

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday, 30 October 2014**

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

*Bills***FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will make it illegal for a government minister or their staff to give improper directions or influence to a government agency that has been served with a freedom of information request. The bill will amend part 3 of the act and make it an offence for a person to give improper directions or influence with respect to an agency's decision to release documents regarding a freedom of information application. It will also make it an offence for an accredited FOI officer to fail to report to the Office for Public Integrity a suspicion that an improper direction or an improper influence was given.

We have seen Mr Bingham's recent report and audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act 1991, made in May, and it is quite a harsh report. It is a lashing report. It goes into detail and lashes out at the government and the poor current state of our FOI processes. I draw on one quote where he says:

Evidence provided to the audit strongly suggests that ministerial and political interference is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers and that FOI officers may have been pressured to change the determination in particular instances.

He goes into many details about the current state of play in regard to the FOI system. For example, he says that most of the agencies are not coping with the volume and the complex nature of recent FOI requests. He says that six of the 12 agencies failed to determine over 50 per cent of access applications within the time frame required by the act. He says that most of the agencies do not even understand how to apply the exemptions and the public interest test under the act.

He says that the agency's chief executives are not providing FOI or information disclosure leadership, and in nine out of the 12 agencies there is no directive at all, according to him, from the chief executive, senior management or the minister about the operation or implementation of the act.

Mrs Vlahos interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: I am very passionate. I very passionate about the putrid, sordid undercurrent of secrecy that this government leads and has led for over 12 years. We all know, without giving reference to any other debate in the house, that recently a bill was introduced into this place in response to a report by the independent commissioner for the ICAC after a matter of weeks since that report was tabled. Yet, here, the Ombudsman made this audit of state government department implementation of the FOI Act in May 2014. He made 33 recommendations, and how many has the Attorney codified or tried to legislate in this house? Not enough; it is an absolute shame.

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Zero. Why, Mr Speaker? Because it is not very sexy for the Attorney.

Mrs Vlahos interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is called to order.

Mr TARZIA: Exposing the undercurrent of secrecy is not sexy to the Attorney, I would suggest. This bill is a result of one of many good recommendations in Mr Bingham's report, namely, recommendation 26, where he recommended, as a matter of urgency, that the act should create offences of improperly directing or influencing a decision or determination under the act, which should be uniform across all government agencies, which codifies requirements for accountability and transparent communication between ministerial offices and FOI offices in relation to all applications.

We saw a brilliant case of investigative journalism this week in *The Advertiser*, whereby a journalist had to go to great lengths to obtain information that should have been released into the public forum. It is unreasonable for that to occur as it did. As the act currently stands, there is no current penalty for ministers and their staff if they unduly influence the release of important documents that have been requested in the public interest. You have to ask the question, Mr Speaker: why after a number of months of this report being tabled has the government not acted on this audit and this urgent and important recommendation, amongst the others, of course? The truth is that they do not want to be held accountable. This is the most secretive and unaccountable government in Australia.

This is not illustrated anywhere better than in the articles in *The Advertiser* this week, where an ESCOSA freedom of information officer was overruled by the Acting Ombudsman, because Paul Kerin's letter was in the public interest. I do not know the details of the administrative process that this particular application from *The Advertiser* went through to determine if the sort of interference this bill criminalises occurred, but I do know that this bill will help prevent this sort of shabby and drawn-out process from occurring in the future and that this government is trying to hide.

This bill is a test for the government. Are they fair dinkum about providing accountability to government, about providing accountability to the people of South Australia and restoring trust with the community about their activities? If you have nothing to hide, then support this bill. Are we going to see the same deception and lethargy that we have seen for over a decade? I hope not. I encourage both Independents—this is a test to show us your independence. I encourage the Independents on the crossbenches, the Minister for Regional Development and the Minister for Trade and Investment, to seriously consider the merits of this bill and support them. I commend it to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

EVIDENCE (PROTECTIONS FOR JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is with pleasure that I stand to introduce this bill today. It is the culmination of an extraordinary amount of work that has been undertaken, and I pay tribute to the Hon. Stephen Wade in another place. During 2013, in particular, we on this side of politics felt it was such an important issue, such a significant area of public policy, that we went to the 2014 election with a commitment to protecting the public interest in the manner outlined in this bill.

I am asking members to give it favourable consideration. In particular, I will be asking for the support of the Independents in this place who, obviously, have been concerned in a number of areas prior to their admission to, or association with, part of the government. I would ask them to think long and hard about the importance of what we are asking be protected hereto, that is, protection for the public to have the right to engage in debate, disclose information, and be able to have the confidence that their issue or concern will be published and considered without the intimidation of having disclosed their name.

The commitment to this bill arises out of our firm view that to maintain a healthy and open society we need a free media and journalists and media outlets holding interest groups, companies and government to account. They do this by publishing important information from a range of sources. Many risk their own wellbeing to expose information in the public interest, much of which would not be disclosed if, in fact, the anonymity of the source were not protected. If journalists are not able to provide their sources with the assurance of anonymity, it is likely that critical information

benefiting the public will not be passed on. This damages the public debate, hides corruption and undermines accountability.

Another aspect that we feel has been neglected in our own jurisdiction is the fact that it seems to have been adopted and welcomed and utilised in so many other areas. It has been used internationally and around Australia to provide protection to people who engage journalists. As a matter of law, shield laws provide that source-to-journalist communications are privileged and the source identity of journalists is protected.

Despite the growing popularity of shield laws across Australia, state and federal governments still recognise the need to protect the privileges of journalists. As I say, South Australia still has no such protection in place. Our common law does not provide protection to the sources of journalists, so we need to legislate. If we are serious about this issue, if we are serious about the disclosure and the important application of the opportunity to disclose corruption and other accountability matters, then we have to make a law. We have to deal with this in a way that is going to protect those sources.

A Senate committee has outlined its consideration of this, and I have read a number of submissions that have been made at the federal level during the last decade. As the Senate committee put it:

Journalists' privilege operates not only to protect the privacy of the source and the relationship of trust between the journalist and the source, but also to protect public interests in the accountability of public officials, an informed public and the free flow of information, all of which are vital components to a democratic society.

That was from the Australian Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee and the bills that followed. All current shield law models contain a provision that privilege can be waived by a court order if it is in the public interest to do so. This proviso creates uncertainty for sources and thereby a disincentive to disclose information to journalists.

Western Australia and Tasmania also provide a number of other conditions the court must consider when making an order, such as the importance and probative value of the evidence, the nature and gravity of the offence, cause of action of the defence and potential harm that may come to the source. A court must not make an order if it is likely that the harm to the confider does not outweigh the desirability of the evidence being given. That refers to the Western Australian Evidence Act 1906.

There is a question of definition of who is a journalist and the scope of protection. Of the shield law models in Australia, there are three variations in terms of the scope of protection: firstly, a person who is engaged and active in the publication of news and may be given information by an informant in the expectation that information may be published in a news medium. It encompasses anybody involved in the production of news and allows for the diversity of news medium, including websites social media and blogs. This definition is used by the commonwealth.

The second model is a person who gives information to a journalist, in the normal course of the journalist's work, in the expectation that the information may be published in a news medium. It is limited to professional news producers and journalists in the course of their work. Thirdly, it is a person who has a protected confidence, the contents of a document recording a protected confidence or protected identity information. It only protects confidence acting in a professional capacity. It would not protect blogs, but would protect interchanges outside even news production. There is a variation between the models of definition of journalist, informant and news medium. For those who are interested, I can certainly provide some further information in respect of that.

As to the protection of associates, the commonwealth, New South Wales, ACT and Victoria all explicitly grant protection not just to the news provider but also to their employer. Neither is compelled to provide the name of the source, again, unless in a circumstance of being ordered by the court. Western Australian and Tasmanian provisions relate to the nature of the information and the means by which it was provided, so they do not have a specific provision to cover certain classes of people or their employers.

There is a provision in the commonwealth, New South Wales, ACT and Victorian legislation to require a journalist to promise to the source not that they will not disclose the source's identity. I quote from the New South Wales legislation:

If a journalist has promised an informant not to disclose the informant's identity, neither the journalist nor his or her employer is compellable to give evidence that would disclose the identity of the informant or enable that identity to be ascertained.

I refer to the Western Australian and Tasmanian provisions requiring it to be shown to be a protected confidence, protected identity or a document recording a protected confidence. So, there is some tracing of that obligation to promise not to disclose.

As to the question of immunity versus privilege, while shield laws in other jurisdictions rely on the protection of privilege, which can be abrogated by the court, another form of protection could be to guarantee immunity to sources. This latter option would then not be subject to court discretion in cases of public interest.

So, there has been an enormous amount of debate about the instigation of this protection and the model that should apply and the extent of it. The Hon. John Darley, in another place, introduced a shield law bill in February 2013. His bill was based on the New South Wales model, except that it used unique definitions and also afforded the privilege to 'prescribed person(s) in respect of a professional journalist'. His bill also extended the privilege to other circumstances outside of court proceedings where a person may be compelled to disclose a source but did not extend the privilege to ICAC proceedings.

On 19 June 2013, the then federal Labor attorney-general Mark Dreyfus QC, announced plans to pursue uniform national shield laws through the Standing Council on Law and Justice. At that stage, I do not think that he had indicated what model he would prefer. But, again, the situation has moved forward since then.

The government's position in not giving any endorsement to this legislation is concerning because it is at a time when there has been significant public discussion at all jurisdiction levels in Australia, there has been notice of the intent, initiated first by the Hon. John Darley, and there have been subsequent bills. Mr Darley and Mr Wade have introduced bills in another place during this session of the parliament. That has been traversed and, with crossbench support, has succeeded in passing the other place.

During the course of those debates, discussions between the Liberal Party and Mr Darley resulted in Mr Darley's bill being promoted as the shell legislation, which he has remained as passionate about as we are, but adding into it some aspects of the Liberal Party bill, which have now been incorporated, as per the outline bill I present for your consideration today. The two fundamental differences are: extending more broadly the definition of who this is to apply to (that is, to consider other journalists, such as those operating as contractors and freelancers) within one of the models I have already described, which has been incorporated into what I will describe as the Darley bill.

The second aspect is that we had always felt that it was important to protect journalists or their sources when questioned even in the Independent Commission Against Corruption forum. That is absolutely necessary if they are to be provided with the same level of protection within that forum and within questioning within that forum. There is little point in giving protection in some arenas and then allowing ICAC to be exempt from that. Obviously, the common response to that would be that, if that were to apply, people would just send everything off to ICAC and seek sources to be disclosed in that forum.

We are very pleased that the Hon. John Darley has indicated that he has incorporated those two differences. We think that it makes a stronger bill, and we think that it will make better law and provide the protection we urgently need. That protection is available in so many other jurisdictions internationally and in Australia, yet we are still left without that protection. I present the bill for consideration, and I would hope that the government will consider it favourably.

Can I say this: many people who come to us, even in asking us to take up a cause for them, are in a category where they are keen for leaders in the community such as all of us to take up a cause but they are concerned for retribution in some way. It is not always by government; it might be by an employer which is not government, that is they are not members of the Public Service, and they are members of an employment situation where they have taken an issue that they feel is concerning about the safety of the workplace they are in. They feel there would be some retribution,

loss of employment, some vindictive action against a member of their family or the like, if they were to disclose that information as to it being out of their mouths.

It is absolutely critical to us, and I think there would not be a member here who has not had a constituent in some way come to them and say, 'Look, I wanted you to know this is what is happening. Take it into parliament. You have the right of privilege to protect me so that you can have free statement about this,' but not everyone comes in here to listen to parliament. We rely on the media—

The SPEAKER: Alas, no—and the member's time has expired.

Ms CHAPMAN: —to ensure that message gets out.

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

A quorum having been formed:

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) (10:57): I was thinking of saying a few words about the Evidence (Protections for Journalists) Amendment Bill, if that is suitable, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Splendid!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Evidence (Protections for Journalists) Amendment Bill 2014 was introduced as a private member's bill by the Hon. John Darley and the bill is a revised version of a bill that was introduced as a private member's bill by, again, the Hon. John Darley in 2013, which in turn lapsed at the end of that parliamentary session. The bill is broadly based on the model that now exists in the commonwealth, although not identical.

This bill seeks to enshrine in legislation the fundamental principle that journalists should not be compelled to reveal their sources—might I add, in any circumstances it would seem—and this will better promote the notion of the public's right to information. However, the bill does not grant absolute protection to journalists and provides that the court may order disclosure but only if the case fails in the public interest test, that is where the public interest in revealing information outweighs the potential detriment to the source.

The government does not support the bill. It has given the issue careful consideration but is of the position that the bill is unnecessary, according journalists a privileged position. I might also add that I have as yet to have produced in any context relevant to South Australia any single example of where the mischief to which this bill is directed has occurred.

The bill has major practical flaws, notably as to its expansive definition of journalists and its application to examinations such as those before the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, which is obviously ridiculous, and the Australian Crime Commission which is quite possibly unconstitutional.

The issue of shield law to protect journalists from revealing material that they regard as confidential has been the subject of considerable debate for many years by lawyers, attorneys-general, academics and, of course, journalists. The issue of uniform national journalist shield laws was considered at great length before the former Standing Council of Attorneys-General. No clear consensus ever emerged.

Various statutory models exist in Australia and elsewhere that modify the common law approach. Legislation has been enacted in New Zealand, the commonwealth, New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Tasmania and Victoria. Western Australia passed its own very distinct legislation in 2012. There are no journalist shield laws in Queensland, the Northern Territory or South Australia.

The common law set out by the High Court provides that it is a fundamental principle of the Australian legal system that the media and journalists do not have a public interest immunity when it comes to the disclosure of information in the interests of justice. That is the High Court's view. The High Court's position is compelling, striking the right balance, and the government agrees with both

the approach and the rationale for it outlined by the High Court. The government sees no need to change the law.

The bill before the parliament leans too far towards protecting the interests of journalists and discounts the legitimate public interest in the administration of justice, which requires that cases be tried by courts on the relevant admissible evidence. It is often asserted, notably in media circles, that the High Court's approach provides inadequate protection to journalists and the confidentiality of their sources. But there is nothing to demonstrate that the current approach is flawed, as supporters of the shield laws often contend.

I appreciate that Australian journalists may not enjoy the comparison, but the recent revelations in the United Kingdom of the extensive abuses committed by journalists and media outlets illustrate that the concerns expressed by the High Court are very well founded. To some extent, this conversation is a very in-house conversation that journalists wish to have with themselves through their organs, such as newspapers and such. It reminds me of an old expression: that's enough from me, what do you think about me?

It is sometimes argued that for journalists loyalty to the source is paramount, but what is the origin of this loyalty? In its most tangible form: the obligations contained in the Journalists' Code of Ethics. Australia's code is produced by the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance. Clause 3 provides:

Aim to attribute information to its source. Where a source seeks anonymity, do not agree without first considering the source's motives and any alternative attributable to the source. Where confidences are excepted, respect them in all circumstances.

Only the substantial advancement of the public interest or risk of substantial harm to people can override this clause. There is no opt-out clause for when this ethical obligation comes into conflict with the law. Others, however, have been unimpressed.

In *ICAC v Cornwall* (1995) 38 New South Wales Law Reports 207 at 240, Justice Aberdie of the New South Wales Supreme Court, for example, dismissed the Journalists' Code of Ethics as a fiction, 'drafted to operate despite the law and perhaps intended to operate beyond it'. This scepticism is heightened by the fact that the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance code is not binding or legally enforceable, unlike, say, the code of ethics for lawyers or medical practitioners. The most severe punishment open to the Australian Journalists' Association is the expulsion of a member, but since membership of the association is not a prerequisite to practice journalism, particularly in any extended definition of it, this is a very weak threat.

The sanction is even further weakened as there is no known example of a journalist ever being expelled or even disciplined for a breach of this rule. There are two features in the bill that give rise to particular concern. These two ill-conceived features are a result of amendments moved by the Hon. Stephen Wade in the Legislative Council. First, the bill is not confined to journalists in a professional sense. The definition of 'journalist' is capable of extending more broadly to other purported journalists, such as those operating as contractors and freelancers. This potentially includes anonymous bloggers.

The bill draws on the commonwealth model in this regard. The then New South Wales attorney-general, the Hon. Greg Smith, said that the commonwealth model had the potential to cover people who 'can sometimes just be lunatics or people with very passionate agendas to push'. I agree with the Hon. Greg Smith. Such protection should not be extended to any anonymous punter claiming to be a journalist propagating malicious rumours from the dark corners of the internet.

Secondly, the current bill, unlike the original version introduced by the Hon. John Darley, extends to any proceedings involving a hearing or examination at which a person may be compelled to answer questions or produce documents. This extension is unsound and ill-conceived. It would hamper the important work of agencies conducting examinations such as the Australian Crime Commission. In particular, this would also apply to examinations under the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012.

This extension is fundamentally unsound, unwarranted and would frustrate and undermine the operation of ICAC. It is necessary for the underlying purpose and effective operation of ICAC that the bill does not apply to examinations conducted under that act. The Independent Commissioner

Against Corruption Act 2012 has its own special regime to determine and resolve questions relating to cooperation with examinations held under the act.

In conclusion, the government agrees with the High Court's position. The common law has been criticised, perhaps in exaggerated terms, as providing inadequate protections to journalists, this criticism invariably coming from journalists who cannot point to a single instance—certainly in South Australia—where they have in any way been unfairly treated as a result of this apparent deficiency in the common law. But there is nothing to establish that present law is flawed. The logic of the High Court's position is compelling. Journalists should not be above the law or singled out for special position. The bill is flawed in terms of both policy and practice. The bill is unnecessary. The government opposes the bill.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:06): I rise today to speak in support of this bill and to commend the great work done by the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place and also Mr Darley in the other place who have worked very hard to put forward this bill on shield laws. Shield laws aim to provide protection to journalists' sources by suppressing their identity and providing journalists with confidential source-to-journalist privileged communications. We need these laws to maintain a healthy, open society and we need free media to make sure that we can disclose corruption and wrongdoing within our society.

Having worked in this field and having now moved into this role as a member of this place, I have had numerous sources come to me concerned about the fallout if their names are revealed. I hear those on the other side talk about examples of where this has not been displayed. The minister has said something along these lines: 'You don't know what you don't know.' I think there is something that needs to be pointed out here. He asks which people have come forward to say they are having an issue with this. That is perhaps the point of this law and where we sit in this debate.

People who are afraid will not come forward and say so. They will not speak out, they will not divulge corruption and they will not divulge wrongdoing within society, because they are afraid to speak to a journalist for the fear that they may have their name and/or their identity revealed. They are scared to do so, so they do not come forward and say so. That is a reason why there is not evidence to put on the table to show the minister that this is what is happening out there.

Public interest is what we have to be concerned about here. If people have the confidence to come forward and know they will be protected and know their names will not be revealed, they can, with confidence, say what is happening to a journalist. If they know the journalist will have the protection to protect them, then you will find that more people will come forward. To not do this is really just hiding corruption. People fear retribution and they will not come forward and say their piece.

This is a law used internationally and, as was pointed out, it is used right around Australia. A number of states have adopted shield laws and I fear that if South Australia does not adopt these, we will just be falling further behind as we are in so many other areas across this country. Sources are privileged and journalists require these sources to come forward to divulge the goings-on, be they within government or within organisations, and people need to come forward and not fear retribution.

I mentioned that, in a previous life as a journalist, numerous sources would come to me and their first concern would be whether or not their names would be revealed. They would often want to tell a story and often want a story reported. It also happens as a member of parliament. People have issues that they want to talk about and things they want revealed, but they are fearful of the repercussions should their names get out in the public. Without this protection, these people simply do not want their stories told: they do not want to get the message out there.

As strong as it might be and as much as it might be to the greater good of the community, some people look after their own interests. I can understand that in this case because they may be concerned about their job, they have families to feed, and they have to run their lives and run businesses in a lot of cases and, if they come forward and reveal to journalists these points and have their story told, they fear the repercussions could be great.

These laws really are to benefit everyone—as we said, to create a healthy, open society, to help the media tell these stories and bring things to light. If we do not bring these laws forward and allow journalists have this protection, people will keep quiet. Things will slip under the carpet. People will not have their say and illegal activity and corruption will continue to evolve. That is something I think everyone in this house is against. We would all like a clear, open society. We would all like to see wrongdoings exposed and we would all like to make sure that South Australia is a better place.

I have a concern about the government not supporting this bill, and I think other people would have a concern, too. If you do not want to support that open dialogue, open communication and an honest, clear and transparent way of operating, people automatically think you have something to hide, and that is not what the people of South Australia would like or want.

This is a bill, I think, to ensure transparency, independence and confidence in the public to speak out when they see wrongdoing without fear of persecution. I think this is a value that we all encourage and it is a value that we would all like to see in our society. I support this bill. I think shield laws and the ability to have a healthy, open society, free of fear of persecution, are vitally important to all people in South Australia. Again, I support this bill.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:12): I thank those who have made a contribution to this debate, particularly the member for Mitchell, who has had the professional experience of being a journalist and understands firsthand what is faced by that profession. I thank him very much for making that contribution and being honest about that.

I ask all members here to be honest when they think about the consideration of this bill and what they have had to seek from constituents when they have come forward and they have said, 'I want to disclose an ill. I want to have this situation remedied. Please don't use my name. I will be in trouble if you do. I might lose my job. My wife might lose her job. I might be ridiculed publicly. But I want to have this issue exposed.' There would not be a member in this house who could honestly say we have not had people contact us, or provide us information anonymously because they state in that material their concern about repercussions of that disclosure.

We have whistleblowers laws in this state, which are under review, and we are waiting for a response from the government so that we might continue and hope to increase the transparency and protection for those who wish to keep governments to account and generally to keep bad people to account. This is what is important. Governments should not just be seeing this as something that protects them, hiding behind a High Court decision which has comprehensively been identified across Australia in other jurisdictions (including the commonwealth, the proceedings being initiated by a federal attorney-general) as being inadequate to give protection in this situation and allowing people to continue being silenced and intimidated into silence. That is not acceptable.

The Attorney-General has come in here and told this parliament his view that a code of ethics for journalists is just a nonsense. His own Premier stood up here yesterday and outlined a statement of principles—which we endorse and which we have asked for, and the late Bob Such stood in this house and introduced amendments to ask the government to sign up to a statement of principles and a code of ethics for members of parliament.

Yet the Attorney has the audacity to come in here and tell us that the code of ethics for journalists is just a nonsense. It is just not acceptable. I ask everyone in this house, and I particularly ask the Independents who maintain, they say, their independence, who must have been in a situation where their constituents have been under this pressure, to understand the importance of passing this law. It is absolutely critical for these important issues we have to determine, for us as a parliament to bring forward these issues to develop public policy and to make law reform when necessary.

It will remain silent, it will remain crushed into submission, if we do not ensure that we have this legislation and all the benefits of the media being able to get access to the public and let them know about issues of concern. It would be an utter disgrace. It would be shameful if we did not give South Australians that same protection. I am very disappointed that the Attorney-General has taken this view about something that has been so comprehensively embraced and identified as necessary across Australia and that he has acted in this manner. It is very disappointing and it can only add to the criticism of the government, when they continue to act in this way, not to provide us with that.

Surveillance law legislation has been argued in this house and defeated—again an active attempt to keep things secret. It is just not acceptable. The public will not accept it, and eventually people will revolt against this. This government needs to be warned. We will not have the hypocrisy of introducing a statement of principles for one group of persons in this community and then arbitrarily dismiss with insult a code of ethics for journalists in this country.

I ask the Independents to give this serious consideration. Be the voice of South Australians who have been pushed into silence and who are subjected to this type of control by this government. Speak up on this occasion. Please consider voting with us on this; it is critical for the voice of South Australians.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
Noes 23
Majority 3

AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.
Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.	Pisoni, D.G.
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.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

Redmond, I.M.	Rankine, J.M.
---------------	---------------

Second reading thus negated.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RIGHTS OF FOSTER PARENTS AND GUARDIANS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 September 2014.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:22): Today I rise to speak on an extremely important amendment which might not seem monumental but which will matter hugely to those who it affects, and the cause of individuals and small groups within our community is a very important one in this place. I thank the member for Hammond for bringing this bill to the house—I know it is something that is very dear to his heart and he is very passionately following it.

Grief is a difficult process, and there have been an unfortunate number of deaths in my local community over the past eight months. As the local member, each one of them hits hard and hits

home. I have seen grieving families deal with their loss. Indeed, I saw this house deal with its loss yesterday in quite a public way.

I believe that Finn's law amendments are an opportunity for the law to show compassion—something that I think that the law is not always able to do. In this instance, there is a very tangible and clear way that the law can show compassion, and I think it is an opportunity that we, in this house, should take.

The job of a foster carer is extremely difficult—extremely difficult. We do not have enough of them; we struggle to deal with the number of children who require foster care in our community, and we need to do more to support them. I think this bill is a very common-sense way that we can support them, to recognise more fulsomely their right and their involvement in the lives of the children they bring up.

This matter, in my view, is common sense. I do not see too much in the way of politics about this amendment. I think this amendment is common sense. It is merely around recognising the contribution that foster carers make in the lives of the children they look after.

Foster carers do a great job. By and large, they do a great job. Done properly, it is a form of care that is immeasurably preferable to institutional care. I think about the history of children in institutional care in South Australia. We have moved away from that in all but the most necessary of cases, and I think that is a good thing.

I agree that the biological parents are still first and foremost the best people, in the first instance, to look after their own children. I do not believe that society is ready, I do not believe that the government is ready, to become the de facto carer of all children, but foster care is, I think, done properly, the best alternative. To provide a loving home and loving parents and siblings to a child is a way to give them nurturing and upbringing and teach them skills about life that they would struggle to get in institutional care with rotating 24-hour surveillance.

I know that the government is still to make a decision on this, so the pressure I would like to apply today I wish to be quite gentle. It is disappointing that this has not been dealt with sooner by the government, but I respect the fact that it is still to come to a firm view, and I implore the Minister for Education and Child Development to move swiftly now to give these rights to parents.

These laws came to prominence after Monica Perrett, who is the parent of foster son Finn who died last May, and who went through this awful process of not being involved in Finn's funeral, started an online petition that raised 40,000 signatures. That is by no means a small issue. That is an issue that resonates very much with our community. It led at the time to a meeting with Ms Rankine in June, at which the government indicated its support but, unfortunately, Ms Perrett now doubts the minister's sincerity. She says:

I was quite thankful because I believed everything she said to me and she came across as a very caring person, but three months Finn's been gone today and I still have not heard anything from the Government at all so obviously she didn't mean it.

Someone said to me this morning that private members' time is a great way to debate small pieces of legislation that are not groundbreaking in their reform but otherwise provide for good, small common-sense issues where the politics of the situation are taken out of it. I would like to say that I believe fundamentally that these amendments are exactly what the member was talking about when he made those comments to me this morning. I would also like to highlight a contribution here where it was said:

I remind the Minister for Education and Child Development of her promise made when talking on ABC Radio on 13 June this year, where the minister promised to look into contacting the department of births, deaths and marriages to see if they can add a statutory declaration to each death certificate of a child who dies in foster care acknowledging the foster parents if it is appropriate to do so.

Again, that is a second example of where the minister has made a statement in a more public way. Again, I would say that we in this house are today trying to provide gentle pressure to the minister to come good on her promise. I would also like to highlight some comments made by Peter Sandeman, who is a former foster child and current CEO of welfare agency Anglicare. He says:

Foster parents are in temporary care for the child, I would like to see more permanency to give them...

I'm extremely sympathetic to her situation—
being Monica Perrett's situation—
and other foster parents...

What we would prefer is to have some arrangement so that all those connected in Finn's life could be involved in celebrating his life...

Again, that is a man who has been through the system, a man who is devoting his life to community service, and I think a very valid voice in this debate. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

IBRAHIM, MARIAM

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:30): I move:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its concern at the arrest, imprisonment and prosecution of Mariam Ibrahim;
- (b) welcomes the decision of the courts in Sudan to release Mariam Ibrahim; and
- (c) calls on the Sudanese government to ensure effective enforcement of its constitution and adherence to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and respect religious freedom.

Today, I rise to discuss this very important issue, this very important fundamental principle, and that is the principle of religious freedom and the principle of pluralism. Over my eight months in this place, I have had a number of students come to me as they visit this place, and I like to take them on a tour, but I try not to give them the civics lesson or the legal studies lesson they would otherwise get.

What I like to show them are a number of things I will think open their mind to a different way of looking at our world. I go to the library and I make a point of looking at the globe that was built in the 1850s, where they can see that there was a time before there was a state of Queensland, where Brisbane was part of New South Wales and there was no Northern Territory. They look at that and go, 'Hang on! So, there was a time before federation and there was a time when things were not always as they are.'

I come into this place and I show them the portrait of Joyce Steele, the first woman who entered parliament. Especially when I tell 15 and 16-year-old young women that there was a time when women were not allowed to vote, they look at me with such incredulity. Their lack of understanding of basic fundamental rights for women I think is fantastic, but it is something that, again, I show them to help open their mind.

I then go round the front and I show them the bust of Don Dunstan, and I tell them that there was a time in South Australia when pubs closed at 6pm on a Saturday afternoon and when men would be at the pub quickly sculling beers before the close in order to stumble home. Again, they look at me like I am some sort of alien from another planet. I show them these things because I want them to realise that the status quo we enjoy here today in this state has not always been so and that, indeed, this state is progressive, that this state evolves, and that we as a society evolve and our laws should reflect that.

In Australia, we should be ever thankful for our independent judiciary. It enforces our laws and ensures, to a large extent, that religious persecution does not happen in this country and that, when it does, it is brought to justice and it is punished, and I think that we should be very thankful for that.

The capital of South Australia is called the city of churches, in some ways courtesy of English novelist Anthony Trollope, not because of the number of churches per se but rather the diverse number of churches he found in 1872. Synagogues, temples, mosques, cathedrals and other religious places of worship can be found throughout Australia's landscape in history, despite being a predominantly Christian society. The good work, especially in charity and support of our most vulnerable, is immeasurable. The principle of religious freedom and the right to worship is

fundamental. In a diverse multicultural society, it goes to the very heart of making our country cohesive, peaceful and productive:

Religious pluralism is an attitude or policy regarding diversity of religious belief systems co-existing in society. It can indicate one or more of the following:

- As the name of the worldview according to which one's religion is not the sole and exclusive source of truth, and thus the acknowledgement that at least some truths and true values exist in other religions.
- As acceptance of the concept that two or more religions with mutually exclusive truth claims are equally valid. This may be considered a form of either toleration...or moral relativism.

This definition, I think, binds us all. This debate and discussion today is not about one religion versus another; indeed, it is about all religions co-existing and being respectful and tolerant of each other.

The reason I bring this issue today is that the founding of the Barossa Valley, the heart of my electorate, was done by those who were escaping religious persecution. Augustus Kavel was a pastor in Prussia in the 1800s and, after disagreements with some edicts by King Frederick William III, was expelled along with his congregation called the Klemzig Congregation for practising their form of Christianity in Prussia.

Pastor Kavel sought to escape the persecution and, as a result, looked to move his congregation to a place that was more welcoming. He saw that there was a beautiful place called Australia that could welcome him and his flock and sought money from the South Australia Company to make this happen, but unfortunately the money was not there. A man who was pushing his cause and the cause of the Lutheran followers quite strongly was a man called George Fife Angas whose descendants still live in the Barossa today and whom I have a great relationship with. George Fife put up the money so that Augustus Kavel and his parishioners could settle here in South Australia and practise their form of Lutheran Christianity and be free and safe from religious persecution.

The experience of those first settlers in the Barossa is still in the mind of Barossans today and this is why this concept that we discuss here this morning is dear to my electorate and it is indeed something worth fighting for. However, freedom from religious persecution is not the norm in many parts of the world. The fight for what we here consider to be a natural part of our society is a foreign concept elsewhere, and I would like to highlight for you two serious cases today.

Mariam Yahia Ibrahim Ishag is a 27-year-old Sudanese woman who was gaoled for apostasy. Mariam was born to a Muslim father and a Christian mother but, being raised by her mother, she took her mother's religion. She since married an American Christian man but, to her accusers, because she married a Christian man she had abandoned her father's religion and was arrested. Leaders worldwide were in unison in condemning her treatment, but I think it was best said by Prime Minister David Cameron in the UK who said, 'The way she is being treated is barbaric and has no place in today's world.'

On 15 May, while heavily pregnant, Mariam was sentenced to death for apostasy after refusing to renounce her Christian faith. She was also sentenced to 100 lashes for adultery because her husband is Christian. Mariam was being held in prison in Khartoum along with her then 20-month old son, Martin, and newborn baby girl, Maya. Her lawyer said she was shackled with heavy chains, even during labour. Mariam had received a reprieve from her sentence until her newborn child was two years old, until her newborn baby no longer needed breastfeeding.

Since I brought the original motion to the house, Mariam was released on 26 June and left Sudan and arrived in Rome on 24 July this year. She was received by Pope Francis in Rome who is the leader of Vatican City and, in conjunction with the Italian government, worked on negotiations to secure the release of Mariam.

This act goes against two very important documents. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights considers the recanting of a person's religion a human right legally protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The committee observes that the freedom to have or adopt a religion or belief necessarily entails the freedom to choose a religion or belief, including the right to replace one's religion or belief with another or to adopt atheistic views.

The second document is the Interim Constitution of Sudan which specifies freedom of religion, but this is hard to enforce in the north of the country where, for all intents and purposes,

Sharia law is in place. The Interim National Constitution of the Republic of Sudan 2005 states regarding sovereignty:

The Sudan is an all embracing homeland where religions and cultures are sources of strength, harmony and inspiration.

I call on the Sudanese government to put those words into action. It goes on further to talk about freedom of creed and worship as follows:

Every person shall have the right to the freedom of religious creed and worship, and to declare his/her religion or creed and manifest the same, by way of worship, education, practice or performance of rites or ceremonies, subject to requirements of law and public order; no person shall be coerced to adopt such faith, that he/she does not believe in, nor to practice rites or services to which he/she does not voluntarily consent.

Again, I call on the Sudanese government to put practice to those very important words.

I do welcome the release of Ms Ibrahim, but I find it unacceptable that the case went as far as it did. Since the case of Ms Ibrahim has been brought to light, a second case, that of Aaisia Bibi, a Christian woman accused of blasphemy in Lahore, Pakistan in 2010, has received greater international attention. She has also been sentenced to death. Ms Bibi is a farmworker who was convicted of blasphemy. She allegedly made disparaging remarks against the Prophet Muhammad during a confrontation with Muslim co-workers who would not drink the water she brought for them because, being a Christian, she was unclean.

Human rights groups, including Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, say that Pakistan's blasphemy law is increasingly being exploited by religious extremists. Those who are sentenced to death do not often receive their punishment, and that is not because they are eventually released. Unfortunately, it is because vigilante groups attack the accused before their death penalty is carried out. In Ms Bibi's case two politicians who were helping her case had been murdered in 2011, after calling for reforms to the blasphemy law and describing her trial as flawed. World and religious leaders, including Barack Obama and former Pope Benedict, have called for clemency. These are but two cases, I think two very striking cases, that need to be highlighted so that we can do our part in bringing about change.

Reading through those two cases make me so very proud and so very lucky to live in a fantastic place called South Australia in a fantastic country called Australia. However, I think having enjoyed the luck and the good fortune to grow up in a country like this, I and members of this place and all in our community owe it to those who are less fortunate, who are not as free as we are, to stand up for the freedoms that they do not enjoy.

At this point I would like to thank my local Lutheran pastors who have brought this issue to my attention. They have been lobbying me on this issue and helped counsel me on a number of aspects of these cases. They are a ready source of good advice, and I thank them for that. I would also like to thank the only Catholic priest in the village (as we call him) Father Mark Sexton, who has four or five parishes that he looks after in the Barossa Valley. He is a man with whom I have had many discussions on this issue. He continues to support—as the Barossa continues to support—the principle of religious freedom and pluralism.

In closing, can I say that there are many causes in our society that I wish were consigned to be an anachronistic part of our history. I think about the discussions we have had in this place on domestic violence. I would love to see a day where I can bring schoolchildren here and we can talk about the fact that there was a time when men disgustingly beat their wives and their children. I would like to come into this place and talk to young women and men and say that there was a time when people were persecuted because of their race, that there was a time when sexism was rife in our society and a time when homophobia existed and was rife and that our laws reflected that. The list goes on. The list very much goes on.

There are social causes which laws may not always be able to help change, but attitudes need to change, and this parliament should be used as a force for social good and social change in advance of those issues and principles that we hold so dear. Private members' time, I believe, is exactly the right time for us to highlight these issues, to highlight the legal wrongs that exist, not only in our own society but in other societies around the world. Hopefully, through this process, we here can do our part to help change the social norms across our society and across the world.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:43): I rise to support this motion. I congratulate the member for Schubert on bringing this issue to this place and also note his contribution to the debate in private members time. As an ongoing student of international politics, it is a bit unclear whether I am a financial or a non-financial member of Amnesty International right this very minute because they have a new way of keeping up their memberships. I have always been very concerned about what has been happening with regard to human rights on a global level.

Having been a student politician, I am also very familiar with the debates that happened in my day in student politics, particularly—and this will age me—the Australian Union of Students and the debates we had on issues concerning international politics. It was a very important part of my growing up and also my education. It is very interesting, all these years later, to have the honour of being in the House of Assembly and debating issues to do with human rights.

This is certainly an issue that fits into that category and, sadly, as the member for Schubert said, it is an area that we do need to bring to attention. I am not sure how much a state parliament can influence global international human rights issues, but I think it is important to make the connections with human rights issues in general and also use this place as an opportunity to continue the argument.

Mariam Ibrahim was born to a Sudanese Muslim father and an Ethiopian Orthodox mother. Mariam's father abandoned her when she was six years old. She was raised by her mother as a Christian; however, under the laws of the Republic of the Sudan, a child is expected to assume her father's religious and ethnic identity. Therefore, Mariam is considered to be a Muslim because her father is a Muslim.

In Sudan, converting from Islam or to another religion is unlawful and punishable by death. A Muslim relative of Mariam reportedly filed a criminal complaint against her, alleging she converted to Christianity after marrying Mr Daniel Wani, a South Sudanese Christian man. Accordingly, Mariam was charged with adultery on the grounds that a Muslim woman's marriage to a non-Muslim man is unlawful. At the same time, she was charged with apostasy for allegedly repudiating her original faith, Islam, and converting to Christianity.

In January 2014, while eight months' pregnant, Mariam was convicted of adultery and apostasy. In spite of sexual relations having been only with her husband, Mariam was convicted of adultery because Sudanese law does not recognise marriages between Muslim and non-Muslim partners. A Sudanese court found Mariam's marriage to Mr Wani was not valid and sentenced her to receive 100 lashes for committing adultery.

After giving birth at a women's hospital in Khartoum, Sudan, Mariam was given the opportunity to embrace her Muslim faith, but she refused, arguing that she could not rescind her genuine personal faith at the request of the court. The court rejected Mariam's argument and she was sentenced to death in May 2014.

I am pleased to learn that Mariam has been released following international condemnation of the Sudanese court's ruling. I understand that Mariam's death sentence was overturned on 23 June 2014 on an order from a Sudanese court of appeal. This is certainly a win for human rights and religious freedom. I guess it does demonstrate that, while we may wonder about protesting about something that is happening somewhere else with different laws and different views about religious thought, it is worth making an effort to raise one's voice.

The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion is recognised in article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Sudanese government is a signatory to this international concord, which protects not only the traditional religious beliefs of major religions, but also the nontheistic and atheistic beliefs, as well as the right not to profess any religion or belief.

Like all of us, Mariam Ibrahim is entitled to full enjoyment of her inalienable human right of religious freedom. In this day and age, it is widely accepted that human beings have a right to choose what she or he believes is right in the religious realm. The way that Mariam was treated by the Sudanese government is deeply concerning, and it goes without saying that her sentence was a breach of the Sudanese international human rights obligation.

I am pleased to learn that Mariam and her husband were successfully granted an exit visa by the United States government and have now resettled in New Hampshire. The government therefore supports this motion and wishes Mariam and her family all the best in their new home.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:49): I would like to say a few brief words on this motion of the member for Schubert. I congratulate him on bringing it. This is probably the tip of the iceberg in this particular case, and I am very pleased, as the member for Ashford just said, that the family has been taken into the United States. Those who choose to knock the United States seemingly forget from time to time about the humanitarian work it does and that it accepts people like this who have been put in a terrible situation.

They are the rules of that country. They are completely different from the rules in this country, unfortunately, and that leads me to say that, in my view, there are too many people in this nation who take what we have for granted. Indeed, we need to pick up on cases such as Mariam Ibrahim's in Sudan, and I acknowledge the interest, particularly, of the member for Schubert and the member for Ashford, who have both spoken. We need to, wherever possible, identify and assist in these sorts of things and have them brought to our attention.

It is a great thing that the family has been reunited and allowed to go. Why on earth anyone would lock up a woman in that circumstance is beyond me. What goes on around this world in many countries, many to the west of Australia, is alarming if what you read and hear is correct—child slavery and things like that, the total rejection of any rights for women, and the list goes on. That is why I have been pleased and gratified that Australia has done its bit. If you use Afghanistan as an example, girls can now go to school. What is happening in some areas, I am not sure because that country is an evolving mess, in my view, but the very fact that girls have been able to go back to school because of Australia's involvement there is a good thing.

I support the motion and congratulate, again, the member for Schubert on having brought it to the house, and I will happily support the motion when it is put to the vote.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:52): I very briefly will explain my very strong support for this motion. It is a very good thing that the member for Schubert has brought this to the attention of the house. Often, there are some things that are—I will not say they are trivial because it would be a terrible thing to say that things in this house are trivial, but this is certainly a long, long way from trivial. These are some of the key principles of pluralism and tolerance—I think, some of the key principles that should be debated in this house. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to do that.

The member for Schubert has admirably outlined the case for the importance of tolerance, but we have seen in comparatively recent history, particularly in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s, also in eastern Europe and Russia and even in China, over the course of the last 50 years, immediately after the Second World War, the catastrophic—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Cambodia is another one, thank you, and some parts of South-East Asia—consequences of a lack of tolerance, particularly of religion but also of different people in our society. Allowing them to go about their daily lives without imprisoning them simply for following a different religion from the majority of people around them is probably the most basic right. You can go, at great length, into discrimination in other areas of life, but just allowing them to go about their daily lives without being imprisoned simply for following a different religion is probably the most basic expression, other than killing them for it. It has been happening in those areas of Iraq and Syria that are under the occupation of the ISIS movement, although I think that Daesh is the preferred term these days.

The world will not improve, societies will not improve, the world will not be a better place to live if this sort of behaviour is tolerated. If we do not stand up and say something, can we really expect to be that effective in the South Australian state parliament? No. But should we sit by and do nothing? No, we should not do that either. We should stand up, we should say that we oppose this, that we do not find it an acceptable way of running a society and that we do not find it is an acceptable way of treating an individual. For the member for Schubert to bring this to the house and give us the opportunity to do that, it is a very good thing, and I will be supporting this motion.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:55): I am pleased that the member for Schubert has brought this motion to the house. I congratulate him on doing so and for his, I thought, very fine speech in moving the motion. I certainly agree with the comments he and the members for Ashford, Finniss and Newland have made in support of the motion.

One issue that was raised by the member for Ashford happens to coincide with the reason that I wanted to speak to this motion this morning, that is, the question of what effect the Parliament of South Australia discussing and debating a motion like this might have. Of course everybody supports the intent of a motion like this. I think the member for Ashford started to answer her own question in the affirmative in her speech, but I do wish to add a couple of other items to what she said.

I think there are three very, very strong and compelling reasons why this motion is very important. Yes, we are all absolutely ecstatic that Mariam Yahia Ibrahim was freed. I remember seeing the footage of her being received at the Vatican—it was extraordinary—and the adulation she received when she returned to the United States. It was wonderful to see, it was very touching. Mariam Ibrahim is totemic of a whole range of people who are suffering around the world under awful regimes and who are suffering from complicit or overtly racist, homophobic and religiously intolerant governments around the world. As a parliament with such a proud history of tolerance, of suffrage, and support for and championing of freedom, I think in South Australia it is critical we do so.

There are three reasons why I think it is worth spending 20 or 30 minutes of the parliament's time talking about this today. Firstly, while we are proud of our pluralism, of our tolerance, of our freedom, and all of those other things that South Australia has in its history, it is not enough to rest on our laurels and assume that we can always have our freedoms. Freedom must be protected jealously, it must be nurtured vigilantly. In identifying situations such as this, which are so opposed to what we stand for, it helps us to understand better those things that we do stand for, understand better how we as parliamentarians can continue to protect the freedoms that the people of South Australia rightly expect from us.

Secondly, people from countries where these situations are taking place live in our communities. People who have fled from these countries live in our communities. It is critically important that we understand, as members of parliament, the circumstances that they have fled from. As the member for Schubert identified, people who live in his electorate fled religious persecution, and people from Morialta have also come from around the world over several generations. A while ago (I have not checked recently) census statistics suggested that Morialta is the most multicultural electorate in South Australia, and I would be surprised if that were not still the case.

After World War II, people came from Italy and Greece and other places in Europe that had been trampled on by the Nazi regimes. More recently, people have come from India and Africa, and refugee communities are building strongly in Morialta. We have a very high number of people from China who are living in Morialta in order that they may have more than one child. It is important that we as members of parliament understand where their communities have come from, not only so that you can connect better and be able to relate better to your electors but also so that their experience of the country may be better informed.

I know that in recent years the South Australian police force has had a particular focus on engaging with multicultural communities, and this is important. It is important because there are many people who come to our country whose experience of dealing with the police force has not been anything like they might have in South Australia. Their experience has been one of mistrust and of oppression.

As the shadow police minister, I am very proud of the South Australian police force. They have much to offer—and I am pleased that they do—but it is critical that they engage with those communities so that, for example, women who suffer from domestic and family violence in their homes have the understanding that if they go to police they will, in fact, have their issues dealt with. Unless we understand and remind ourselves of the circumstances from which people in these situations have come, the policy settings that enable that support to be given are unable to be put in place. So, it is important to have these reminders.

The third point is that this parliament is, of course, the first opportunity for the people of South Australia to express their will. Whilst on the world stage we may be a state parliament and the national parliament deals largely with foreign affairs, we are part of the international collective. When people speak up for Mariam Ibrahim, and others in her situation, that is part of what can be received in the international community. Those fighting for freedom and for their communities against oppression in the international community can add the South Australian parliament to the list of communities and parliaments in countries around the world who have said, 'No, this is not acceptable,' and give solace to those.

I particularly think of the experience I have had in meeting political activists from the Maldives and from other countries where I know that, when they see people standing in solidarity with them, they take comfort. I mention the Maldives because it is only in the last several months that Ahmed Rilwan, a journalist in the Maldives, has been taken, and we do not know what is happening to him.

Child slavery and human trafficking occurs around the world and, as the member for Finniss identified, there are countries where the government is complicit in these activities taking place. There are countries where homosexuality has led to people being imprisoned or currently awaiting charges. There are hundreds of people in prison awaiting charges in Nigeria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Gambia, Morocco, Lebanon and Cameroon for being born gay, lesbian, bisexual or otherwise non-traditionally identified.

There are people in gaol or awaiting charges for apostasy or failure to comply with the religious norms of the country. There are people who are in gaol or awaiting charges simply for questioning the government. This parliament stands in solidarity with those communities and those people who continue to fight for freedom and against oppression. I commend the member for Schubert for bringing this matter to our attention for our constant reminder of the freedoms for which so many have fought, which we must continue—as is our duty—to nurture and be vigilant in their protection.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:02): I would like to speak briefly on behalf of my constituents, and I commend the member for Schubert for bringing this motion before the house because as we all know (and many speakers have spoken about it in the chamber today) religious freedom is at the heart of the formation of our state. What we do in this house as representatives of our communities, and as custodians of democracy with those people on their behalf, is at the forefront of what we do every day, I would hope.

From my perspective, like the member for Morialta I have a particularly diverse electorate in the north with people having come from Asia, Greece and Italy following the post-European war battles, but also from modern history and the Asia-Pacific area—Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese people. Many of the people I meet in my electorate were unable to stay in their places due to wars on ideology but also, increasingly, I have people in my electorate who are unable to participate in their religious practices.

Last year, I was able to go to Vietnam and speak to some Hoa Hao Buddhists who practise their faith in my electorate in Virginia at a temple I visit every year. In Vietnam, they are persecuted for their faith, and the government is rewriting their religious books to write out religious faith practices to disallow them to pass their faith on to a new generation, and I find that abhorrent. The idea of what has happened in Africa recently, with many cases of people persecuted for being of different faith, gender or sexuality and with values different from those of the government, is something which no government should suppress—namely, the diversity within a decent human format for people to be able to live as peacefully and coexist in a tolerant society.

I commend the member for Schubert for a magnificent speech about the core values of what a decent civilised society should be in Australia but particularly in South Australia. I would hope that all of those things are foremost in our minds every day as we move forward as the custodians of democracy for our electorates.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:05): Can I just quickly thank all the members who spoke in this place on this issue. I think all the contributions were extremely sincere and heartfelt. I would also like to thank at this point the Lutheran community in Lyndoch who originally brought this issue to my attention. I want to give a bit of a shout out to them because this is something they have felt quite

passionately and strongly about. They are the ones who came to me and said, 'Stephan, you are our elected representative. What are you doing about it?' I can fulfil my commitment to them today.

Can I say that this is an important issue. It is one that is not going to go away and one that we are going to need to play our parts in here. I know we are many thousands of kilometres away from where the action is, but it was international pressure that helped to gain the release of Mariam Ibrahim. In any debate, it is the ones who are silent who become irrelevant and the ones who speak up who become part of the force for change. Thank you very much.

Motion carried.

CYPRUS CONFLICT

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:06): I have briefly spoken about this motion, but today I would like to speak in a more fulsome manner about the importance of the significance of the invasion of Cyprus and read to the house the motion. I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 20 July 2014 marks 40 years since Cyprus was divided;
- (b) notes the first Turkish invasion of Cyprus on 20 July 1974 and the second Turkish invasion of Cyprus on 14 August 1974;
- (c) recognises the continuing support of this parliament towards achieving a just and fair resolution for the Cyprus problem;
- (d) notes that any solution to the Cyprus conflict should result in the demilitarisation and reunification of the island for the benefit and welfare of its entire people and peace in the region;
- (e) acknowledges the many South Australian Cypriots whose families and property have been illegally displaced and seek a just settlement; and
- (f) calls on the commonwealth government to aid the current peace process and relevant United Nations resolutions on respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus.

The first Turkish invasion of Cyprus took place on 20 July 1974 and is known as Operation Attila by the Turkish armed forces. I was a child at the time and was due to have a play date with a friend of mine. Their house was in mourning because their families were out of contact and could not be reached because the island had been invaded. That is the first contact I had with Cypriot people in my life. I have found that, as I have grown up and moved to South Australia, I have come to a wellspring of Cypriot people in South Australia. This motion is not only important to the Cypriot people of descent, but also Greeks in the surrounding area of the significant geopolitical region.

A ceasefire was reached two days later by 22 July, and a round of peace talks ensued between 25 and 30 July 1974, then a second invasion occurred between 14 and 16 August 1974. On 13 February 1975, Turkey officially declared the Republic of Cyprus a Turkish federated state, which was protested by the international community and to this day is still protested around the world. Recently, the member for Unley, myself and the Speaker of the house joined many other people on the steps of Parliament House to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the invasion.

Importantly, the UN considers the Republic of Cyprus to be an independent state. As a result of the invasions, the European Commissioner for Human Rights found Turkey guilty of the following charges: displacement of persons, deprivation of liberty, ill-treatment, deprivation of life, deprivation of possessions. The invasions have left a scar on many people's heart, including those of Cypriot background who live in South Australia. More than 43,000 Turkish soldiers are still stationed in Cyprus, enforcing the division that has torn families and lives apart. The creation of a Greek Cypriot-Turkish divide has left more than 200,000 Greek Cypriots unable to return to their homes and lands.

Over 2,000 Greek Cypriot soldiers were taken as prisoner of war and moved to Turkey. Some have yet to be accounted for or yet to be released, over 40 years later. Priceless pieces of Cypriot cultural heritage have been lost due to the invasion as either collateral damage or were smuggled out of the country during the war, and 36.2 per cent of the territory under the sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus is still under the military occupation of Turkey. Cyprus is still occupied, still divided, more than 40 years later. All of these factors, and more, personally affect the Green Cypriot

members of my electorate and the state. This private member's motion is about recognising the heartache and despair this division has caused and calls for a peaceful resolution.

Our state has a proud history of supporting peaceful resolution and the adherence of international law. We are a state that stands for democracy and religious freedom, as we have just heard in the previous motion. In the 1990s, the then ALP opposition leader Mike Rann and the then parliamentary secretary for the federal minister for health, the Hon. Trish Worth, were patrons of the Justice of Cyprus Committee. I am a member of that committee, and I have served on it for several years, along with Peter Louca, who works for the Minister for Health.

Mike Rann brought the issue of Cyprus to our parliament frequently. On 15 July 1999, he wrote an open letter to the ambassador of Turkey, Mr Umut Arik, to urge the Turkish government to resolve the situation peacefully and to respect human rights and international law. It is also interesting to note that the Hon. Don Dustan visited Cyprus in 1957, just when the Cypriot Independence Movement was starting to take form.

As I have worked through the veterans community, I have met with many people who have acted as peacekeepers in Cyprus at times. I am also aware that the Speaker of this house has a very keen and passionate interest regarding this issue. In a speech in 2005, the member for Waite, a former UN peacekeeper who is passionate about Cyprus too, said:

A terrible dark time for Cypriots was the invasion, and we should raise those concerns quite openly and wilfully with the Republic of Turkey.

The member for West Torrens is also a passionate advocate regarding this issue and has commented about it in the chamber on behalf of his many Greek and Cypriot constituents.

Our state government supported 14 Greek Cypriot families to file claims for compensation against the Turkish government at the European Court of Human Rights, and this was an excellent thing to do. When you meet Cypriot peoples all around the world, they recognise that we are a leader in ensuring that there is justice and peaceful resolution of this area.

There are still many people today who live in South Australia who have a close affinity with Cyprus. According to the latest census collection statistics, approximately 1,333 South Australians were born in Cyprus. We have the third largest community of Cypriot-born people in Australia, being behind only New South Wales and Victoria.

This motion is not against Turkish Cypriots and the people of Turkey; it is about a just and peaceful resolution to this problem. This motion is a condemnation of the injustices and atrocities that occurred, an action done by a government that condemned people to heartache. This motion is about supporting the healing process while recognising the realities of what happened in the past.

In July this year, I spoke in the chamber about the formation of a bilateral South Australian parliamentary Friends of the Republic of Cyprus, which I co-convened with the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC, in the other place. The formation of this group and this motion go hand in hand to promote a just settlement of the Cypriot problem. I urge all members to support this motion and to condemn the atrocities that have occurred and give, in this forum, respect to those who died.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:14): I rise to support the motion and, of course, to congratulate the member for Taylor for bringing the motion to the house. It is terrific that we have a strong bipartisan view as a parliament on this issue. I do not think that it matters where you are from in South Australia, you have been positively influenced and positively affected by the constructive contribution that Hellenic peoples have made to South Australia, both before the war in their smaller numbers and after the Second World War as migrants, as part of the growth in the Australia-wide economy. South Australia is very fortunate to have received many people from Greek-speaking parts of the world or that region in the Adriatic and Mediterranean Seas and, of course, many of those Hellenic people were from Cyprus.

Cyprus has a very interesting history. For about 100 years it was very much in the hands of the British until about 1960, so there are parts of Cyprus that have a very English feel. I understand that the English were very sympathetic in their architecture to both the Greek and Turkish inhabitants of Cyprus at their time of arrival, so it has a unique look and feel to it.

Prior to the invasion by the Turks on 20 July 1974, it was a favoured place for holidays. It had a very vibrant and strong economy and was the playground of the rich and famous from all around the world. At the time of the invasion, Cyprus was about 78 per cent Greek Cypriot, 18 per cent Turkish, and 4 per cent Armenian, Maronite and Latin Cypriot.

About 180,000 Greek Cypriots were forcibly expelled from their homes during the invasion and eventually another 20,000 were forced to abandon their homes, too. By the time the ceasefire was agreed three days later, about 5,000 Greek Cypriots had already fled their homes and although a ceasefire was agreed, many parts of the island did not adhere to it.

Over 3,000 people were killed in the invasion and about 1,500 Greek Cypriots are still missing to this day. Today there are fewer than 500 Greek Cypriots remaining in the occupied area. A physical sign of the significant change that the Turkish invasion made was the city of Famagusta which is now known as the 'fence city'. It was a thriving economic engine room of Cyprus before the Turkish invasion. We saw harmonious living of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots in that city and yet since that invasion the city has been nothing more than a ghost town, and that is a shame and a deliberate consequence of the invasion in 1974.

The Turkish invasion ended in the partition of Cyprus along the UN monitored green line which still divides Cyprus. In 1983 the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus declared independence, although Turkey is the only country that recognises it. The rest of the world does not recognise the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, only the invaders—Turkey—recognise it as being an independent state.

The international community considers the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as being a territory of the Republic of Cyprus illegally occupied by the Turkish forces. I think it is significant that every year we recognise the anniversary of this invasion, and this year is particularly important because it is the 40th year. Forty years is a generation. We have seen a lot happen in the world since 1974, but things have remained the same in Cyprus—northern Cyprus is occupied by Turkey.

In 1976 and again in 1983 the European Commission of Human Rights found Turkey guilty of repeated violations of the European Convention on Human Rights. Turkey has been condemned for preventing the return of Greek Cypriot refugees to their properties.

The Hellenic community and the Cypriot community in particular has this parliament's full support for their campaign to return Cyprus as a united independent country, regardless of whether we represent the blue side or the red side. I am proud to be an active member and an adopted family member, if you like, of the Cypriot community here in South Australia. I for one was very pleased to see the completion of the new community centre, or the history centre, that has been added to their social buildings in Bowden. Every time I go as a guest I am made to feel extremely welcome, and I thank the Cypriot community for that. I thank them for their contribution to the South Australian economy, to the South Australian community and for the culture that they have added as active members of our community.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:21): Again I would very much like to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover, in this case the member for Taylor, on bringing to the house an opportunity to speak out on something that many people agree was wrong, despite the fact that it has been going on for 40 years. A wrong was committed, and it is a good thing that we are here still discussing it and still bringing it to the attention of the parliament, to those in this house and to our communities.

It is an interesting fact of history that South Australia has been unusually active in this debate over a long period of time. As the member for Taylor said, former premier Mike Rann was a strong contributor to this debate, to this situation, and he certainly made his views known and clear, and continued to do so. He did not do it on just one occasion: he did it on many occasions. This is not the first time that this house has discussed the situation in Cyprus.

I should also note that the former Australian foreign Minister, Alexander Downer, played a role in attempting to improve the situation over there for quite a length of time, in fact, as part of the UN, I think it was—

Mr Gardner: UN envoy.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: As the UN envoy. Thank you to the member for Morialta for pointing that out. I think as a state we should be proud that our leaders have played a role in trying to bring peace and a peaceful resolution to this situation, which is unacceptable and should not be allowed to continue. In fact, in many ways it is an indictment of the situation in Europe and the international community's often unwillingness to do things that, 40 years on, the situation is as it is with no real change. However, again, I am very happy to support the motion and look forward to any further contributions that may take place.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:24): I thank the members for Unley and Newland for their contribution. I will take the house's advice and put it to the vote.

Motion carried.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:24): I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates all South Australian athletes and the Australian team for their participation and achievements in the 20th Commonwealth Games held in Glasgow, Scotland; and
- (b) commends the Commonwealth Games Federation for integrating para-sports into the main Commonwealth Games program.

The Commonwealth Games were held in Glasgow, Scotland over 11 days between 23 July 2014 and 3 August 2014. The games hosted 6,500 athletes and officials from 71 countries. The athletes competed in 17 sports, and I will touch on a few of those sports in just a moment.

This was the third time Scotland hosted the Commonwealth Games and Billy Connolly was the official games ambassador. At the 2010 Commonwealth Games held in Delhi, India, the Australian team received 74 gold medals and 178 medals in total, the most medals in both categories of all competing nations. This year, we received 137 medals in total and finished second to England.

The 2018 Commonwealth Games will be held at the Gold Coast between 4 April 2018 and 15 April 2018. I have absolutely no doubt that we will get our nation back on top, through a whole range of reasons leading to improved performance, not the least of which is that we will be competing at home. I am sure that will help and we will get ourselves back on top again, as we were in India. A committee has been established to consider a bid for Adelaide to hold the 2030 Commonwealth Games, and Mr Rob Gerard is the chairman of that committee.

I initially gave notice of this motion when I was the opposition shadow minister for recreation and sport, a role that I genuinely cherished. I really enjoyed it. Obviously it had a strong connection with my own sporting background but, far more importantly, to the work that I and others in this place do these days, and the very important place that sport holds in communities across South Australia for many reasons. There is the obvious contribution to fitness and health, to team-building, to community-building, ideally even contributing to far better health in later years, even after people have stopped actively participating.

There are many reasons to support sport in general, and we should be very proud in South Australia of our level of participation and involvement, particularly when it comes to the Commonwealth Games. This year, there were 413 Australian athletes at the Commonwealth Games, (199 female and 214 male) and of those, there were 37 South Australian athletes (17 female and 20 male). While our state's population share is approximately 7 per cent of the national population, we actually had a 9 per cent share of those athletes who went to the Commonwealth Games.

We can be proud of the fact that, at the top level of sport in our nation and internationally, we are contributing per capita more than our population share, but we should be exceedingly proud when we consider the number of medals won. We in South Australia have 7 per cent of the national population and contributed 9 per cent of the athletes to our Australian team, but our athletes won 20 per cent of the medals. By any standard, that is an absolutely outstanding result and something that our South Australian athletes should be very proud of.

With regard to individual medals won by South Australians, Jack Bobridge won the men's cycling 4,000-metre individual pursuit, the cycling women's 10-kilometre scratch race was won by

Annette Edmondson, the cycling women's sprint was won by Stephanie Morton, the cycling men's keirin was won by Matthew Glaetzer and, in shooting, the 25-metre rapid fire pistol for men was won by David Chapman. Of course, we won some medals in team events as well. The cycling men's team won the 4,000-metre team pursuit, we won swimming medals in the 4x100-metre medley relay, and South Australians won medals participating in the women's hockey team and also in the netball team. Those are all gold medals.

In addition to that, we won silver medals in cycling's 500-metre time trial, swimming men's para-sport 100-metre freestyle S9, cycling men's 1,000-metre time trial B2 tandem, cycling women's 3,000-metre individual pursuit, cycling men's 4,000-metre individual pursuit, cycling men's para-sport sprint B2 tandem, swimming women's 200-metre breaststroke, cycling men's 20-kilometre scratch race, cycling men's individual time trial. South Australians won bronze medals in athletics women's marathon and a bronze team medal for the cycling men's team sprint.

That is an absolutely outstanding performance, by any measure. All of South Australia can be exceptionally proud of the South Australian young men and women competing at both the Commonwealth Games and the Para-Sports Commonwealth Games representing us. They did extremely well. As I said, we have 7 per cent of the population, 9 per cent of the participants and 20 per cent of the medals won. Something that I really want to focus on here is part (b) of my motion:

commends the Commonwealth Games Federation for integrating para-sports into the main Commonwealth Games program.

We would all be aware that there are the Olympic Games and, when the Olympic Games are over, there are the Paralympic Games. For that to have ever taken place was a gigantic step forward in recognising the extraordinary achievements of genuinely elite Paralympians. In my time as shadow minister for recreation and sport and engaging with representatives and participants from many different sports, including disabled people, a message that came through loud and clear is that they wanted competition for disabled people to be part of the main competition, and they have certainly achieved that with the Commonwealth Games and I think that is absolutely outstanding.

It was a very common message that came to me that people representing disabled athletes did not want a representative body for basketball and then a different representative body for disabled basketballers—or swimmers, or shooters, or any other sport. They wanted the sporting body that represented the sport as a whole to not only represent men and women, young people and older people, but also simultaneously represent able-bodied and disabled athletes.

For that to have happened at the Commonwealth Games I think is extraordinary. It is a very positive step forward with regard to our broader society giving opportunity and recognition to people, whether or not they happen to be physically disabled; and that, at that extremely elite level of international sport (which the Commonwealth Games are), the same recognition should go to a disabled athlete as it does an able-bodied athlete.

The Paralympics and the para-sports program in the main Commonwealth Games program is not a second tier. It is not an also-ran competition. In exactly the same way as women's sport should be recognised and valued just as highly as men's sport should be, top tier elite levels of sport, undertaken by athletes with physical disabilities, should be considered and recognised just as highly as fully able-bodied athletes. It is absolutely outstanding that the Commonwealth Games internationally has decided to take that up. I know other members of this house will want to join me in congratulating a South Australian athletes and supporting this motion. I look forward to both sides of this house being unanimously supportive of this motion.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:35): I am pleased to support this motion. Australia enjoys an outstanding international sporting history, and the Olympic, Commonwealth and Paralympic games provide an opportunity for our country's finest athletes to compete against the world's best in a competition which promotes friendship, solidarity and fair play. Indeed, the Commonwealth Games, also known as the 'friendly games', are built on three core values: humanity, equality and destiny.

This year, Glasgow hosted the 20th Commonwealth Games, which featured 6,500 athletes from 71 countries. These athletes competed in 17 sports over 11 days, from 23 July until 3 August 2014. Sports included athletics, cycling, gymnastics, rugby sevens, shooting, aquatics and

netball. The 2014 Commonwealth Games featured a total of 22 para-sport events across the five sports of athletics, swimming, lawn bowls, powerlifting and, for the first time, track cycling.

I am pleased to acknowledge that South Australia was well represented by our nine athletes who completed in these para-sport events in Glasgow. The South Australian government, through the South Australian Sports Institute (SASI), has long supported Commonwealth Games, Olympic and Paralympic athletes. Its high performance and Paralympic scholarship programs offer financial and service assistance to targeted individual athletes who have typically achieved an elite level of performance at the senior open level in Olympic, Paralympic and Commonwealth Games' sports.

Each year, up to 20 Paralympic and 20 Olympic and Commonwealth Games athletes are awarded SASI scholarships, with grants of up to \$4,000, and access to SASI facilities and services, including physiologists, psychologists, coaches and performance analysts. Each year, approximately \$95,000 is allocated to these scholarships: \$60,000 to high performance, \$35,000 to Paralympic. In the sports of swimming and cycling, the Paralympic athletes work closely, wherever possible, in an integrated program of testing and servicing with the SASI Olympic stream athletes.

Since 2002, the South Australian government has supported a joint appeals process for the Olympic, Paralympic and Commonwealth Games appeals. The Joint Appeals Committee is coordinated through the South Australian Olympic Council and funded through the Office for Recreation and Sport. In 2012-13, the state government allocated \$110,000 to the South Australian branch of the Australian Commonwealth Games Association for the 2014 Glasgow Commonwealth Games Appeal.

At the 20th Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, Australia's total medal haul included 49 gold medals, 42 silver and 46 bronze—a total of 137 medals won by athletes from across the nation. As we know, the 137 medals placed Australia second in the medals tally behind only England, with 174 medals, and ahead of Canada, with 82 medals.

The Australian team consisted of 417 athletes, including 41 South Australians. While South Australians made up just 9.83 per cent of the team, our state's athletes contributed an incredible 19 per cent of Australia's total medal tally. SASI is able to boast a contribution to Australia's tally of 20 per cent of all gold, 26 per cent of all silver and 11 per cent of all bronze won at the games in Glasgow.

The South Australian Sports Institute is proud of its 23 Commonwealth Games medallists who, individually, won 26 medals across the seven sports, including athletics, hockey, lawn bowls, netball, shooting, swimming and cycling, with South Australia's cyclists collectively winning an impressive 17 medals. Their fantastic sporting achievements significantly contributed to Australia's total medal haul for Commonwealth Games events and included 10 gold medals, 11 silver medals and five bronze medals, with medals in team sports and team events being counted only once per team, rather than per member.

Nine SASI cycling athletes broke five Commonwealth Games records. I have to say what an achievement it was by Anna Meares, Glenn O'Shea, Jack Bobridge, Luke Davison, Alexander Edmondson, Matthew Glaetzer, Stephanie Morton, Kieran Modra, and his pilot, Jason Niblett. SASI swimming coach, Peter Bishop, and former SASI cycling coaches, Tim Decker and Ben Cook, along with former SASI hockey coach, Craig Victory, were all selected to the Australian coaching teams.

South Australia was strongly represented in the cycling coach and official selections demonstrating the quality and the excellent standard of support available to South Australian athletes trained through SASI's programs. The state government congratulates every Australian athlete and official who helped achieve these results for our country in the 20th Commonwealth Games. All athletes who represented Australia at the games in Glasgow deserve congratulations for their dedication, their skills, their talent and their commitment.

The list of all Australian athletes who have distinguished themselves at this prestigious event is considerable with 137 medals won for Australia. On behalf of the state government, I would like to take this opportunity to celebrate the South Australian 2014 Commonwealth Games medallists, many of whom were already world champions before their selection to the Australian team and remain a

source of inspiration for young athletes across the nation. We are extremely proud of their dedication and achievement and I congratulate them all:

- Jessica Trengrove won the bronze medal in athletics for the women's marathon;
- Rohan Dennis won a silver medal for cycling in the men's time trial;
- Jack Bobridge won a gold medal in the men's 400-metre team pursuit and a gold in the men's 4,000-metre individual pursuit;
- Luke Davison won a gold medal in the men's 4,000-metre team pursuit;
- Alexander Edmondson won gold in the men's 4,000-metre team pursuit and silver in the men's 4,000-metre individual pursuit;
- Glen O'Shea won a gold medal in the men's 4,000-metre team pursuit and silver in the men's 20-kilometre scratch race;
- Annette Edmondson won gold in the women's 10-kilometre scratch and silver in the women's 3,000-metre individual pursuit;
- Matthew Glaetzer took out gold in the men's keirin and bronze in the men's team sprint;
- Anna Meares won a gold medal in the women's 500-metre time trial and a silver medal in the women's sprint;
- Stephanie Morton won a gold medal in the women's sprint and a silver medal in the women's 500-metre time trial;
- Kieran Modra, along with his pilot, Jason Niblett, won a silver medal in the men's tandem 1,000-metre time trial and a silver medal in the men's tandem sprint for athletes with a disability; and
- Breanna Hargrave piloted for Brandie O'Connor, and together they went on to win a bronze in the women's tandem sprint and in the women's tandem 1,000-metre time trial.

South Australia is also home to interstate athletes who base their daily training environment here in Adelaide, including cyclist, Scott Sunderland, who won a gold medal, and Nathan Hart, who won a bronze medal.

In South Australia, where the Tour Down Under is so close to our hearts, and the nation cycling program is based, we are especially proud of the enormous success of our cyclists who continue to shine on the world stage. I would also like to congratulate the South Australian members of the gold medal winning women's hockey team: Jane Claxton, Karri McMahon and Georgie Parker; Wayne Ruediger, who won a bronze medal in the men's fours lawn bowls team; and our fantastic Adelaide Thunderbirds team members, Natalie Medhurst and Renae Hallinan, who were part of the gold medal winning Australian Diamonds team in netball. I have said before in this chamber that I had the privilege of playing friendly games with the Australian Diamonds as part of the federal parliamentary team, and it was an experience I cherish.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What position did you play in netball, member for Torrens?

Ms WORTLEY: Wing attack. In shooting, David Chapman won a gold medal in the men's 25-metre rapid-fire pistol and competed at the Commonwealth Games with his daughter, Hayley. In swimming, Sally Hunter won gold in the women's 4 by 100-metre medley relay and silver in the women's 200-metre breaststroke. Of our athletes with a disability, I congratulate Jesse Aungles, who won a silver in the men's 200-metre individual medley SM8, and Matthew Cowdrey, who won silver in the men's 100-metre freestyle S9. We congratulate every member of the Australian Glasgow 20th Commonwealth Games team, particularly those athletes who have called South Australia home.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You might like to continue your remarks at the end of the motion because you have run out of time, member for Torrens.

Ms WORTLEY: I will continue my remarks at the end.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:46): It gives me great pleasure to make a contribution to the member for Stuart's motion on congratulating our Commonwealth Games team, particularly our South Australians who were part of that great team. The Commonwealth Games were a fantastic spectacle and, as we saw on the screen, stadiums were largely full, with plenty of interest around the 17 sports on display. I am pleased to note that South Australian athletes took out 20 per cent of the Australian gold medals at the Commonwealth Games which, as others have mentioned, were 11 days of high activity, high colour, great competitive individual efforts and great team efforts from those 6,500 athletes and officials from 71 countries.

There were 41 South Australians competing at the games, winning 26 medals in seven different sports, with local athletes particularly dominating in cycling. I think South Australia has a proud history in cycling, not only in the Commonwealth Games but further afield in the Olympic Games. We can all be very proud of the cycling program here in South Australia, and I pay tribute to my old trade school teacher, Charlie Walsh, who never used to get off a bike. He would ride from machine to machine and from schoolroom to schoolroom. He was one great South Australian who inspired many, but I digress.

I think athletes from South Australia were phenomenally successful at the Commonwealth Games, and the campaign came to an end with the curtain going down at Glasgow. We all remember the athletes; we have affiliations with some more than others. I must say that Jess Trengove's personal best in the marathon was an outstanding effort, and Paul Raison, Margaret Gayen and Sean Roberts produced performances that saw all of them finish in the top seven in their respective events.

There were nine gold medals, 10 silver medals and three bronze medals from those South Australian athletes in cycling. There were three hockey gold medals, two netball gold medals, one shooting gold medal, one swimming gold medal and three silver medals and one bronze in athletics and lawn bowls. I must pay tribute to the two Riverland girls, who were gold medal winners in hockey: Karri McMahon and Georgie Parker. They are outstanding role models for all young South Australians and all young Australians, and their performances were well noted.

I would like to highlight some of the remarkable performances by South Australian athletes. We all watched in awe the great cyclist, Anna Meares, as she broke Commonwealth Games records, claimed Australia's first gold medal at the games and became the first female cyclist in history to win the same Commonwealth Games cycling event three times. She was the first athlete to earn a track cycling award at four editions of the quadrennial event and drew level for the most games track cycling gold medals.

Fellow 23-year-old South Australian Stephanie Morton won silver in her games debut in a fantastic effort and went on to win gold in the women's sprint. Jack Bobridge, of course, Luke Davison, Alexander Edmondson and Glenn O'Shea dominated the men's team cycling sprint, claiming gold to defend their 4,000-metre team pursuit. They led at every point of the 16-lap race and broke the games record, and that was outstanding. I must say that is one of the memorable events at the games.

The netballers included Natalie Medhurst and Renae Hallinan. I had the pleasure of meeting Renae at a Sport SA Awards nomination breakfast recently. She is an inspiration not only to all women in sport but she is also an outstanding role model to all young aspiring athletes. I commend Renae both on and off the field. In women's hockey, the two Riverland girls, SA players Karri McMahon and Georgie Parker, and, of course, Jane Claxton claimed gold in what I would call a nail biter against England. It was to the late equalising goal and then a frenetic penalty shootout that got Australia across the line.

While South Australian representatives were not as successful in the athletics field, I think that Jessica Trengove put on an inspired performance to claim the bronze medal. Again, that personal best is always a great achievement by any sports person. It was to the cheers of her family and supporters who packed the Alma Hotel. After she returned home she said that that was one of her inspirations that really pushed her to the absolute end to get that bronze medal. Hoyleton shooter David Chapman claimed a gold medal, with a record finals shoot at the Commonwealth Games in

the 25-metre rapid fire pistol men's final. It was already a special games for David as he was selected with his daughter Hayley, who finished sixth in the semi-finals of the women's 25-metre pistol event.

It was a great recognition by the Commonwealth Games Federation to incorporate para-sports into the main program, with para-sports athletes competing in such events as athletics and aquatics. There were many great and memorable moments, but I think that one of the important points is that South Australia is preparing for a Commonwealth Games bid in 2026 and potentially 2030, with the Gold Coast hosting the event in 2018. Already, we have had a desktop audit of all facilities in South Australia, but there is still plenty of work to do. The South Australian government needs to continue to work and fully support the development of our athletics. The cutting of one of our high-performance programs this year and a reduction in scholarships is no help, but I would like to make sure that the government does recognise the importance of the Kidman Park facility and the SASI program down there.

I recently toured the facility. It is an ageing facility, but we are doing the best we can with that facility. There is scope for this government to look into the future so that we can inspire not only our young to stay in South Australia to train and to be part of a national team but also to bring other international sportspeople to the state, to have a world-class facility, like other states are embarking on at the moment. I ask every member in this chamber to be mindful that, when we are lobbying for better facilities, upgraded programs and high-performance programs, we put money behind those programs to promote our great athletes.

As I have said, I will be working in a bipartisan way with the Minister for Recreation and Sport to bring the Commonwealth Games to South Australia. I think that it is a great event that South Australia has missed out on. We will be looking closely at how the Gold Coast performs, and we will be looking very closely at how we put our tender to the international body to make sure that Adelaide is on the agenda.

Our South Australian athletes who competed at the Commonwealth Games certainly did the state proud and should hold their head high. Many of the athletes were competing at their first Commonwealth Games and they will only learn from the experience. We must also acknowledge the effort that goes on behind the scenes, whether it be support staff, coaches and volunteers who help prepare those athletes. Once again, I congratulate all our athletes and look forward to seeing them continuing to shine into the future.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:55): It is a pleasure to support this motion. Aspirational targets have been mentioned by a few and they are critical to all of us in life, but every level of sport involves some person challenging themselves to get a result and, when those results are achieved, they go to that next level and you never know what comes from it. I think that the Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games are the absolute top of the tree that any person could ever aspire to. I pay tribute not just to those who are successful in getting selected for it, but to those who—and I hate to even try to determine what the number of hours would be—want to do things. It is inspirational and part of the Australian psyche, I think, to do our absolute best. Sport is one of the key things that we love.

I will not repeat the names and the details that have already been quoted, other than to commend all people on the achievements they have undertaken. There are two people I want to mention, David and Hayley Chapman, who reside in the Goyder electorate. I have met both of them—I know David better than Hayley—and they are outstanding people. David is 49. He competed in the Olympics in 2000 and 2012. He has competed in the Commonwealth Games in 2006, 2010 and 2014. He is not a man of substantial stature but he is committed to what he does. He is a farmer. He still runs the farm and will always run the farm. He is a member of the Balaklava Sports Shooting Club. He is always available to help mentor and coach other young shooters. I was just doing some research on him and learnt that in his teenage years he had a vision that by the time he was 35, so in the year 2000, he was going to do something big. I do not think you can do anything bigger than get selected for a home Olympics in Sydney. He achieved it.

After having been a shooter for about 10 years, taking up a love that was his father's, he got married and started a family and withdrew from shooting for a 10-year period to consolidate things and then came back into the competitive side of shooting and was good enough to get selected for an Olympic team within five years. He has continued through with his love of that. He is very much a wonderful example that no matter what age you are, no matter how good your eyesight might be—

and I am 52 and my eyes are on the way out, so I am not sure how a shooter can still focus that well at the age of 49. It is wonderful for him and it is not just an individual success because it has taken him years to get to that stage to win the Commonwealth Games gold medal. I pay homage to him and congratulate him on that.

His daughter, Hayley, is only 22. She competed in the Olympics in 2012 and the Commonwealth Games in 2014. She notes that her sporting hero is her father. I think that is just wonderful that through three generations of family, they have all been inspired by what their parents have done. It is wonderful that a young person took it up in her teenage years and has been coached by her dad and also has external coaching now and goes to university. She has not got onto the dais yet to receive a medal, but she will because she has instilled into everything she does the will and the commitment that has been demonstrated by her dad. I pay homage to both of them, I congratulate them on their efforts and I see them as being examples of so many people (in the hundreds of thousands) around Australia who commit to sporting activities. Very few manage to reach it, but the rest of us, no matter what we have done in our life, respect them tremendously for it. Well done.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:58): I will be very brief in my comments but I support this motion. I concur with what everyone else has said here this afternoon and congratulate all the South Australian athletes and all the athletes who took part in the 20th Commonwealth Games in Glasgow. We have mentioned some of the big names like Jess Trengove, Jack Bobridge and Anna Meares but I would like to single out a couple of athletes who come from the electorate of Mitchell.

Two of those are teenagers Emma Adams and Jack Rossiter, both shooters from the Reynella Small Bore and Air Rifle Club. They are wonderful young athletes who did incredibly well to actually make it to the Commonwealth Games. Their club and state coach, Carrie Quigley, said they always stood a chance and their performance was very impressive, and they are earmarked for big things at the Olympic Games in Rio.

Both Emma and Jack produced outstanding results. Jack finished 10th out of a field of 21, just out of qualifying in the top eight to go on to the final, but he did very well to finish 10th. Emma finished 14th out of a field of 28, just missing out on qualifying for the final eight to go on to the final. I commend them for their efforts. Emma is currently a student at Reynella East High School and, as I said, well on her way to going to Rio, along with Jack.

Swimmers from the Marion Swimming Club were Sally Hunter, Matt Cowdrey and Jesse Aungles, with coach Peter Bishop. They are three great athletes. Sally won an individual silver and relay medals as well. Matt Cowdrey, who it is suggested is in the twilight of his career, came second in his swimming event, the men's freestyle S9. He was beaten by Australian teenage sensation Rowan Crothers, who set an unofficial individual world record—so a great performance there. Matt has just been a stellar performer in the Paralympic field. Jesse Aungles, as was pointed out a little earlier, is also a Paralympic swimmer and he won silver in the 200-metre individual medley.

In closing, I hope to witness a Commonwealth Games in Adelaide in my lifetime; 2030 would be fantastic. I hope we do get those games so that we can watch many more great athletes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (13:00): I appreciate the support from all members of this parliament. I know that the member for Morialta would have liked to make particular mention of Matthew Glaetzer from his electorate. Bring on the Gold Coast in 2018 and hopefully one day we will have a Commonwealth Games in Adelaide.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert will not catch things thrown into the chamber from the Speaker's gallery, but it was a good catch.

Mr Pederick: He can do it from the other gallery.

An honourable member: The upstairs gallery.

The SPEAKER: Yes, that would be more challenging.

*Parliamentary Committees***STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

The SPEAKER (14:01): I present the report from the committee concerning the application from the Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor of Adelaide Mr Stephen Yarwood for the publication of a response to a reference made in the House of Assembly, and I move:

That the report be received.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Citizen's Right of Reply***CITIZEN'S RIGHT OF REPLY**

The SPEAKER (14:02): The report I have presented relates to a request from the Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor of Adelaide Mr Stephen Yarwood for a right of reply in relation to a reference to him made by the member for Heysen in the House of Assembly on 14 October.

A submission from Mr Yarwood was referred to the committee on 15 October by me under the house's sessional orders which provide for the right of reply procedures. The committee considered the submission at the meetings on 15, 16 and 28 October and has recommended to the house that a response in the terms included in the report I have just presented be incorporated in *Hansard*. This is the first occasion on which the committee has recommended to the house that a response be incorporated in *Hansard*.

In recommending that the response be incorporated in *Hansard*, the committee notes, as required by the sessional orders of the house for a right of reply, that it has not judged the truth of any statement made in the house or the submission of the person making a response. The response reads as follows:

Speaker, House of Assembly

South Australian Parliament

North Tce, Adelaide 5000

Dear Mr Speaker,

I write to clarify and correct statements made by the Member for Heysen, Ms Isobel Redmond, in the South Australian Parliament on the 14th of October 2014.

Ms Redmond claimed that we had a long conversation in which I launched 'a torrent of verbal abuse' whilst walking to Government House.

She also claimed I called her an abhorrent name and suggested I had pushed a camera at a prior event.

I wish to advise that these claims are untrue.

I request my response to be inserted in *Hansard*.

Yours sincerely

The Right Honourable

The Lord Mayor of Adelaide Stephen Yarwood

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Capital City Committee—Annual Report 2013-14

Government Boards and Committees Information—Annual Report 2013-14

Final Report: Boards and Committees

Operations of the Auditor-General's Department—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. J.R. Rau) on behalf of the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Guardian for Children and Young People, Office of the—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993, Review of the—September 14

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Food Act 2001—Annual Report 2013-14

Health Advisory Council—

Far North Annual Report 2013-14

Port Augusta, Roxby Downs and Woomera Annual Report 2013-14

Quorn Health Services Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

The Whyalla Hospital and Health Services Annual Report 2013-14

Safe Drinking Water Act 2011—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

South Australian Community Visitor Scheme—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Police (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Witness Protection Act 1996—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W. Bignell)—

Primary Industries and Regions SA—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Adelaide Convention Centre—Annual Report 2013-14

Adelaide Entertainment Centre—Annual Report 2013-14

Motor Sport Board, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14

Tourism Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium, Board of the—Annual Report 2013-14

Dog and Cat Management Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Heritage Council, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14

Pastoral Board—Annual Report 2013-14

River Murray Act 2003—Annual Report 2013-14

Question Time

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Why did the government fail to meet its own timetable to produce third-party water access legislation, which was to be released by mid-2013 for public consultation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:07): I will get a detailed answer for the member from the Minister for Water and get back to the house.

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): Supplementary, sir: is this one of the matters that the Treasurer discussed with Dr Paul Kerin prior to his resignation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:08): Prior to Mr Kerin's resignation, I was not the Treasurer: I was the energy minister. The discussions I had with Mr Kerin were in relation to energy policy and energy regulation. I will have to discuss with the water minister what conversations he may have had, or the former treasurer may have had.

Regardless of that, the government is the master of its own destiny, we decide what the policy parameters are, and the regulator is the master of their own destiny and they decide the regulation that they implement on the policies that we set. That is how it works in South Australia and that is how it works in Western Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and the commonwealth. If anyone has any plans to change that, they should announce it immediately.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Thank you, sir. Why has the government failed to introduce third-party water access legislation since the election?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:09): It is the same question as the first one, Mr Speaker.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I said yesterday, sir, the government is happy to work cooperatively with whomever the ESCOSA board chooses as their chief executive, and we support the process. It is an independent body.

Ms Chapman: That's the wrong answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, it's the right answer—it's just the wrong question, as usual.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My apologies, sir. We are a reforming government and we are interested in increasing competition and market access to third-party operators, and the government will have more to say about that.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Can the Treasurer perhaps provide an update to the house on comments made by minister Hunter, who said:

In terms of our third-party access legislation, I understand that we are in discussions with the commonwealth on that and once we have a response from the commonwealth and we can address any concerns they might have then I will proceed further.

If it is the Treasurer who is having those negotiations with the commonwealth, can he update the house on those negotiations with the commonwealth? Is the reason why those negotiations have stalled to do with the commonwealth's asset recycling program?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:10): Just to provide some additional information for the benefit of the house—and I will provide a fuller answer once we have a report from the Minister for Water—but something that I am aware of that I know bears on this question is the whole question of the integrity of the water network.

You will remember this was a celebrated debate in the lead-up to the 2010 election where the member for MacKillop wanted us to collect all of our stormwater and recycle that and start using it. One of the issues that arose in that context was the access points into the reticulated network for, essentially, the providers of water. So the argument went that you could clean up water to a potable water standard, put it into the reticulated network and that third-party access would provide the basis for another source of water. Well, it's not as simple as that. The CSIRO, while they have looked at this matter and while they do conclude that you can take stormwater up to potable standards—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, while you can take stormwater to potable standards, when you introduce it into the reticulated network what happens is that, because even potable water has different chemical composition, it reacts with the water that's in the existing network and can produce some unfortunate results. In particular, what it does is reduce the disinfectant effect of the filtration system that is already part of our system. One of the reasons why—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is something—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We tend to take for granted, Mr Speaker—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I hear the interjection—

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I hear the interjection that 'potable water is potable water', but the truth is it's not. It has a slightly different chemical composition and it reacts—it is not inert. There are lots of materials inside pipes which can leach out and compromise the integrity of the water supply.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am trying to assist the house with what I think is relevant information about something which—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —is of importance—

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —for the integrity of our water supply. A lot of things that we take for granted like hygiene and a fresh-drinking water supply are not universally experienced all around the world. We have incredibly high water quality standards; we have some of the world's experts on this. What I am telling you now isn't information that I have of my own knowledge, it's information that comes from world-leading experts based here in South Australia about maintaining the integrity of our water quality.

Ms Chapman: So, what's the hold-up?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What that means then—

Ms Chapman: Oh, great!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —is that third-party access into our reticulated water supply system is a complex process, and there are important considerations—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that need to be taken into account—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —before one would allow open slather access.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is not the complete answer to the question—

Ms Chapman: You've got 25 seconds.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I offer this for the assistance of the house.

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): A supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: That will be the fourth.

Mr MARSHALL: What we are keen to understand in this house is what is—

The SPEAKER: Let's just call it another question.

Mr MARSHALL: What is the hold-up with the negotiations with the commonwealth regarding third-party access to our water system here in South Australia?

Mr Gardner: Give Paul Caica a go.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:15): As the Premier was articulating in his earlier answer, there are of course concerns, but we will get a detailed response to the member and to the house because we are keen to increase competition as well.

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Has the government or Treasury undertaken any modelling in relation to the impact of a third-party access regime on SA Water's dividend?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:15): Lots of things can impact the dividend that SA Water pays. As I was articulating to the house yesterday, in the final year of the last Liberal government, they took \$170 million in today's money out of SA Water compared to \$26 million that Labor has taken out—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —this year. If the modelling has been done, Treasury do modelling on all types of scenarios that involve utilities and assets that we own.

Mr Gardner: Lots of secret plans.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Opposition Whip says they have secret plans.

Mr Gardner: That's not what I said.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You said 'secret plans'. It seems to me, if you want to talk about secret plans, I think the Treasurer—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: In one breath, the Treasurer is indicating that he will get an answer, and then the rest of it's just waffle. So, we either have an answer or not—clearly not.

The SPEAKER: That the answer is waffle is not a point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, it's not relevant. It's not relevant to the question—anywhere near it.

The SPEAKER: That is a disorderly point of order. Treasurer.

Mr Goldsworthy: It's not germane.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for Kavel is correct. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A little bit of auditioning going on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Don't worry, it won't hurt a bit.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It won't hurt.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It will be painless. You will go to sleep and just wake up and it will be a different job; you'll be fine.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: —is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir; I apologise. Treasury do modelling on many scenarios. As I have said to the house on many occasions, it is only proper that Treasury offer the very best advice they can to the government of the day but, again, policy is decided by elected representatives and elected governments, not by unelected officials. We are the ones who decide policy. We are the ones who decide whether utilities are held in public or private hands.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Judge us on what we do. Don't judge us on what the bureaucracy investigates.

WATER INDUSTRY REFORM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): Supplementary, sir: will the Treasurer table the modelling that Treasury has done into the impacts of third-party access on SA Water dividends?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:18): No doubt the opposition is very keen for modelling to see what impacts privatisation would have on dividend payments and the value of the asset. So, obviously what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to do now is get as much information as he can to assist—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in their secret plans to privatise SA Water.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, point of order.

Mr PISONI: The minister is not responsible for the Leader of the Opposition. He continually refers to the Leader of the Opposition, and he is not responsible for the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: It is true. It is true that the Treasurer is not responsible to the house for the Leader of the Opposition—not, not, not responsible.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir, but gee, we don't want to change him. We like him just the way he is.

The SPEAKER: And accordingly I warn the—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: —Treasurer a first time.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Don't go changing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Don't go changing, yes. No, the government won't be releasing modelling that we do, but we have a very transparent system. The pricing orders that are issued are gazetted and made public, and the public have plenty of transparency in the way water pricing and the dividends are calculated.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They are. As I said, the reforms we have made have been quite significant. Independent regulation and the licensing of the water industry instigated by ESCOSA under the Water Industry Act are reforms this government has undertaken.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not going to assist the opposition, Mr Speaker, in their plans to privatise SA Water. The reason they want—

The SPEAKER: So, the answer is that you're not tabling them. Thank you. The leader.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Will the Treasurer rule out the sale or privatisation of any SA Water assets?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20): This would have to be one of the most galling questions that have been advanced in this place. For the Leader of the Opposition to stand here and ask us whether we would rule it out. We ruled it out—we ruled it out during the election campaign.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Who were you talking to? The privatisation of SA Water assets—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I watch the television. I invite the ladies and gentlemen of the media to play back a little segment during the election campaign where the Leader of the Opposition got the critical question about SA Water, and didn't he choose his words carefully? You could see the terror in his eyes. You could see that he had been told, 'Make sure that you use the words carefully because if you don't—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley has a point of order.

Mr PISONI: He is not responsible to the house for the Leader of the Opposition, and he continually—

The SPEAKER: I uphold the member for Unley's point of order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We could not have been clearer during the election campaign, and the Leader of the Opposition could not have been more evasive.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time, which is such a pity after a successful point of order. The leader.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary to the Premier: will he rule out the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:21): We have already announced that it is our intention to sell either a portion of the Motor Accident Commission—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, we didn't. Our commitment was absolutely clear: significant state functions. We made that absolutely clear. I signed a pledge. Any number of organisations can provide insurance for motor accidents. It is not a significant and essential state government function, and we stand by that decision—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Absolutely—and it is our intention to pursue it.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary, sir: is the Premier saying that the Motor Accident Commission is not a significant state asset?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22): It is not a significant state function.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Will the Premier be seated.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition be seated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time for that flailing display, and the Treasurer is warned a second and final time for imitating that display, and the Minister for Health and the member for Kaurana are called to order for imitating that display.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: No, the Premier hasn't finished.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Let's just go through this carefully in case there is any dispute about this. We had a very clear pledge. We set them all out, the television cameras took pictures of us—it's all online, they are set out there in black and white—about the commitments we made in relation to privatisation. We chose our words very carefully because the truth is that there are often assets that are disposed of by government for the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned, and the member for Mitchell is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There are often assets, quite substantial ones, that we sell from time to time which allow us to gain the revenue that is necessary to apply to other purposes, and it was always our intention to explore those matters. But we will not expose the South Australian community to the price gouging that would occur if a private sector operator was running such a crucial utility such as our water utility.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: For those opposite who represent country regions, all of that windfall that you are talking about that somehow was sloshing around in the state coffers, the lion's share of it goes to subsidise country people to ensure that they get the same price of the delivery of

water as people in the metropolitan area; that is where most of the money goes. The other lion's share of it goes to subsidising pensioners.

I can wager a bet. I don't think you are going to get a private sector operator that is going to provide that level of cross-subsidy to people in the community who cannot bear the burden of accepting the full cost of the delivery of water. That is a responsibility the state government does and we are prepared to accept that responsibility. That is why, just like with the privatisation of ETSA, where all of the burden falls on those who can least afford it, they wanted to privatise SA Water. We ruled it out.

Mr MARSHALL: A supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary is asked, the member for Mount Gambier is called to order and warned a first time. The member for Heysen is called to order. The member for Morialta is warned a first time and so is the member for Hartley. I remind the Treasurer that he is on two warnings. If his lips move outside standing orders, he will have to leave the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And I will consult the opposition as to sentencing should that happen.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My supplementary is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the net asset value of the Motor Accident Commission, and can he then explain to the house what a substantial asset is if the Motor Accident Commission is not a substantial asset?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:26): Value and function are two very separate issues.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition scoffs. The reality is the Liberal Party are attempting to tell us that they think the Motor Accident Commission is an essential service that can only be provided by government. The opposition and the government differ on this. We believe that the market can provide a better scope for third-party premiums. We do not believe that the private sector, the market, can provide water security, and they are two very different functions. What the opposition are saying is that value and function are exactly the same; therefore, it is not about what the function is, it is about the value.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, we are in politics for the social issues. We are in politics because we care about working people, and water and the delivery of water and the safety of water are fundamental to the function that SA Water have, and that is why under a Labor government it will remain in government control.

The function of third-party premiums is not something that the government needs to be doing. The market is mature enough to offer that service by private providers. It amazes me that the Liberal Party are actually arguing that the market can't do it better than the government. Is it any wonder they are still in opposition? Is it any wonder business are dismayed at the opposition, that they are actually arguing against the private sector being involved in the writing of third-party premiums? That is why they are lost, because—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker—98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: So his lips moved out of order then.

The SPEAKER: Well, presumably the opposition don't want me to remove the Treasurer from the chamber just at this juncture, so should I remove the Treasurer under the standing order—

Mr Gardner: Suspend the sentence for two minutes.

The SPEAKER: Well, I was thinking of suspending the sentence until the end of question time, but he hasn't been removed yet.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:29): Supplementary, sir, to the Treasurer: if, as the Treasurer claims, consumers are better off with the Motor Accident Commission service being provided by the private sector and the market will provide cheaper premiums, as the Treasurer claims, why did the government rule out the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission before the election, committing the government to deny the consumer those benefits?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:29): I reject the assessment of the departing member for Davenport. Unlike him, I am not bored. Unlike him, we are committed to the people we represent, and want to stay here. I don't accept the categorisation that he has just made to the parliament; in fact, we reject it. We believe it is not a function that the government can do better than the private sector. I believe that, and I am surprised that members opposite do not share my view.

Members interjecting:

Mr Marshall: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I call the member for Chaffey to order, and arising out of a previous question, I warn the members for Mitchell and Heysen a first time and the member for Schubert a second time. Supplementary.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Will South Australian motorists have lower or higher third-party insurance premiums under privatisation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:30): Obviously the government will do all it can to keep third-party premiums as low as possible, and that has always been our intention. Any politician can get up and tell you, 'I can bring down the cost on any function, whether it be water, electricity, third-party,' but the real question is: will they be lower than otherwise they would have been? And that is the real question.

I have to say, it's always cheap and easy for an opposition to say, 'Can you guarantee X,' when the honest public debate is: how much in the normal course of events will premiums go up naturally under government ownership and how much will they go up under the efficiency of a private market operator who is driven by profit? So the question that the opposition should be asking is: can the government guarantee that premiums will not increase by as much, or more than they would have, if it remained under government control? But the opposition aren't interested in those types of facts. All they are interested in is drafting pamphlets for the next election.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES COMMISSION

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:32): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer think there was a conflict of interest for the then ESCOSA acting CEO to conduct an internal review of an FOI determination made by the acting CEO's wife?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:32): It's a matter for ESCOSA; but I have to say that it is probably not the member for Hartley's finest hour in asking that question. I don't believe any public servant acts in a way where a conflict would arise without it being declared. I note that Mr Kerin has made comments today saying that he thinks the two individuals involved are fine public servants and that he holds them in the highest regard.

I have complete confidence in the independence of ESCOSA. Can I just say that over the last three days the opposition has been accusing the government of interfering in the independence of ESCOSA. The function of the FOI processing in ESCOSA is independent of government, and now

I am receiving questions about whether or not I should interfere with that process and direct how these matters are managed. It is a matter for ESCOSA. I know the chief executive of ESCOSA. He is a man of high integrity and, quite frankly, I know he finds these questions offensive as, I understand, does the person who wrote the letter of resignation. Quite frankly, I think this matter should just pass before us.

Mr Tarzia: Supplementary, sir.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned a second and final time. The member for Hartley.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES COMMISSION

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:33): Supplementary sir: did the Treasurer or his office therefore ever advise the acting CEO that, despite the potential for a conflict of interest, the acting CEO could proceed with the internal review?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:34): It is not the place for me because it's not my FOI and it's not my document. I can't explain this any clearer and simpler for the opposition than to say this: ESCOSA is an independent body; they process their own FOIs. The government is not in there, my office is not in ESCOSA saying, 'Look, you should process this one and you should process that one.' That is a matter for the board and the chief executive of ESCOSA.

The question is: do I have confidence in the way that they have delivered it? The reality is this: the document was released under FOI. Is it the first FOI to be appealed to the Ombudsman that has been rejected initially? No, it is not—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say, Mr Speaker, that ESCOSA has high-calibre employees. They have a very good culture and, if the opposition has evidence to the contrary, I ask the member for Hartley to walk outside this chamber and repeat his allegations.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Sir, 127.3, I did not make any allegations.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Hartley asking a question or is he making an impromptu speech?

Mr TARZIA: No, it was a point of order, sir, because 127.3 is a personal reflection. I did not make any accusation; I just asked a question.

The SPEAKER: Obviously that is a matter of political conjecture. Would the member for Hartley like to ask a question?

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:35): Another question, sir. Richard Bingham recently put a report together on the audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act, written in May, where he says on page 88, 'FOI officers have been pressured to change determinations in certain instances.' My question is to the Attorney-General. What has the Attorney-General done to ensure that this no longer occurs?

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) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his question. This is to do with subject matter that I think we have been canvassing in the parliament now for quite a while, and nothing much has changed since—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Sorry? Hello, hello? That appears to have been a totally random interjection, Mr Speaker, not connected in any way with events current or present.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If you put it up to your ear it makes a noise.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order. The Deputy Premier is finished.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary, sir: will the Attorney-General advise the house what FOIs have been interfered with by the government as referred to by Mr Bingham in his report in May?

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) (14:37): Before I—he is very distracting with that thing. I think I explained this before. We do not actually have any particular examples about what it was that the Ombudsman was on about. It was more of a—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, it just appeared to be a Dennis Denuto sort of moment, the vibe, you know, and so—

Mr Marshall: A Dennis Denuto moment, seriously? And you're the Attorney-General!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, did you like him more than Bud Tingwell? What did you think? Anyway, the point is basically this: there is no particularity given about these matters. We do not believe that there is a culture of interference in FOI matters.

Ms Chapman: How do you know if you've never asked?

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: She is, as usual, offering helpful tips.

The SPEAKER: No. If the deputy leader interjects once more, I am afraid she will have to leave us. She already has a second warning.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Realistically, it is not possible for me to physically go around and visit every single person in the Public Service and say, 'Are you misbehaving with FOI?' I am not capable of doing that, but can I say this: I have continuing meetings with Commissioner Lander. I am interested in any suggestion that Commissioner Lander might make about how we can improve matters. In fact, as recently as yesterday, I had a chat with Commissioner Lander about a number of matters emerging from the body of his report—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I know, but I thought I would canvass broader issues with the commissioner.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There were a whole range of matters which were raised in the commissioner's report which warrant further discussion, and that further discussion is occurring about that and these matters.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would be reluctant to send the member for Bragg out on the member for Davenport's last day. Supplementary?

Matter of Privilege

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:40): No, I rise on a matter of privilege for you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Given the Deputy Premier's answer in relation to Commissioner Lander's comments regarding FOIs—and in that report, of course, there was the issue about Gmail accounts being used to make sure certain information was not released to the applicants—will you, Mr Speaker, conduct an investigation into that matter? If members of parliament's FOI responses were denied information through the use of a Gmail account or other non-government email accounts, that would be denying a member of parliament information they are rightly entitled to, which would be a contempt and a matter for privilege. It would be impossible for the opposition to establish that, because they are already denying us information.

The SPEAKER: And you say it would be a contempt of parliament?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Therefore, it is a matter for you, Mr Speaker, to investigate.

The SPEAKER: I shall look at the matter of privilege and hope you will be here to hear my report.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: You'll have to be quick.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide.

Question Time

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:41): My question is to the minister for child protection. Can the minister update the house on her attempts to contact the father of the two-year-old girl who came into contact with the Families SA worker accused of alleged child sex abuse?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:41): I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. The department has undertaken a number of initiatives to attempt to contact this particular father, but can I make it very clear from the outset that this child is not under any sort of guardianship order, that the child is with its birth father and we essentially have no control over the father, no reason to have any control over the father and no indication that the child is not being well cared for.

We have sourced telephone numbers and they have been unsuccessful. We have sourced an address, I think, through Centrelink and that was unsuccessful. We sought an address through Medicare and that mail has been returned as well, so the department is looking at other avenues it may be able to pursue to locate that particular father.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:42): Supplementary: will the minister outline what processes the department is going through to locate the father of the two-year-old girl that were mentioned by Tony Harrison on the radio this morning? It sounds like the processes you have mentioned had already occurred: Tony Harrison says there are new processes underway.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:43): The department is doing everything it possibly can. I know I am meeting with the member for Adelaide later today and I would be much more comfortable in discussing those things privately with the member for Adelaide. As I said, these people are not part of the child protection system and I am loath to discuss their circumstances publicly.

CELL THERAPY MANUFACTURING

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:43): My question is to the minister for health industries. Minister, what is the latest milestone for South Australia's growing cell therapy sector and what potential does this have for South Australia's health industries?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:43): Last week, I visited the Cooperative Research Centre for Cell Therapy Manufacturing at Mawson Lakes. What the CRC does is quite remarkable, and there is great potential for South Australia as a result. It is Australia's only facility exploring cell therapy manufacturing techniques, and it is a step closer to commercialising potential life-saving medical technology following a deal with a global leader in blood component and cellular technologies. The aim of the CRC is to develop cell therapies that treat previously incurable or intractable conditions such as type I diabetes to make those treatments both affordable and accessible.

What I learnt when I visited Mawson Lakes is that CRC has recently concluded its first commercial transfer of intellectual property to Terumo BCT Australia, which holds more than 400 patents and has about another 300 patents pending. This is an important milestone for an impressive facility, expected to create more than 2,000 jobs across Australia by 2020-21, most of which will be located here in Adelaide. It will be a hub for cell research in the Asia-Pacific.

I want our government to be a strong advocate for this type of research and this industry. Our newly formed Health Industry South Australia and its new chief executive, Marco Baccanti, who started on Monday, will be pushing strongly for more medical research to call South Australia home. When complete, the South Australian health and biomedical precinct will be one of the largest health precincts in the Southern Hemisphere. We will be well positioned to develop innovative solutions for all types of medical problems. It is important that research is commercialised to accelerate the development and delivery of world-class health care and to open the door for new industries and new jobs for South Australians.

A key plank of that biomedical precinct will be, of course, the SAHMRI, which will tonight play host to a symposium about affordable cell therapy. I will be there to listen to what some of the leading researchers in the cell therapy sector have to say. This is an exciting future in health research and we want South Australia to be a leader in the field.

DEFENCE WHITE PAPER

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. Can the minister update the house on recent consultation with the local defence industry and how this is shaping the government's submission on the Defence White Paper?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46): I thank the member for his question. I know there are many working in the shipbuilding industry and advanced manufacturing sector in his electorate. The federal government has invited submissions to their 2015 Defence White Paper and the state government has undertaken a thorough consultation process with the South Australian defence industry through our agency Defence SA, the Defence SA Advisory Board and the industry body, Defence Teaming Centre; and, of course, we have closely consulted with the Economic Development Board.

The culmination of these activities was the South Australian Defence White Paper industry summit, held here in this chamber on 21 October. The event was highly successful. It was attended by over 100 people, including the CEOs of every prime and large SME in South Australia as well as a number of small businesses. Subject matter experts Professor Hans Ohff, Professor Barry Burgan and Professor Göran Roos presented, along with speeches from industry leaders, state government and unions regarding their concerns about federal government industry policy and the future of naval shipbuilding in South Australia.

Feedback received after the event was extremely positive. The information provided at the summit has been collated and included in the South Australian Defence White Paper submission, which was forwarded from the Premier to the federal government on Wednesday this week. The

state government's submission emphasises the following key recommendations. It asks the federal government to:

- recognise the critical partnership of the states and territories in delivery of defence objectives through training and skills infrastructure and industry program,
- acknowledge that industry is the critical fourth arm of defence,
- ensure that priority local industry capabilities for defence's strategic self-reliance are clearly defined, promulgated and genuinely supported, and
- provide work flow continuity as a key strategy to reduce costs and increase innovation, productivity, global competitiveness and military capabilities.

Importantly, the submission says that the federal government should provide consistent strategy, policy and investment surety, including a continuous build approach to underpin development of a robust, indigenous naval shipbuilding and sustainment capability in Australia by committing to build surface ships and submarines in Australia over 30 years.

Also, the submission says that the federal government should make use of Australia's extensive military and commercial automotive experience when defining local industry involvement in plans to build the Army's combat vehicles through the program known as Land 400. There are a number of other very important recommendations in our submission.

The state government will produce a report regarding the summit for distribution to all attendees which will include the South Australian government Defence White Paper submission and supporting economic data. This is a crucial time for South Australia. The most important white paper we have seen for decades is being prepared. If this goes the wrong way for South Australia, then the government is seriously worried for our children and our grandchildren.

To be perfectly frank, this is probably the most important manufacturing decision this country has faced since World War II. It is far bigger than the automotive industry in terms of its consequences—\$250 billion on naval shipbuilding over 30 years is a nation-building amount of money. It is a mountain of investment, and our white paper submission makes it clear that it must be spent in Australia. To do otherwise would be a catastrophe for jobs in this state.

The information that appeared in the media this morning leaked, apparently, from Canberra, regarding the future frigate build is positive speculation—but it is speculation all the same. I think the people of South Australia would see a clear program of work with a budget to accompany it as a preferred course.

I assure the house that the Premier and the government will continue to advocate the case for South Australia—for our industry, for our workers and for our businesses. To borrow from US President Barack Obama, 'Yes, we can.' We can have an advanced manufacturing sector; we can do this. Every business, every small business—whether a restaurant retail outlet or otherwise—will suffer if we get this wrong.

PRISON TENDERS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister advise of the outcomes of recent tenders undertaken by the Department for Correctional Services?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is well known that our prison population continues to grow, and I would like to thank all our staff and correctional officers for their professionalism in managing our prisons here in South Australia.

I am pleased to update the house about two tenders awarded last week which will see a further 56 beds commissioned by mid-December 2014. A new \$2 million 24-bed accommodation unit will be built at the Mount Gambier Prison, in addition to the current expansion of 84 beds at that facility, and due for completion by late June 2015. A further \$5 million 32-bed accommodation unit will be built at Port Lincoln Prison.

The new accommodation at both locations will house low to medium security prisoners and will consist of purpose-built modular-style accommodation units similar to those used on mine sites. Construction of these will be completed in a matter of weeks and will help ease the current pressures experienced in our prison system. We will, of course, continue to scope out other medium and longer term strategies to help address the capacity issues in our prisons.

At Mount Gambier, three of the units will comprise four double rooms (including amenities) and a fourth unit which will feature a communal kitchen and recreation area and also a programs area. The Port Lincoln expansion follows the same design principles and includes two extra wings. The tenders were awarded to EMAC Systembuilt Group, a proud South Australian company, with secondary contracts awarded to two other South Australian companies: Mossop Group, for the Mount Gambier Prison expansion, and McMahon Constructions at Port Lincoln, for the installation of amenities such as power and water to the sites.

Expansions like these formulate part of the state government's short-term planning of our prison system. It will also be an immediate boost to the local economies through the construction phase through the use of local contractors and also lead to additional ongoing employment opportunities through the need for additional correctional services staff.

Let me be very clear. These expansions are part of a strategy to ensure that South Australia's prison system continues to meet the growth in prisoner numbers now and in the future, and more options will be explored to meet our required capacity needs. The growth in prisoner numbers is not unique to South Australia and is something that all Australian jurisdictions are experiencing.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Morialta.

PRISON TENDERS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:53): Given the minister's comments that the government is going to be doing work to ensure that they continue to meet the needs of the growing prison population, with all of the builds that the minister has just outlined and the 80 extra bunk beds that they have just put into prison cells, when, by the government's numbers, will prison-approved capacity be overtaken by the average daily number of prisoners in South Australia?

An honourable member: Good question.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:54): It is a good question, but it is also speculative in the sense that—

Mr Gardner: By your numbers.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, if you let me finish, in the absence of any other policies, obviously the numbers continue to grow. As indicated already, the government is looking at a whole range of strategies both in terms of people in prisons and also prisoners who will be managed on the outside. What I can tell the member is that, given all the announcements we have made to date, we anticipate that we will have beds for 2,714 prisoners at the end of this program.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:54): My question is to the minister for child protection. Does the minister stand by her answer given in estimates this year that all children placed in out-of-home care are allocated a Families SA worker, given that the guardian of children's report this week revealed that 10 per cent of the surveyed children in out-of-home care had not been allocated a caseworker?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:55): Yes, the guardian did make that point in her annual report, and it's disappointing that for whatever reason there were a number of children who didn't have an allocated caseworker at that point in time. It is a requirement that they have one, and often it's the supervisor who will take responsibility for that. The guardian made a lot of other very positive points in her annual report that I am sure the member for Adelaide has read.

Ms Sanderson: I have.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Good.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given that the 2015 AFL season is five months away and the season draw was released today, can the minister advise how much extra people will pay for season passes and match day tickets due to the government's public transport levy?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:56): Thank you to the member for Mitchell for that question. I know he's got a keen interest in this. I can advise the house that I have been in discussions with both the SMA and the two football clubs, and we are talking through how best these costs to provide public transport for the 2015 season will be resolved, but we haven't finalised that as yet.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:56): A supplementary question, again to the minister: has he received figures from the department as an estimation of how much will be put on season passes and also match day tickets?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:56): I will have to check—but not from the department; that's not my recollection, no.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Mitchell.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:56): Has the minister received them from anywhere to get a figure on how much will go on the season passes or the tickets?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:57): I am aware that the SMA has been considering how, across all of the different ticket categories, different amounts may be recovered both to AFL 11-game season ticket holders and the tickets which the SANFL make available, as well as general admission, member guest passes and, of course, across all the different corporate suites. My advice is that, so far as the clubs and the AFL are concerned—the ones, of course, who will have to be issuing their tickets—they don't have a final position about how they are going to be applying what costs may be recovered yet; hence, we are continuing our discussions.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:57): Supplementary, sir: given that the government has budgeted to receive \$1.7 million this year, and around \$4 million in the years after, from the transport levy, can the minister tell the house what other events will have this levy imposed, given that there is a budgeted figure?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:58): That's a good question. As we discussed both after the release of the Treasurer's budget and also during estimates, these costs will be recovered from commercial events where more than 5,000 people attend. We estimate that there will be many of those events, for example, in the next financial year.

The regime is that there will be a six-month period before the event is hosted at which time a venue manager—the actual host of the location of the event—will need to talk to the transport department about the nature of the event, how many people are anticipated to come along to the event and the manner in which they are anticipated to come. For example, will a lot of people seek to arrive at a particular point in time or will they get there very gradually? Perhaps a good example of that is the difference between the beginning of an AFL game, where a lot of people will want to

arrive in a relatively short period of time, compared to, say for example, how people may travel along to an Ashes test game, where the number of people travelling to the oval may occur over a longer period.

We will have those discussions with the venue managers and, of course, with the people who are actually organising the event or participating in the event, work out what those requirements are, work out how we might provide public transport to facilitate those movements both to and from those events, have a look at what public transport would be scheduled to be provided to that part of the city and whether they would be sufficient or not, or indeed whether we might need to bring on additional services. Then, of course, there would be a discussion about whether those services would most desirably be paid services or whether they would be free services. Once we have gone through all of those decisions, we will be able to arrive at a figure for those events.

Of course, once we have all of the events that we are anticipating over the course of a financial year which, at the beginning of a financial year is difficult, given that there is only the requirement for six months, we will be able to make an estimate. I should also make clear that, of course, the legislation provides for a discretion for me as minister to work out how best those costs are recovered from the venue manager.

Mr WINGARD: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, that would be a fourth supplementary, member for Elder.

Mr WINGARD: Was the last one not a question, sir?

The SPEAKER: We will come back to you.

CLIPSAL 500

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Minister, can you update the house on how announcements of new additions to the Clipsal 500 race schedule have affected ticket sales for the 2015 event?

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) (15:01): Ticket sales are going very well. We have sold 61 per cent of the grandstand seats already and going very well. We saw a 60 per cent spike in ticket sales a few weeks ago when we announced that the Ferrari series was coming to Adelaide.

We have 30 drivers coming over here to race their Ferraris around the circuit, the first time this has happened in Australia, and on top of that we have 150 Ferrari owners from around Australia coming to Adelaide for a Festival of Ferraris. It is expected that they will bring an extra 3,000 people into Adelaide specifically for the Clipsal 500. It is a terrific event. In the last sitting week, we announced another great attraction, which will bring more and more people to the Clipsal 500. Robby Gordon's stadium super trucks will be out on the track. The minister—

The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith: We've already had a test run.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —and I snuck away during the lunchbreak of the last sitting week and had a drive around in these super trucks. They can go up to 200 km/h, they get six metres in the air over the ramps and stay airborne for about 40 metres. I actually thought that we were going for a ride in a semitrailer sort of rig, but we turned up and it was something completely different. They guaranteed a smooth landing, and I have to say that, when you're hurtling towards one of these ramps and you're about to get airborne, you wonder whether it is going to be a smooth landing. But just like the minister's transition from that side to our side, it was a very smooth landing, wasn't it?

The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith: Very smooth.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It was high paced. You probably didn't have any doubts at all on the ramp as we took off. It was terrific—

The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith: It was fast and furious.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It was terrific. Fast and furious, as the minister says. Robby Gordon is a NASCAR champion and he has come out here, and this is going to be another great

attraction. It was terrific to be along with the head of the V8 supercars today, and many of the V8 drivers, as we launched the Clipsal 500 for 2015. It is going to be one of the greatest Clipsals we have ever put on.

I am very happy to say that Clipsal have agreed today—and we announced this at the luncheon—that they have signed on for an extra two years. So, they will take their sponsorship through to 2017, and we thank Clipsal very much for that sponsorship. We thank all the sponsors and the corporate backers. Of course, the government puts a lot of money into this race, but it brings \$36 million worth of economic activity into South Australia. It fills nearly every hotel room in the metropolitan area and a little bit further out as well. It is just terrific.

The member for Hammond, who is still dancing around because of his great time at the Kiss concert two years ago, told me that he is delighted that Jimmy Barnes and the boys have Cold Chisel back together again to celebrate 40 years of Cold Chisel, obviously a band born and bred here in Adelaide. It is going to be terrific to see them on the Sunday night at the concert. So, there will be plenty of things for people to see on and off the track. Four days later, we have the Foo Fighters down at Hindmarsh Stadium as well. So, there is a terrific amount of activity happening in Adelaide.

We had the Rolling Stones last Saturday night, of course, and didn't Adelaide put on a terrific show. Mick and the boys were very happy with the two weeks they had in Adelaide. They loved the place, and they got a lot of satisfaction. It was terrific. We believe in having a vibrant city, a vibrant state, and we are out there trying to get more events and to grow the events that we have at this time.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has answered the question.

SERVICE SA

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister advise how long Service SA customer service centres are closing down over Christmas and New Year this year? Will this year be different to past practice?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:05): I don't have that information to hand, so I will convey it after question time to you—I think we have settled on that time—as well as bringing back the answer to the house.

PRIME MINISTER'S PRIZES FOR SCIENCE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, how are South Australian educators leading the nation?

Ms Chapman: Leading or leaving?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:05): That would be the member for Davenport who is leaving.

The SPEAKER: The minister is called to order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. I want to thank the member for Reynell for this question. It is very timely, being that we are about to celebrate World Teachers Day tomorrow, and it is also the 20th anniversary of World Teachers Day and the 20th anniversary of the Council of Education Associations of South Australia. They will be conducting their awards ceremony tomorrow night, acknowledging top teachers here in South Australia.

It goes without saying that we have thousands of dedicated teachers who every day strive to provide the best outcomes for their students, to find new ways to engage them in their learning. It is not an easy job but it is a tremendously rewarding job that can have a positive impact on a child that lasts the rest of their life.

In Canberra last night I was delighted to be a guest at the annual Prime Minister's Prizes for Science. The Prime Minister's Prizes for Science are the nation's most prestigious awards for excellence in Australian scientific research, innovation and science teaching. Brian Schiller, a teacher from Seacliff Primary School, won the national Excellence in Science Teaching in Primary Schools

Award, securing \$25,000 for himself and \$25,000 for his school, with that money going towards improving Seacliff Primary's capacity to teach science.

A good teacher teaches but a great teacher inspires, and that is what Brian Schiller has been doing. He inspires his students to question the world around them. He encourages them to think for themselves. These are the sorts of traits that reflect the best of what our public schools have to offer. In 1995 Brian Schiller was South Australia's state winner in the National Excellence in Teaching Awards. In 2012-13 he was nominated in the South Australian Public Teaching Awards for Excellence in Teaching and in 2013 he was a national finalist for the BHP Billiton Science Teacher Awards. Last night was a very proud night for Brian and his mother and his sisters, all of whom were on hand to see him receive this accolade. When I congratulated his mother, she said, 'I must have done a good job, mustn't I.'

It was a proud night also for Seacliff Primary and the school's principal, Greg Miller, who also attended the night's events. Importantly, it was a proud night for the South Australian public education system. It is a great reminder of the things our teachers do every day in our classrooms and it serves as an inspiration to others working in the public education system and the next generation of teachers.

I would like to think that Brian Schiller's success can be in part attributed to the focus this government has on improving STEM outcomes for our students with minimum instruction times on science, mathematics, numeracy and literacy in our primary schools. We are building specialist schools to create the skilled workforce of the future. Seaview High School will have an advanced manufacturing specialisation, The Heights school, Hamilton College, and so it goes on.

Last night the Prime Minister spoke about the importance of connecting science with industry, and he stood up amongst the crowd and said, 'Last year I said to you don't judge us on what we say, judge us on what we do. I hope we have passed muster.' There was deathly silence apart from one lonely clapper in the audience. If the federal government were truly committed to science education and the connection with the industry, we would be seeing our fleet of submarines built here in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I warn the Minister for Education for introducing irrelevant material. My understanding is that she was given an excellent feed by the commonwealth government last night, so it seems somewhat churlish to criticise the Prime Minister.

Grievance Debate

EVANS, HON. I.F.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:10): I rise today to certainly grieve—and that may be too harsh a word because the man is sitting right here—the loss to the parliament of Iain Evans. I have grown accustomed to speaking, but I do actually feel a bit nervous because I have five minutes to say a lot. I am a naturally conservative person who does not want to reinvent the wheel. In fact, I believe that most of the time things have been done before and almost all of the time things have been done by people more competent than I am. I have been very keen to engage with those who I think can help mentor me and help give me the wisdom of those who have come before, and Iain is certainly one of the greatest exponents of that and a man to whom I have turned regularly.

The member for Davenport takes with him today over 20 years worth of institutional knowledge. As someone who has seen what happens when institutional knowledge walks out the door in other organisations, I do indeed think that this is a great loss to the South Australian parliament and to the South Australian Liberal Party. Having said that, I have his phone number (we all do) and I will be making very good use of that.

Iain often provided the cautionary tale, and I am a great fan of the cautionary tale. As someone with youthful exuberance who too often goes too far, it is good to have that cautionary tale in my mind, and Iain provides that. On any number of occasions his wealth of experience has been used to give us the alternative point of view. Through his experience, he has helped to moderate and give us a better understanding of the issues we grapple with in this place.

Iain also has a great ability to get to the heart of an issue. In politics things become very complex very quickly. A whole different range of pressures come to bear and it is extremely difficult on many occasions, especially with more complex pieces of legislation, to be able to get to the crux, to the heart, of the issue. Iain's contribution and advice is always succinct and to the point and strikes at the very heart of the things we seek to discuss.

On behalf of the class of 2014—which I affectionately call 'the kids', which I know is an insult to some of the members of the class of 2014—Iain, we are deeply going to miss you, your wisdom and your knowledge. The generosity with which you have given your time to us and the manner in which you have given frank, fearless, intelligent and cogent advice is something that has helped us on our journey so far. It is also interesting to note that whenever there are stupid questions to be asked, we want to go to the people we can trust, and stupid questions we have had and you have answered them very well.

Many people are going to talk about the achievements of Iain, but I have a couple of quick anecdotes. I did not know Iain that well before coming into parliament, but he comes with a reputation. When you go to see Iain, you always have to ask yourself, 'Are we going to get good Iain or are we going to get grumpy Iain today?' You can never tell. It does not matter whether it was good Iain or grumpy Iain, you still always got the answer you needed and you still always got respect and courtesy. Can I say that once you get past grumpy Iain you realise that the wealth of knowledge and experience is still there.

I am disappointed to learn that Iain is an Adelaide Hills sauv blanc drinker and, as a member from the Barossa, I find that a bit difficult to swallow. Iain's greatest piece of campaign advice that I have been able to glean is this: he says, 'Always wear the same clothes when campaigning; that way people will be able to recognise you by your clothes as well as your face.' So he has been wearing the same daggy pair of cargos for 20 years.

In closing, I will read from something. It says, 'His loyalty was unquestionable and, to some point, I think his loyalty possibly cost him the achievement of various positions within this place, but the credibility he gained as a result of maintaining loyalty is to his credit.' They are words that Iain said in his maiden speech about his father, and I think that would be just as true of him here today.

OAKLANDS ESTATE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:14): A week ago last Monday night, I was pleased to attend the AGM of the Oaklands Estate Residents' Association. The meeting was attended by over 40 or so residents and was held in the heart of the area in the beautiful surrounds of the Oaklands Estate Kindergarten. On this particular night, we heard from David about the history of the area and, in particular, the grand old homestead that had been at the centre of this estate for so many years.

This association is a group of local residents with passion, energy and drive to care for and advocate for their local area. They have operated at a local level at all times with the residents top of mind, working with local council to achieve their outcomes. The meeting was filled with energetic conversation based on frank and fearless honesty which I have no doubt is the foundation and reason for the group's successful longevity.

This is a group that was formed in 1952. Membership is open to all residents of the estate and the association is proud that many of the original estate residents from the fifties and the sixties are still living in the area and continue to be active in the association and other community affairs. The area is also home to new families who have moved into the area over the last 20 years or so to enjoy the ambience and amenities of the estate. Residents are of the view that these families are attracted to the area by the family-sized homes on family-sized allotments, situated close to shops, schools, public transport and recreation facilities.

The estate includes around 300 homes and is estimated to house around 1,000 occupants. Oaklands Estate encompasses the triangular area that is bounded by the River Sturt, Oaklands Road, Chambers Street and Minchinbury Terrace. It was originally known as the Oaklands Estate and was officially included in the suburb of Marion around 1966. However, the locals still fondly and generally refer to this area as Oaklands Estate.

The association has an extensive and successful history, finding its origins with concerned residents when they formed the association in response to the rapid transition of the estate from a rural to an urban area. Much of the beautiful character of the estate seen today is due to the hard work in the early years by this group. The establishment of street trees and high-quality reserve areas, as well as building and retaining housing types that complement the character of the area are the group's focus.

The group has always been keen to preserve the estate as a quality residential area to ensure the maintenance of parks and gardens and of roads, footpaths and drainage systems, to encourage neighbourly attitudes, to ensure a quality of life acceptable to all and, importantly, to always be prepared to pursue matters likely to be of benefit to residents of the estate.

The association is active in promoting regular newsletters. They have their website and they also hold an annual barbecue open to all estate residents and information nights on matters of interest. Recent activities of the group have seen them monitoring the environs of the new Marion station and surrounds, being actively involved in the new wetlands on matters such as lighting, plantings and revegetation, and speed signs on access roads. They have been lobbying for the additional two zebra crossings in the Park Holme Shopping Centre car park, which they were successful with, and the group undertook a street tree survey on the estate, with a list compiled where new trees can be planted.

The Oaklands Estate Residents' Association is indeed a model community group of action of robust membership and I am hopeful they will continue to champion their area well into the future and I look forward to continued involvement with them.

EVANS, HON. I.F.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:19): I make this speech this afternoon with some really mixed emotions, not only with some sadness but also with a sense of being pleased for the member for Davenport. I say that because the member for Davenport has been able to choose the time of his retirement from this place. That is something not everybody who has served in this parliament has been able to do. In that respect, the member for Davenport has been able to choose the time of his retirement for him to move on, together with his family, into the next phase of his life.

The member for Davenport should be very proud of and pleased with his achievements spanning the 21 years of his service in the parliament. Not only has he been a shadow minister, a minister, a deputy leader and a leader, but he has also been an exceptional local member. The 21 years the member for Davenport has served here, we know, have not always been easy for him. There have been the turbulent years in the 1990s of the Liberal government when he became a minister in that decade, but we do know that he has raised and succeeded with many issues he has brought to the parliament.

One thing I think it is important to highlight is, I believe, and I think many would agree, that the member for Davenport has one of the best political minds we have ever had in this place, and that has really equated to being an outstanding strategist. I recall quite clearly early in my first term here that the member for Davenport was then the shadow minister for the environment, and he was pretty good. He worked along a process and he corralled the then minister for the environment into a situation where a privileges committee was established to investigate the issue of whether the minister for the environment had actually misled the house. That committee deliberated and it was dealt with in due course. We have seen many examples of the member for Davenport's strategies coming to the fore in this place.

At a personal level—and I will refer to the member for Davenport by his Christian name—Iain has been a very good friend to me. He has provided full and frank advice, whether or not I have sought it. There have been times when I have had the door opened and then the door has been shut and I sort of copped it a bit, but not very often. His motivation in giving me that advice was only really to provide some very strong support to me in my pursuit as a member of parliament. I have always appreciated that. I can truthfully say I have always appreciated his friendship, advice and support. His family has also been very strong supporters of mine, particularly in the period leading up to my being elected to this place, and I certainly have never forgotten that and, again, always appreciated that.

The member for Davenport, when he was leader of the opposition, promoted me into the shadow ministry after the 2006 election. Again, I certainly appreciated that opportunity being given to me. I know I am running out of time and I do not have time to put in *Hansard* everything that I want to say, but he has been, and will continue to be, a person of strong conviction, loyalty, integrity and honesty, and it has been a privilege to work with him as the member for Davenport, and I would like to think I have earned his respect and friendship. I wish him, his wife, Fiona, and all his family here with us today all the very best for the future.

WHITLAM, HON. E.G.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:24): I rise today to pay tribute to a great Australian Prime Minister, Edward Gough Whitlam, and the passing of the man universally referred to and immediately present in the mind and memory as 'Gough', a person of intellect, ambition, vision, fortitude and optimism.

Following 23 years of conservative government, Gough Whitlam's government held office for 1,071 days, from 5 December 1972 to 11 November 1975. In that time it changed our institutions, our laws and our view of ourselves and our place in the world. It created Medibank (which survives today as Medicare), funded the construction of community health centres and new hospitals—particularly in the burgeoning outer suburbs—and created much-needed new and increased social security services and benefits. It abolished tertiary education fees and expanded university funding, established the Schools Commission and granted state aid to independent schools—all on the basis that equality of access to education was fundamental to a civilised and inclusive society.

It returned the land to the Gurindji people, and who could forget the extraordinary moment when the prime minister poured that sand into Vincent Lingiari's hands? I have to say I am often reminded of that with Paul Kelly's song, *From Little Things Big Things Grow*. The Whitlam government also established the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee and the Aboriginal Loans Commission and Land Fund. It drafted the Land Rights Act. It prohibited discrimination against and funded legal services for Indigenous people. It established the Family Court and brought in no-fault divorce. It created and funded women's support services and organisations and made great progress in the struggle for equal pay for women.

It established the single mother's benefit (which later encompassed all single parents) and, on the basis that women were in charge of their own reproductive health, gave them access to the contraceptive pill by removing the sales tax that then applied. It ratified the World Heritage Convention, negotiated treaties to protect our ecosystems and the species that relied on them, and otherwise legislated to protect our unique environment. It also established the Australian Heritage Commission, the Australia Council for the Arts and the National Gallery. Increased support was provided for local actors, producers and filmmakers through new Australian content requirements.

The Whitlam government withdrew our men from Vietnam, ended conscription, and freed resisters. Australia's relations with Asia were recast in a positive and constructive way. It cleared away the remnants of the White Australia policy, promoted multiculturalism, and increased both support services for immigrants and foreign aid. It engaged with the United Nations and took a principled position on apartheid.

The government renewed suburbs and cities, their public transport and their sewerage systems. It also lowered the voting age, abolished the death penalty, enhanced human rights protection through legislation and international agreements, and established the Law Reform Commission and legal aid. Many of these achievements—these indicators of a confident and mature country with a forward-looking, innovative, inclusive and compassionate people—remain to some degree today, some more than others.

The reforms I have outlined say much about the measure of the man we remember today. In a way, Gough Whitlam represents both the catalyst for and the embodiment of a time of extraordinary change. Today, I pay tribute to the prime minister who changed the lives of so many people through education reform, many of whom were the first in their family to receive a tertiary education. The impact of this has been generational. Today, beneficiaries of the Whitlam government's free university education hold positions of leadership in our universities, our medical institutions, our parliament, educational institutions, businesses and boardrooms.

Thirty-nine years tomorrow—Gough Whitlam's last month in office—the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 was enacted. It is one of the most significant human rights protections in Australia. Gough was a man of vision of which our nation continues to benefit.

EVANS, HON. I.F.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:29): I rise today to pay respect and recognition to the member for Davenport, the Hon. Iain Evans, who has served in this parliament for some 21 years and tomorrow will start a new career. I am sure everyone in the house wishes him well in his next chapter, challenge and endeavour.

He has of course been an active champion of the Liberal cause for as long as I can remember, from when we were both much younger, at least 40 years ago. He has been a champion not just for the Liberal cause and what it stands for but also for this parliament and the importance of it in the structure of democracy in South Australia, and for the Liberal Party of Australia and our South Australian division in particular. He is retiring today from this house, from this parliament and from the very public office that that attracts, but I have every expectation that he will continue his contribution to public policy and to our party work and the cause that we have all been strongly advocating.

He has served in this house as a member of the parliament. He has served the state as a minister, and the details of that will be traversed, I am sure, by the Premier and Leader of the Opposition later this afternoon. He has also served us on this side of the house as the leader of the party. It was a privilege for me to represent our side of the house with Iain, as his deputy, and I thank him for the extra work, time and commitment it takes to do so.

May I say that, while some may wish to dwell on the differences between Iain and me, we have had much in common. Of course, each of us have been party to beating the footpaths during election campaigns, and there have been dozens of those at the state and federal levels. We have each been strong advocates for electoral reform and in public policy discussions.

Can I say to the members here that you have had the benefit of witnessing Iain in full flight in debate. Sometimes, if we had a different view, I would have to say that the sort of reasoned argument that went with it was a bit thin, but it was always entertaining and it was always powerful. If I had not been on the other side of a few of those arguments, I would have actually been persuaded by them. He has demonstrated a very strong debating skill in this parliament, and he has been a powerful advocate for those he has represented on those occasions.

The public largely see him at community events, at the local football, on televisions or listen to him on radio, and have had the benefit of that contribution for now over 20 years. We on this side of the house also get to see Iain in the party room, in our private discussions, in Liberal Party meetings and in the party structures, and that is also very indicative of the commitment that Iain has made to what he stands for in this house. Again, we have that added advantage of being able to see his contributions. They are just as powerful, they are just as committed and they are just as effective, so we get to see that advantage more so.

Can I recognise his work in relation to the support of the federal structure. These are not occasions to dwell on constitutional reform but, perhaps for slightly different reasons, Iain and I have always been at one over the importance of states, state governments and state parliaments, the importance of keeping the services close to the public at the state level and not have everything run from Canberra, and our dismay at the ever-encroaching reach on the federation of Canberra under different Liberal and Labor governments.

He has studied that and advocated very much at a financial level. I hope that he will remain in the taxation debate that we will inevitably have to have in the public arena and in this parliament. His contribution will be valued and I hope will be welcomed by all.

His greatest personal quality, in my view, is that he likes people. If there is one thing that is important about coming in here to represent an electorate it is that you actually have to like people. I have seen a few who did not, and they were not really interested in identifying what the people want or the concerns they were expressing and wished to have represented. That is a fine quality of Iain's, and I think it will serve him well in his future career.

Fiona, you will get him back. He is a bit thinner. He has been thin and put on a bit of weight during this time, but you have got him back in shipshape condition for tomorrow's next enterprise—well done. Can I say from my brother, who served in a winning grand final in the under 17 Sturt team back in 1976, that he sends his good wishes to you, Iain. It was probably your finest hour and highest point in football; nevertheless, he sends his good wishes and recalls the great barbecue celebration they had afterwards. All the best, Iain.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

An honourable member interjecting:

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) (15:35): Unusually, it's not going to be a grievance. I also would like to say a few words, if I may, about the member for Davenport. Obviously, the member for Davenport preceded me in this place and, by the time I arrived here, he was quite an experienced campaigner. I learned some lessons very early as a consequence of his skills.

I remember very early on, because I was basically involved in reading things in the library and whatever, I thought it would be interesting to get involved in the CPA. There was a contest, on one occasion, for a regional delegate for the CPA. I cannot remember what year it was; Iain might be able to recall. In any event, as a sort of 'wet behind the years' type, I thought, 'That's alright. The government will support me, and that's all going to be very well.' Anyway, up until almost the last moment, it appeared that there was only one contestant for this proposition, and it appeared to be me at the time.

The weird thing, Mr Speaker, is that this was not a bad opportunity if you were into CPA, because you were actually a regional delegate, which means that you are obliged to visit other CPA people in quite a number of regions, and it sounded pretty damn interesting to me. Anyway, the vote came, the hooter went off, and we went to the other place. Then I realised that there had been a bereavement on our side of the house—I do not need to go into details—but it meant that a number our people had decided, quite reasonably, that they would attend to this matter which involved a friend of theirs who was a member of parliament.

At the same time, the member for Davenport's nomination went in, and he won. At the time, I thought, 'That's a bit rough,' but then I realised that it was actually just clever. Anyway, I have to say that there is a happy ending to that story, because later on when he was not able to go, he used to say to me, 'You can fill in.' So, that was good.

The other thing I want to say is that I have had the opportunity since then, over a number of years, including a few years as a minister, to have the privilege of working with the member of Davenport, and can I say that that has always been a challenge in the sense that he is no slouch. He asks very difficult questions. I have often said to him that, if he had his time again, he could have made quite a good career as a barrister. He does this in committees, and he certainly does it in negotiations about matters, and that is that he asks really good questions.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Dangerous questions.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed. I just want to let members know that, last year, the member for Davenport, on behalf of the opposition, and I were engaged in a very complex process, I guess you would call it, of completely revamping our electoral laws in South Australia, intended to create greater probity, greater accountability, transparency, public funding and a whole range of other very complex and very difficult things, through a series of meetings, which went over many months, possibly the best part of a year, I cannot recall, but it was a very long time.

Can I say that those meetings were always conducted in a spirit of good faith, in a spirit where there was absolute confidence that the nature of those discussions remained within the group conducting those discussions, which were essentially the member for Davenport, me and I think Jeff Green and Reggie Martin, and we had, obviously, some other people who helped us from time to time. The end result of that was that we wound up producing what I believe to be the best set of laws of that type that any state in the commonwealth has. We are well in advance of the commonwealth. That was done with a minimum of fuss and it was done very much in a spirit of integrity and harmony.

I want to congratulate and thank the member for Davenport for that process and all of the other engagements we have had of that type, because it has always been a real privilege to be able to work with somebody who understands the importance of trust, particularly in this business. I wish you all the very best for your retirement.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

Bills

RETURN TO WORK BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Long title—After 'WorkCover Corporation Act 1994' insert:

, the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986

No. 2. Clause 2, page 11, line 5—Delete 'This Act' and substitute 'Subject to this section, this Act'

No. 3. Clause 2, page 11, lines 6 and 7—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

(2) Part 7A of Schedule 9 will be taken to have come into operation on 1 July 2013 immediately after the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Firefighters) Amendment Act 2013 is taken to have come into operation.

(3) Clause 27 of Schedule 9 will come into operation on 1 January 2015.

No. 4. Clause 18, page 35, after line 9—Insert:

(6a) If on an application under subsection (3) the Tribunal declines to make an order in favour of the worker under subsection (5), the Corporation is liable, subject to subsection (7) and to limits prescribed by the regulations—

(a) for the employer's reasonable costs of the proceedings before the Tribunal (unless those costs are covered by an award under subsection (8)(a)); and

(b) for the costs payable to the worker under subsection (6).

No. 5. Clause 33, page 48, line 34—Delete 'reasonable and necessary and'

No. 6. Clause 33, page 48, line 39—Delete 'as follows' and substitute 'the necessary costs of'

No. 7. Clause 33, page 48, line 40—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 8. Clause 33, page 49, line 1—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 9. Clause 33, page 49, line 3—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 10. Clause 33, page 49, line 4—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 11. Clause 33, page 49, line 10—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 12. Clause 33, page 49, line 12—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 13. Clause 33, page 49, line 16—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 14. Clause 33, page 49, line 18—Delete 'the cost of'

No. 15. Clause 33, page 49, line 20—Delete paragraph (i) and substitute:

(i) other services (or classes of services) authorised by the Corporation.

No. 16. Clause 33, page 49, line 33—Delete 'unreasonable.'

No. 17. Clause 55, page 68, line 35—After 'subsection (4)' insert:

(but subject to subsections (6) and (6a))

No. 18. Clause 55, page 68, line 37—Delete 'However, if' and substitute 'If'

No. 19. Clause 55, page 68, after line 40—Insert:

- (6a) Furthermore, if in relation to a worker who was working part-time at the relevant date there is evidence that, at the relevant date, the worker had a legally enforceable right to return to full-time work, the hours worked factor applying in relation to the worker will be based on full-time work.
- No. 20. Clause 98, page 97, after line 28—Insert:
- (2) Despite section 27 of the South Australian Employment Tribunal Act 2014, the Tribunal will conduct a review of a reviewable decision as a hearing de novo.
- No. 21. Clause 104, page 100, line 15—Delete 'section 43(10)' and substitute 'section 43(14)'
- No. 22. Clause 105, page 100, line 22—Delete 'section 49(1)(a) and (b)' and substitute:
section 51(1)(a) and (b)
- No. 23. Clause 105, page 100, line 26—Delete 'Section 49(1)(c)' and substitute:
Section 51(1)(c)
- No. 24. Clause 106, page 101, line 2—Delete 'section 104(2)(b)' and substitute:
section 43(13) of the South Australian Employment Tribunal Act 2014
- No. 25. Clause 106, page 101, line 28—Delete 'Section 55' and substitute 'Section 57'
- No. 26. Clause 137, page 118, after line 15—Insert:
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of a report under subsection (2) to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.
- No. 27. Clause 179, page 143, line 20—After 'employer' (first occurring) insert:
(or a representative of such an employer)
- No. 28. Clause 179, page 143, line 20—After 'employer' (second occurring) insert:
(or the representative)
- No. 29. Clause 180, page 144, after line 40—Insert:
- (11a) Section 17(1) of the Ombudsman Act 1972 does not apply in relation to a review under subsection (8).
- No. 30. Clause 203, page 156, after line 21—Insert:
- (ab) without limiting paragraph (a), whether the jurisdiction of the South Australian Employment Tribunal under this Act should be transferred to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal; and
- No. 31. Schedule 3, clause 1, page 160, after line 9—Insert:
- (1a) If—
- (a) a worker suffers an injury of a kind referred to in the first column of the table in this Schedule; and
- (b) the worker was a member of SACFS presumptively employed by the Crown as a firefighter—
- (i) on or after 1 July 2013; and
- (ii) before the injury occurred; and
- (iii) for the qualifying period referred to in the second column of the table opposite the injury; and
- (c) the injury occurred—
- (i) on or after 1 July 2013; and
- (ii) in the case of a worker who is no longer a member of SACFS presumptively employed by the Crown as a firefighter—no more than 10 years after the cessation of that presumptive employment; and
- (d) during the qualifying period referred to in paragraph (b)(iii), the worker was exposed to the hazards of a fire scene (including exposure to a hazard of the fire that occurred away from the scene),

the worker's injury is presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to have arisen from his or her presumptive employment by the Crown.

No. 32. Schedule 3, clause 1, page 160, line 10—Delete 'subclause (1)' and substitute:

subclauses (1) and (1a)

No. 33. Schedule 3, clause 1, page 160, lines 18 to 42 and page 161, lines 1 and 2—

Delete subclauses (3) and (4)

No. 34. Schedule 5, clause 5, page 164, after line 15—Insert:

and

(c) without limiting subclause (3), sections 17(1) and 25 of the Ombudsman Act 1972 do not apply in relation to a matter referred to the Ombudsman.

No. 35. Schedule 9, new Part, page 173, after line 8—Insert:

Part 7A—Amendment of Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986

22A—Amendment of section 31—Evidentiary provision

(1) Section 31(2b)(b), (c) and (d)—delete paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) and substitute:

(b) the worker was a member of the South Australian Country Fire Service (SACFS) presumptively employed by the Crown as a firefighter—

(i) on or after 1 July 2013; and

(ii) before the injury occurred; and

(iii) for the qualifying period referred to in the second column of Schedule 2A opposite the injury; and

(c) the injury occurred—

(i) on or after 1 July 2013; and

(ii) in the case of a worker who is no longer a member of SACFS presumptively employed by the Crown as a firefighter—no more than 10 years after the cessation of that presumptive employment; and

(d) during the qualifying period referred to in paragraph (b)(iii), the worker was exposed to the hazards of a fire scene (including exposure to a hazard of the fire that occurred away from the scene),

(2) Section 31(4a)—delete 'subsection (2a)' and substitute: 'subsections (2a) and (2b)'

(3) Section 31(4b)—delete subsection (4b)

No. 36. Schedule 9, clause 27, page 175, line 4—Delete subclause (4)

No. 37. Schedule 9, new Division, page 188, after line 23—Insert:

Division 11A—Review of provisions relating to firefighters

66A—Review

(1) In addition to causing a review of this Act to be conducted as required under section 203, the Minister must, as soon as possible after 1 July 2018, appoint a person to carry out a review concerning the operation and impact of—

(a) the amendments to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 made by the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Firefighters) Amendment Act 2013 and Part 7A of this Schedule; and

(b) Schedule 3 of this Act.

(2) The person appointed by the Minister under subclause (1) must present to the Minister a report on the outcome of the review no later than 4 months following his or her appointment.

(3) The Minister must, within 6 sitting days after receiving the report, have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I want to say a very few words about this matter because I indicate that it is my intention to accept all of the amendments that have returned from the Legislative Council. In so doing, I hope in a few minutes' time these pieces of legislation will pass from a bill to the law of the state. In doing that, I want to make some brief remarks. I am not going to canvass the merits or otherwise of the legislation because there has been more than enough time and words expended on that topic over a very long time.

I just wanted to say, for me, this is an exercise that began almost two years ago in January of last year when the Premier asked me to start looking at this question of the WorkCover scheme. Since that time, I have been struck by how much actual goodwill there is out there if you are prepared to sit down and talk to people and listen to what they have to say, do your genuine best to try to understand their point of view and try to accommodate them where you can. Of course, in an area as complex as this area, it is not possible to make everybody 100 per cent happy, but it is possible if you work hard enough to make most people feel that they have been listened to and treated with some degree of respect.

Therefore, what I would like to do is actually make some expressions of thanks to people because I believe that this legislation will, in the fullness of time, be seen to have been one of the great reforming pieces of legislation that this parliament has produced and it has produced it in a circumstance where I have to say—and I say this on the public record—the Leader of the Opposition has been very positive and very engaged in this process. He and I have had numerous talks about this matter over great lengths of time; in fact, if I recall, most of ANZAC Day was devoted to talking about this. We have had very positive engagement with the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Rob Lucas in particular on this. There have been, obviously, as you would expect, little bits and pieces where the Leader of the Opposition and the government have not seen absolutely eye to eye, but in the scheme of things they have been relatively minor matters and they have been resolved.

The first thanks that I wish to place on the record is to the Leader of the Opposition, to all of your members and the Hon. Rob Lucas, for the very constructive way in which you have engaged on this very important project. If the success of this project turns out to be what I really believe it will be, that success, by reason of your behaviour, is as much your success and the whole parliament's success as it is the government's success. I really do sincerely appreciate that support. I also have to say that, unusually for me—and I know this is going to be shocking for some people—I do wish to thank some of the crossbenchers in the other place, because they have assisted in bringing us to where we are now. I say to those members in the other place—they know who they are—I do really appreciate the fact that they have engaged constructively in relation to this matter.

The thanks I have just given relate to the very end of the process, not the whole long way it took to get there. I now want to express some thanks to some of the people who, for the last 18 months or so, have been working hard on this. I would like to acknowledge—and this is in no particular order—Joe Szakacs, the secretary, and Jamie Newlyn, president of SA Unions; the PSA; the AEU; the ANMF; United Voice; the CFMEU; the CPU; the SDA; the AWU; the AMWU; the NUW; and in particular some individuals there: David Gray, Donald Blairs and Peter Lamps.

From the employers side, can I say equally there is a long list of people who have been really helpful. I want to acknowledge Business SA; AiG; the MTA; the MBA; the NECA; the PIA; the Nursery & Gardening Association; the AHA; and the Aged Care Association; along with many other employer associations and, in particular, but not really to single them out, Rick Carney, Robin Shaw and Steve Myatt, all of whom have been very helpful.

Of course, one part of this scheme is lawyers and, yes, we have engaged with lawyers for a long time. I have to acknowledge and thank the Law Society, The Australian Lawyers Alliance, but in particular Steve Dolphin, Mark Calligeros and Patrick Boylen, all of whom have made a fantastic contribution in assisting us in refining this.

I want to thank some people at WorkCover, soon to be Return to Work SA, who have done an extraordinary amount of work in supporting this project and without whose help this would have been completely impossible. Of course, Greg McCarthy, the chief executive, has been outstanding.

I should perhaps not tell parliament this, but I will. I did say, I think at the closing of the second reading in this place, that if this bill passes, 'Greg it's over to you, sunshine.' Apparently, he is now known over there as 'Ray' as in little ray of sunshine, and nobody calls him Greg anymore, and I am thinking of getting him some Ray Bans, because he is going to have a busy time over the next few months getting ready for this. I thank Michael Francis, Rob Cordiner, Julia Oakley, Emma Siami, Trudy Minett, Rachel Fitton and John O'Loughlin. Special attention to Trudy, Emma, Rachel and John for their immense assistance to me and also to minister Hunter in the other place, without whom this task would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Richard Dennis, that doyen of parliamentary drafting, Richard Ewatt and Jo Ryan have all been fantastic. They have done a great job in supporting us. The number of times we sat around the table and threw ideas around and literally developed things only to change our minds and have to do it again, Richard's patience is incredible.

There are many others, but the last group of people I want particularly to thank are my personal staff who have worked extraordinary hours to keep this happening. Obviously, my chief of staff Kim Eldridge; Stephen Pinches; Libby Eatts—Libby, as you probably know, is the one who drives us all to keep passing legislation; Erin Sneath; Clare Scriven, for her work in the workers compensation improvement project; and, last but certainly not least, Jim Watson, who has done the most extraordinary amount of work.

In fact, I told him today that we will have to change his name from Jim to Boutros Boutros because of his diplomatic skills in being able to explain this to everybody. He has a career in the United Nations if he gets sick of doing this sort of work. To all of those people, thank you very much. I commend the amended bill to the house.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL BILL

Final Stages

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

- No. 1. Clause 43, page 24, line 11—Delete 'special circumstances' and substitute 'good reasons'
- No. 2. Clause 43, page 24, line 15—Delete 'special circumstances' and substitute 'good reasons'
- No. 3. Clause 43, page 24, line 17—Delete 'circumstances' and substitute 'reasons'
- No. 4. Clause 92, page 42, line 4—After 'Tribunal' insert 'after consultation with the Minister'

Consideration in committee.

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

That the amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Members

EVANS, HON. I.F.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:52): At last, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is pesky when the business of the state gets in the way.

Ms REDMOND: It is indeed, especially on such an important occasion as this. I have been contemplating what I could possibly say that is adequate in terms of noting the departure of, I hope my good friend, Iain Evans. They say in politics that if you want a friend, buy a dog. I hope that Iain leaves this place after 21 years knowing that he indeed has rather a lot of good friends here and that they will remain with him, whether he likes it or not, for a lot of years to come.

Iain is actually one of the last members of the Evans family that I met. I think I met his auntie Jean first, then maybe his uncle Bob, then dad Stan and then mum Barb. Of course, his brother

Andrew has been my plumber for over 35 years and his sister Yvonne taught my children at Stirling East Primary School. She was the best teacher they ever had. He is indeed blessed to have not only all these wonderful brothers and sisters—I should also mention Daphne, David and Robert up there as well, the whole gang is here—but also Fiona, his wonderful wife and mother of their four children, Staten, Alexander, Fraser and Allison, who are all sitting in the front row. They are a credit to both of them, but I suspect Iain would acknowledge that a lot of it has to do with Fiona because he has been so dedicated to his job in this place and as the member for Davenport throughout much of the children's early lives. They were quite young when he became a member 21 years ago.

Iain came into this place with community service in his DNA. If you add up the years of service to the community, exhibited by the people sitting in the gallery today, you would find that it would amount to many hundreds of years over all the organisations they have served, sometimes 30, 40 and 50 years, on all sorts of organisations.

Iain came into this place with not just a sporting background in both cricket and football but a background in serving the community very significantly through Apex, becoming national president. I think he even rode a bike across the Nullarbor Plain before coming to this place. He had actually had quite a long and creditable history of community service, as well as, of course, like the member for Kavel and the member for Bragg, being the child of a politician and having had a long involvement in the political process. I know that that family connection and that community connection served him very well when coming in as the member for Davenport 21 years ago.

Iain was, in my view, a consummate politician and he covers the whole breadth. Some people come in here and they are good at doing the parliamentary stuff but not so good at doing the out in the community stuff; others come in who are fabulous in their community but may not be so good with the parliamentary stuff. Iain, as I say, was a consummate politician. He was across all the issues. He was always out in his community doorknocking, right through his 21 years, always communicating with his electorate and always understanding what their issues were.

In addition to that, he has been one of our most formidable parliamentary performers. I love his debating style and, if I knew Iain was going to do a grievance, I would always stay in the chamber to listen because it would always be entertaining and worth hanging around for. Iain also has a really good analytical, legal mind, so anyone who has been here when he has done the committee stage of bill and he has skewered the people on the other side could have learnt a lot of lessons—even the lawyers amongst us.

I know that before the member for Bragg and I were elected in 2002, Iain had to represent the legal processes because the only lawyers on our side happened to be in the upper house. Iain, needless to say, as a builder, had to do all the legal work down in the lower house, but he was very good at it. An earlier speaker—I think the Attorney-General himself—has already indicated that he would indeed have made an excellent barrister. As well as that, of course, he is an astute political strategist with that long corporate knowledge. He is highly regarded, I am sure, by everyone in our team and we will certainly miss his wise counsel.

The member for Davenport's work ethic is second to none. Very few people, I consider, would have actually continued in Iain's situation. Being one of the original superannuation scheme people who had been a minister for some time, I am sure he would have been better off financially staying at home rather than coming to work, but he came to work every day and worked hard every day, putting in a lot of effort to try to help us to get into government.

As well as that, he is also a very funny guy; some people maybe do not know that, especially those on the other side. He is a very funny guy and, in fact, the family themselves are pretty funny. I have had discussions with his mother before now because we are always puzzled. I am from a family of five children as well—and indeed there is an Evans back there, so I think maybe I am related to them in some peculiar way. When they have a family get-together, there is usually a song that goes with it.

Most recently, there was a significant anniversary for Stan and Barb, and the five children had got together and prepared a song that took them through the years of their long marriage and ended with all sorts of fun and games. It was a wonderful celebration. That is typical of what happens with the Evans family. As I say, I know I have spoken with Barb previously about people bemoaning

the fact that Christmas is coming, that it is so terrible because the family all gets together and that there are all these terrible stresses, when in fact, like my family, when this family gets together it is just fun and games and a lot of laughter.

When Iain became a minister, he actually stole one of my staffers. The staffer had been a waiter at Rigoni's. I am sure you are all familiar with Rigoni's. Trevor was a waiter at Rigoni's. I acted for the owner and Trevor came to work for me as a student studying law and politics at Adelaide Uni. He came to work one day and said, 'Do you know Iain Evans?' I said, 'Yes, of course I know Iain Evans.' He said, 'I've been assigned to Iain's office as a political intern through,' who was it?

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Clem Macintyre.

Ms REDMOND: Clem Macintyre. 'He's assigned me to Iain's office,' he said, so he went to work for Iain just on a political intern basis. I was paying Trevor a paltry sum, being a university student at the time and me having a very small legal practice. When Iain became a minister, he actually rang me and said, 'Where can I contact Trevor? I'm about to offer him a job as an adviser.' In a moment, I will tell you a bit more about Trevor, but he stole Trevor from me. Iain went on to have all sorts of adventures as a minister, with Trevor some of the time as his chief of staff.

I will remark on one little moment when he became the minister for racing and his brother Andrew gave him a sugar cube. Iain said, 'What's that for?' He said, 'So you can figure out which is the front of the horse.' If I may, I will just read briefly from an email I got from Trevor earlier this week, because I contacted him advising him that Iain would be retiring today. He said he was:

...interned to Iain as a young, naive law student, helping Iain (then a backbencher in his first term) to develop legislation to reform recreational greenways. Following the Olsen election in 1998, Iain took me under his wing as a ministerial advisor and, following his appointment to cabinet, as chief of staff.

He talks about Iain's work ethic, and so on, but then he talks about the things that they got going. He said:

Our first go was at prostitution reform but, unfortunately, we never got a leg up on that one. Next, we introduced the emergency services levy. That was popular. So we moved on to renegotiating the police enterprise bargaining with Peter Alexander and the newly appointed police commissioner Mal Hyde. Let's just say it was not without its challenges.

The police portfolio, however, was not without its entertainment. I recall my first ministerial council in Wellington, New Zealand. Joe Hockey was still a rookie MP and Amanda Vanstone was federal minister for justice. Iain and I had a bet that I couldn't get Mal Hyde smoking a cigar and Amanda Vanstone drinking Jameson's straight—or was it the other way around? Let's just say, I won the bet.

I will just close with Trevor's comment that it was during his time in Iain's office that:

...a romance began to bubble in Iain's office and I owe Iain so much gratitude for so many things. My office romance has now become my loving family. My wife April of 16 years and our two children aged 14 and nine all started in Iain's office of industry and trade. Both April and I wish Iain and Fiona the best of luck for the future. Cheers, mate—

Trevor's email finishes.

One of the most important things, though, was Iain's passion for the environment and, when he held the portfolio of the environment, he added many, many hectares to the state estate in the national parks. He also protected the yellow-footed rock wallaby and I think he even had an involvement in declaring the leafy sea dragon our marine emblem for the state.

Even when he became the shadow minister when we moved into opposition (when I came into the parliament), he developed the 2006 policy document for the environment which the Conservation Council at the time said was the best policy document on the environment they had seen in 10 years. He has a passion for the environment that has actually made a difference to this state, and I hope that is one of the things of which he will be very proud.

I do not want to take up too much time, but I want to tell two quick stories about Iain as leader. I relished having Iain as leader and want to tell two quick stories, one quite serious. When Iain was leader, he, very graciously, made me shadow attorney-general. In that role, I had some serious misgivings about the way the federal government was treating David Hicks and, indeed, the Labor government on the other side had moved a motion condemning the federal Liberal government for their treatment of David Hicks. I had given the party room notice, but Iain, obviously, as leader had

to tolerate a shadow attorney-general getting up in this place and supporting a Labor motion condemning the federal Liberal government, which was very generous of him. He neither accepted my resignation nor sacked me from the position of shadow attorney.

But the more fun thing I want to talk about was an occasion on which I went out of my office in Stirling to drive down to the parliament and, when I got to the car, I noticed that there was a little card under the front wiper.

Members interjecting:

Ms REDMOND: Some people know what's coming. Before starting the car, I got out and I got this card from under the wiper: it was Iain Evans' business card. I turned it over and it said, 'I love you.' To say that I was taken aback would be an understatement. Iain and I have been good friends, but there was absolutely, never in my wildest imaginings, anything that could have led to me getting a note on my windshield that said, 'I love you' from the leader of the opposition. When I got down to parliament I thought, 'I've just got to find out why I've got this note. We need to have a talk. If there is something I need to know, Iain, now is the time to tell me.'

I went around to see him, and the leader was actually involved in momentous discussions—it was a sitting day, obviously. As soon as he saw me go past the door of his office he came bounding out at the rate of knots, most concerned, and said, 'Did you get a note under your windscreen wiper?' I said, 'Well, yes, I did. That's what I've come around to see you about.'

It turned out that with this parliamentary car business, we both had cars that were almost identical: same make, same model, same colour—almost the same numberplate—and when he saw my car parked at the front of parliament he thought that his wife, Fiona, had parked the car there and so he put a note to his wife under the windscreen wiper.

When he got home he said to Fiona, 'Did you get my note?' She said, 'No, what note?' He thought she was having a go at him and pretending she had not got it. Finally, she convinced him that her car had not been parked there and she had not received any note. Then, all night they were panicked about who got this note—because it could have been anyone in the parliament who had a parliamentary car. Luckily for him, it was me, and I knew that as much as we are good friends, he did not mean to give me a note that said, 'I love you'.

I close by saying it has been a privilege and an honour to serve with the Hon. Iain Evans. He has been a mentor, a guide, a wonderful contributor to the parliament—to the parliamentary process—and, of course, particularly to the Liberal parliamentary team. I hope he will remain a friend, not just to me but to many of us. I know that his family will be happy to have him back with them for a change—or at least I think at this stage they would like to have him back with them for a change. He has made an enormous contribution to this state in so many ways and should leave this place proud of what he has achieved and pleased that, unlike so many who come into this place, he is leaving at the time of his own choosing. I wish him, and his family, all the best for his future—wherever it takes him.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 28 October 2014.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I refer to Part B, Volume 2, page 450, contingent liabilities. In reference to the agreement indemnifying the commonwealth from any third party losses or damages arising from a failure by the state to complete the common user facility and in accordance with the agreed design and schedule or meet the agreed performance criteria, are you aware of any potential claims of this agreement?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The quick answer to the member for Stuart is no. Defence SA has recognised a contingent liability with respect to a claim from ElectraNet for additional unforeseen costs associated with the undergrounding of powerlines on Mersey Road. To elaborate

on that, Defence SA engaged ElectraNet in 2011-12 to place underground a section of a 66kV powerline along Mersey Road to facilitate the transfer of large items from the Techport Australia common user facility to the CUF expansion across Mersey Road. Following completion of the works in November 2012, ElectraNet lodged a claim for additional unforeseen costs associated with the contracted works. Defence SA is disputing the claim, which remains outstanding, but such events are not uncommon in the normal course of business.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What is the size of that claim that is in dispute?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: There is some uncertainty as to where that will land, but my advice is that a figure of around \$300,000 was the opening point, so it will be at some point around that.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Same volume, page 442—Defence Industry Development. Has the review of South Australia's defence strategy been completed and handed to the minister in early August, as per advice to the house during budget estimates back in July 2014?

The CHAIR: What page are you on, member for Stuart?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Page 442.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, progress on that has been considerable. I have seen a draft, but I have held that over for a moment while we deal with the more pressing issue of the defence white paper submission. The consultation was linked to the summit, and one or two other pressing matters needed attention in first order. I would expect, however, that that strategy will be through cabinet very soon, and that you will certainly see it before Christmas.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Just for clarification, are you not the recipient of the strategy?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I think the strategy to which you are referring is the government strategy, so it will be a strategy of government that will be made public.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Now that, as was announced today, the government submission on the white paper has been put to the federal government, how much longer do you estimate it will take to get this strategy completed, presented to you and made public?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I have seen drafts already—fairly advanced drafts—so I do not think it will be long at all. I cannot give you a date, but I would imagine we will have action on that within a month.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The next page is 443, and the reference is consultants. What additional consultancy work was done by Defence SA to explain the increase in expenditure from 2012-13 to 2013-14?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Full-year spend in 2013-14 on consultants was \$399,000, predominantly for strategic advisory services in relation to positioning Techport Australia as a strategic contingent facility for US Navy Voyage, emergent repair and maintenance and crew R&R. This is something we have been pursuing for some time.

When a contract is executed during the year, in accordance with the Department of Treasury and Finance accounting policy framework, Defence SA assesses whether the engagement is a contractor or a consultant, Defence SA expenditure on consultant services generally for specific strategic policy advice, industry surveys or economic modelling. Recent and forecast expenditure is as follows: 2012-13, \$224,000; 2013-14, actual expenditure was \$399,000; and budgeted in 2014-15 is \$82,000.

In 2013-14, consultant expenditure of \$399,000 was largely to US-based Fletcher Rowley Inc., with \$359,000 paid to them to provide strategic advisory services in relation to positioning Techport Australia as a strategic contingent facility for US Voyage and emergent repair and maintenance, as I mentioned earlier. That consultancy has now concluded. The US Voyage repair strategy is ongoing, with Defence SA in dialogue with the US government and navy representatives on the matter.

Mr WHETSTONE: We will start off on page 1151, Volume 3, Overseas representative officers, in reference to where the department funds their operations. What were the final costs, including contractor and audit fees, to close the Singapore, Dubai, Shanghai and India offices in 2012-13, as stated in the report?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Net expenditure for overseas offices was \$0.462 million in 2013-14 and \$1.026 million in 2012-13, which was a decrease of around \$0.564 million. The main reason for the reduction in that expenditure is due to the closure of the offices the member mentioned; hence, operations were only part of year.

The Dubai office closed on 30 September 2012, the Singapore office on 30 September 2012, the India office on 31 January 2013, and the Shanghai office in China closed on 30 June 2013. Although the Shanghai office was formally closed on 30 June 2013, two staff members remained, one until the end of December 2013 to assist with the post closure tasks, and a second staff member until 30 September 2013, when her statutory maternity leave ended.

The main reason for the increment in net expenditure in China is due to the engagement of a Chinese legal firm, approved by the Crown Solicitor's Office under Treasurer's Instruction 10, to assist in the closure of the Shanghai office; there are some licensing requirements that need to be dealt with carefully. The Jinan office in China will remain open as the only stand-alone office SA maintains in China. The costs relating to the overseas representation provided through Austrade are not included in these figures I have mentioned; these costs are shown elsewhere in the budget papers.

Mr WHETSTONE: What overseas SA-only trade offices does the government now operate?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: We have an office, as I mentioned, in Jinan, in Shandong Province. We have, as you know, an office in London, the Agent-General's Office, but that falls under the administration of the Premier. It does work for us but we do not account for it. Our other overseas representations are in Shanghai, where we have a person placed with Austrade, at the Shanghai office, if you like, administered by them, but we fund that single position: they work for us but with Austrade. We have a similar arrangement in Hong Kong, where we have a person. We have put someone into Mumbai, imbedded again with Austrade. So, it is just the three: Mumbai, Shanghai and Hong Kong. But, of course, we are considering the South-East Asia strategy at the moment, and obviously under consideration is where we might place someone in South-East Asia and we have not reached a landing on that at this point.

Mr WHETSTONE: The spend on operating overseas trade offices has reduced from \$1.249 million in 2013 to \$492,000 in 2014. Are the savings from the reduction of those spendings on overseas trade offices being redirected to other trade and export-related expenditure?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I will have to come back to him with a detailed answer on that specific amount, but I will just say to him I am reviewing all of the budget arrangements within this portfolio at present.

We are only talking a relatively small amount of money in budget terms at about \$21 million. Frankly, as you could probably gather from what I am saying, I would be arguing that perhaps we need to put a bit more effort into this area. As a matter of interest, I recently added up the amount the government was spending on a raft of economic portfolios and looked at that as a percentage of government's overall spending effort, and it is quite a small percentage, yet this is the area that generates the wealth and the income from which we drive other services. I assure the member that if there are any dollars saved as a result of the closing of offices, I will make sure that we apply that expeditiously to other programs.

I think there is a lot of work to be done to create jobs, particularly in the regions, like in the member's electorate where there is so much opportunity yet to be realised and there are so many producers who probably could export but need a bit of a hand or a bit of encouragement. Whatever dollars we have that we have saved will be deployed appropriately. I will seek an answer specifically to what happened to that amount of money as a result of the closure of that office and how the balancing items work with regard to our embedding of people with Austrade and come back to the member.

Mr WHETSTONE: Moving on to Volume 3, page 1151, under Commonwealth Revenues. There is a line that refers to TradeStart, and an explanation on the following page reads that the trade agenda for this funding agreement, a period of approximately 3½ years, ended on 31 August 2014. Initially it was 30 June 2014. Can the minister explain why the funding agreement deadline was extended and what the funding agreement is with TradeStart, given that the current one ended on 31 August?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: This is a pretty interesting program, TradeStart. The former DMITRE's net contribution to TradeStart in 2013 was \$301,000 with a contribution of \$321,000 from Austrade. DMITRE's net contribution to TradeStart in 2012-13 was \$331,000 with a contribution of \$338,000 from Austrade. This is based on the existing tender between DMITRE and Austrade which is in its final year. We have just successfully renegotiated that arrangement for an extended term.

It is a key mechanism for the commonwealth and the state to cooperate in promoting trade effort. I want to say how impressed I have been in the short time I have been the minister with the activities of Andrew Robb, the federal minister, who has got all the trade ministers from the various states together under a Team Australia approach in a whole host of ways ranging from the B20 to other conferences. He is working very hard to get the states harnessed around the commonwealth's more broad agenda because we have resources deployed, and I think Austrade falls within the ambit of that.

The Department of State Development uses that money under commonwealth guidelines to employ five export advisers to cover the state. They are in various locations; I think one of them might even be in the member's area. They do a pretty good job on our behalf. We have a TradeStart adviser in the north and west of SA, a TradeStart adviser in the South-East. We have a 0.5 position also in the South-East, we have two in the city, a lot of them working in the regions and helping people in the regions, so it is a pretty successful program. They are helping quite a lot of people, and that has all been reported on in the budget.

I am reasonably happy with the way that is working, but I am asking my agency if we can do things better, particularly in regard to working more cooperatively with business associations and the business sector more generally to get better access to farmers and small businesses that might need help. Again, this is an area that I am reviewing to see if we are getting maximum bang for buck, and I will be very happy to brief the member on what we are doing there at a convenient time.

Mr WHETSTONE: Just on that, is there an Austrade officer on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The five export advisers who cover this state, I am advised, are based, as I mentioned, in the Adelaide CBD and suburbs, where there are two. In the Riverland, there is a 0.4 position, and in the Limestone Coast and Upper Spencer Gulf there is one FTE. I do not see a briefing note here that says there is someone on the West Coast; however, I will check that. I think that is a very good question, and we probably do need to apply some effort there.

As I said, I am just reviewing all these people at the moment to see if they are engaged. It may be that the two FTEs we have based in Adelaide at Hindmarsh Square in the investment and trade agency are actually working with people on the West Coast. It may be that, although they are not physically located there, they might be very effectively engaged there. I will report back to the member on what activity we have had with businesses, farmers, industries on the West Coast and send that information to the member.

Mr WHETSTONE: I remember at estimates I asked you that question, and you said that you were going to look at it, so I urge you to look at it because that was some time ago. Given that South Australian Austrade offices have exceeded targets in previous years, has the state government considered expanding regional office hours? For instance, we have 0.4 in the Riverland. Would you consider the merit of engaging officers with more time?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: First of all, I thank the member for reminding me about budget estimates. I will just send a signal to my agency through *Hansard* that I will be asking for a report from them on any questions I have not answered; I will make sure that I come back to you on that. Yes, we would be prepared to consider new approaches in the Riverland and elsewhere. My

question to the agency is: where do we need to put the TradeStart officers to get best bang for buck, to get best performance?

The question I am asking them is: do we need to put more people out into the regions and say, 'Here we are, come and see us, we are here to help,' or would we be better to partner up with organisations more effectively, like Food SA, rural producers or primary producers associations, Business SA, certain industry associations, or even couple up more effectively with RDAs or with organisations that have a membership base who can then feed our information and services out to a distribution list of people?

I am just asking that because it raises the question: do you need to physically be in that particular region to get to a lot of businesses in that region, or would a better model be to be central, contact them all electronically or physically, then go out and visit on a mobile basis at various times and then come back to a central point? I must say that I am attracted to the idea of working more effectively with rural industry associations. I think Food SA do a great job. I have also met with Rob Kerin, and I think his organisation has reach as well. I am just asking whether we can get our TradeStart officers to work even more effectively with those organisations and by so doing get out into places like the Riverland more effectively than we are at the moment.

I am just a new minister with a fresh set of eyes asking all those questions over again. I am very happy to come back to the house once that process is complete with some fresh approaches on TradeStart. Obviously, we will need to consult with the commonwealth on that because their money is deployed and they place certain requirements on us, so whatever we do we will have to comply with the commonwealth's wishes, but we are working on it.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you for that, minister. I refer to Volume 3, page 1166, Transactions with SA government—Expenses, and \$16,000 was expended to the SA government on overseas trade representation in 2014. Can you outline which SA government organisations received the \$16,000 in overseas trade representation funding and what was the money for?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I thank the member for that thorough question. My advice is that we would not have that level of information with us today, so I will have to take it on notice and get back to the member with a detailed breakdown of that amount.

Mr WHETSTONE: Also under travel-related expenses, how much money was spent on travel relating to overseas trade missions in the reporting period?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Due to the nature of the department's activities, overseas travel is a common occurrence, of course, because it is the agency for trade and investment. I am advised that several trips were undertaken to achieve agency-wide benefits and involved key officers from various areas across the agency. This has resulted in individual trip spending in different ministerial portfolios.

As a result, the details below relate to overseas travel for the entire department, and I will mention them in a moment. Costs relating to the minister, the minister's staff and others include airfares, accommodation, meals and travel, while costs for the departmental officers also include salaries. The activities we undertake are consistent with Premier and Cabinet Circular 013 annual Reporting Requirements. Costs for travel to New Zealand are not included.

The cost of overseas travel incurred by the department during 2013-14 for departmental officers was \$860,980. For a minister or minister's staff and other persons, it was \$175,126. Thus the total cost for overseas travel in 2013-14 was \$1.036 million compared with \$994,000 in 2012-13. The number of trips, by the way, in 2013-14 of all natures was 39, with 34 trips in 2012-13. The average cost of a trip in 2013-14 was \$26,567, which was less than the average cost of trips in 2012-13, which was \$29,254. That is the broad information.

Can I just say that this again is an area where the government is conducting a review. The Premier has an excellent grasp on this issue and wants all ministers to coordinate and synchronise their activities so that if, for example, the minister for education is in India, when they come back there is a proper debrief and then, when the minister for primary industries goes two months later, there is a handover and they are able to connect up again with the officers and representatives in country in the full knowledge of what preceded you. This is an area where we want to go even further.

It is also apparent that we could probably improve the regularity of our travel, perhaps even make travel to certain destinations at the same time each year. In that way we could communicate with primary producers, industry and industry associations and give them a bit of notice so that in June every year we could go to one particular destination, in October every year we could go to another destination, and they could budget and prepare and plan.

So we are reviewing this but, if we want to engage, we do have to travel, we do have to get over there, we have to do things. Can I also say that we are very heavily engaged with Shandong Province at officer level, with a high-level engagement approach where we are sending over senior officers from our agencies to work with senior officers in China doing all sorts of things. That has partly resulted in such an amazing outcome in the last few years, with our trade to China virtually tripling. So, we are getting dividends.

That is the other thing I would like to measure: the product of such visits and such activity. I think if we do it well and invest well in that travel, we can get a dividend back for South Australian businesses, and that is a good thing.

Mr WHETSTONE: On the same page, under Grants and subsidies, expenses, can you outline the total applications and grant spending for the Gateway Business Program in this financial year and advise what is planned for the program going forward?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: This is another program I am taking quite a keen interest in with a view to asking whether or not we can get more juice out of the engine, so to speak—and I know the member will be comfortable with that term. The Department of State Development offers funding of up to \$25,000 over two years for eligible South Australian exporters, mostly small to medium-size enterprises, to support export market development activities for their businesses.

Given the challenge of the export environment and exporters' focus on the domestic Australian market over the last three years, the gateway budget has been revised and refocused on a number of occasions. Personally, I am not convinced that we are actually getting as much value out of this program as we could be. I think some of funds have been underdeployed in some years going back in time for various reasons, perhaps because the rules have been a little stringent. There is a range of reasons, so I am just reviewing that to see whether or not we can deploy more funds and even grow the size of that particular program.

Actual spend in 2013 was \$95,476. The Gateway Business Program involves competitive grant application processes and a strong focus on preparing companies for export. The grant was originally announced, as the member would know, back in November 2010. Companies are expected to match the 50 per cent funding offered under Gateway should they be successful in obtaining a grant, and individual activity caps range from \$2,000 to \$10,000. Again, I think it is a good program, but it could always be improved and we are working on that.

Mr WHETSTONE: Moving back to Volume 3, page 1149 of the report, the number of employees in the department for 2014 was 58, with 28 TVSPs or early termination payments in 2013-14. How many of those staff worked directly under the umbrella of the Globally Integrating the South Australian Economy program?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I will be answering the member, but one thing I have noticed is that, as a minister, you get copious quantities of chopped-down trees in the form of binders full of paper. Can I say that under the investment, trade and strategic project operations area we have around 18 FTEs; in the TradeStart area, around four; in the population policy area, around six; and in the immigration area around 10. That is a rough figure, but it is a fluid thing.

I will have to come back to the member with a detailed breakdown of exactly what numbers are deployed under which specific programs. A bit of restructuring and reorganisation has gone on in the past 12 months, with possibly more coming as a result of the creation of DSD from the former DMITRE, so there has been quite a bit of shifting around. We are just steadying that down at the moment, and I will probably have more accurate advice for the member in the near future. Employees receiving a TVSP in 2013-14, I am advised, from my agency included two people from Immigration SA, and I think that was it from my agency.

The CHAIR: Having reached the end of our allotted time, I thank the minister and his advisers and request the changeover to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport and Minister for Racing. We are leading off with agriculture, food and fisheries. You could ask the question and tell me what page and we could get ourselves organised.

Mr PEDERICK: In regard to the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, I refer to Volume 4, page 1441. The report notes that 15 of the 119 pay point managers were yet to undertake training, but the department had indicated this would be completed by the end of August 2014. Can the minister confirm if this has occurred?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The audit review of controls relating to the payroll environment highlighted areas to improve existing controls, and those issues have already been addressed. I guess that is the good thing about having the Auditor-General come in and look through departments to pick up on things that can be improved. We have certainly acted on that already.

During the 2013-14 review of payroll processing, audit identified at the time of their audit that there were inconsistent practices in the review of bona fide certificates and leave returns. Audit identified that, while the majority of pay point managers had completed online training, 15 out of 119 pay point managers had yet to undertake the training. I am advised that all current PIRSA pay point managers, including any new managers, have now completed the online training. This was achieved by the end of August 2014, with the training designed to ensure pay point managers understand their responsibilities when reviewing and certifying bona fide certificates and monthly leave returns.

In addition, a report is being distributed every six weeks to divisional business managers to verify the ongoing accuracy of the pay point manager listing and to ensure all new managers have undertaken the online training as part of their induction to the role. PIRSA has also provided to all current pay point managers updated procedures on the review of bona fide certificates and leave returns, reinforcing their responsibilities and the consistent approach of review required by all pay point managers.

Mr PEDERICK: In relation to that, minister, you may have answered most of it in regard to whether the department has a credible process in place to identify new pay point managers and ensure they complete online training prior to approving bona fide certificates and leave returns and, also, exercising human resource delegations.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, that has all been incorporated in the new training and the induction as well for new people coming on board.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to Volume 4, page 1442. The report recommends that PIRSA review the business needs for officers to have administration access to enter demerit points and consider system or process changes to allow a reduction in the number of officers with this access which the department agreed to investigate. I can say that demerit points is a matter that lies very deep in the heart of commercial fishermen. Can the minister confirm if there has yet been a reduction in the number of officers with administration-level access?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Audit identified at the time of the review of the Primary Industries Information Management System (PIIMS)—which is the system used to manage fisheries licensing activities—that PIRSA considers system or process changes to allow a reduction in the number of officers with administration-level access.

PIRSA subsequently undertook a systems review and has changed the access levels required by a majority of the users for the purpose of entering demerit points. This has reduced the number of users with fisheries administration-level access in PIIMS from 10 to four. This lower-level system access for clerical officers entering demerit points has further strengthened current controls with only senior administrative staff and managers now having administration-level access.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to Volume 4, page 1444. The report mentions that SARDI did not record milestone reports for November and December 2013 due to unplanned staff absences. Can the minister explain these staff absences and if SARDI is now resourced to deal with future staff absences?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The audit review of SARDI revenue for 2013-14 considered control arrangements implemented by the department and the testing of transactions processed through the standard invoicing system. This highlighted some areas for improvement to strengthen existing controls, and most of these issues have already been addressed.

Mr PEDERICK: With regard to that, you say that most of the issues have been addressed, but is SARDI now fully resourced to deal with future staff absences so these milestone reports are recorded on time?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Audit noted that for the months of November and December 2013 the project by milestone details reports were not issued for divisional review as per the SARDI contract management procedures due to unplanned staff absences, as you said.

I am advised that despite the reports not being produced, the operational staff responsible for monitoring and following up milestone status actions continued with these activities as a matter of routine by using the contract system online in the absence of distributed reports. To mitigate the risk of unforeseen staff absences, a further two backup staff have now been trained in the generation and distribution of these reports coupled with an easy-to-follow instruction sheet.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to Volume 4, page 1444. As at May 2014, the milestone details report noted 66 milestones totalling about \$2 million where no explanation was provided regarding why the milestones were overdue. Of these 66, 32 milestones totalling \$1.3 million were more than 30 days overdue. Can the minister provide details of the \$2 million worth of milestones not recorded and why no explanation was provided?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I do not have the specific details, but I am advised that this snapshot in time does not reflect any concern over the management of funds relating to these projects but, rather, there are some housekeeping matters that have now been addressed.

The overdue project milestones had been investigated but not documented in the system. The importance of tracking outstanding milestones is acknowledged, and maintaining a complete and up-to-date record of actions has been reinforced with the six relevant administrative staff. Improvements to recording practices have been developed and were implemented with staff during July 2014. In the recent project by milestone details report run in October 2014, all items have an entry to explain any overdue milestones.

Mr PEDERICK: In regard to the overdue milestones, can the minister provide any more detail regarding the processes in place to report the \$1.3 million worth of milestones that were more than 30 days overdue?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: There are no additional processes being put in place. We just made it clear that the processes that are there have to be followed.

Mr PEDERICK: But just in line with that, minister, what checks have you put in place to make sure that happens? Sometimes these things will just go on and on.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: As I mentioned a bit earlier, all the staff were brought together in July to reinforce the proper process that they need to go through. In October, when they ran the project by milestone details report, all the items had an entry to explain any overdue milestones. I think it was probably something that went wrong. It was identified, and it has now been fixed.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to page 1440 in regard to expenditure, and a review of the systems used by the department and SSSA to process departmental expenditure. The audit found that:

- changes to the Basware access levels were only being approved by managers in instances where there was a change in financial delegation, with other changes being approved by the Procurement Advisory Unit prior to being sent to SSSA. This practice was not consistent with the established requirement for approval of all changes by managers

I am only going from memory, minister, but I think this has been ongoing for several years. What procedures are being put in place to tighten this up?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Audit identified at the time of the audit that current practices were not technically consistent with the documented approval procedures for changes to Basware

access limits. PIRSA demonstrated that there was no risk associated with the current practice and the controls in place. Audit acknowledged that the current practice was appropriate, and PIRSA updated the procedures for this minor administrative change in June 2014.

Mr WHETSTONE: Did you swap that tie with the minister for corrections?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, sir, it does not have his name on it.

The CHAIR: Are we moving to another area, member for Chaffey?

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes, I am moving to the Office for Recreation and Sport.

The CHAIR: So, those advisers will need to scurry down the corridor fairly quickly. What is your question page?

Mr WHETSTONE: My question page is 1275, Volume 4. A review of the grants payments function revealed certain areas where internal controls required improvement, including the identification and management of potential conflicts of interest and grant recipients not formally accepting funding within required time frames. Minister, how have you ensured improved identification and management of potential conflicts of interest within the sport and rec grant expenditure?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The Office for Recreation and Sport human resources and funding assessment committees' conflicts of interest information will be cross-checked prior to and after the sitting of the funding assessment committees. Both registers have the full potential conflicts of interest.

The issue raised by the audit was to consider implementing a requirement for funding assessment committee members to make a positive declaration regarding the existence of any conflict or potential perceived conflict of interest. The audit also suggested that the Office for Recreation and Sport implement a mechanism to ensure that any declared conflicts of interest are recorded in the interest register maintained by its human resources section and, further, to consider implementing a formal review of the register, as part of the grant assessment process, to ensure that all identified conflicts are appropriately managed.

The Office for Recreation and Sport does maintain a register of conflict of interest for employees. These are managed annually by a separate policy and are maintained by Human Resources. Separate funding assessment committees are established for each call of grant funding, and each member of the funding assessment committee is asked to identify any conflict of interest. At the time of audit, these systems and processes were independent of each other. The Auditor-General has requested that these systems be cross-matched for members of the funding assessment committees.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, how many instances were there in 2013-14 where grant recipients did not formally accept the funding offer within the required time frame, and what penalties are in place if recipients allow the funding acceptance time frame to lapse?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We do not have an answer with us in relation to how many, but I guess it is good to understand that so many sporting clubs are run by volunteers, as you would know because you have a lot in your area as well. So, sometimes when they are faced with the prospect of having to fill in all the forms and do everything right, they do not always hit the time frame. So, what we always do is give them another opportunity to get their information into us, as required, and to work with them.

The Office for Recreation and Sport has a very good reputation throughout the state for working, throughout the whole grant process, with those people who want to apply for a grant, and they make sure that they are not going to miss out by filling the form in the wrong way. We have a lot of understanding for people and a recognition that they are not necessarily government workers who are used to filling in all the forms. We work with the clubs because, at the end of the day, it is their money being returned back to them as taxpayers to help the clubs and their communities.

Mr WHETSTONE: I concur that the Office for Recreation and Sport does have an excellent reputation. Moving on to Volume 4, page 1312. The brief provided by the department for its activities under recreation, sport and racing states that it includes the provision of strategic policy advice to

the Minister for Recreation and Sport on matters relating to the South Australian racing industry. How much funding does the state government commit to the racing industry, and how many staff are working in the racing industry field to provide the strategic policy advice?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We have 0.5 of an FTE working in that area, and Sue does a very good job at being across all three codes. As you would recall, back in 2000, under the former government, the racing moved away from government, and its revenue from government is in revenue forgone that we used to get through the wagering tax. So, that money now goes to TRSA, and it is between \$7 million and \$10 million a year. So, that money that used to come into government now bypasses government with our blessing, so that it can help the three codes of racing through TRSA.

There are no real levers that we have to control any of the three codes of racing anymore, but we do work side by side with them with the issues. When we had the unfortunate death of Caitlin at Murray Bridge a couple of weeks ago, we all jumped in and offered any help across government. Sometimes it might not necessarily be the racing minister who needs to step in and provide help. It might be the planning minister, it could be the Attorney-General, it could be the consumer affairs minister.

I guess the good thing about having a racing minister and a person in the Office for Recreation and Sport whose sole focus is to deal with the racing codes is that we are there ready to pick up the phone. We have a good understanding of what they need and what their sports are all about. We have a close association but no direct control.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, have you been given, or have you sought, any advice on how within the racing industry we could enhance a training program for industry participants? I am not trying to stray away from page 1312 but the industry is looking at shortages of industry participants—trainers, strappers and the like—and the idea of having a TAFE training facility for overseas students who come to the state.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I thank the member again for the question. It is a really good point. We had a meeting last year with Frances Nelson and we talked about that because we probably have one of the best training facilities in Australia. I offered to Ms Nelson, as the chair of Thoroughbred Racing SA, that I would be happy to work with her through the various levels of government and the different departments to try to make it easier for overseas people to come down to Adelaide and do their training—as you say, as trainers, strappers, jockeys.

I think it would be a win-win situation. We would have more people out there to ride track work. We would obviously build some connections, particularly through the emerging racing countries like China where it is becoming increasingly important. We have always had a very strong relationship with Hong Kong and I think we could further develop that. I have not heard back from Thoroughbred Racing SA but we are willing to hop in and do that because it gives them another revenue source. All three codes of racing have found it increasingly difficult to match the stake money that is being provided interstate, and there is no point in just shelling out more money. If we can work with the industry to try to give them a revenue source of their own that they can continue to grow in a sustainable way, then that is something that I would definitely back in, as a punter.

Mr WHETSTONE: One final question before we move on, relating to employees in Volume 4, page 1313. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure paid remuneration to 125 employees in 2014 and there were 91 employees who received TVSPs in the reporting period. Can you provide a breakdown of the number of employees in the Office for Recreation and Sport and which pay brackets they fall into?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: All up, including the South Australian Sports Institute (SASI), there are 74 staff. I do not have the breakdown of their different pay bands but I am happy to provide that to you if you so wish.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you.

The CHAIR: We are now going to another area, so we need to change advisers. Thank you to the advisers. I ask the tourism people to move in as quickly as possible.

Mr TRELOAR: I refer to Volume 5, page 1915, regarding Communication of Audit Matters. The Auditor-General communicated an issue to the CEO of the commission that the timeliness in documenting an approval for one procurement process was conducted under a tight time frame. Can the minister explain what that procurement was and why that particular procurement was conducted under a tighter time frame than usual?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I thank the member for Flinders for his question, and I acknowledge his great part of the state. What a tourism mecca it is! The matter related to the engagement of a supplier to facilitate payments to the South Australian Tourism Commission's suppliers in China. This procurement was undertaken within a tight time frame with the assistance of an in-country legal firm approved by the Crown Solicitor's Office.

Approvals were confirmed in minutes by the South Australian Tourism Commission's accredited purchasing unit rather than separate procurement documentation. Audit noted the tight time frame and unique circumstances associated with this procurement. In the 12 months since entering into this service agreement, fees have totalled less than \$11,000.

Mr TRELOAR: I refer to Volume 5, page 1935, financial note 5, Employee benefits—expenses. I note that the number of executives on over \$141,500 has increased from seven to 11. Can the minister explain what skills or expertise the commission has benefited from in having that increase?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I want to acknowledge the fantastic and strong skills that every employee in the South Australian Tourism Commission has. The increase is largely due to the payment of five TVSPs (targeted voluntary separation packages) in 2013-14, at a total value of \$661,000, compared with just one in 2012-13, so it was people taking these packages. The value of 2012-13 was only \$66,000, so it has increased from \$66,000 to \$661,000 in the space of a year because there were more separations. It is an increase of \$595,000, which was funded by the Department of Treasury and Finance.

As a result, the following positions were abolished: campaign services manager, senior policy adviser, senior human resources consultant, destination development and international adviser, and business manager projects. The number of employees with remuneration greater than \$138,000 has increased by four, compared with the previous year, from seven to 11. This increase is due to the six termination payments to non-executive staff. There were two fewer executives paid greater than \$138,000 in 2013-14 than in 2012-13.

The remuneration of these employees is a private matter; however, the salary ranges of all executives are published in the annual report, which I tabled today. The remuneration of these employees reflects all costs of employment and includes salary and wages, termination payments, payment in lieu of leave, superannuation contributions, salary sacrifice benefits and fringe benefits.

Mr TRELOAR: I refer to Volume 5, page 1933, financial note 8. The commission spent \$40,000 on consultants. Can the minister detail the services delivered by those consultants?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The expenditure on consultants, as you said, was \$40,000, and the details were as follows, and they were \$20,000 each: one was to Resolution Media Network Pty Ltd, and the purpose was for search engine optimisation assessment and strategy, and that was from June until August 2013, at a cost of \$20,000; and the second one was KPMG, which was for development of strategy, policy and procedures for the digital revolution project, which was from April until May 2014 and, again, that cost was \$20,000.

We won a big national award for our online presence. The South Australian Tourism Commission needs to be congratulated on its excellent online presence, not only for people who are planning trips to South Australia but also for those who are in our great state, so that they can go online and see the attractions and get involved in events when they get timely information.

Mr TRELOAR: I refer to Volume 5, page 1915. I refer to a comment made under Shared Services. It states:

Last year's Report made specific comment on the progress being taken by SSSA to remediate key control weaknesses raised in prior years for the systems and control environments, in order to achieve a satisfactory ongoing standard of control operation over financial transaction processing.

Can the minister give a report on how those weaknesses are being addressed?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I thank the member again for his question, but it is probably a question best directed to the minister with responsibility for Shared Services.

Mr TRELOAR: I refer to Volume 5, page 1917. Minister, total expenses increased by \$1.9 million to \$61.4 million in 2014. Significant factors contributing to this change are under four dot points. Most interestingly, there was an increase in advertising and promotion expenses of \$3.4 million due mainly to increased consumer advertising. Can the minister give some detail around this increase in advertising and the benefits gained?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Certainly. It was a matter of timing. We had the Barossa ad, which cost \$6 million, and it has won, I think, 11 international awards, including the best tourism commercial anywhere in the world. It won that in Cannes. We also had an ad to promote Adelaide and we launched that at the start of February this year. We did that to cash in on the fact that Adelaide had been named by Lonely Planet as one of the top 10 cities in the world.

Also, the timing was perfect in that we just had the Santos Tour Down Under the week before. We were about to have Mad March, with the Adelaide Cup and the festivals: the Fringe, the Adelaide Festival and WOMADelaide, and we of course had the unveiling of the brand-new Adelaide Oval, which was such a huge success. We had a good story to tell about Adelaide that we did not want to wait until 1 July and the new financial year, so we brought that advertising campaign forward by about five months. We brought money from this financial year into the previous financial year to make sure that we could get that into cinemas and onto television screens and actually get people talking about Adelaide.

We did a lot of research, some focus groups and surveys in the Eastern States and the good news was that they did not have an opinion of what Adelaide or South Australia was all about. They did not think we were really bad, but they did not think we were really good, so we had to go out there with a blank canvas and really promote what Adelaide is all about. I am happy to say that we have seen a big jump of about 7 per cent in the number of interstate visitors coming to Adelaide and South Australia this year, so that marketing is working. The most important thing we can do as a tourism commission and as a government is to spend as much money as we can on telling the rest of the country and the rest of the world who we are and what we are all about.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Matter of Privilege

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The SPEAKER (17:14): I refer to the member for Davenport's matter of privilege earlier today, where he proposed that it is a contempt of parliament where a member of parliament, on making a freedom of information request, is denied access to information that resides on a personal or non-government email account.

The premise of the member for Davenport's proposition is that a member of parliament has a right, as a parliamentarian, to this information. No doubt, the house and all its members are aware that, under the Freedom of Information Act, members of parliament are no more entitled than is any member of the public to a legal right to access documents held by the government when making an application under the Freedom of Information Act. Access to documents held on personal or non-government email accounts are not covered by the Freedom of Information Act.

An FOI request by a member of parliament does not carry with it parliamentary privilege, such as those powers possessed by parliamentary bodies such as committees, to access any document within their jurisdiction. The denial of access to information beyond the ambit of the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act does not amount to a contempt of parliament, as the member of parliament does not possess the requisite privileges to access this information as part of his or her FOI request.

It is a different situation, however, if a parliamentary committee, in carrying out its functions, were to undertake an inquiry and sought information from personal or non-government email accounts. The committee's proceedings would be covered by parliamentary privilege and, as such, any denial of access to information, whether on personal or non-government email accounts, could amount to a contempt of parliament and be treated as a breach of privilege. Accordingly, I am not going to give the matter precedence.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee (resumed on motion).

The CHAIR: We now have the Minister for Regional Development and the Minister for Local Government. The member for Goyder is leading with the questions. What page are you looking at on local government?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am looking at page 38 of the annual report. Under the heading 'Local government: a new role for the Auditor-General is underway', the report identifies that the changes that occurred to the Public Finance and Audit Act from 1 September 2013 involve the Auditor-General, potentially, in the process. I am aware that the Auditor has written to the Local Government Association and, I think, councils twice this year already. I am just wondering what involvement the Minister for Local Government has had, whether he has had feedback from the LGA on this and whether any issues have been identified as part of that initial consultation with them.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: There have been no issues raised with me, to my knowledge. However, I understand that, at the time of finalising the annual report, staff at the Auditor-General's office were in the process of reviewing the documentation provided by the LGA and councils, and that the outcome of any future examination will be provided in a specific report to parliament in accordance with the act.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I appreciate the answer from the minister. Indeed, it has been not a contentious area, but the potential for the Auditor-General to have a stronger involvement with local government has been raised in some of the parliamentary committees in the past. The audit report identifies that the examination of the accounts, efficiency and economy, and/or the cost effectiveness of a council's activity is not necessarily in the purview of the Auditor-General but is provided by the individual auditors that are appointed by each council. I am just interested to see how that moves forward. It might be an area that the minister keeps a bit of an eye on just to see what occurs.

I will move on, though, and jump to page 1347 of Volume 4; I hope the minister is able to respond to this one. In this part of the report, which is under the planning, transport and infrastructure component, towards the bottom of page 1347 it identifies cash inflows: repayment of loans—local government, \$240,000 for the year ended 30 June 2013 and \$255,000 for the latest financial year. I am just interested in a breakdown of what that was for.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: We will take that question on notice. We will get that back to you.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Still within the same volume at page 1358, again, this is an issue that relates to financial transactions. About an inch from the bottom of the text it refers to 'Transfer payments to local government: Councils'. For the latest year it is \$10.856 million. I am interested in a breakdown of what that payment was for and, indeed, is it a consistent area of payment across all councils or is it to one council? Has the minister got some detail on that?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: We do not have that information, but some of that money could be from other portfolios which deal with local government. Certainly, we will get all that information and a detailed breakdown for you.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am trying to be a patient person and I understand it is very difficult to have a briefing paper that includes all possibilities. I suppose, from my perspective, I have looked at it via the key word search opportunities that exist on the internet now to identify what local government is, and that is a substantial amount of money, so I would have expected the detail to at least have been available in some way because I am referring specifically to a page and a payment that has been made.

We will move forward to page 1430, and I am seeking clarification. The minister would note that in the early part of the numbers included on the page there is a substantial payment, via the Local Government Grants Commission, of \$167.4 million in the year ended June 2013 but nothing in the 2014 year payment. Equally, for the Outback Communities Authority it is \$895,000 to 30 June 2013 and only \$13,000 for the year ended 2014. My presumption is that reflects the transfer of responsibility from one department to another. I am just seeking confirmation of that.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Yes, it is a transfer to other facilities and agencies.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Thank you, minister, for confirming that. Do you have the detail available today for the Outback Communities Authority which, as I understand it, is one of the areas you are responsible for, and I appreciate the fact that your office recently provided a briefing to me on some aspects of it? I refer to the \$13,000 in expenditure that occurred in the 2013-14 financial year.

I refer to the same line on page 1430, grants and subsidies—\$13,000 is shown for the year ended 30 June 2014 for the Outback Communities Authority. I am interested in why there is zero in the Local Government Grants Commission but there is still some residual payment being made in the Outback Communities Authority.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that the \$13,000 that you are talking about there was when it was in DPC, before it was transferred across to PIRSA.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I know that because it is under DPC. I am just interested because it is in the area of your responsibility, and I thought your briefing paper would include some detail on that.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that it is just for normal operations. We will double-check that and get back to you if it is not that, but we have been advised it is for normal operations.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I now turn to page 1506. Towards the very bottom of the page under Advances—this is in the Primary Industries and Resources section—I note towards the very bottom there is a \$76,000 payment in the last financial year for local government grants and I am interested in what that was for.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: In the figures here we have commonwealth, industry and state grants. We need to clarify that for the member, so we will need to get some more work done on that. I apologise to him.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Minister, this one is about the Local Government Finance Authority.

The CHAIR: Is this on page 1506?

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, it is page 1073, which is in Volume 3. Minister, we will talk about this one. It is at the very top of the page. I think we both from our past lives respect the work the Local Government Finance Authority does. It has been of wonderful service in providing good value loans and, indeed, good returns on investments that councils wish to undertake. I have noticed that, as part of this, the loan borrowings have increased and the deposits have dropped. I think the difference is about \$122 million in comparison to previous years.

I am particularly interested in the figure of \$3 million for guarantee fee and administration expenses. I do not ask you this question as any form of trap but, prior to the election, I had a discussion at the request of the LGFA because there was some concern about what the future guarantee costs might be for local government borrowings, which have the guarantee of the state government. I am just trying to work out, following those six or seven months since then, if there have been some submissions lodged to you, and if some issues have been sorted out there in an effort to try to keep borrowings as low as possible as a cost to local government; that is the reason for the question.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The Local Government Finance Authority is not under my responsibility; it is under the Minister for Finance, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis. I have no formal responsibility for the Local Government Finance Authority Act or the Local Government Finance Authority. To my knowledge, I have not had any correspondence from the LGA or the association, but I do believe that there may be some discussions with the LGA, in conjunction with the Treasurer.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Chair, I will accept the answer. I see it as a subsidiary and it is included following the local government stuff, but we will move on. I appreciate the fact that the minister would tell me if he knew. I admit that this question does not necessarily have a line reference, but it is an important issue. It relates to one of the matters that is to be considered as part of the Local Government Association AGM agenda, which is meant to be considered tomorrow morning, and some legal advice that the Local Government Association has had about the transfer of Housing Trust properties through to the NGOs predominantly.

The minister would appreciate the fact that there had been, I think via minister Piccolo, the member for Light, a commitment given when he was a minister that, when transfers are to occur, there would be something included in the contract for the transfer that would ensure that local government was not disadvantaged financially by the rates subsidies that had to be provided. As I understand it, when local government becomes aware—not necessarily when an application arises—of the fact that a complying group now has control of that property, they are eligible for a 75 per cent subsidy. I am interested to get an update from the minister on what has occurred in negotiations about that.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Yes, the LGA has raised this matter with me, and I have also raised it with the relevant people. Minister Bettison has asked my officers to work with her office to get more clarity about the whole thing. This is regarding the mandatory rebate?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, 75 per cent.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Yes, 75 per cent—to look at that and to get some more information with a view to taking that as part of the comprehensive review of the Local Government Act, which we will be working on towards the end of this year and early next year. I understand the effect on local councils by the transfer from Housing SA to NGOs.

Mr GRIFFITHS: There was a lot of concern during the early stages of this. I certainly have a recollection of the City of Marion talking about the fact that, if all of their Housing Trust properties were to transfer, it would be a loss of \$1 million in rate revenue too. Minister, if we can go to regional development now.

I refer to page 1444, particularly the subtitle at the very bottom of the page which talks about corporate governance. Some may contend this is a not linked question, but in previous estimates and auditor-generals sessions I have asked questions about where grant obligations have not necessarily been met. It has been as high as 17 in the past (in most recent years) and then has gradually reduced. Is the minister able to confirm that all grant obligations made to any type of body, that the minister has control over grants and those obligations have actually been met for the period ending 30 June 2014?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Generally, all grant payments are made in arrears; we do not make any in advance. Payment is on production of actual expenses by way of invoice. They are actively managed by SAFA. So, we certainly do pay them in arrears and on receipt of the relevant invoice.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Thank you. I appreciate the answer from the minister. Given that the regional development section of primary industries and regions is linked together but it is not actually identified within the audit report, are you able to confirm to me what page it is on and what the total expenditure and income area is, because I would love to see that?

The CHAIR: What page?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am sort of flowing on from page 1445.

The CHAIR: 1425?

Mr GRIFFITHS: No; it starts on 1445. There are expenditures and then there are incomes for the area.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: We have three programs that you are talking about there: agriculture and food, forestry and regional development. If you go to page 1453, that is the page number, the activities of regional development are under No. 3. There are Nos 1, 2, 3 on the top and regional development is No. 3.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Most enlightening. I appreciate that. I will write that down. Minister, given that you pointed that out for me, are you able to say that within that expenditure and income area it identifies the amount of dollars that are spent by your department on consultants?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that, on page 1468, the whole lot is under PIRSA, so it may not be under my direct delegation. However, no money has been expended for consultants, I am advised.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am seeking confirmation. It talks about some underspends that were occurring up until 30 June 2014 as to the Upper Spencer Gulf, the Riverland Futures and that sort of stuff. Can the minister confirm for the public record that those funds have now been fully expended?

The CHAIR: What page are we on, member for Goyder, with the underspends?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I think it is page 1469.

The CHAIR: Page 1469, and where are we looking? Just for the table, we just want to keep up with you.

Mr GRIFFITHS: There are lines there for expenditure, Chair, but the words that talked about an underspend for that financial year are in different part but, for the life of me, I cannot remember where it is.

The CHAIR: So there seems to be an underspend somewhere but we are not sure where. Do you want to take that on notice?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Expenditure on regional grant programs, including the Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund, the Upper Spencer Gulf, Outback Enterprise Zone Fund and the contribution to Regional Development Australia, has varied between the 2012-13 and 2013-14 financial years based on the approved arrangements in place with various grant recipients.

The Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund paid out grants of \$4.653 million in 2013-14 compared with \$6.890 million in 2012-13. It was an increase of approximately \$2.2 million. The \$20 million fund is fully committed, with the remaining funds for approximately \$4 million being allocated to seven projects across 2014-15 and 2015-16.

The Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback Enterprise Zone Fund paid out grants of \$0.98 million in 2013-14 compared with \$2.475 million in 2012-13. That was a decrease of approximately \$1.5 million. The \$4 million fund is fully committed with the remaining funds for about \$0.3 million being allocated to two projects across 2014-15 and 2015-16.

The CHAIR: I thank the advisers for their time.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. G.G. Brock.

Bills

COMMISSIONER FOR KANGAROO ISLAND BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Members

EVANS, HON. I.F.

The SPEAKER: On indulgence, we shall hear from whoever wishes to speak about the member for Davenport, such as the member for Davenport.

Members interjecting: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:50): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the government and the house for the opportunity to give a valedictory speech and say goodbye to this

grand old lady we call the House of Assembly. I promise the house I will not speak for five hours and 28 minutes, which is the record I hold in this place, much to Michael Wright's regret.

The day before I announced I was leaving the parliament after 21 years I took my daughter Allison to lunch at Parlamento's to tell her that I was making the announcement the next day. It was the first she had heard of it. She instantly burst into tears, as did I. There we were, head on each other's shoulders, crying our eyes out; it was a moment that confirmed to me that I had made the right decision. This was one of life's beautiful moments, which I will treasure.

I can still remember the opening lines of my preselection speech: 'Family man, business man, team man, Liberal', four reasons to preselect Iain Evans as the candidate, and they are four areas I wish to comment on today. As we in this place know, politics is hard on members of parliament's families. A minister's family has it even tougher, a party leader's family has it tougher again, and the family of a leader who is removed by his party has it tougher again.

I have been very lucky that I have spent 30 years with one of life's beautiful people in Fiona. Fiona has been a wonderful support to me over my political career, not only in that but through our business and through my senior roles in Apex and other community activities. More importantly, her compassion and care, her warmth and strength, intelligence and determination, her love and understanding, have been a wonderful example and role model for our children. Although we had four children under eight when I entered politics, and were running a business employing 30 at the time, with four retail shops, Fiona went back to complete some courses, including a university degree in accountancy. She works full time and is now halfway through a CPA. I am so proud of Fiona's achievements in her own right. The best thing a man can do for his children is love their mother, and that I do indeed.

I have said in other forums that I was like a footballer who played one season too many—and that may have contributed to the grumpiness that the member for Schubert referred to in a light-hearted manner in his contribution—and I apologise to my family for not retiring at the 2010 election. Our children—Staten, Alexander, Fraser and Allison—have been a great support, particularly during campaigns, but I am sure they will not miss the letter boxing, the enveloping, the folding, the putting up of signs, and the fundraising.

You never know why someone votes for you, as my eldest son Staten found out a few elections ago when, on election night, he was chatting up a young lady from Flagstaff Hill in the Davenport electorate. This young woman proudly stated that she had voted for the only woman on the ballot paper, 'Lain' Evans. When Staten confessed that 'Lain' Evans was indeed his father Iain Evans, it killed off what could have been a beautiful relationship. Staten has always been there without complaint, he would always ring on the difficult days, he has actually learnt to like listening to the ABC, and I certainly appreciate his support. I remember him doing so much letterboxing on one occasion that his underarms, through running, were red raw.

Alexander, our second son, is a very laid-back young man with a great sense of humour. He had great joy in teasing me in the most recent campaign that he and all his mates were voting Labor because the young uni student that Labor had picked as its candidate was 'hot'. He told me throughout the whole campaign that I was going to lose because I was going to lose the 'dirty old man vote' and the 'red-blooded male vote', but I am not sure that our state director actually ever polled those particular constituencies. Alexander was very disappointed when he found out that he did not live in Davenport and could not vote for the hot candidate, so he voted for the member for Heysen instead.

Fraser gave us a good laugh in 1997, when he was quite young, and when the Democrats caused a threat, of course, when he was travelling down in the car with my father-in-law and mother-in-law. We were talking about how dad might lose that night and how the Democrats had put a lot of pressure on. Fraser piped up from the back seat and said, 'Don't worry about that, grandpa. We're gonna beat those demacrackers.' Later, at morning talk, when I was being sworn in as the minister, he proudly told the whole school that I was going that day to Government House to swear at the Governor.

Allison, my daughter, can take or leave politics, she would have you believe, but she actually has a good interest in public affairs, being a journalist, and it looks like she might study economics

next year. Allison fell more in love with politics when she came with me to the races and, after losing the first six, backed the winners and the last three and went home with an extra \$100. All of a sudden, this politics was not such a bad thing. Thanks, kids, for all the love and support; I really appreciate it.

In a sense, I am the son closing the family business. Between my father and I, we have been in parliament for 46 consecutive years, dad being elected in 1968 as the member for Onkaparinga, in Fisher and then Davenport. The 46 years represent 25 per cent of the state's history. It is a record that Stan and I and our family are very proud of, and I wish to make some comments in regard to those years.

As a result of dad's involvement, I have been involved in every campaign federal and state for those 46 years—federal campaigns under leaders Gorton, McMahon, Snedden, Fraser, Howard, Peacock, Howard, Hewson and Abbott, and state campaigns under Hall, Eastick, Tonkin, Olsen, Brown, Olsen, Kerin, Redmond and Marshall. I have lived through the, 'We want more water', the Whitlam dismissal, the Liberal Party split, the formation of the Liberal Movement, the State Bank campaign, the privatisation campaign in 1989, the GST election, and the WorkChoices election. I remember going to function in Mount Barker when prime minister Gorton arrived, and we had 10,000 people at a Liberal Party function on the Mount Barker oval—just a few more than the member for Kavel has in this branch now.

While I have enjoyed politics, it is time for me to have another conversation in my life. My father came to this place by defeating the sitting member H.H. Shannon, then education minister in the Playford government. As president of the local branch, it fell to Stan to ask Shannon, then 70 years old, to step down as six other people in the branch (not Stan) wanted to contest the seat but would not challenge Shannon.

Shannon mistakenly refused to go and said to dad, 'Stan, I'm not stepping down, so you just don't have a candidate.' Dad replied, 'Well, you do now: it's me.' I would like to have been a fly on the wall when dad went home to tell mum—who was raising five well-behaved children under the age of 14 at the time, who was running the family business, who was running the football club canteen. I am sure she was thrilled at the proposal that she would now have to run a state election campaign for dad.

Dad went to work, signed up 1,600 members at two shillings each, and won the preselection and, indeed, the seat. The papers reported, 'Man of the street defeats the minister.' My role as a nine year old was to stand on the Scott Creek booth from eight in the morning to eight at night for the 72 voters who attended that day. I regret to report that my first attempt at campaigning was not good: there was a swing against the Liberal Party in that booth. I put it down to the school shorts.

Dad went on to serve 25 years in this place. He was the longest serving whip of any parliament in Australia. He successfully moved a motion, which was passed by the parliament, calling on the government to establish the first ombudsman in Australia—a position, sadly, wrongly attributed to Dunstan by some.

Perhaps one of his proudest moments was when Steele Hall, the premier, and Rob Millhouse, the attorney-general, called a meeting at Belair to form a branch of the Liberal Movement. Hall and Millhouse were excited. They rolled up to Belair and the hall was packed. Little did they know that Stan had stacked the front of the hall. Halfway through the meeting the chants started: 'Let's hear Stan. Let's hear Stan.' Stan spoke against the formation of the branch of the Liberal Movement and won the debate. The branch never formed. He was the only Liberal MP holding a metropolitan seat who did not join the Liberal Movement. Dad was proud that having left school at 14 he out debated people who would hold the positions of Premier and Attorney-General within the state.

My father was street-smart and canny in some things he did. He was the undersecretary to Steele Hall. He was receiving lots of letters from someone called Yelnats Snave about issues in his electorate and the Adelaide Hills. It was not until, I think, Peter Middleton, the Premier's press secretary, worked out that Yelnats Snave is Stanley Evans spelt backwards and someone (Stan, I think) might have been writing letters trying to get answers that he wanted, because he was actually receiving the letters, that that process was ultimately stopped.

Dad was also good at rounding up the numbers for whatever battle was happening within the party, preselections or delegate entitlements. I remember one particular battle where a farmer cousin Fred arrived right on the death knock when they locked the doors. He stood in front of the whole college, which had been subtly worked with the numbers over a period of months, leant back, scratched his backside and said, 'Crikey, uncle Stan, if grandma was here we could have a family reunion!' At that point, I think everyone knew the numbers were done.

Supporting Stan and Fiona and I over a 46-year journey has been my mother, one of life's great ladies. It is hard to put into words the contribution to family, politics, the Liberal Party and community over that 46 years. Perhaps the fact she was awarded an OAM has said it all. It was mum's strength, love and forgiveness that carried dad on his difficult days. When dad stood as an Independent he was home only five days in a year for dinner—they were the kids' birthdays. Mum just kept carrying the load. Observing this, dad dare not lose, and in defeating Dean Brown became the only MP in Australian history to have beaten two sitting MPs, Shannon and Brown. It is fair to say that Stan was great campaigner.

As an example of mum's commitment, she twice cooked a three-course meal for over 440 guests as fundraisers for our campaign. Thanks, mum and dad, for always being there and for the advice; though, I have to say, Stan, I will not miss you selling raffle tickets down the street. Dad would sell raffle tickets, come back to my office, flick through the raffle books and say, 'I spoke to Mrs Jones. Problem with the footpath. I said you'd ring her,' 'Bill Smith's got a problem with the road; I said you would write to council.' He would sell 200 tickets and my office would get 20 jobs. I will certainly not miss that.

To my siblings—Yvonne, Daphne, David and Andrew—and their partners and their families, thanks for supporting Fiona and me. All of them too have been in politics for 46 years, with a father and a brother involved. I know it impacts your lives and your friendships. I just want you to know that we appreciate your support and love. To Fiona's family, Brian and Shirley, and Brian's late wife, June, to Sally, Donny, Tim, Shane and Sam, Peter, Andrew and Andrea and their families, thanks for being such great support.

Prior to entering politics, Fiona and I, with my brothers David and Andrew, ran our own building, plumbing and retail business. I entered politics to advocate for small business as the backbone of the state economy, and that is why over the past 28 years I have argued strongly on behalf of the small business sector. I am returning to the private sector as the CEO of a start-up export company, and I really do look forward to going back to my small business roots.

I was proud to have been elected leader and deputy leader of my party without ever challenging the incumbent. To have been elected only the 13th leader of the party in its 100-year history is an honour of which I am proud. I would have loved the opportunity to take the party to an election, but as luck would have it that did not work out.

Teamwork in politics is important. If you do not have teamwork, you usually end up spending longer in opposition than you really want. Politics does not have to be that hard. For instance, when asked days before the election if you rule out a challenge to the leader, the answer to that question is 'yes'. When you look someone in the eye and shake their hand and guarantee your support for years, honour the deal.

When you meet colleagues to discuss challenging the leader and agree that no-one has the numbers to defeat the leader, and also agree that no-one should challenge the leader, as an unsuccessful challenge would be a disaster and set Labor up for a long time in government, do not challenge the leader the next day and then withdraw four days later. If you want to see the impact of that, look at the 2005 challenge and the 2006 election result.

When you are 59-41 ahead in the polls 15 months out from the election, do not challenge the leader. Most people who read political polls think that 59-41 is a winning position. If you do challenge the leader, do not do it while he is at the funeral of one of your colleagues interstate.

I entered parliament as a Liberal, not only because I was brought up in a Liberal household but because of my life experience. I was kicked off a building site for not belonging to a union. Ron Owens from the builders' labourers union had that pleasure. I could not get my uni exams because I did not belong to the students' union. Land that had been in my family for 130 years was compulsorily

acquired. Labor announced a development freeze halving the value of our property in the Adelaide Hills. My business suffered 21 per cent interest rates under Keating as treasurer and the State Bank collapsed. I am a Liberal because I believe in individual freedom, free enterprise, surplus budgets, lower taxes and, through efficient government, providing services to those in need. It is these values that I have held for 21 years.

I laughed during the week when an online comment responding to an article about my retirement said that I was a typical Liberal from a wealthy, privileged background. My father did not finish second year at high school and left school at 14. Prior to politics he was a stonemason, contractor, primary producer and garbage collector. When a Labor MP interjected that Stan was a garbage collector, Stan quickly responded, 'Better the collector than the garbage.' My mother was the intellect of the two. She actually did complete second year at school and went on to be a dressmaker.

In a wealth sense, I did not come from a privileged background. I was only the second leader of the party to be publicly educated, being educated at Heathfield Primary School and Heathfield High School. However, I was privileged to be born into a family with a different form of wealth, and that was in the form of community service. I grew up in a family where community service is just what we did. It was not just my parents' community service, which I have spoken of previously, but other members of my family as well. My sister Yvonne has been recognised for her long service to SAPSASA and her involvement in basketball and netball; my brother David was national and state president of the Vauxhall Owners Car Club and was heavily involved in Apex and football; my sister Daphne was involved with the Ravens and Garville netball clubs, Netball SA and heavily involved in the Liberal Party; and my brother Andrew, who has been a councillor and deputy mayor, was also heavily involved in Apex. Fiona herself has been involved in Apex and school and various kindy committees.

It was during the time when Andrew was the deputy mayor that he was knee-high in a sewerage pit. There were rumours that Alexander Downer was going to retire. *The Australian* newspaper rang Andrew and asked, 'Is it true that you're going to stand for Mayo?' Andrew, in typical tradesman's fashion, said, 'Look, mate, I'm standing waist high in a sewerage pit and I'm not standing for Mayo for two reasons. Firstly, I'm a plumber; why would I take a pay cut? Secondly, I can go home tonight and wash all the shit off, and in politics you can't do that.'

I love being involved in my local community. When preselected I was on 36 local committees. I was lucky enough to at the time be elected to positions of state president and national president of Apex, the youngest person ever to hold those positions. I have a strong sense of duty. I entered politics because I do see it as the highest form of community service. It is through politics and policy reform that you can make people's lives better. You can provide them with more opportunities in life and build better communities. That is why I have been very privileged to have served in this place. It has given me a chance to serve, to help others and, I would like to think, improve the state.

In my view, politics is a noble profession. MPs set their own standard of conduct and I believe that you can have integrity in politics. In politics there has to be a relationship between the two sides. I thank the Labor MPs with whom I have dealt over the many years for their trust in my word. When we agreed on positions they were matters of mutual interest—as we call them. I particularly refer to former treasurer Foley, Treasurer Koutsantonis, Deputy Premier Rau, the Premier and the member for Playford. I have dealt with them on many issues.

I have a quick story about Kevin Foley. Three weeks out from the 2010 election I got a phone call from an old cricket friend of mine who was a grandfather. His granddaughter had lost one eye to cancer and was about to lose the other eye to cancer. This was right in the middle of the election campaign. He had rung me up to see if we could get \$45,000 in funding from the government to fly this young girl to the USA to get the procedure done to save her eye as it was the only place in the world the procedure was done. He was asking me to ring the treasurer in the middle of the campaign to see if the government would hand over \$45,000, so I undertook to do it.

I rang Kevin and said, 'Look, Kevin, these are the circumstances.' Kevin, to his credit, said, 'Meet me in the State Admin Centre at 2 o'clock.' So, in the middle of the campaign there is Kevin, this family and me meeting about this young girl. Kevin, to his credit, had various specialists from the

health sector there and we had her doctor. He agreed to spend the \$45,000 to send this girl to America on the basis that an Australian doctor went with them so that they could learn the procedure and bring the procedure back to Australia. As luck would have it, the young girl's condition was too far gone for that procedure to be of any use, but it was just an example where a trusting relationship between the two sides can benefit everyone involved.

It is these values of family man, businessman, team man and a Liberal, founded on a foundation stone of community service that has moulded Iain Evans into the member for Davenport. I was privileged to be a minister for five years. I thank John Olsen for the opportunity he gave me, and I thank Nick Minchin, Vicki Thomson and John Olsen for their friendship and advice.

I am very proud of my achievements. I have put out a press release. I will not go through everything that I was proud of, but I did have a wry smile on my face over the last period when the debate was around the desal plant, the emergency services levy, and marine parks—all issues that were started by me, and proudly so.

The banning of mining in the Gammon Ranges was a particularly proud moment, but there are also two others. The issue of Growdens where I fought for seven years to win \$13½ million to be returned to 400 families that had been ripped off by an investment scheme was a great achievement, and I am proud of my involvement in the Easling matter, which I know caused some difficulty for the government. The reason I took up the Easling matter was quite simple: in my view it was the right thing to do regardless of the difficulty of the circumstances around it.

Finally, can I thank all the staff who make this place work: Hansard, the library, the catering staff, security, chamber staff and everyone else involved in the parliament. I have really appreciated the professional way all of the staff in the parliament make it work and thanks for putting up with me over 21 years.

Hansard will be pleased to know that I have been reading *Hansard* since I was nine years old. When your pocket money depends on your father keeping his job you take an interest in what he does, so while others were reading Batman comics, I was reading *Hansard* which may, I guess, contribute to my interest in politics.

I would also like to thank parliamentary counsel, particularly Richard Dennis, Aimee Travers, Mark Herbst and others, who have taken my ideas and made them into bills. I did a lot of legislative work, and parliamentary counsel tell me I hold the record for the largest number of private members' bills passed in the parliament.

To my drivers, Paul Adey and Warren Bartsch, two nicer guys you will never meet. I thank them for their support, but also for making sure they never beat any of my children at noughts and crosses.

I thank the leader's staff, in particular 'Treasury Tim' as we called him. Tim Melrose did an outstanding job over many years and, in particular, was of great assistance to me as shadow treasurer.

I thank all my ministerial and electorate staff over the years: Janita Giles, Karen Petney, Rebecca Murray, Kate Melrose, Rachel Lawson, Jess Keen, Kate Holmes, Louise Bajada, Nicki Willing, Heather Cowden Tonkes, Rebecca Rosser, Steph Greene, Chris Coxon, Trevor Cooke and Craig Bildstein.

In particular I want to pay tribute to Sarah Taylor and Charlotte Edmunds. These two young women were with me during the period of shadow treasury leading up to the 2014 election. We had 10 portfolios. As shadow minister you get nothing. You get the title and the work, but you do not get a stamp or an envelope or any extra resource, and for these two young women to carry 10 portfolios in the policy sense, the costing sense, and all the research work was just an outstanding effort and I cannot thank Sarah and Charlotte enough. They are a great credit to the Liberal Party. Thanks, Sarah and Charlotte.

I take this opportunity to thank the people of Davenport for showing faith in Fiona and me by re-electing us six times. We really enjoyed working with all the community groups and value and appreciate the friendships we made over the last 21 years. It was a privilege and honour to represent them.

I thank the Liberal Party for giving me the opportunity, all the headquarters staff and the state directors over the years. I pay special thanks to the Davenport branch and its members for their unconditional loyalty and support; in particular Pam Lehmann who started as a volunteer with my father in 1970 and is still there helping me today.

I want to thank all my colleagues I have worked with over the 21 years, in particular the Hons Rob Lucas, David Ridgway and Terry Stephens, and the members for Kavel, Heysen and MacKillop who have all been good friends and supporters over the years. Special thanks to Rob Lucas for his advice and support. It has been great working with him for the full 21 years of the time I have been here. To the member for MacKillop, I want to pay tribute to him for acting with honour in circumstances which he and I know. Mitch, I will always remember it. Thanks.

To the leader, Steven Marshall, I wish you and the team all the best. With hard work, discipline and unity, you are in reach of something very special and I sincerely hope, Steven, that you are the next premier of the state. I thank all the members for their comments in this debate. It has been an honour. It has been a privilege. Thank you and goodbye.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (18:16): I rise to pay tribute to the member for Davenport for his 21 years of meritorious service. I begin with the observation that I once made to Kevin Foley, which was that once you start talking about yourself in the third person, it is time to go, and I can make this pledge: you will never hear Jay Weatherill talking about himself in the third person.

Can I also say, I was pleased to actually hear at least some evidence of who we have to blame for the member for Davenport. I always believed that the member for Davenport was likely to have been bitten by a trade unionist. That is the only explanation for the way in which he has turned out, and it is Ron Owens from the BLF who is responsible for producing the member for Davenport.

On a serious note, the member for Davenport has been, I think, routinely regarded by those of us on this side of the house as the most dangerous opponent. I say that with respect, because of the careful way in which he constructs his interrogation of ministers on this side of the house. That is a mark of respect, because of the care and preparation in relation to the way in which he carries out his work.

I have always been fascinated, actually, by the member for Davenport in many ways. First, I can recall his prescience when John Howard introduced the WorkChoices legislation and he predicted that this would be a disaster that would actually rebound on him. I believed the same thing and, on this, we had a meeting of minds. What the former prime minister, in fact, did was allowed a case to be taken to the High Court—because it was always going to be challenged—which would provide, if you like, a constitutional guidebook for the next Labor government to completely reform the industrial relations system, and so they did, as predicted by the member for Davenport.

He does understand the long-term position and that is one of the reasons that he has had such a long and successful career. I have also been fascinated by how the member for Davenport has managed to engage in this extraordinary balancing act, coming from the right wing of the Liberal Party but managing to hold a seat in what is one of the most progressive areas of the state—the Adelaide Hills. I know this from close observation because my in-laws live in the seat of Davenport, in Blackwood.

Mr Williams: They vote for him!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I hope not because Tuesday night dinners are going to be a much more rancorous affair if they have, but I do know that they have an incredibly high regard for him as a local member. They are probably tempted to vote for him but, hopefully, have resisted the temptation.

Also, the positions the member has adopted, where he has always paid careful regard to the lifestyle questions, the issues about the care and protection of the environment (I am not suggesting that these are not genuinely held), tend to fit with the complexion of the electorate, but perhaps not with the complexion of the Adelaide Hills. It is fascinating: the Adelaide Hills controlled by the right, whereas they are in a sense populated by a lot of greenies who float between the Liberal Party and the Greens. That is just an observation.

I pay credit to a range of attributes the member for Davenport has, without necessarily endorsing the merits of this. I do notice that the member for Davenport has always been a fierce advocate on behalf of people he feels have been falsely accused. Reasonable people can differ about whether the accusations are false or accurate, but he has taken it seriously on behalf of his constituents (for a number of them he has made regular and persistent representations on their behalf to me), and I am sure his constituents have appreciated the persistence with which he pursued those representations.

I also pay tribute to the way in which he conducts himself in relation to his dealings with other members of parliament, in particular the question of keeping his word and of keeping confidences. These are important matters for the successful functioning of a parliament. They are quite important for the way in which ministers and members of parliament are able to interact and achieve things.

If everything is going to be brought in here to question time and paraded in front of the cameras, it rather changes the nature of the relationship between an MP and a minister. The member for Davenport understood that. If he thought he had an issue that would be advantageous to be raised here, of course he would prosecute it, but from time to time he also understood that some things were better dealt with in private for the mutual benefit of his constituent and the interests of the government in being able to provide a sensible solution.

I want to make an observation about one element of that, where there was great cooperation with the member for Enfield, and that is in the question of the reform of the electoral system, in particular public funding. It is interesting that the former premier would not go near public funding; he thought it was the third rail of South Australian politics—touch it and you would be electrocuted. Interestingly, the world has moved so far on, and the concerns about the negative influence of corporate donations has become so profound.

We thought that this was something we had to achieve in a bipartisan way. It occurred to me, after testing the waters in this matter, that this was something that was popular. When we actually announced public financing of elections, instead of getting this cascade of abuse (which we fully expected) it was actually welcomed and people were saying, 'When are you going to do it?' Such was the concern about the integrity of the political system.

You only have to look at New South Wales to see how worrying these things are. But the member for Davenport piloted through those reforms, and I make this prediction: these reforms, requiring as they do the centralisation of finances for the Liberal Party (which I know is a challenge because of the nature of the way in which the Liberal Party is constructed, which is a series of fiefdoms that have their own pots of money), will be the best thing that ever happened to the Liberal Party.

They will provide for the centralisation of finances, which will ultimately force you to centralise your political authority, and you will stop making stupid preselection decisions, like some of the ones you have taken, with all due respect. So, in the long term this will be in your interests and you will look back at the member for Davenport and thank him for that. It will not be good for us, but it will be good for you.

In relation to another matter, the proper entitlement for members of parliament, for too long we have all accepted the common view that we are not worth a cracker, and if we keep buying into that it will be a race to the bottom. If we do not value ourselves, nobody else will. The member for Davenport understood that and the rest have us should begin to understand that as well. I am sad we were not able to conclude some of the things that we have been talking about but I think in the future we need to realise that there is an important relationship between the proper remuneration of MPs, the standard of MPs we get in here and, also, the regard in which we are held in the community.

The truth is that politics can be a brutal and lacerating process. I know the member for Davenport was given the briefest of periods in the leadership role, which came as a surprise, but we on this side of the house do not know all the internal machinations that occur within politics: we can only observe from a distance.

But it is proper, I think, on these occasions for many to make, I think, positive observations of those we find opposite and to celebrate those contributions that are important and good, and that

is the spirit in which I have addressed my remarks today. I pay credit to your 21 years of meritorious service.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (18:25): Today, of course, is the end of an era and, of course, that era is the Evans era here in the South Australian Parliament. We have already heard 46 years of continuous service to the people of South Australia and the South Australian parliament, representing a quarter of the life of this parliament. What an outstanding service it has been.

Iain Evans was born in Adelaide and educated at Heathfield Primary School and Heathfield High School. He then went on to the South Australian Institute of Technology where he completed his bachelor studies. He was first elected to the South Australian parliament as the member for Davenport in December 1993.

From that point on, he held a number positions of very high office in a range of portfolios, including as minister for sport and recreation; police, correctional services and emergency services; racing; industry and trade; and environment and heritage; and he was Australia's very first minister for volunteers. Of course, he served as a member of the Executive Council for South Australia from 1998 to 2002 and he also served as the leader of our parliamentary party, the highest honour that can be bestowed upon somebody in our parliamentary party on this side of the house.

Iain Evans loved the electorate of Davenport and he was very comfortable in a range of activities in the electorate of Davenport. He was very comfortable on the cricket field and on the footy field but, I think, where he was extraordinarily comfortable was right here in this house. When we saw him performing in this house, it was a sight to behold.

When Iain Evans gave a griever after question time, everybody would stay, especially Daniel Wills who loved to report on it in *The Advertiser* the very next day, and it was a great bit of theatre. But, more than the theatre of oratory in this house, he had that eagle eye for legislation, for holding the government to account and advancing his own agenda in terms of public policy in this place.

I believe that we are all a product of our parents. I see, as I am getting older, I am becoming more and more like my parents and I am fearing more and more for my children. But I would like to reflect today on Iain Evans, because I think Iain Evans is a product of his parents. I think there is no doubt he has the political acumen and the cunning of his father and I think it is without doubt that he has that great generosity of spirit, community service, selflessness and family orientation of his mother. I think they are the two great contributions that make up Iain Evans' personality.

The good thing about this theory of mine is that his four children, who are here with us today—Staten, Alexander, Fraser and Allison—will also be very lucky recipients because their parents have got wonderful traits and, if they inherit those wonderful traits, and I am sure they will, they will go on to be extraordinarily successful people.

Very few people understand the pressures of leading a parliamentary party. Even fewer understand the pressures of leading the Liberal parliamentary party. It is an honour but it does come with huge responsibilities and it is certainly no bed of roses. Two people here today understand that very well. My good friend the member for Heysen has been a strong supporter of mine and, most importantly, I reflect today on the contribution that Iain Evans has made to my time as the parliamentary leader of the Liberal Party.

As I quipped to a Davenport SEC meeting the other day, 'I gave up God for Iain Evans.' I probably blasphemously said that it was a good exchange. I will not reflect on that at the moment, but Iain has always been available to me as the leader. I think there was an eight-month period where we met every single Sunday morning because he realised that I was a new leader and he wanted to make his impression and offer me every level of support that he possibly could. He did not covet the leadership of the Liberal Party. He made that abundantly clear right from day one, but what he did was to offer to serve the party and to mentor me, and for that I will always be very grateful.

Politics is a funny game. Everybody is an expert. John Cahill once said to me that being a football coach and a political leader are pretty similar because everybody thinks that they are an expert and everybody knows what people should be doing differently. Politics is, as I said, a very

tough game. Everybody is an expert and everybody has their opinions and sometimes those opinions are right and sometimes they are just quite simply made up.

When I came into this place there were plenty of people offering me advice on all sorts of people in this chamber. People were offering me advice on Iain Evans—most of them very good; some people had some concerns but I am very grateful that I made up my own mind about Iain Evans. What I found in Iain Evans was a man who was a product of his parents. He had excellent political acumen but he also had wonderful integrity and was hardworking. He loves his electorate. He loves politics. He loves the Liberal Party. He loves the Liberal philosophy, and I have loved working with Iain Evans.

He is 55 years of age and, as has been reflected on by other people earlier today, very few people who leave politics go out of this place on a high. Many people go out bitter and broken. Many people go out not of their own accord—they are banished. You see a lot of ex-politicians who are carrying a lot of baggage for the rest of their lives. I think that is not true of Iain Evans. Iain Evans has never looked better. I think there has been a big weight lifted from his shoulders and probably an even greater weight lifted from other parts of his frame.

I think he is really looking forward to the challenge which is ahead. He will do a great job because he is a quality person and he has a huge amount to offer the private sector here in South Australia. He is not going to retire; he is not going off to do the gardening. He is going off to make a further contribution. After a 21-year contribution in this house he is now going off to make a further contribution to the people of South Australia, and we certainly wish him all the very best in that endeavour.

Iain, when you leave this building for the last time tonight as the member for Davenport—because, of course, Mr Speaker, you will remember that he retires as of 12 midnight tonight—

The SPEAKER: It is 10pm.

Mr MARSHALL: I had better speed this final valedictory speech up, sir. Iain, when you do leave this parliament building tonight and you look over your shoulder at the great edifice which is the South Australian parliament, I hope you have many happy memories that are permanently etched, because we certainly have many fantastic memories of your contribution in this place. I hope that you reflect on your many fantastic achievements in this place and also the many great friendships that you have made. I wish you, Fiona and your entire family all the very best.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Hear! Hear!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (18:34): I suspect it is time to draw this to a close. I suspect the member for Davenport has to go to dinner with his family, and Fiona will be angry at him for one last time, as a result of parliament, if we do not get him to that dinner.

I would like to give notice of giving notice to other members that I think it is appropriate that this debate is continued in a formal way in private members' time. The Opposition Whip and I will make sure that happens and invite other members to speak at that time—without telling the house what to do, sir.

At 18:35 the house adjourned until Tuesday 11 November 2014 at 14:00.