view would be that both volunteers and paid workers would be in a capacity to deliver training. What I have heard very clearly from the CFS Volunteers Association, with whom I have had numerous meetings, is that they do not want the role of the CFS volunteer diminished, and I can give that undertaking.

#### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICES**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:08):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister advise: will the government meet its announced budget savings targets in the corrections portfolio?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:08):** I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. As the member would be aware, like every other minister, I am required to deliver budget savings to the government and it is also very clear from recent discussions with the relevant unions that some of our proposed measures will not be proceeding this year. I have asked the department head to look at other measures and, like every other minister, every endeavour will be made to deliver those savings as required.

#### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICES**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:08):** Supplementary, sir. Given the minister's answer and given the announcement earlier this week that the government's original savings strategy of firing 49 staff is now off the table, which parts of the corrections portfolio will be cut, and how and when will that take place?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:09):** I thank the honourable member for his question. I will just bring to the member's attention, if he has not already seen it, a joint communiqué put out by the corrections management and the relevant union, the PSA, saying that they will work together to identify savings so that we can actually meet our government requirements. Given that that communiqué was only released last week, I don't have an answer for you today.

#### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICES**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:09):** Supplementary, sir. When will the minister be providing this information?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:09):** I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. As soon as the relevant unions and management meet to discuss a whole range of measures and they are brought to my attention for my consideration, I will be happy to bring it to the member's attention.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY**

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:10):** I wish to spend a couple of minutes today talking about the emergency services levy and a very bad government. You can always pick a bad government because they make bad decisions, and we have a government before us that has made a number of bad decisions. The most recent one was the decision about the emergency services levy and I want to bring to the attention of the house some of the reasons why I believe it is a bad decision.

I had a phone call from a constituent this week who gave me the details of his emergency services levy obligation last year and this year, and by his calculations he is looking at an increase of 840 per cent—840 per cent. This is a farming property of relatively low risk and there is a local CFS brigade, but, by and large, like most farmers, this constituent of mine provides for his own fire cover. He ploughs firebreaks, he maintains and operates his own firefighting equipment, and he has water points dotted around his property. He has already spent a large amount of money as most—



invariably all—farmers do to provide their own fire cover and the cost of maintaining a CFS emergency network is relatively small per property. But his obligation is going from \$153.70 per year to \$1,235.95.

I decided I would go back and look at a little bit of the history of the emergency services levy and one of the things I looked at was the original second reading debate. The then minister, the former member for Elder, had this to say to the house on 21 July 1998:

Apparently this bill comes before the house based on the government's view that the current system of funding for the emergency services is inequitable. The opposition agrees with the government on that matter.

He said that was one of the few things where the opposition might agree with the government. He went on to say:

The simple truth is that this bill represents a major redistribution of the responsibility for emergency services funding away from the government and towards the taxpaying public of South Australia.

What the Labor Party said when the emergency services levy and the legislation was first introduced is the exact opposite to the decision they took quite recently to shift any obligation from the Consolidated Account for emergency services in South Australia and back to the general population.

The reason I would argue that this is a dumb or stupid decision—a decision of a poor government—is I believe that one of the things the emergency services levy has always sought to do is to make sure that the cost of providing emergency services was reflected reasonably closely in the amount that each individual was obliged to pay towards the service. I think on analysis we will find that nexus has been completely broken.

One of the other things that the then shadow minister said was, 'We want to make sure that the parliament has some ability to see how much is being raised, whether it is being raised for the right purpose and whether it is being spent properly.' Isn't it interesting that the Economic and Finance Committee, which does that very work on behalf of the parliament, was only provided with half of the story this year, and the very day that the committee tabled its report in this parliament was the same day that we all learn that the remissions were being withdrawn to the tune of 100 per cent. How on earth could the parliament be reasonably informed, as the Labor Party in opposition decided it should be?

The bit that really interests me from the debate back in 1998 is the contribution by the former member for the then seat of Ross Smith, one Ralph Clarke. I think at one stage he was deputy leader of the opposition. I am not sure whether that was the case at that particular time—from memory I think he was—but he said of the emergency services levy:

When we get into government we will use it in a progressive manner and to the best effect by taking from those with the greatest means for the benefit of those with the greatest need.

He said that the government would use this to tax the people who are not their own natural constituency, and that is exactly what this government is doing.

### FESTIVAL OF MUSIC

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:15):** The 2014 concerts of the Festival of Music are almost over. They are the annual showcase of the musical abilities of public school students from all over South Australia. This is the 118<sup>th</sup> concert series since 1891.

It is the only educational program to hold the South Australian Heritage Icon Award which is presented in association with BankSA and the National Trust. It is a joint endeavour of the South Australian Public Primary Schools Music Society and the Department of Education and Child Development, and it involves more than 230 schools represented by the 6,000 participating students, with each of the 12 concerts in the series featuring a mass choir of 450 different students accompanied by either the northern or southern orchestra of student musicians and the northern or southern performance troupe of student dancers. Additionally, six assisting solo or group assisting artists round out the tremendous night or afternoon of entertainment at Festival Theatre.

This year's souvenir program features art by Soubin Kim, a student of the Modbury West Primary School, one of the great schools in the Florey electorate. Soubin's art is also featured on the

music book and the certificates awarded throughout the year. It is a marvellous achievement and I am sure many fine pieces of art were submitted for consideration for the prestigious honour.

The member for Schubert and I attended opening night and witnessed the welcome to country from Auntie Katrina Power. I have so far attended two of the concerts, each really enjoyable as music is such a great entertainment and a unifying force, and seeing students performing so well for their families on the big stage is a real treat. The proud school communities cheer and really get behind their choirs and it is a great, but no doubt nerve-racking, experience for the young performers to appear in Festival Theatre.

The Florey schools of Para Vista, East Para, Modbury West, Modbury Special, The Heights School, Modbury and Modbury South, along with Redwood Park and Ardtornish, which are both just across the road from Florey, are involved this year. Each of these schools has a Florey Music Award, something I have sponsored since my election. This is a way I can support the work of the Instrumental Music Branch, the Music Society, and Primary Schools Music Festival Team. Over the years I have come to know many of these dedicated professionals, among them Anne O'Dea, Lesley Raeside and Rachel Neale.

It was a note from Rachel, sent with my additional tickets, which brought home to me how important positive reinforcement can be because she mentioned that her son Christopher had just completed his honours in classical percussion, achieving first class, and that he was a recipient of the Florey Music Award at the end of his year 6 studies. My warmest congratulations go to Christopher along with my very best wishes for a successful career in music. I also acknowledge his parents' support and that of the efforts of every parent who has encouraged their child by providing a musical instrument, lessons and transport to and from lessons, not to mention attendance at their rehearsals and performances.

It really was not that long ago that performance skills were more highly valued than perhaps they are now because, without radio, TV and other high-tech entertainments, we relied on recitation and musical performances for our enjoyment. Just as the Muriel Matters and Lionel Logues of their day began with school elocution and music, the value of performing arts should be recognised widely and celebrated.

This year's Festival of Music program featured the specially commissioned song cycle *Flight* written by noted Australian composer Paul Jarman. It explored the history, science and expansion of flying, especially the pursuits of Icarus; the acclaimed jetman, Yves Rossi; and pioneer aviatrix, Nancy 'Bird' Walton. Perhaps they could have added Muriel's pioneering dirigible flight and in any case may highlight her exploits one day in a forthcoming concert. The trilogy's presentation was enhanced by the work of Patrick Jeremy and Bec Schembri's choreography.

Also featured this year is a piece called *Parallel Universe* by Anne McMenamin, with extra composition and arrangement by G. Lehmann. It is the story of a young boy, Danny, who is set free by flying on a trampoline. It is a great song with a great message.

More than a year's work goes into the finished concerts and I thank everyone involved—the choir conductors, accompanists, orchestra conductors, school choir leaders, principals and especially the students. It is a highlight of every year, and if you have not already attended a performance, I urge members to take advantage of either tonight or tomorrow night's concerts and join with the parents who will be filling the concert hall, otherwise we will all have to wait another whole year.

### WAIKERIE CARAVAN PARK

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:19):** I rise to speak about the petition that was tabled in the parliament today with more than 1,850 signatures. That petition was generated by a local businessman in Waikerie by the name of Dean Grosse. Dean is a partner, with his wife, in Havenhand Chocolates in Waikerie. He was very concerned about the Waikerie caravan park that is now potentially not going to be redeveloped on the river's edge. This has been a real concern not only to the people and businesses of Waikerie but also to tourists who travel to Waikerie who are looking for that river experience.

The Adelaide-based Edwards Group owns the existing caravan park, which is now being redeveloped into a lifestyle village, and they are looking to make a significant investment into the new Waikerie caravan park, which is on the river side of the Ramco Road. It is an outstanding site. It is grassed, it is on the edge of the river, and every tourist, traveller, caravanner, everyone, when they are travelling to the river, wants to camp next to the river and have that river-time experience.

The Edwards Group is looking to invest a significant amount of money, \$7.2 million, into the project. The project formally began in about 2011 but it has hit hurdles, one after the other, with regulations. I think you would say that it has been stringent requirements that have been over the top, and it really is a barrier to investment and economic drivers. Tourism is one of the great industries here in South Australia, particularly on the River Murray, and at the moment Waikerie is being denied that.

The group predicts that the new caravan park development could bring up to an additional 15,000 visitor nights per annum to Waikerie. I believe it is an outstanding project, a project that will require significant funds, but, sadly, once again the government here in Adelaide is making decisions and putting these overzealous requirements, regulations, on the development of this caravan park. I think this is a prime example of how the state government is stifling investment with red tape and, at times, unnecessary regulation.

Anyone in this chamber who has been to Waikerie will know that it is a great river town. It is one of the great towns in my electorate, and it is the entrance into the Riverland. The upgrade of the riverfront precinct has gone ahead (and I congratulate the council for that), and the Waikerie Magpies are in the grand final up against Barmera-Monash. However, this caravan park presents itself as another great opportunity for the people of Waikerie to be proud owners of a riverfront caravan park. Just as importantly, it is about generating an economy in a river town that has been through the drought, through those tough economic times. It is about grasping an opportunity, about those developers being able to go ahead and develop that land on the riverbank and create a great tourism attraction.

Let me tell the house that every resident and business in Waikerie wants a riverfront caravan park. I have had many tourists or travellers who have been through Waikerie on their way to the Riverland take the time to drop into my electorate office and say that it is a great aspect and that I need to take it up to the government and make sure that this project goes ahead. So I call on the government, I call on the Minister for Regional Development, and I call on the Minister for Tourism to come forward and have a look at this project, have a look at how it would benefit the river community of Waikerie, have a look at how it would benefit tourism numbers, and have a look at the great mystique of a river caravan park on that Waikerie riverbank.

Every other Riverland town has a caravan park on the river. They provide that unique opportunity for campers, caravanners, tourists and people who just want to have that river experience to come to the Riverland and camp, and experience river time. So, I urge all ministers and all departments to have a look at this. Do not make decisions in town. Come up and have a look at the opportunity this caravan park development will present.

Time expired.

### CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:25):** Today I wish to talk about a survey that has been carried out over a three-year period by the CSIRO, along with Earthwatch Australia, TeachWild and Shell. It is a survey that looked at pollution and debris along the Australian coastline. This survey was conducted at sites approximately 100 kilometres apart along the Australian coastline. What this survey has shown conclusively, and in doing so has dispelled a myth, is that debris washed up along the Australian coastline is as a result of careless littering and less than appropriate, indeed illegal, fishing practices.

It had previously been argued by many that a lot of this debris had originated well beyond our shores and had washed up onto our coastline. This myth was well and truly debunked. The report states:

The majority of coastal debris in Australia is from Australian sources, not the high seas.

It goes on to say:

Consumer behaviour and illegal dumping are the primary causes of marine debris in Australia.

What we do know is that this debris, particularly plastic and discarded commercial fishing nets and material, is having a devastating effect on our marine life and in particular our sea birds. It is reported that around 43 per cent of sea birds have plastic in their guts. It is also thought that up to 15,000 turtles have been entangled in illegally disposed of fishing nets.

Particularly telling is the reference to South Australia and our container deposit legislation and our ban on single-use plastic bags. While our coastline in South Australia is still suffering pollution from the inappropriate behaviour of residents and fishers in this state, our results, due to the controls we have in place, are having a more positive impact than elsewhere in Australia. We all, including the fishing sector, can do much better in this regard.

This brings me to the main point I wish to make; that is, the idea of a national container deposit scheme. For many years, South Australia has fought the Eastern States and the federal government and I pay particular attention to the former member for Schubert for bringing this matter to attention at a national level to say: why is it that we do not have a national container deposit scheme? We have always fought against the other states. The other states succumbed to strong lobbying by major beverage producers to scuttle any national scheme at a federal level. In doing so, it was a refusal by the states and the commonwealth government over many years to use South Australia as a basis for, if you like, exploring the possibilities and benefits of a national container deposit scheme.

The benefits of recycling in South Australia are obvious. We have over 100 depots that collect not only containers that have deposits on them but we have created an industry where a whole lot of material can be recycled at these particular venues. We have no deposit containers in the litter scheme. I was in Sydney on the weekend and had a look at their three-bin system along Bondi Beach. To me, it shows that it is not having as positive an impact as it could have if they did have container deposit legislation in place. It is time, more than ever before, to revisit genuinely the benefits that will arise from a national container deposit scheme and I call on the states and the federal government to genuinely revisit this issue.

With the little time I have left, I read with interest recently an article detailing the impact the federal government policy on e-waste will have on our recycling industry in South Australia. It appears that the federal government made a decision to award export permits for e-waste from South Australia to be shipped overseas despite a financially viable recycling e-waste sector in this state. This decision will not only create a loss of jobs in South Australia but it also appears that a significant amount of this exported e-waste will find its way to landfill in the foreign country of destination.

I do not think that any of us should be surprised by the federal government's decision given its lack of commitment and denialist approach to anything that is about helping and protecting our environment. To that extent, I call on the federal government, I call on the state government in South Australia, and I think they are doing that, but I particularly call on the federal government to abandon this ridiculous policy to ship e-waste to overseas countries and allow for this material to be appropriately recycled in South Australia to further show the people of Australia and the rest of the world how much we are leaders in this particular area.

#### STATE BUDGET

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:30):** I rise today to offer what I think are helpful hints to members of the government in relation to the budget and the discussion we have been having about it over the past number of months. I do note the great varied and many number of speeches made in this house by members opposite about all things various to do with the federal government. In fact, we heard it just then from the member for Colton. If only he were a minister again, and the fantastic job he did when he was in charge of PIRSA is something I congratulate him on.

The member for Elder, the member for Kaurana and the member Reynell have all talked about the federal government and the bad policy the federal government is seeking to institute. Maybe they do not think that their federal colleagues are doing a good enough job arguing that case on their behalf and are showing them the way here in this house. What I think it is for a couple of members,

especially the member for Elder, is that, if they squint their eyes just so, if they can delude themselves into thinking that the leather on the chairs in this chamber is a little paler green, if they can ignore the beautiful portrait of Tom Playford sitting up there, maybe members opposite can believe that they are members of the federal parliament.

I am sorry if they believe that, but unfortunately they are members of the government in the South Australian parliament. They should be talking about state-based issues and standing up for the government of South Australia. I find it quite odd that we have a running commentary on all things federal, yet we have so very little commentary espousing the virtues of the state government and the policies they are seeking to put forward.

The budget that has been handed down demonstrates what I think is a new and unprecedented process in South Australia. Gone are the days of 'consult and decide', the Premier's great 'I'm not Mike Rann' mantra, the 'consult and decide' mantra. We do not even have, in the great tradition of Rann and Foley, the 'announce and defend'. We do not even have 'announce and defend' anymore. What we have is 'announce, point somewhere else, try to get everyone to look the other way and then walk off'. We have announce and walk away, and it is of great disgust to the people of South Australia that this government does not even seek to defend its own budget. Instead it seems to point the finger anywhere else it can and try to fool the South Australian public into wiping from their memory the last 12 years of Labor rule.

This is entire rhetoric and spin around external factors when, really, if this Treasurer wants to look at why this budget is such a mess, why the budget is in complete disarray, he need not look to Canberra: he should instead talk to his mates who sit next to him. He should talk to the Premier. He should talk to Kevin Foley. He should talk to his good mate the member for Playford, although I understand that, at the moment, their relationship is not as good as it was, but still they sit next to each other in the chamber, and they could discuss this matter with each other because that is where the genesis of this budget mess lies.

South Australia is desperate for a government that takes responsibility for its own actions, that it is mature enough not to just say, 'Well, it's not my fault. There's a department for someone else that takes responsibility for everything.' In this house, I think that we have often talked about the fact that if interest were a government department it would be the fifth largest department. I believe that the department for somewhere else would have to be the largest department in the South Australian government.

The South Australian public are desperate for a government that is willing to stand up and say, 'This is our record. We are the government of South Australia. We will take responsibility for the \$16 billion budget we have control of, and we will do what we can for the people of South Australia.'

I would like to put a couple of things in context in the last couple of minutes. First, all week we have heard about the increase that the changes to remissions on the emergency services levy will bring (\$90 million a year), which could be reversed by a reversal of federal budget cuts. I would like to point out that, in the 2013-14 year, this government was \$311 million over budget, and it would take only a quarter of that being brought under control in order for there to be no need to remove the ESL remissions.

The genesis of this budget mess also lies in the fact that, even though since 2011-12 this government has raised \$441 million over revenue, it has spent \$841 million over budget—an extra \$400 million since 2011-12. In the examples of waste, the one piece of waste that I would like to talk about in these last few seconds is that this government has spent \$267.9 million giving voluntary separation packages to over 2,000 people yet at the same time has increased the Public Service by 1,898.

Time expired.

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:35):** I rise to express my concerns that the renewable energy industry in our state is facing an uncertain future. Australia has made enormous strides in the renewable energy sector. According to a recent report by PricewaterhouseCoopers, Australia has become the world's unexpected champion in cutting emissions for a second year running. Australia

managed a 7.2 per cent cut in the amount of carbon dioxide emissions per dollar of economic activity in 2013. This is compared with a global cut of 1.2 per cent according to the PricewaterhouseCoopers low carbon economy index.

Here in South Australia we have led the charge nationally in our expansion of the production of renewable energy. We have seen our renewable energy sector flourish to the benefit of our environment and our economy. The state government has set itself a target of achieving 33 per cent renewable electricity by 2020, and it is possible that we will reach this target in the coming year.

It is worth noting that the installed capacity of renewable energy has grown from 0.8 per cent in 2002 to 31.7 per cent, a great achievement by South Australia. The economic benefits have been enormous right across the state, but particularly in regional South Australia. Within my electorate of Giles and the areas bordering my electorate, there are a great many innovative initiatives that are creating jobs for local communities, creating a cleaner healthier environment and contributing to making South Australia a world leader in green industries.

One example is Sundrop Farms located at the top of Spencer Gulf, well north of Goyder's line. This is the world's first commercial Sundrop Farm. The farm has developed technology to grow high-quality produce using the sun's energy to desalinate sea water to produce fresh water for irrigation. In October 2011, Sundrop Farms was awarded \$345,000 from the South Australian government to demonstrate the use of solar energy in horticulture. The project employs unique hybridisation, allowing the use of heat captured by solar thermal technology for three interlinked purposes.

In the first, the highest temperatures are used for power generation to meet the electricity needs of the greenhouse. The waste heat from the power generation is used to drive a thermal desalination process to provide water, and the remaining heat is used to warm the greenhouse. Sundrop Farms is an example of sustainable future horticulture. This is an industry that has potential not only to create jobs but also to grow food in areas where it is needed.

Much of the success of Sundrop Farms in South Australia can be traced back to government policies that encourage and incentivise such enterprises. For example, the Clean Energy Finance Corporation (a corporation, I should point out, that the federal government wants to eliminate) is now cofinancing Sundrop Farms' 20-hectare expansion project, which will use solar thermal technology to desalinate sea water to provide irrigation and to heat and cool the greenhouses. Sundrop Farms has development approval to expand this greenhouse to a 20-hectare site and is receiving case management support through the Department of State Development.

I could go on at length about the importance of the wind energy industry in South Australia, the jobs created in regional South Australia and the manufacturing opportunities that are being developed in communities such as mine in Whyalla.

All of this is at risk because of the attack at a federal level on the renewable energy target and the disgraceful manner in which the federal government has deliberately created uncertainty when it comes to investment in renewable energy industries. This will cost South Australia very dearly, both in terms of investment dollars (in the billions), in terms of jobs and in doing the right thing by the environment. The opposition needs to work—

Time expired.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

*Bills*

## **COMMISSIONER FOR KANGAROO ISLAND BILL**

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 17 September 2014.)

Clause 17.

**The CHAIR:** I remind members that we have put through amendments 8 and 9 and we are into the remainder of the general questions, because we have had lots of them, on clause 17.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I have given the Attorney a commitment that we will go through the amendments rather quickly.

**The CHAIR:** So you have finished with clause 17 and I can put clause 17 as amended.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 and 19 passed.

New clause 19A.

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

Amendment No 10 [AG-1]—

Page 9, after line 26—Insert:

19A—Review by ERD Committee

The Environment, Resources and Development Committee of the Parliament must inquire into, consider and report to the Parliament on the operation of this Act—

- (a) after this Act has been in operation for a period of 2 years; and
- (b) at the end of each period of 4 years thereafter.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I recognise amendment No. 10 is an improvement on the way I consider the original bill to be drafted, but it is my intention to move another amendment later which sets a four-year sunset period on the term of the bill's operation also.

New clause inserted.

Clause 20.

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

Amendment No. 11 [AG-1]—

Page 9, after line 29—Insert:

- (2) The Minister must undertake consultation (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) with the Kangaroo Island Council and the Commissioner in relation to any proposed regulation under this Act.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** To be consistent with other amendments and issues debated, it talks about consultation with the Kangaroo Island Council. My request would be that the minister give consideration to the member for Flinders—Finniss—being included in that.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Apologies, Finniss.

**The CHAIR:** You already gave that undertaking yesterday.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am happy to consider it, and the member for Flinders would probably be very helpful.

Amendment passed; clause as amended passed.

New clause 21.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I move:

Amendment No 8 [Griffiths-1]—

Page 9, after line 29—After clause 20 insert:

21—Expiry of Act

This Act will expire 4 years after the day on which it comes into operation.

The intention of this is to actually, as I mentioned briefly before, put some form of expiry onto the operation of the act. While I appreciate, as mentioned, that some changes have been brought about to the original bill as proposed by the minister, in considering this the opposition wanted an opportunity for a significant level of review beyond that provided by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. It was our intention to seek the finalisation of the act, which would then be in four years' time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am not happy with the amendment because I think we have sufficient checks and balances in there. The whole idea of this thing was that it would supersede in a more lasting fashion the activities of KIFA. If the parliament comes to the view at some point in time in the future that this should be either amended or wound up, it can do so.

I think having a self-executing clause, as they refer to them in the legal world, embedded in this is unhelpful. This thing will either justify its existence or not. If it does not, a future parliament can deal with it as it wishes. It would also, can I say, lead to the possibility of people deciding to simply sit it out, waiting for the expiry date, and just be noncompliant at least for a period of time towards the end of the term, in the hope or expectation the thing would simply disappear. I do not think that is in the public interest.

New clause negatived.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:47):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:47):** Now is the appropriate opportunity for a third reading contribution?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is, indeed.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** There are some people, Deputy Speaker, who wish to make contributions at this time also, but we have got through a lot quicker. It has been about seven hours and 10 minutes so far, minister, I think.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I think it is actually true that there will be some comments made that might not have been before—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Back to task. We have done such a good job.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Yes. There might be some in the chamber who listened to the debate that occurred and thought we were taking an inordinate length of time to actually debate the bill.

*The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** No. Can I assure those who are unsure about their position on that that it was because of the desire of the opposition to scrutinise the bill to ensure that our position was put, to put the concerns raised with us on the public record, to seek clarification, to try to ensure that the bill could be in its absolutely best possible form and to put in the minister's mind some issues that were concerning us. It is seemingly the case that the minister holds some quite strong convictions on some things. He queries the reason why the opposition holds seemingly opposite convictions. It is because we can see some grounds for concerns to be raised.

I put on the record again that, while the Kangaroo Island Council has supported this bill, the amendments proposed by the opposition and, indeed, the position that we hold on it is that the bill should hold grave concerns for local government. The Local Government Association has supported it via a two-paragraph letter—I understand that also—but we consider quite strongly that we have



taken the broader perspective opportunities and potentials that may exist from the introduction of this bill into the parliamentary system, the creation of the commissioner's position and what could flow through to other areas.

I also put on the record though that, from a delivery of service and an investment in resources to create infrastructure and services, we also want to see the best possible use to remove duplication, to ensure efficiency, to get outcomes that the community demands and to produce a result that we can all be proud of. That is why we have taken a long time to debate this bill. I would have loved the Minister for Local Government to make a contribution, just to put on the record his position in relation to the concerns that we have raised, as we see it, on behalf of local government in relation to this, but it has been a robust debate.

The minister has, in the main, been quite forthcoming with information. I think there was one little stage of the debate in which some comments made by the minister, without questioning from others about the detail behind that, got us trapped for a little while going through some things, but I do respect that we have given this bill a great level of debate. We have ensured that the community's position has been put. I think those who read it in the future will recognise that the contributions made from the opposition highlight both sides of the argument as put by people in the wider community, but what we come down to completely is to ensure that the people who reside on Kangaroo Island and the people who visit Kangaroo Island get the outcomes they want.

The member for Finnis holds a very strong view based on the feedback that he has had from people—and it would be in the hundreds, no doubt—that this is not the way to achieve it. The opposition has put its case. The minister has carriage and has managed to convince the majority of the house of a different position, so we will live with what democracy has landed upon us, but I hope that in the fullness of time, the outcome is that the people benefit. That is what we are all here for. I look forward to the passage of the bill.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:51):** This has been a protracted debate, and before I get too far into it, I just want to make mention of some comments that the minister made yesterday in relation to Southern Ocean Lodge. I was part and parcel of that from day one in another capacity, which I think I mentioned. Southern Ocean Lodge has, I think, one local Kangaroo Island person working at it. Put simply, they do not want to work there, not because it is not a nice place, but they do not want to work to the conditions down there—if they are required at times when they have family things on or sport or whatever. They simply do not want to do it. That needs to be understood.

The Southern Ocean Lodge is fantastic. I love the place. In fact, the opening was spectacularly successful. A group of us went down there with then premier Mike Rann, Kevin Foley and the list goes on. However, what concerns me in the minister's statement that he would like more high-quality accommodation is one thing. There is quite a bit of quality accommodation around the place, but I had a fellow called John Lashmar ring me about two or three weeks ago. He has property at Cape St Albans, north of Cape Willoughby, on the eastern end. He rang me to say that everything is off in regard to his project.

He has had investors wanting to do a high-quality accommodation project there. They have been working on it for two years. I do not know where KIFA came into this; I would not have a clue. However, he rang to tell me that, because the bureaucrats said that he cannot have any accommodation within two kilometres of the coast because of the sea eagles, it is all off. The investors are not interested. They have walked away from it.

I do not think you will fix that, minister, with a commissioner. In fact, I am damn sure you will not because you get done over—and everyone gets done over, I might add; the holistic done over—by these people who simply walk over the top of whatever people want to do. Having high-quality accommodation and wanting more is one thing, but the other point I make, which I talked about during my contribution and which really riles me, is that there has been a complete and utter failure by the government or KIFA or whoever to deal with this issue of getting across the water.

That is the issue in getting more people to Kangaroo Island. It is not airports and 100-seater aircraft or whatever. It is the cost of getting across the water. The Watergap project of a few years ago clearly identified that there was a role for the federal government, whether it be Liberal or Labor,

and the state government, whether it be Liberal or Labor. There has just not been any effort made. I have banged on about this ad infinitum in this place.

Even today I had an email from an island resident saying, 'All these plans and structure plans are ridiculous until such time as the cost is addressed,' and they are quite oblivious to what is going on up here. They are not critical of SeaLink; it is not the fault of SeaLink. It is the issue of getting across there without sorting out the cost of it—similar to Tasmania. I am not suggesting the Tasmanian solution is ideal either. However, it needs to be dealt with.

If the minister does one thing, if he takes that on board and tries to do something about it, they will probably put a bridge across to the island and call it the John Rau bridge, or a tunnel, or whatever—I do not know. The fact of the matter is I can bang on as much as I like, as can the member for Bragg, but someone has to be the champion in cabinet at both state and federal levels.

I have had this discussion with the federal member for Mayo whose seat covers the island and he knows my views on it. But someone has to bang some heads on it; they really have to bang some heads on it. For anyone with an income of \$200,000 or \$250,000 a year, it does not mean much to them to get on the boat, or to get on the plane. That is a ridiculous situation. I am very lucky: I get my plane fares paid for, but they can pay up to \$450 or \$500 return. The system is ridiculous in this place with travel, I might add as well, that I can also get on cheaper. Island people cannot do that.

However, for families who want to go to the island—mum and dad with two or three kids—and have a week or 10 days over there, it is becoming prohibitive for them to do that. You cannot just have all high-end tourism at the expense of families who traditionally have been the backbone of the tourism business on the island.

Yes, the ferry carries lots of daytrippers and they give them a good day out, but that is not the same as putting people in beds and giving kids a good time. After this morning's debacle, their efforts to go fishing are now limited to the nth degree. They used to be able to go fishing in Shoal Bay, a piece of water adjacent to Kingscote which is the only bit of calm water in and around Kingscote, the main town. That is gone after 1 October—finished, done, dusted, gone.

I do not want to reflect too much on what happened this morning regarding the debate and the outcome but let me tell you that, when something goes wrong with one of these fishing families and when there is a tragedy involving them because their lives have broken down, I know who I am going to point at. I can tell you that—they are talking about it outwardly—and what the government needs to do here is to pretty rapidly put some counselling in place. I had a phone call; a family who left here today are completely distraught. If anything happens, I swear to God I am going to hold the people responsible who voted for what happened here this morning. I tell you I am furious about it.

To get back to the bill, let me say that I am somewhat staggered, perplexed and stupefied by the attitude of the Kangaroo Island Council on this. I think they have been completely conned and they think the commissioner is some sort of panacea to all their financial ills. It is not going to happen. There is nothing in it for them whatsoever. The minister has not given any indication. We asked questions about the economy and we could not get answers on how it is going to boost the economy.

Let me just go back to the day that the member for Goyder and I went in there. We were greeted as though we had rabies or something similar; we were given the cold shoulder. The next day the minister, Mr Spencer and whatnot went there, and that is fine—I have no problem with that. However, with indecent haste and without everybody there who could have been there, they quickly called a special meeting and rammed through the motion supporting the bill for a commissioner. I will stand corrected but I think there were either five or six councillors there—they barely had a quorum.

I do not know what you have done, what you have offered them, whether they have been given some sort of financial incentive or whatever. I just find the situation blatantly ridiculous. When you have your contribution you can tell the house what happened, but I do not think the council, or a number of the council, in any way understand what this is all about. I really do not think they do. They have been conned and you have had agents from the council running around trying to whip up support with members of parliament. I just think it is appalling.

The Kangaroo Island Council is very sadly and regrettably in a financial mess. I think it is three weeks ago tomorrow (or it might even be four, I will have to check) that I was on the boat going to the island and I had a local contractor come to me and tell me that they were owed \$50,000 by the council for work done and it had been outstanding for 60 days.

I discussed this matter with my colleague, the member for Goyder, who was a council CEO, and there is no way known that a local authority should get in that sort of financial mess. They should be over and above being behind in their accounts and these accounts should be paid within one or two days at the most at the end of the month. It is simply unacceptable and particularly poor that this has been going on. I think the local government minister is aware. I wanted to find out so I asked some genuine questions to people about the situation with councils and their inability to pay their bills. They sit differently and, indeed, they always have the capacity to raise money through additional rates or whatever. I do not know why successive ministers for local government have not grappled with what is going on.

As I pointed out, we are having a new council elected on the island, as is the case all around the state, in early November and things may change at the elected member level, but I have been really worried about what has been going on over there for some time. Indeed, one former councillor, Rosalie Chirgwin, was bullied and intimidated in an appalling manner. I stand to be corrected, but I believe she had a councillor and the mayor turn up at her place uninvited. She lives alone out in the bush. Now, this bill really worries me. Is a commissioner going to fit this?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Point of order. The debate about this bill is not an opportunity for the member for Finnis under privilege to vent his dislike or disagreement with members of council and produce hearsay material which is disparaging of people who are past or former elected members of the council. That is not the appropriate thing for us to be doing in this place.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair is a little concerned at the way things have drifted off and would ask the member for Finnis to address the third reading of this bill and not canvass other broader topics.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I am relating this story to the house to ask whether this commissioner bill is going to be able to do anything about the way the local authority on the island operates, given that this is the only one that is going to be over 68 councils? The minister may or may not know the answer to that, but it has been my view all along that he has not been able to satisfactorily answer the question in the house as to exactly what the commissioner is going to do.

The point of the amendment from this side of the house was to remove the local government, in this case the Kangaroo Island Council, from the bill. Unless they can assist or whatever, I do not know. I cannot see any financial assistance going in that council's direction. I cannot see any governance going in, so what is the purpose of having the local government authority in there? That is the question I am trying to allude to. Wouldn't you be better off just leaving them as it is and taking them right out? Now, we have passed that and it will go to another place, and heaven knows what they will do with it up there, but it really worries me that if this eventually goes through the council on Kangaroo Island will, in effect, be significantly neutered.

I cannot see why they think it is going to be a panacea for everything. We have talked about plans to the nth degree and where that goes, and I have listened with interest. We have had hours of debate, as the minister knows, and we have had questions asked. However, I do not think a lot of those questions have been answered and I do not know why on earth this has been put in place. Correct me if I am wrong, minister, but I do not think you knew a lot of the answers to the questions that were in there. There were not a lot of firm decisions coming from you on answers to questions in relation to that bill, if you are serious about it. So I am somewhat frustrated.

It will not make any difference to me. The harsh reality is that our kids have all left the island; they have given up because there is nothing over there for them and they are not interested in farming either, for that matter. They have gone. Indeed, at least one of them will leave the state, and perhaps two of them, because there is not enough here. The reason many kids do not stay on the island is because there is not enough there. If the minister can give me an assurance that by putting this bill through it is going to lift economic performance and create jobs and whatnot, then terrific.

I did an extensive interview in the local paper this week, and my view on the commissioner is that I am opposed to it. I said that if the government really wanted to do something that would lift the population and create jobs then perhaps it could look at putting a new prison over there. I am not being silly about this; put a new prison in. There would be young families working in the prison, blah, blah, blah—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Not all of them, surely; not all the young families would be working in the prison. The adults of the young families—

**Mr PENGILLY:** I have visited a number of prisons in South Australia and a lot of the prison staff are reasonably young, let me tell you. That may be something you could consider, minister. If you want to put government money into it, if you are not going to do anything apart from draw up plans and whatnot, it may be something to consider. It may be from left field, but it has been raised. In fact Mr Dudley Kelly, who is now deceased but who was chairman of the district council 30 or 40 years ago, I suppose, thought it was a good idea, and I raise it again.

Just putting people into bureaucratic positions is not going to help; I cannot see how it is going to help, and therefore I am opposed to the bill. I will watch with interest what happens when it gets to the upper house but, at the end of the day, I again say to you, sir, through the chair, I do not know what it is going to achieve.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:08):** I rise to speak to the third reading of the Kangaroo Island commissioner bill. From the outset, I can say that Kangaroo Island, its economy and its governance has varied considerably over the last 175 years. I am not going to go through all of what has happened; I gave a number of speeches on that when we celebrated 175 years as a state, which, of course, started in July 1836 on Kangaroo Island. I welcomed the then premier, with the member for Finnis, to Kangaroo Island for the 175 year celebrations.

However, let me say this. It is an island that has, to a large degree, determined its own destiny. It has had a number of industries, some of which have come and gone, some of which have been temporary, and some of which have been lifelines for periods of time; but, overwhelmingly, the sustaining industry—after fishing, its first industry, and salt harvesting—has been agriculture and primary industry. That has been its core economic base.

Very quickly, though, by the turn of last century, tourism became a very significant operation. There are many debates and records of meetings of the establishment of the Flinders Chase National Park. It took 20 years, I might tell you, to convince the people of Adelaide that it was an important area that should be preserved, to have one remaining water system in Australia unadulterated, to ensure that it preserved an area that was fox and rabbit free, to ensure that there would be sufficient research maintained for bees, which of course were significant in agriculture and horticulture, and that opportunities to experiment with forestry could be developed and, to quote one of the reports from the early 1920s, 'to be a place of sanctuary for weary workers'.

In between that, there had been a number of activities that developed tourism, peppered with periods of great hope for mining. I have to say the gold and silver mine rushes for Kangaroo Island were very short-lived, they did not last terribly long. Gypsum, on the other hand, was an area which gave a sustainable income for a significant period. So, we have, as an island, had industries that have come and gone but, unquestionably, a very important and valuable supplement to the food industry from Kangaroo Island has been tourism. To a large degree, it has developed with very significant accommodation facilities.

In my lifetime, the development of the Ozone Hotel and its major expansion in the 1970s and 1980s, the development of Linnets accommodation at American River, the very significant developments at Penneshaw in more recent decades upon the original Penneshaw Hotel and the expansions there, have all been very significant developments in tourism for South Australia and have provided a very good base. Right next to where I grew up at Western River, morning teas have been served to people who travelled out on Linnets buses back in the 1940s and 1950s, including a number of premiers of the state who sat on the verandah at that homestead to be served morning tea after, usually, the menfolk had gone fishing. So, it is not new.

If I can come to a time forty years ago, the early 1970s, you only have to look at *The Islander* newspaper from those times to see that the three big issues of the day for that time (1972) were: the amalgamation of the Dudley and Kingscote councils on the basis that there had been a suggestion that the local community was overgoverned by two councils and there would be a streamlining and a cost saving benefit if the councils were amalgamated. There were the usual expected cries that that would actually leave the island with a less strong voice by amalgamating to one council, but in any event that subsequently prevailed.

The second issue was the announcement by the then education minister Hugh Hudson that he would extend the matriculation year at the Kingscote Area School and that other schools on the island, there were five of them at that time, had continued to expand. The third issue of the time was the representation of the council and the public on the hospital board and the significance of having a voice on the most significant (probably), apart from education, state government agency on the island.

What has changed? We have had the following decades. We have had continued contribution through the Bannon and Brown/Olsen periods where very significant contribution was made to the island and its development in the agriculture, forestry and tourism areas particularly. We had a change of significant sea travel service. Unfortunately, under the Labor government, we saw the demise of the hospital board into nothing more than an advisory council, and the way things are going we will probably not even have that by the end of the year.

We have seen, under the watch of this government, the schools all amalgamated. A couple have passed since, like the Karatta School's demise, but now they have been amalgamated under this government and notwithstanding all sorts of promises about what they were going to do they have closed down the year 11 and 12 services at the Parndana campus and there is every expectation that year 10 is about to go.

They have gutted the education services and they have muted the voice of the hospital services. They have given, quite frankly, very little contribution towards road services, a little bit to supplement some sea services by adding a facility where you can have a cup of coffee as you get off the sea services at Penneshaw, but largely there has been an abandonment of infrastructure investment in the last 12 years, a drought exceeding anything I can remember occurring under any government, Labor or Liberal, in my lifetime.

Unsurprisingly, when we look at the newspaper today, we see that we still have a desperate community looking for representation and looking for delivery of service and infrastructure. It has now got to a very critical stage. That is why it was so terribly disappointing, when we got this year's state budget, to see that the only thing Kangaroo Island was going to get was a walking trail—a walking trail, for goodness sake!—and an announcement that some property, unknown yet, is going to be flogged off to help pay for it. I have to say that there is bitter disappointment.

The background of this is that we had the initiative of Mr Rann, the former premier, when he announced when attending the 175 year celebrations that there was a KI futures authority—I do not think it quite had that exact name; it certainly did not have the same composition at the time. There was going to be some work done to have a clear understanding, do the reports and prepare a contemporary assessment of what was needed for the island. The usual suspects were there: water gap costs, cost of transport, cost of living, cost of fuel, airport upgrades. Nothing has changed; these things are still there.

Then we had the appointment of some personnel. We had a new board established, chaired by Mr Raymond Spencer, who had another role in economic development for the state. Some members were put on that. Ms Kristina Roberts was appointed to provide some assistance in the preparation of the report.

Since then, this organisation has again delivered up to the government a number of recommendations, and they include all of the usual suspects in relation to infrastructure. The government has completely ignored these—they have just been shoved over here as though they did not even exist. What have we got? We have some planning reform, which helps suit the government in redoing the DPA; we have a KI brand, which hopefully will help with some marketing—in any event, the government just has to announce that. It is up to other people to use it and so on.

We have, I think, a Rockhopper service for transport on Kangaroo Island. I have seen the bus stop. It is about three seats long, and it is on the side of the Playford Highway, just in case the minister ever goes there to see it. I have never seen a person on the service or waiting at the bus stop, I might tell you. It is in the middle of the island. It is not to say that to have a service that will collect people, for example, at the western end of the island to go to the airport or to go into Kingscote on a regular arrangement is a bad thing, but typically it is a service that does not actually respond to what is most needed.

Most people who live west of Parndana have a car because they have to have a car, because they cannot rely on a bus that turns up once a week or goes to only one destination or the like to provide that service. It may help those who are visiting Kangaroo Island to catch the SeaLink service down at Penneshaw, when it goes on to provide that service, and you might save a bit of petrol if you happen to have a SeaLink service that coordinated with that Rockhopper service.

But, frankly, I am appalled at the cheap, easy options that the government has chosen to cherrypick out of the list that KIFA and its predecessor have identified as necessary for the economic development of Kangaroo Island. They have picked out the cheap options, and it simply will not assist Kangaroo Island to do the things they want to do. So, what do they do next? When their backs are up against the wall, they have spent the money everywhere else, what do they do for Kangaroo Island?

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** Extraordinary things with free-range eggs.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** 'Extraordinary things with free-range eggs.' Can I tell you this: I went to school with Tommy Fryar. I think that he was voted the least likely person to succeed at doing anything at school.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We're straying.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Notwithstanding the support that he probably did not get from his family, he excelled—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We're straying.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —incredibly in getting those chooks to lay eggs, free range, and sell them to the world. Every time I see him, I tell him that I am still buying his eggs, and I am still happy to. Let me tell you what else has happened! His sister married an Ordway and they had chooks—to eat. Guess what has happened to their business? It has wound up; it does not operate anymore. They do not sell chooks at the market anymore. Another one has come along which we hope will survive, but let me tell you, minister, that for you to start interfering with people whom you think you have fostered into some kind of panacea of profitability is bulldust.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** He's a success story.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** He was a success story before you and despite you—and despite your government.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Could we remind members not to interject and not to respond to interjections, and I ask the deputy leader—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Protect me from these puerile interjections. I appreciate it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You would only know they were puerile if you listened to them.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Can I just go to a positive, to this extent. Whilst the government, I think, in the last 12 years has abandoned Kangaroo Islanders, has feathered its own nest, has ripped the guts out of the ratepaying base of that island and has made it more and more difficult for families over there, I do want to say that, notwithstanding that, KIFA and some of the personnel have assisted in some of the moderating and mediating. I do not take away from that work.

That is not to say that it cannot be done if Kristina Roberts just remained as a member of the department, was not part of KIFA and she could continue that role. If she is any good at it, surely that is what the department would do. However, these are existing organisations. There was pure grain development. There was an opportunity to try to help that, as if the late Duncan MacGillivray was not

doing a good enough job with Rodney Bell and others to develop that. At any rate, if she helped out a bit, that is fine.

If she, as I understand it, went to the government to say, 'Look, we've got a proposal on the table to help reopen the abattoir, to actually provide industry, to provide jobs, to provide a 52-week of the year operation. There would need to be a doubling of lamb rates over there for sale, but nevertheless, let's look at it. Let's look at grain feeding lambs and let's look at that opportunity.' I think she did some work to help that. What did the government do? Stuff all! We have no provision for rewiring the facility. A huge piece of infrastructure over there is sitting idle.

All the hard things on the list have just been pushed aside and the easy, cheap things have been announced. I just find the assertion by the government that it actually gives a toss about what is happening on Kangaroo Island to be absolutely shallow.

Now that the nominations have closed for council, let me say this. I have made some general comments during my contribution on the local government's financial predicament on Kangaroo Island. The other major problem with the decision that there was going to be a signing off by the council in support of the government's bill, as a proposal from KIFA, is that the mayor of the council, Jayne Bates—whom I voted for and supported—was also a member of KIFA, and another member of her council has also been put onto KIFA. This is the usual practice of the government. Anyone who they think might cause any trouble or they might need to absorb into the system they put on a board or a committee or something; that is the usual way to shut them up.

I put this on the record now. I think that it was quite inappropriate for the mayor of a council (she has not renominated, so I am happy to say this now) to even agree to go on the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority and be part of an organisation, which, in my view, is a direct conflict of interest. Whatever process the government puts up in the future, the independence and the consequential integrity of a local government council, duly elected by the people, must ensure that its members, particularly its mayor, remain independent of boards and advisory committees and the like of government. I am very strong on that view and I make that statement today. I would not have in this debate had Her Worship renominated for council, because I would not want it alleged that I was interfering with re-election, but I will put it on the record now, because I am very unhappy about it.

The other matter I want to say is this. I recognise that Mr Spencer, Kristina Roberts, Mr Matthew Goode and members of the minister's staff have made themselves available for a number of briefings and public meetings and I thank them for that. I did attend a briefing in the minister's office here at Parliament House with a number of my colleagues. At that meeting we received a briefing as to the detail of the bill from Mr Matthew Goode and, as I say, I thank him for that. This was on 21 May 2014. Also, Ms Kristina Roberts was present. She is a member of KIFA.

I raised the question of how the management plans were going to operate and whether that might cause a delay in advancing the infrastructure and all the other important things for the island, which they had also confirmed, yet again, along with a mountain of other reports. Her answer was words to the effect, 'It won't take the 12 months,' because I thought I would throw it along the line of, 'This will take another year. We've got more plans to do. How is this going to delay what we want at the end of this?' She said words to the effect, 'No, it won't take that, it will only be a few months because we already have a draft plan.'

Subsequently, I called for a copy of the draft plan, because Kangaroo Islanders and, I think, South Australians, had burnt their fingers badly enough believing that the government would listen to the development of management plans on marine parks. So I asked for a copy of this draft. At a subsequent public meeting at the Parndana Hotel, which the minister and the Minister for Regional Development attended, I again asked for a copy of this and it was represented that there is no document in existence. I find that incredible.

The reason I say that is because if members, and indeed the minister, even looked at the KIFA website and identified the areas of direction they propose to go in, it is pretty clear what they want to do. One of them, of course, is in the planning area and, as I have already pointed out, the minister has already been active in that space and ensured that there will be an opportunity for major developments in coastal regions on Kangaroo Island, particularly of a tourism flavour, etc. I do not

doubt for one moment that there are drafts sitting in the back pocket of somebody and I will not be misled on the development of these plans.

If I ever find that there are any plans in existence, that there is a draft proposal that is going to go out to the community and that it was germane prior to these debates and it has not been disclosed, I will be raising that issue and I will not be happy, and nor should any member of this parliament be happy. It is not acceptable that we be kept like mushrooms and fed bulldust. This is not acceptable.

We need to know and be able to work with the government in relation to proposals that they have. They need to be honest in coming to the parliament and asking for our blessing to support a governance structure and, in this case, somebody who is going to be a panacea of moderation who is able to assist the economic development of this particular area of Kangaroo Island. We need to have the full facts. I place that on the record.

Finally, I want to say something about the Local Government Act itself. I did say during the debate that I was concerned that we had not had a response from the Local Government Association on this issue in respect of the process of what will happen to local government in the event that they refuse to provide information or documents, including prescribed contracts, to the commissioner as per the processes set out in the bill. There is another penalty if you do not comply with their management plans. In relation to section 272 of the Local Government Act, this comes into play specifically in the bill, and I remain concerned about that.

Time expired.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:28):** What a whirlwind journey this has been. A mere eight hours ago we began this and we could have gone to Singapore but, no, we have been here talking about this—much of it repetitive and much of it not particularly pertinent to the actual matter before the parliament.

I want to make a couple of brief remarks in relation, specifically, to the third reading contributions, the first being that of the member for Goyder. The member for Goyder is a very shrewd person. He made some very truthful statements to me today, which were that he expected to be brief after the return of this matter onto the *Notice Paper* but he, cunningly, did not mention the fact that he was only speaking for himself and, therefore, here we still are. But he was as good as his word, I will give him that. He was brief.

We have had a few contributions from the member for Finniss, as we have indeed for the last couple of days. He made a comment about sea eagles. The issue there relates to the application of guidelines in respect of the conservation of native fauna. I cannot for the life of me see how a person who can get high-level access to senior bureaucrats would not help that. The criticism appeared to be that bureaucrats are slowing it down, 'blah, blah, blah'. Well, why do we not go right to the top right away instead of having all these so-called problems occur?

Let us just talk about water gap very briefly. Everybody knows there is something about Kangaroo Island. It is surrounded by water; that is why it is an island. This is coming out of left field, isn't it? That has nothing to do with 12 years of Labor—it pre-dates that. In fact, as I understand, it goes back to the Oligocene era. It has something to do with the melting of the polar ice caps at the end of the last little ice age when the connection between Corny Point and Kangaroo Island was eventually severed by the marching of the waves. That is my understanding of the island's aetiology, as they say in legal circles.

It is nothing to do with this government that Kangaroo Island is an island but it is, by definition, being an island, surrounded by water, and that has been known by everybody for some time. The suggestion by the member for Finniss that it is all up to the state government to solve this problem is manifestly ludicrous.

We have been trying for some time to negotiate with the commonwealth government of various complexions to see whether they would be interested in subsidising or providing some assistance. They have made it very clear they are not interested in doing that at all. They also say,



as would any transport economists, if you start building in subsidies to things, you just drive the price up, and you actually just fatten the pockets of the people who are doing it.

The other point I would make about this is there are many people on the island who have a direct financial interest in SeaLink. I do not recall hearing any declaration from the member for Finniss, so I assume he does not have one or there is none in his family, but the fact is it is difficult to get a completely objective view from somebody who is not directly personally associated with the financial progress of SeaLink. Obviously, subsidising SeaLink would be damned good for SeaLink, so let us keep that in the back of our mind when we are talking about watergap policy.

The next point I would make is the suggestion that there is no effort made is false—absolutely false. I have some red hot news for members of the opposition, which is that, even as we speak, within the internal circles of government, there are very well-planned moves afoot to have a meaningful conversation with those who operate the SeaLink ferry service about whether or not we can deliver better outcomes to the island. We are not going to—

**Ms Chapman:** Going to have a talk.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, talking is the precursor to agreement, which is different to what happens in here. I am not going to rush out and claim something that has not happened, but I just say to the members opposite: just be careful how critical you are. You may find yourself a little bit surprised, and you may find yourself, in full self-respect, coming here in the not too distant future and saying a few words like, 'I tell you what, we were a bit sceptical about you people but, my goodness, you have achieved great things.' I am just putting that out there. You wait and see.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The next outrageous thing—there were many—from the member for Finniss was the suggestion, and I do find this offensive and outrageous, that members of the council on Kangaroo Island were in some way induced by some glittering prize being dangled in front of them by me to support this bill. That is outrageous. It is highly defamatory to those councillors, and I utterly reject it. It is outrageous, from my point of view, to suggest that I would go around dangling anything, particularly public moneys, in front of people to secure a vote in here. That is outrageous, and I think it would be appropriate for the member for Finniss, who has not had his best day ever in here, to come back in and actually put on the public record that he apologises to those people for making that outrageous suggestion.

The further point I would make is that not only have there been no inducements offered by me but I can guarantee you that there have been no threats made either. That is something that I could talk about, but I will not because I am not going to get into the sort of space that the member for Finniss got into.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** On a happier note—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The deputy leader, who has ticks and a big square around her name, is not going to raise a frivolous point of order, I am sure, so what is your point of order?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** My point of order is, firstly, the minister has referred to the absence of a member when in fact that is disorderly because reference to any member who is not present in the chamber at any one time it is not to be brought to the attention of the house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is true.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** That is the first thing. The second is the assertion by the minister that he is not going to progress a certain statement in light of allegations that were made by a member of this house and then not proceed with them. He is suggesting that there is some improper statement or conduct by another member of the house in this debate, and then he does not even have the courage to go on and say what they are. However, I make this point: this is a third reading speech. This is not a getting stuck into members of—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Order, Attorney. I have not finished yet, Attorney. I think it is very unfair and quite pointless of you to say that the other side has engaged in anything worse than has occurred on my left. I would ask all members to continue in the spirit of goodwill now that we are almost there, and I ask the Attorney to continue his remarks now.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, I will. Next point, a happier point: I was actually celebrating Mr Fryar and I do not claim any credit whatsoever for his success. I am saying that he runs a great operation. He has 50,000 of the happiest chooks I have ever seen in my life. He has these magnificent dogs which actually, I believe, are brought up to believe they are a chicken and they defend the chickens from cats and they keep everything away from the chickens. Madam Deputy Speaker, you may not believe this but, if I went into one of those pens with these chickens—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Acting like a chook.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I might be okay in that case, but if I went in there as myself, I would be torn to pieces because they would recognise I was not a chicken.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Anyway, I am just making the point that they are great dogs. They are moranos, I believe, if I am not mistaken.

**An honourable member:** Maremmas.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Maremmas. They are great looking dogs, but do not pat them, Madam Deputy Speaker, unless you are dressed in a chicken suit. The other thing is that there were some comments made by the deputy leader about mayor Bates. The comments were something like this: 'Mayor Bates shouldn't have been involved in the conversation as a member of KIFA.' At the risk of getting into something that was explored in *Summer Heights High* about fine and not fine, the fact is that if we had not involved the council directly in something, that would have been not fine because everyone would have said, 'Why didn't you involve the council?' Now we do involve the council and it is not fine because you involved the council. It is an interesting debating point.

Then there is the conspiracy theory, the bit about the draft plan. This is the bit about the *Apollo 11* landing being filmed in Universal Studios and all that sort of stuff. We have been down this path before: it is nonsense.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** It could have been 'Draft 51'.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, Area 51 and Roswell and God knows what else. The last point is that the member for Bragg, rather menacingly, said that if there does turn out to be a draft plan, which I assure you there is not, but if there does, she would 'not be happy'. The only observation I can make about that is that most times when I am in here, she does not appear to be happy anyway, so it would be hard to tell the difference. I assure her that there is no draft plan. I am not holding something in my back pocket. The whole point is that this thing will evolve out of the community from which it comes.

All of that said, I would like to say that I do believe that in particular the member for Goyder has tried to focus on an issue which is, from his point of view, concerning. I give credit to him and fundamentally, obviously, to the member for Finniss and the member for Bragg. At the kernel of all of that elaborate eight hours of conversation there is a legitimate concern about something, and I acknowledge that.

I say to all of you who are concerned I do not think you should be. This is not designed as some sinister plot to cause damage to the Kangaroo Island community. If this is as useless as people opposite say it is, it will do no harm—

**Ms Chapman:** Except waste \$6 million.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —and if it is as useful as we believe it is, it will be a very good investment in a part of South Australia which could do with a little bit more attention from the state government.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. J R. Rau.*

## **AUSTRALIAN CRIME COMMISSION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (EXAMINATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2014.)

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:41):** It is my pleasure to speak on the Australian Crime Commission (South Australia) (Examinations) Amendment Bill. In my fifth year here I think this is the first government bill on which I have had the opportunity to represent the opposition's point of view, apart from perhaps one where somebody might have been caught short.

Perhaps as the lead speaker I might relieve the Deputy Premier and some of the members by not using the full time that is potentially available to me. However, I cannot help but note that sometimes those who are crying about the amount of time taken to progress something should look to their own contributions, and curtailing and failing to waste time might assist themselves.

The bill at hand deletes six words from the Australian Crime Commission (South Australia) Act to essentially fix what was an unforeseen consequence of an amendment to that act contained within the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012. As the minister's second reading speech describes 'the examination provisions in...the ICAC Act were adopted from the examination provisions in the ACC Act.' 'Those provisions describe that counsel assisting the examiner, any person authorised by the examiner, or any legal practitioner representing a person at the examination may—and I quote from the Australian Crime Commission (South Australia) Act 18(6)—'examine or cross-examine any witness on any matter that the examiner considers relevant to the ACC operation/investigation.'

In the ICAC Act the words 'or any other investigation' were added after the equivalent relevant section in order to increase the flexibility in what the examiner may ask about. Essentially, it was suggested that, if it was suitable for the ICAC Act, then it might as well be suitable for the ACC Act, and so schedule 3, part 2 of the ICAC Act added a similar provision, namely, 'or any other ACC operation/investigation' to section 18(6) of the ACC (South Australia) Act.

In November 2013, the Australian Crime Commission wrote to the government to request that this extra provision be removed as it is inconsistent with the act of the commonwealth and the act in other states. I thank the Deputy Premier for providing me with a copy of that correspondence and, for the record, it is worth identifying those concerns that the Australian Crime Commission had with the act in question. It sets them out in five parts, and I quote:

- (a) section 17 of the ACC (SA) Act 2004 only authorises an examiner to conduct an examination for the purposes of a special ACC operation/investigation;
- (b) when an examiner is deciding whether to issue a summons to a person under section 19(1) of the ACC (SA) Act 2004, the terms of the authorisation and determination for the special ACC operation/investigation under which the summons is to be issued, and the relationship between those terms and the facts and circumstances relating to the proposed witness, are circumstances he or she must take into account under section 19(2) of the ACC (SA) Act 2004;
- (c) if the witness can give evidence relevant to more than one special ACC operation/investigation, the examiner may issue a single summons under all relevant special ACC operations/investigations;
- (d) as far as is consistent with the operational security requirements, and without confining the examiner's capability to follow unexpectedly leads within the proper scope of the examination, the witness should be entitled to know in general terms what he or she will be questioned about and it is the purpose of section 19(3) and (4) to achieve that outcome; and

- (e) if the insertion is proclaimed it will deviate from the wording in the equivalent provision in the *Australian Crime Commission Act 2002* (Cth).

The point we have reached here is that on 20 December this year two years will have passed since the ICAC Act was passed through this parliament. The fact that the government has not chosen to recommend the proclamation of this aspect of the act will cease to be of any event, because two years in things become proclaimed automatically.

So, the government has until 20 December to progress this bill through the parliament. It will please the government to note that the opposition is supporting it in this endeavour, and that is why we wanted to get it through this afternoon, to give the Legislative Council as much time as it needs to pass this bill before the end of the year, so that the cooperative national scheme and the Australian Crime Commission which is, on behalf of the federal government, expressing these concerns need not be concerned anymore.

In order to prevent inconsistency in the national scheme the bill therefore has the support of the opposition. It is entirely possible, unless the minister says something in his summation that might provoke further interest, that we might not even need to go into committee, but this rests on the shoulders of the Attorney-General and his behaviour, I suggest at this point, and I look further to further contributions, perhaps by the excellent member for Hartley.

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:47):** I speak in favour of the bill and commend the member for Morialta for instigating it. It is a brief but effective amendment and requires a brief but effective submission, since brevity is, after all, the soul of wit.

As we have heard, the bill deletes six words from the ACC (South Australia) Act 2004 to basically fix what was, as we have heard, an unforeseen consequence of one of the changes to the act, which was contained within the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 2012.

It is an important bill because it does amend the inconsistencies with that act, and I will be the first to support (no matter who instigates such a submission—whichever party) common-sense submissions like this. I will be the first to support legislation like this, because it is very important. It is important for the integrity of the important agencies involved that there be no ambiguity as to their functions on examination, because there are large things at stake here with regard to these bodies.

The ICAC and the Australian Crime Commission are two very important inquisitorial bodies, and it is important that the ACC be equipped with wideranging examination powers. Serious criminals are brought before the ACC, and it is extremely important that the consistency of the act not be compromised by anything such as the words of section 18(6). I support the amendment and commend the tireless member for Morialta for instigating it, and I commend the bill to the house.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:48):** I rise to speak on this bill to note and thank the member for Morialta's forensic assessment of the merits of this bill and his succinct contribution outlining the opposition's support of the same, aided and abetted by the very able member for Hartley, and I support the bill.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hang on, that was only 20 seconds—I want that noted. Attorney.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:49):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I have been in this place for a while, and I would like to say to those members who have been here less time than me that we have witnessed an historic moment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We have indeed.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Particularly the very last moment.

**Mr Gardner:** John, committee awaits.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes. Can I say first of all to the member for Morialta: there are many people who have been ministers for years, let alone shadow ministers for years, who could not have done as competently as the member for Morialta did. Excellent. The member for Morialta, having been here for a while and having studied things and being an acute person, has realised that getting

to the point, saying what you have to say and sitting down, is overwhelmingly devastating—because that is what people are interested in. Member for Morialta, congratulations on your foray into the legislative thing, you have done a great job.

Secondly, member for Hartley, you have contributed to a few of these things, and can I say again, as you promised, brevity is the soul of wit and you delivered. Well done. Can I congratulate you both for having such a salutary and calming effect on the member for Bragg who, but for your presence, would no doubt have been entertaining us for another hour or two about chickens and things. She is actually finding your example a leadership example for her. She is saying to herself, 'My goodness, these younger members have actually tumbled onto something that I have not worked out in all the time I have been here,' which is, if you just say what you have got to say and sit down it's really good. So congratulations to all of you, and to both the member for Morialta—

**Mr Gardner:** If only we had the same effect on you, sir.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, but you are, I am congratulating you. I am not provoking you, I am congratulating you.

**Mr Gardner:** At great length.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Not at great length, it is only a minute. Can I say in relation to you two gentlemen that anything you can continue to do by way of the calming and soothing effect, the balm sort of effect, you obviously have on the member for Bragg, all of us on this side would greatly appreciate it, and I would encourage you to exercise that marvellous thing. It is an important piece of work and I am pleased that everyone acknowledges it. It is simple, it is small, but if we do not do it we would look ridiculous.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (16:52):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (RENEWABLE ENERGY)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 August 2014.)

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:53):** It is my pleasure to speak on this bill on behalf of the opposition. I am the opposition's lead speaker, and I think the member for Flinders is also going to speak. We will make this as brief as possible, but I have to say that I do not think we will wrap before 6. So, I will just say that now.

This bill, the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation (Renewable Energy) Amendment Bill 2014, comes to this house and a great deal of work has gone into it and I really do understand the very positive intent of this bill. I think it is coming for very genuine and very positive reasons from the government, and I thank them for that. I also thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for her significant amount of work on behalf of the opposition on this bill.

I also thank the minister, his staff and departmental staff, who have all put a lot of time and effort into this bill over, I suggest, around two years now, or maybe a little bit longer, in terms of the various versions that we have been working through. Everybody has put a lot of time and effort into this to try to improve this bill. It did need a lot of improvement, certainly from my perspective, and I thank all those who people who have contributed towards that effort.

It is very difficult to balance everybody's interests when you are looking at trying to create a bill that is reasonably specific today, here and now, that balances interests which are all very long term. I have to say, there is more that I would have liked to have changed on behalf of my constituents, but I guess in all these discussions and these negotiations you come to a point where you have to weigh up the positives and the negatives.

There are significant positives in this bill, and we have also come a long way on behalf of my constituents, who are largely the prescribed interested parties represented in this bill. Certainly, the member for Giles has many constituents who are also prescribed interested parties under this bill. I would have liked to go further, but I have made a decision, at least in my involvement, that it would not have been right to push any further because it is quite likely that some of the positives of the bill would not have come forward. It is a great positive to be trying to give as many opportunities as possible within reason, cost constraints, etc., to develop renewable energy within our state; that is a very positive goal.

The opposition supports this bill. I will have significant questions to ask in committee of the minister managing the bill on behalf of the government. I am not looking for problems, but I am going to be looking for some fairly significant clarifications. The reason I say that is that every single party affected by this bill, whether they be a solar or wind farm developer, a pastoralist, a person, a family, or a corporation which holds native title interest, or whether they be a company that holds a resources tenement—one category of prescribed interested party is somebody who may hold a native title interest in the land—all these people and organisations have exceptionally long-term interest in the land. There is nobody there who will not be around for probably decades to come, at least, so that is why this is a very important issue.

One of the important intents of the bill is to create opportunities for renewable energy production in the more remote parts of our state. We are all aware of the difficulties that there have been, particularly with regard to wind farms and the development of wind farms in close country parts of South Australia. There are many people who want them, and many people who do not want them. There are many people who say that their homes, their livelihood, their sleeping patterns and the health of their families have all been negatively affected, and it is very hard for any of us to come to firm conclusions about what is happening to a person's home, a person's body or a person's sleep pattern, etc.

It does make good sense to try to get them further away, to where there are fewer people affected and fewer communities involved. I support the government in trying to do that, but of course people living, working, and pursuing cultural interests in pastoral areas also have rights. One person living in pastoral South Australia is just as important as one person in close country or one person living in the city, so it is very important to consider the views of those people.

The government has gone through a fairly extensive consultation process with as many of those people as possible, as have I. This bill, as well as having very important personal interest for me as the member for Stuart, does affect my roles as both shadow minister for mineral resources and also for energy. It is probably easily forgotten, as we tend to be focusing our discussions on pastoralists and native title holders, but the holders of resources tenements are very important players in this as well.

I have to say that at one stage through my negotiations, after seeing the consultation opportunities that had gone out primarily to pastoralists, I was disappointed (and I do not know exactly where this went wrong) that when I asked the minister's office whether Aboriginal communities, Aboriginal people, holders of native title or people who may hold native title had been consulted with I was told no. I believe that has been rectified, but I think it is really important that all the people involved in this bill—families, corporations and organisations—deserve equal representation. Certainly, pastoralists are very important, but every Aboriginal group that is a prescribed interested party deserves full representation, as well as the mining companies and resource tenement holders.

Very briefly, what this bill does is allow opportunities for solar and wind development. In the case of solar development, it proposes an excision from the leasehold; a section of land would be taken out of the pastoral lease so that a solar farm could be developed. In the case of a wind farm, a licence to operate that wind farm would be potentially offered to a wind farm developer. There would be a period of initial access for companies that wanted to pursue these sorts of things and, if

they were successful, following that there would be a licence offered to undertake these developments.

Money would be paid, by way of compensation to prescribed parties, which would go into a fund, and it would be paid for the initial up-front access as well as for the licence opportunity, if you like, which would go on for 25 or 50 or more years. That money would go into a fund and be negotiated by the government on behalf of the prescribed interested parties. The government would keep 5 per cent of that money—a brokerage fee, if you like, or an ongoing administration fee or whatever purpose the government chooses—and 95 per cent would go to the prescribed interested parties. If down the track there were disagreements, the ERD Court is the place where those disagreements would be dealt with. I will not go into all the details, but I think that is a pretty fair summary of how things are proposed to work under this bill.

There are of course a lot of questions and a lot of concerns about the money because the money is what is meant to offset the compensation. The total quantum of that money that might be negotiated by the government on behalf of the prescribed interested parties, and also how 95 per cent of that total quantum of money would be shared between the prescribed interested parties, is very much up in the air.

I have to say that I understand that it is not possible for the government to try to explicitly define all the ways that the total quantum might be determined or how the sharing out of it might be determined. I really do understand that, but it is equally important that this house understands what an awkward a position that leaves the prescribed interested parties—to have the government negotiating on your behalf, instead of you negotiating on your behalf; to have the total amount of money that might go into the fund being really unknown; and also to have how that fund would be divided up unknown.

Many of the prescribed interested parties get on exceptionally well, and in the bill the holders of resources tenements would not get access to a share of the 95 per cent. The pastoral lessees would get it, and also the holders of native title would get access to the money that is paid up-front, if you like, to have access to the land to essentially do their exploratory investigations, and that might be 2½ and I think up to five years in total. Once a licence is conferred upon a renewable energy developer, as well as the pastoral lessees and the native title holders anybody who may hold native title is also potentially able to access a share of the fund. Deputy Speaker, you will understand how that makes people really wonder where they are going. Keep in mind the long-term view: that we are putting something in place at the moment that maybe in a year or two, or maybe in 20 or 30 years, a wind or solar farm developer might come along and want to take the opportunity to develop a wind or solar farm.

Having said that, I just have to accept, and my constituents have to accept, and the member for Giles' constituents have to accept (the member for Flinders has constituents in this category, and I believe that the member for Chaffey does as well), that we have done the best we can to leave the grey area as small as possible. Certainly, we did manage to put into the bill that the minister of the day must negotiate on behalf of the interested parties, after consulting with them, and with their views and opinions in mind. I guess that is probably about as good as we can get at this stage. The minister of the day may be Liberal or may be Labor, and may understand energy and outback issues better or worse. We just have to accept that that is how it is going to go, and that is at the heart of the most difficult part of that bill.

I draw your attention, Deputy Speaker, to negotiations that have gone on for in excess of 10 years with regard to the Cultana training range in the member for Giles' electorate. Those negotiations, of course, were with the federal government—Liberal and Labor—where they were trying to negotiate with native title holders and other people who had cultural interests in the land as well as the pastoral leaseholders. That negotiation did not go well, and it stretched out over a very long time. I am not pointing the finger at anyone here, because over 10 years there were successive governments, but I can tell you that the people—not the governments, but the people—in the local area were very dissatisfied with that process.

You can imagine leaseholders who were quite comfortable, and there were certainly some of them who thought, 'Look, this is okay. I am happy. I will sell you my pastoral lease, as simple as

that. Maybe we'll have to haggle over the numbers just a little bit, but broadly speaking I am happy. Let's get on with it.' Other pastoral leaseholders would say, 'I don't want to go. This has been part of my family's history for a hundred-odd years. I do not want to go. I am completely opposed to this and I refuse to go.' Well, the reality is that 10 years later none of them are really satisfied with the process they went through. Those who wanted to go had to wait 10 years to go; their whole lives were on hold for 10 years. Those who did not want to go, after 10 years they still had to go or they had to divide up their property. So, really, no-one is comfortable with that. I mention that as an example of how difficult it can be for governments and for the real people involved when you have to enter into these sorts of things, where the government is essentially negotiating on what is taxpayer-owned, publicly-owned, leased land that might be put towards another purpose.

I also want to touch on, in my mind, another grey area. There is an assumption that this bill will apply only to parcels of land on pastoral leases that are near transmission lines, near the mains grid. There are four mains lines, essentially, two of which I know that the member for Giles would be very aware of: one that heads from Port Augusta up to Woomera and onto the Woomera rocket range, and includes Roxby Downs as well, and one that heads up into the Flinders Ranges up to Leigh Creek. There are also two others: one that runs just at the end of the southern edge of the pastoral zone in the Riverland area, and another one that just scrapes through the member for Giles' area in what, I suppose, would be the south-east corner of his area and the north-east corner of the member for Flinders' area. There are also mains grids there.

That looks pretty simple because then you could say that you really could not develop a wind or solar farm too far away from those mains grid lines because there are constraints with regard to: you produce your solar or wind power here, you have to run it through a transformer, you have to put it through other lines to get into the mains grid and then you are on board in terms of being able to sell your electricity to customers. I am sure that will be, in the main, where people are looking at developing wind and solar, but they are not the only ones. We will have some questions in committee to try to clarify this.

It is not inconceivable that a company might want to develop a mine and they might say, 'Well, to run this mine we are going to need truckloads of diesel, truckloads and truckloads of diesel, to supply us with the electricity that we need, or we could use less diesel and we could supplement that with wind and solar.' So, we would have, potentially, a standalone minerals development; it could be minerals, it could be oil or gas, whatever, and a really smart, capable, good developer could say, 'I can contribute renewables to this.' They might need to put a solar farm or a wind farm on a pastoral lease in proximity to their new mine and that might be a very smart and good thing to do and this bill would cover that, which is positive, but it has not been part of the mainstream conversation—it could actually be anywhere.

One thing I will be asking in committee is in regard to the potential scale of wind and solar developments. It is quite easy to imagine the larger end where a developer wants to put their electricity into the mains grid and, essentially, they are hoping to make money by generating electricity and selling it into the main publicly accessible grid, but there may also be others with much smaller developments who might just want to use it for themselves, for their own independent industrial or commercial interests.

It might also be that someone wants to do a development for wind and solar that would fit into this bill very neatly to connect into one of the RAES towns (the remote area electricity scheme towns), of which there are 13 across our state. They are all supplied with electricity by standalones for that town; diesel and gas generation linked into one grid that supplies that town only. Again, the member for Giles has approximately half of those, I have approximately half, and I think the member for Flinders has one at Nundroo.

Somebody might come along and say, 'I'd like to put a wind or solar electricity development on a pastoral lease in proximity to one of these 13 towns and supply power into the town.' Now, you will not be able to do that on non-windy days and you will not be able to do that when the sun is not shining, but it could be an outstanding supplement to the current diesel and gas power generation that goes on. So, there is another potential example of where this bill might apply nowhere near the mains electricity grids whatsoever. I would ask people to consider that possibility.



I think the potential scale of the development and how those things could dovetail into electricity needs would be very important. As I mentioned, there are 13 towns on the remote area electricity scheme across outback South Australia, but there are approximately 30 towns in total across outback South Australia and most of them are very small, maybe this bill could support some of them as well, and that would be really good. Those towns are currently not getting any electricity, so there is no expectation that this would necessarily provide them with 24-hour electricity but it might supplement what individual people are currently doing. In those cases, if they are not near the mains and they are not a RAES town, typically, people, families, businesses are supplying their own electricity.

This might be a way of contributing to those towns, and that will be at the very small end. It will not be what we are familiar with with wind farms and what we see when we drive through many of the country electorates—big wind farms that have anywhere from 10 to 100 turbines. That is a very genuine opportunity, but I will be looking for some clarification during the committee to see what is and what is not possible. I think it is very important that is on the record, so that in five, 10, 15, 20 years down the track people are aware of it.

Another positive aspect of this bill is that I hope it will contribute to avoiding the great unforeseen difficulties we have had with regard to an overlap between the Mining Act and the planning act when it comes to wind farm developments. I bring to your attention, Deputy Speaker, the proposal by Investec for a wind farm at Hornsdale, which was given approval, not to develop but to thoroughly investigate and proceed, if you like; it was not the final signoff. However, there was a significant problem.

There were already exploration and mining tenements in that area that were held by a relatively small mining company and/or, in different combinations, a local family who had already started mining phosphate on their property near Tarcowie. The Tarcowie Phosphate company, as far as mining companies go—I know the family would not mind me saying this—was miniscule; however, to that family it was everything. To that family it was an exceptionally important adjunct to their agricultural business. They had already started mining phosphate, they had already started selling phosphate, and they already had plans to develop that operation further.

If you can imagine the beautiful rolling hills of the Tarcowie area, many of them have rocky outcrops or rocky ridges running along them, primarily rounded top, rolling-type hills but with rocky outcrops here and there. That is where they wanted to mine, that is where they had permission to mine, and that is where Investec wanted to put their turbines, because it was at the top of the hill where the greatest wind resource is. That is an issue I have been trying to work through with the government and the family for a long time.

I have to say that the government, through the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, and particularly Mr Paul Heithersay, have been trying very hard to get through this issue. For now at least it seems to be okay (resolved would be the wrong word). However, that issue arose because nobody had ever thought about the fact that somebody gave mining permission and somebody else gave wind farm permission. Here at least, on land that is held by pastoral leases, we have a way to work through this, and I think the government has done well to try to develop that.

There are also, of course, as I touched on briefly before, many issues across country South Australia with regard to the development of wind farms. I do not imagine there is a country member of parliament in this place who has not been asked by constituent, 'Why not put a wind farm across Mount Lofty and see if they like it?' That is a very fair way to think if you live in a country area, whether it is your land or you just live near the land, and you are going to get a wind farm and you do not like it.

This does address in a very positive way the problem of trying to place wind farms in more sparsely populated areas of the state. I say again: the people who live in the more sparsely populated areas of our state deserve exactly—exactly—as much consideration when it comes to their opinions as anybody who lives in the country, or anybody who might live in Adelaide and does not want to look up at Mount Lofty to see it covered by wind farms.

One thing that this bill will not help my constituents or the constituents of Giles, Flinders or Chaffey who live in pastoral areas with is their extraordinarily strong and understandable frustration that mains electricity grids run through their cattle station or sheep station and they cannot access the electricity. You can sit there in a town or a homestead and you can see the mains grid right there, and I have to pay, the pastoralist has to pay, \$20,000, \$30,000, \$50,000 and sometimes \$100,000 a year for diesel for electricity, and they are not allowed to access that electricity. Every member here would understand how very frustrating that would be.

It is now going to be the case that, if a solar or wind farm were to be developed under the auspices of this bill—and if that were done with fruitful and satisfactory negotiations, I would think that was an outstanding outcome, a really positive outcome, and I am fully behind the good results that can come from this bill—not only would that pastoralist be looking at the mains electricity grid that goes close, they can see it right there, but also they will be looking at a wind farm, potentially, and they may still not be able to get the electricity to their homestead or to their small town, their shearing shed or to whatever development they have on their property! I really feel for those people with that issue.

It does affect outback businesses in pastoral areas, which have to generate their own electricity and to pay a fortune to do so. I put on the record that, while this bill contributes positively to the development of renewables in a more sparsely populated part of our state, as a state and as a government and as contributors to developing the state, we have to do more to get electricity into the pastoral areas of our state, electricity that those people can use.

If you head out to the eastern end of my electorate of Stuart, you will come to the New South Wales border, and you can see their electricity, which comes all the way from Sydney to our border—just like if you go to Queensland, you can see the bitumen road that comes all the way from Brisbane to our border, but that is a different story. It is incredibly frustrating for our pastoralists to know that their neighbours just over the border can access mains electricity to their homestead or to their hotel if it happens to be a business in town. Our people, more often than not, cannot do that.

In their further deliberations, I urge the government to consider not only how we can develop renewable energy in outback parts of our state but also how people who live in outback parts of our state can directly access the electricity that is being harnessed in their backyard. It is a very important issue.

The key issue that remains unknown is how the total quantum of money will be developed when the minister negotiates it on behalf of other people and how that will be derived. This is a really important issue, and an important component of this issue which I think most people have not really thought through is that every single one of the parties affected by this has a very long-term interest.

If you are going to develop a solar farm or a wind farm under this bill, you will be entitled to a 25 plus 25-year licence. If you happen to be a pastoral family, company or enterprise, who may have been there for 100 years or who may have just arrived (you would like to be there for 100 years, you would like to have your family there for 100 years) or you are the holder of a resources tenement, whether you are just exploring or whether you are producing, the shortest development licence from exploration through to closing your production is 10 to 20 years. From the first time somebody says, 'I think there's gold in them there hills,' through to finishing their goldmine is 10 to 20 years; most are much longer.

Of course, in this vein, the people with the absolutely longest connection to the land are the Aboriginal people, those people who hold native title and whose families have been there for tens of thousands of years, who, of course, understandably and rightly, have a mindset to say, 'We would like our families to have a connection to this land for thousands of years to come.' It is very natural and very appropriate and I support them in wanting to have that connection.

There is nobody involved in this issue who does not have a very long-term view. We are trying to set up something that, even if a developer banged on the government's door tomorrow morning, everybody involved would be tied up with this issue for decades and decades. That is why I believe it is important to go through it in some detail at the committee stage in an effort to try to get some clarification for all the people involved and to try to get at least a bit of clarity about how some of the unforeseen circumstances might eventuate, circumstances that none of us—the minister, the

minister's staff, departmental staff, my constituents and I—can see There are things that we can predict but there are certainly others that we know will arise in 10, 20, 30, 50 years that we cannot predict. So it is important to try to get a little bit of clarity about how those things will be dealt with.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:26):** I commend this bill to the house and congratulate the government on bringing the bill and also the work that the member for Stuart has done on this as our shadow minister but also as the member for Stuart who, of course, has a vast area of pastoral lease within his electorate, as does the member for Giles who I know also has an interest in renewables and was speaking briefly about them earlier today.

It is good to see this bill finally get here. I think it goes way back to 2010 when a germ of an idea from the current government led to the development of this bill. Essentially the bill aims to enable wind farm development on pastoral lands. My understanding is that this has been nigh on impossible up until now because the opportunity and the capability simply was not there. By passing this bill we create the opportunity for development to occur, but it does not necessarily guarantee it.

The member for Stuart has been through a whole range of arguments and debate around how and why this bill may be applied but essentially it is about opportunity. I have just a half a dozen or so pastoral leases in my electorate. There are three inland from Elliston, a couple inland from Venus Bay and a couple more north of Bookabie. It is probably unlikely that wind farm development will take place on those pastoral leases. My understanding is that you really have to target those areas with a good wind resource and, in my area at least, it is more likely to be closer to the coast.

The wind resource in the pastoral areas really varies depending on the terrain, but certainly there will be opportunities for solar, I am sure. In the discussion paper it has been suggested that it is likely that developments will take place close to existing transmission lines. I think one of the big challenges is not really the generation of electricity; it is the transmission and delivery of that electricity. I have certainly seen an example of that with the wind farm at Cathedral Rocks which is due west of Port Lincoln on the south-western tip of Eyre Peninsula, and from the city of Port Lincoln you can see those turbines turning on a clear day.

It is not too far away, yet there are factories on the outlying areas of Port Lincoln—fish processing plants—that cannot access enough electricity. So it is all very well to talk about the generation of electricity; it is just as critical to talk about the transmission and delivery of that electricity. It will be interesting to see how the electricity market evolves in this state and this country over the next few years and what options are taken up. I believe that there will be a suite of solutions. I suspect that oil and gas will be the primary source for a long time yet. It is certainly as efficient as we have at the moment, but renewables will continue to play a part and they may grow in their importance.

We have talked about consultation in this bill and how there are various stakeholders: those with native title, the original owners of the land; and those who own a pastoral lease—and of course, it is not owned freehold, it is just leasehold; it is ultimately owned by the Crown. For the most part, I think they are 49 years. Is that right?

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Forty-two.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Forty-two; my apologies. They are renewed each and every 42 years, of course. They are the primary carers of that land at the moment. There are mining interests and of course now with the passing of this bill, there will be those companies that are keen to be involved with renewable energy.

I was interested to see that disputes will now be referred to the ERD Court, because there is no doubt that there will be disputes. When you strive for coexistence among varying land uses, they are often, in the first instance at least, seen as competing land uses, and almost invariably there is angst in the initial stages of discussion or even development. I think the ERD Court is the right place for those disputes to be carried out. It is always interesting to see how the legislation will be tested at that time.

The member for Stuart certainly mentioned money. Often things do get back to money and I think the existing landowner needs to be acknowledged and compensated, and that is dealt with in this bill. It looks to me that the payments will generally be between \$8,000 and \$12,000 per turbine.

That is fair and reasonable. It is probably in line with what landowners are receiving on the inside of the country of course. A lot of the wind farm developments have been subjected to some discussion, and often my belief is that those who have a turbine or a wind farm on their property are more than happy with the development and those nearby who do not have the same opportunity are not necessarily so pleased.

I know the member for Stuart is keen to get to committee and given that it is late on a Thursday we will move on, but I just wanted to make a brief contribution, commend the bill to the house and acknowledge the work that has been done on both sides, particularly by the member for Stuart, but also by our shadow minister for the environment, Michelle Lensink, in the other place. I look forward to the passage of the bill.

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:32):** I also speak in support of this bill and commend the bill to the house. I would like to firstly acknowledge the enormous contribution of the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place, the member for Stuart and the member for Flinders, and acknowledge the enormous impact that such a bill has on their electorates, having many pastoral leases in their electorates.

I have to declare that I have enormous interest in renewable energy sources. Having been in the funds management industry for a couple of years, it was a great privilege to start to learn about renewable energy sources. I sincerely think that government has an enormous role to play in facilitating investment in the area and in facilitating growth in the area, be it solar energy, biomass waste to energy, water energy, wind energy or, particularly, geothermal energy. History has shown us in recent times that this government has failed the renewable energy sector, particularly in the geothermal energy space.

Obviously, as we have heard, renewable energy development cannot and could not have occurred on pastoral leases, because the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 was drafted prior to its occurrence. There have been enormous obstacles arising from existing provisions, and it is fantastic that this bill is hopefully coming to a head.

The Pastoral Land Management and Conservation (Renewable Energy) Amendment Bill was drafted to allow this coexistence of pastoral activities, wind farm development and mining. The bill hopefully will enable wind farm development on pastoral land. It has been said that up to 40 per cent of the state's land mass will be open to potential renewable energy development—and this is a good thing. I think we should always aspire to ensure, of course taking into consideration all the relevant parties, that we maximise the potential of our land since we do have so much of it.

It has obviously been said that the most likely location of wind farm developments, as the member for Stuart alluded to, will be in proximity to the state's transmission lines, and it is believed that it is hard for wind farm developments to operate outside a 30-kilometre radius of these lines.

It is important that we note the important role that the Howard government played in initiating the initial investment into the renewable energy space, in renewable energy technology, setting a substantial target many years ago. I note that it has been said that South Australia has—

**Mr Hughes:** 2 per cent.

**Mr TARZIA:** It can always be improved, member for Giles—no doubt about that. In fact, the member for Giles should ask—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is unparliamentary to interject and to respond to interjections. I draw members back to the task at hand. The member for Hartley.

**Mr TARZIA:** Deputy Speaker, it is fantastic that we have bipartisan passion for renewable energy. I just sincerely hope and wish—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Back to task.

**Mr TARZIA:** —on behalf of this space, that the government did more about it in their 12 years in office. I note that South Australia does have a certain percentage of energy coming from the renewable sector, but I am sure the member for Giles will be appeased—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Back to task.

**Mr TARZIA:** —to hear me say that it needs to be much more.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are still responding to interjections.

**Mr TARZIA:** Obviously I have struck a nerve here, Deputy Speaker, but more needs to be done in this space. They seem to be sincerely all talk and no action in this space. One only has to look into my own electorate in Lochiel Park in Campbelltown, in Hartley, where we have had a sustainable energy project that was set up many, many years ago and is still unable to be fully utilised by the local electorate.

Conversely, the Liberal Party has a strong record in this space. In fact, at a state level, the previous Liberal government (many, many years ago now) had a strong record of leadership on greenhouse gas emissions, and some may actually remember—those who were here—that in 1998 the Liberal government actually initiated South Australia's first government greenhouse target program, which is a very good thing.

As I have mentioned, we are advised that renewable energy could not previously occur on pastoral leases because of the original act that was in place. This particular bill, following its passage, will allow coexistence of pastoral activities, and that is a fantastic thing. I thank honourable members for their contributions and really hope that, in a bipartisan manner, we can progress this bill through this place.

There are a number of issues still to be clarified, as the member for Stuart did raise: issues concerning monetary payment, dispute resolution, the time in which a minister is able to determine whether an application is open-ended or not, and whether and how grant licences can be issued, with or without the consent of interested parties. There are also issues still to be rectified concerning the resumption period. However, all in all, I will support this bill. I commend the bill to the house and I hope that we can resolve some of those outstanding issues in the committee stage.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (17:38):** I thank honourable members for their time in the consideration of this bill. This bill before the chamber today makes it possible for a wind farm developer to apply for a licence to build and operate a wind farm on crown land subject to pastoral lease, and for that wind farm to coexist with a pastoral leaseholder's activities. The bill also expedites access to pastoral land for solar energy projects.

As it is the first of this type of legislation in Australia, the amendments will send a strong message to industry that South Australia is a competitive place for renewable energy investment. We have benefited greatly as a state from renewable energy development and, since 2003, there has been \$5.5 billion in renewable energy investment, with 40 per cent of this occurring in regional areas. This bill will ensure that such benefits continue to flow into regional South Australia. This package of amendments will benefit developers, pastoral lessees and native title holders, as well as ensuring that the interests of mineral and resource companies are preserved through ensuring strong consultation with these groups at an early stage in the licence application process.

The bill was originally introduced into the Legislative Council in May this year by minister Hunter. I would like to thank the minister and also acknowledge and thank the member for Stuart for his input into this process to date. Following amendments in the other place, the bill now provides similar rights to pastoral lessees, as is provided for existing mineral and petroleum and geothermal exploration tenement holders. A land access agreement now needs to be negotiated between a wind farm developer and a pastoral lessee before a wind farm licence can be issued. The negotiation of this agreement will give the pastoral lessee an ability to discuss sensitive areas such as water points and draw up an agreement which addresses the usage of common infrastructure such as access roads.

The wind farm licence will, for safety reasons, include areas such as substations, control rooms and maintenance sheds that need to be locked and therefore cannot be part of the access agreement. The land access agreement provides for the Environment, Resources and Development Court to intervene if requested by either party. Wind farm licence conditions will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis in recognition of the varying nature of pastoral lease land and the great variation in scope of wind farm projects.

The bill now requires the minister to specifically consult with a pastoral lessee before he or she authorises a wind farm payment. Another change to the bill passed in the Legislative Council altered the court in which the disputes under the wind farm division will be heard. The ERD Court is now the court rather than the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

The passing of this bill by the South Australian parliament will continue this state's strong role in facilitating development by ensuring that practical regulatory regimes are in place to promote appropriate development. I would like to thank my colleagues in both houses for their work on this important piece of legislation. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** My question is about part 2, clause 4 and, essentially, I have the same question for solar energy facility definition and wind farm. If the answer is the same, no problem: if the answer is different, please let me know. This gets back to what I alluded to before in my contribution with regard to scale or size. Is there any minimum or maximum size facility that could be part of this legislation? Are there any specifications with regard to what type of wind farm or solar farm could be dealt with?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The only definition we have is that it would be at commercial scale not private use.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That makes good sense but could it be commercial scale for a commercial operation that might be privately owned? I am thinking about perhaps an outback hotel or a roadhouse or a cluster of businesses together. They might want to develop this for themselves for commercial purposes. Would that be in or out?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am advised that, although it is targeted at commercial scale, something of the nature of the operation you have described could be subject to this bill, yes.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Similarly, even though it might be technically private use in terms of only being homes clustered in a town, could they group together to do a small wind or solar development to supply their town jointly? It would be a commercial development, if you like, to provide electricity to them jointly as commercial customers but, essentially, for private use.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Yes, as long as, of course, we are talking about pastoral lease land not the township itself, but, yes, that scenario otherwise could operate.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Just to be clear, often there is a cluster of houses already excised out of a pastoral lease, so the wind farm or the solar would be on the pastoral lease but supplying the town. All those sorts of options are potentially available under this bill?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Yes, that is correct.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I am looking at clause 7(3), new subsection (8), which states:

Despite the preceding provisions of this section, the Minister may, from time to time, issue directions to a lessee for the purposes of the condition referred to [above] (and such directions will have effect as if they were conditions of the lease).

What that is really saying is that, within the context of this clause, the minister could throw in some other conditions if the minister wanted to. That might well be good, but I am looking for some direction

on or some examples of how it might be used because the example that is given in the bill alarms me. It states:

Directions might, for example, specify areas in which trees are not to be planted so as not to interfere with the operation of a wind farm.

That makes good sense, except it would almost never apply in a pastoral setting. Are there other types of examples?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** As I understand it, this is replicating what is already the case with freehold. It is essentially about ensuring a wind easement so that any large structure that would inhibit the wind from reaching the turbine, once it is agreed that there will be a turbine, would be problematic. That could be, say, a large shed. That may have been, on pastoral land, a better example to use, but the case remains the same.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** So, it is really just about any subsequent development by the pastoral lessee or anybody else who could interfere with the operation of the wind farm or the solar; that is really what it is about. This condition would not be invoked for any other reason than that?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** That is exactly right. It is, as I understand it, exactly the same as the freehold arrangements.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Clauses 8 and 9 essentially both deal with solar, so this section of the bill is really talking about land that is excised out of the pastoral lease. When that land is resumed for a solar development, what expectations would the government have of the developer with regard to removal of equipment and rehabilitation of that land—hopefully, decades down the track?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I understand that the provisions for the standard of rehabilitation and the expectation for rehabilitation are already sitting within the act, and these clauses do not trouble that. All they do is have a different resumption time frame, down to two months from four, but the expectation of how the land would be rehabilitated sits in the existing act.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Within those aspects of the existing act, it probably was never envisaged, quite understandably, that there could be acres and acres of solar farm. If a solar development goes bust, and the developer genuinely just does not have the resources to remove the equipment, are the provisions in the existing act good enough to cover for that very large-scale impediment?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The advice is that we are content with the existing provisions, that they would be sufficient. However, I have also been advised about a cognate question, which is: what is the most likely scenario to occur under that circumstance of a solar farm development going broke? The suggestion is that mostly the way these organisations and these businesses are operated with the bank is that they have non-recourse bank financing.

The expectation would be that, in the event they were no longer able to continue their business, the bank would seek an alternative operator to take over and operate. The expectation would be that the rehabilitation and remediation would not be required because it would be an ongoing proposition. That said, your specific question was: irrespective of all that, what if it does need to be removed? We are satisfied that the existing provisions are sufficient.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I understand that, and I guess my difficulty is that, if one of these solar operations goes bust, it will not be because the sun stopped shining; it will be because the customers disappeared, most likely. If you are just putting it into the mains grid, I think that once it is set up, it is set up and it should work for decades, and that would be great.

However, I am thinking also about some of these other smaller opportunities which I think could be really positive, but I also worry that, if you get one of the smaller-scale developments we were discussing before that you said were quite okay, and if somebody could make a go of it they

could fit into this legislation, it is not unlikely that some of those customers might not be there for decades. Ideally they would grow, ideally because you can get the electricity there would be more customers and it would get better and better, but I have seen outback towns shrink too.

I am happy to accept what you say, that you believe that the existing provisions will be good enough for remediation and clean-up, because I would hate to see some sort of Mad Max-type landscape left behind because what was once a wonderful idea did not actually work in that place.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** To elaborate a little on our answer as well, it appears that in a worst-case scenario the Crown becomes responsible for the clean-up, which means there will still be clean-up. I also note that usually these assets, although large, are nonetheless portable and nonetheless useful, so the most likely thing would be that it would be packed up and sold.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I am looking at clause 9(3) and the combination of (a) and (b). Paragraph (a) essentially says that 'if the resumption is for the purposes of a solar facility...', but (b) says 'in any other case'. I am not aware of 'any other case', other than the resumption being for the purpose of solar here. There may well be one, but if the minister could explain I would be grateful.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am advised that you are absolutely right: the expectation is that it is for solar, but that clause exists just in case there is something different that comes up and is probably one that parliamentary counsel has recommended be applied in this kind of clause.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** There is no real expectation that that would ever be used for anything else?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** No.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you, minister.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** This is the interpretation of access and I refer to new section 49A—Interpretation. Each of the following are access agreements in relation to pastoral land:

- (a) an agreement between an applicant for a wind farm licence in relation to the land and the lessee for access to the land, or infrastructure...

That is the access to land in advance of a licence agreement. Proposed subsection (b) states:

- (b) if a resources tenement is held over the land...

What I am real trying to understand or confirm is that the pastoral lessee is wrapped up in that. Unless I have misread it (and I am not an expert in these things) it does not seem to require the pastoral lessee's involvement in that section of the land. It talks about pastoral land, but it does not talk about the pastoralist, if that makes sense.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before the minister commences her response, do we need to report progress or extend, and, if so, are we going to go significantly after 6pm?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I suggest that I am about 30 or 40 per cent of the way through.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** We will report progress.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Tuesday 23 September 2014 at 11:00.