

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23 February 2016

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Motions

NGARKAT CONSERVATION PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (11:02): I move:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 30(2) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 excluding allotments 104 and 105 in approved plan No. DP28853, Hundred of Fisk, lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office at Adelaide, from the Ngarkat Conservation Park.

The purpose of the motion is to excise the parcels from the Ngarkat Conservation Park and open them as public road. Under sections 30(2)(b) and 30(3) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, an alteration to the boundary of the Ngarkat Conservation Park will require a resolution of both houses of parliament and a subsequent proclamation by the Governor.

The Ngarkat Conservation Park is located 200 kilometres south-east of Adelaide and is one of four contiguous parks which, at 270,000 hectares, is considered the largest single remnant of native vegetation in the settled agricultural regions of South Australia. Ngarkat Conservation Park has a significant role in the conservation of biological diversity, provides for a range of low-key recreational opportunities and also provides an important overwintering area for the apiary industry.

The private agricultural property Kirra Station is wholly bounded by the Ngarkat Conservation Park. The Tatiara District Council has requested that the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources assists with formalising practical access to Kirra Station.

This motion addresses the proposed alteration to the boundaries of the Ngarkat Conservation Park to allow for a road opening to create legal access to Kirra Station. The land opening requires 10.85 hectares of land to be excised from Ngarkat Conservation Park. The land is located centrally to the eastern portion of Ngarkat Conservation Park and makes up less than 1 per cent of the park's total area.

The Tatiara District Council has closed an unmade road reserve and surrendered it to the Crown. It is proposed that the closed road be added to the Ngarkat Conservation Park and the 42.78 hectares be used as an environmental offset and part of the overall realignment of the park boundary. The land swap reflects a trade from a road to vegetation, so the swap is environmentally sound. This excision has been supported by the SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board, the South-East Aboriginal Focus Group, the South-East Public Lands and Biodiversity Advisory Committee, and the Tatiara District Council. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:05): I rise to support the motion. As the minister said, Ngarkat Conservation Park is the largest conservation park in the settled areas of South Australia. It is a significant tract of native vegetation and, indeed, it abuts probably an even bigger area of native vegetation and conservation park in Victoria, directly across the border. This is an important piece of our conservation of native vegetation in that part of the state and, as I said, it is the biggest in the settled areas of the state.

The Ngarkat park is partially in my electorate of MacKillop and it was partially in Hammond, but I suspect that now it is in Chaffey. The boundary of the two electorates runs through somewhere in the middle of the park. I am not sure whether all or part of Kirra Station is in my electorate or all or

part of it is in the electorate of Chaffey, to be quite frank, but I will come back to that in a moment. As well as being an important piece of conservation, Ngarkat is an interesting place and serves a number of purposes.

Ngarkat has provided winter habitat for the beekeeping industry, and there has been some controversy over this for some years. There are a large number of beekeepers resident in the local area as the town of Keith, which is just adjacent to the park on the south-western corner, is home to the beekeeping industry in South Australia because of the lucerne that is grown there and the importance of bees to the fertilisation of the flowers in the lucerne crop. That is a very important industry not just in that region but for the state. Ninety per cent of the small seed grown in the whole of Australia is grown in the Upper South-East, mostly in my electorate and some a little bit over the border at Frances in Victoria. It is a very important industry for the state and for the nation.

Beekeepers need to have somewhere to winter their bees and, traditionally, they have had pretty good access to Ngarkat park, and the native vegetation there has provided very good wintering for bees, particularly banksia, honeysuckle, etc., a lot of which flower in the winter months, when they provide the bees with a source of both pollen and food.

Another interesting thing about Ngarkat park is that in most summers it seems to catch alight from lightning strikes. Being such a large and fairly inaccessible area because of the sand dunes, it causes a fair bit of havoc when it does catch alight because, as I said, it is a large and relatively inaccessible area and it is reasonably hard to fight fires there. Certainly, in the time since I have been the local member, we have had campaigns which have lasted well over a week to control fires in Ngarkat park, and that has happened on more than one occasion.

Traditionally, the beekeepers, because of their economic interest in the park, have been at the forefront of controlling fires in the park and played a very important role. They have always been willing to get out in the middle of the night, or whenever it is necessary, to start work putting in firebreaks, carrying out back-burning and controlling fires in that vast area. Their efforts need to be recognised, not just for the importance to their own economic welfare but to the welfare of the park per se.

There has been a lot of controversy over the years, particularly between the department of environment, the local beekeepers and the local CFS as to how we should control fires. I am happy to bring the information to the house that the fire management today is much better than it was 20 years ago; common sense has prevailed. It does not always happen, but it has in this instance, and the way fires are managed in the park, in my opinion at least, is much more sensible than it was.

So, we have not wasted huge amounts of human effort and financial resources the way we have previously, and in so doing in my opinion we have saved the park from incredible devastation. I have been in the park after major bushfires, and all that is left is bare ground, bare sand. Obviously, being Australian native vegetation, the flora does bounce back very rapidly, but of course the fauna is devastated when this happens and fire has an incredible impact on the amount of fauna in the park. In some instances some of the species that are quite rare and endangered take many years to recover and to migrate back into parts of the park that have been burnt in a very severe bushfire.

So, it is incumbent on us to ensure that we do everything possible to minimise the adverse effects of bushfire in this area. That, in my opinion, from time to time, might entail controlled burning and mosaic burning and putting cool fires through parts of the park to break up the amount of fuel load that is left on the ground into areas that have a relatively low fuel load, such that they can be used both as a buffer and a point from where we can stop fires progressing when, inevitably, we get fires in the park.

They are always started by lightning. There is nothing we can do to stop them from starting, but I believe that we can do a lot to stop them from becoming devastating and burning out large proportions of the park. There have been instances where in excess of 50 per cent of the park (which is a big area) has been burnt.

Also, interestingly, within the park is a farming property called Kirra Station. Kirra, being an isolated farming property totally surrounded by a large tract of native vegetation and conservation park, has been used for many years as a quarantine station and provides a very important service, particularly to the livestock industry of this nation.

I have not been to Kirra for a number of years, but the last time I went there two new sheep breeds were being introduced into Australia to enhance the meat production capacity of our sheep flock—the Texel breed and the Finnish breed. The Texel breed was suppose to bring bigger muscling to provide more meat on the carcass of a sheep, and the Finn was introduced because of its high fecundity rate, to increase the lambing percentage from sheep. Both breeds have been infused quite widely into our sheep flock across the nation. I do not believe they have had quite the impact that was first thought and hoped, but they certainly have had an impact, particularly the Finn with its fecundity rates probably has had a greater impact than the Texel, but I stand to be corrected there.

The Kirra Station does provide a very important asset to the animal industry here in Australia, which again I would argue is one of the most important industries we have. This motion is a very sensible one. The only access to Kirra is via a roadway, the tenure of which has been part of the park. I think it is a very sensible move to declare that as a road to guarantee access to Kirra in an ongoing way. I applaud and support the move to close an existing dedicated road, which has never been turned into a made road, is not used as a roadway, and rededicate that as part of the conservation park. I think the area of the park will increase slightly via this move and, sensibly, the access to Kirra will be guaranteed into the future.

The only other comment I would make about the park is it is a very popular place for tourists, particularly four-wheel drivers and motorbike riders. In my experience—and I have ridden a motorbike through the park from south to north a few years ago—the people who utilise the park for those recreational purposes are very sensible and do stick to the tracks and do not abuse the park and cause problems there. It does attract a lot of people from a wide area of the state, and obviously from Victoria at least, who come there to get that outdoor experience in a very isolated area. Once you get into the middle of the park, it is isolated: you are a long way from nowhere.

I commend the motion to the house. I am sure that it will receive universal support. I hope that the park continues to be managed in a relatively fire-free way, because that will lessen the burden on myself, because every time there is a significant fire there, I get the phone calls from some of my disgruntled constituents. I hope that it continues to be managed in a way that minimises the impact of fire. With those words, I commend the motion to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are the lead speaker for the opposition, member for MacKillop?

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:16): I rise to support this motion in regard to Ngarkat National Park. The motion reads:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 30(2) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 excluding allotments 104 and 105 in approved plan No. DP28853, Hundred of Fisk, lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office at Adelaide, from the Ngarkat Conservation Park.

I note that that was first presented in the council, as I read in the heading. In regard to Ngarkat, and I will expand on my remarks shortly, my electorate used to share a boundary with Ngarkat but now it is just inside because of the last redistribution four years ago. This motion we are going through today needs resolution of both houses of parliament. The park, Ngarkat, covers 270,000 hectares, and it connects via the Ngarkat Highway between Pinnaroo and Bordertown, and there are various other tracks and roads by which you can access the park.

Landlocked inside the park is the rural property Kirra Station, which can only be accessed by a track which is legally part of the park and is currently maintained by the Tatiara District Council. The boundary shift will take this land, which is 10.85 hectares in total, from the park and legally vest it to the council as a road. In exchange, there will an environmental offset of an extra 42 hectares of unmade closed road which will become part of the park. This road is currently unmaintained and unused.

Certainly, just in regard to Kirra, I think it has been a very important part of quarantine efforts here, not just in South Australia but for Australia, in importing genetics from around the world, because of its isolation in the middle of a national park. It certainly clears up a whole heap of issues

around biosecurity and the risk involved there. Just for a little bit of history, back in 1984, there was an evaluation of Angora goats imported from Texas to the Cudal Mohair Stud in Cudal, New South Wales:

The importation of some 74 Texan Angora goats by 17 different syndicates in 1984 has resulted in three quarantine stations holding progeny and while numbers have built up by breeding both within the imports and by crossing with Australian Angoras, the importing syndicates are somewhat reticent to cooperate in more than basic husbandry and reproductive management. Nevertheless, some evaluation work has been possible on Kirra Animal Quarantine Station (situated some 80Km north of Keith, South Australia) in conjunction with fleece classing research.

In regard to the angora goat program, by March 1990 some 1,100 angoras have resulted from this breeding program on Kirra, and in early 1990 the Kirra management committee agreed to allow National Mohair Pool to class the mohair clip and carry out research designed to develop classing techniques and evaluate production. All animals were shorn in March and September 1990 and the fleeces were weighed and classed. A comprehensive classing code was used to describe the condition, style, length, kempiness and fineness of each fleece. At each shearing, classed fleeces from each description were sampled and three such samples from each management group were randomly selected for testing of sourced yield and mean fibre diameter.

This resulted in 390 test results covering the range of classing types from the four mobs—whether it is kid bucks, kid does, adult bucks and adult does—at two shearings. By combining the classing codes with the test information, it was possible to estimate the clean fleece weight and mean fibre diameter of all animals. Additional information about kemp, style and condition was available from the classing codes. Breed effects were also determined by applying fleece information to the breeding information from the station's records. Shearing information on the buck flocks was less complete than that for the does because of special shearing requirements and the removal of sires from the mob for mating and semen collection. It was not possible to evaluate the reproductive ability of the animals since most of the breeding involved embryo transfer and/or artificial insemination.

Part of the results and discussion around what went on at Kirra were that shearing in March proved somewhat difficult, with a high sand content in the fleeces causing problems with combs and cutters. As a former shearer, I can relate to that. This problem is also encountered in sheep shearing in the district. The September shearing provided easier work with less sand and, while the grease content appeared higher and the style better, the tests indicated that the source yield was similar to that of the March shearing at least in the case of the female flock. Care is needed in interpreting yield information because of the specific sandy conditions experienced in summer in the Kirra environment.

Some other evaluation in regard to imported Texan angoras and their crosses was conducted by the Agricultural Business Research Institute, University of New England in Armidale, New South Wales. They talk about the Moplan estimated breeding values (EBVs) that have been calculated to aid breeders in selection among the Texan and Texan crosses from Kirra due to large variation among these goats. No Texan does were bred to Australian bucks for the reciprocal cross and no Australian angora goats were reared at the Kirra Quarantine Station, therefore heterosis could not be evaluated from this data.

Hybrid vigour influences most traits and will probably cause most angora breeders to overestimate the breeding value or the genetic merit of the Texans based on the performance of first crosses. Differences in performance of Texan and Texan crosses at the Kirra Quarantine Station were evaluated, the largest data set for these goats in Australia.

A little bit of history from the Warburn Stud website: in 1991, after several visits to Kirra Quarantine Station and seeing the superior American Suffolk breed of sheep came the purchase in February 1992 of a share in one of the top Rams APS 18921.90, therefore becoming the first stud to use those superior genetics in New South Wales. This introduced a larger frame sheep. Other rams that have influenced their stud have been several Langley Height rams which bred true Suffolk type. That is a little bit of the history of what has happened at Kirra and the vital part it has played around the issues of quarantine in this country. It is in the perfect situation. I think this is sensible legislation to get through the house, with the act formalising that the road become part of Tatiara District Council, and giving up the 40-odd hectares of unnamed road back to the park as the trade-off.

I, too, will discuss Ngarkat and the fires, as the member for MacKillop did. As indicated, it is about 270,000 hectares. It is interesting to note that whenever you look at a map involving Ngarkat generally you will see great fire scars through it. There have been countless fires in Ngarkat. Living at Coomandook, not far from it, when the fires start they get going, and you can see the red glow in the night sky. Some people say it is a lightning magnet out there, because that is generally how the fires get going.

These fires have done a fair bit of damage over time. I know one that was over 85,000 hectares in total, which is a major fire, and it tests the authorities and the CFS—which I am part of—in fighting these fires. Generally the trucks stay outside the scrub line and do what they can and the planes can go over occasionally and drop loads of water and gel to deal with the fire.

However, it does cause a real issue for neighbouring landholders. There was an issue, over 10 years ago now, where a big fire could have come out of Ngarkat and head towards the Mallee side up around Parrakie and Parilla, the Lameroo side. It was said that for all intents and purposes there could be up to 100-kilometre an hour winds later that Sunday afternoon that would bring the fire out of the park onto farmland. People were keen to light a burn-back, but everyone was worried about who would take the rap for burning the native vegetation.

I will give you some news: the native vegetation burnt anyway and we lost a lot of farmland because a decision was not taken on the ground. The problem we have is that the people on the ground are nervous about making that proactive decision. I believe they would have been protected by at least a couple of acts of parliament if they had lit the match on the burn-back—because that is exactly what should have happened. It would have saved the stress of losing all that country on the Parrakie, Lameroo and Parilla side and having a major fire to deal with.

In fact, the firebreak was going to be the Mallee Highway. Anyone knows that if a decent fire is coming at you with a fair bit of wind behind it (as we saw with Pinery) the highway is hardly going to be a firebreak. I think people need to be well aware of their rights. I also think that the commanders in these situations need to take really good note of the guys on the ground so that we do not see something escalate especially, as in this case, when that scrub was all going to burn—and it did burn.

However, I must say there has been some good proactive work done in recent years with scrub rollers to knock down breaks around the park, and people have been more aware, especially since that fire, I believe, of making sure that there is some form of control. The issue is not about being wanton or random about getting rid of scrub and native plants on the edge of the park: it is about the reality of what a fire can do. Coming from the country, we have all seen it and what it can do.

I commend the work of our CFS and our Victorian and New South Wales friends who come over at times to help us fight fires and also certainly Aerotech and the McCabe family, with their planes, and the vital work they do with other pilots in keeping our state and its people safe. Just on that, there are a couple of great park firefighting tractors that are based in Keith that are strengthened for fighting fires in the park. I heard that one was out the other day at Messent and the driver said he was going alright until the plane dropped a load of gel on him and then he could not see out of the windows. Be that as it may, he was safe because of the combined efforts. They have converted some rigs to withstand a fair bit of heat and a fair bit of abuse when having to go through the scrub and trying to tackle these fires.

Certainly, in light of that, beekeepers are a vital asset in the park, I believe. They have had restricted access in recent years, which I think is an issue, because they are really the unseen guardians of the park in my mind, who access tracks and keep tracks made up so that they can access their sites to winter their bees and drag that good Mallee Park honey out of the park.

I think we have to be mindful of that vital honey industry and the work that they do for this state, and certainly the work that the bees do for our agricultural commodities in regard to pollination of a vast array of crops. We must always be aware of making sure that it is one industry that gets more help. I think we need to stop and think about the work that these people do. Sure, they might be lining their own pockets, but they are also carers of the park. They are using it for commercial

gain, but they also know they have to look after the park and the flora so that they can make an income.

As the member for MacKillop mentioned, Ngarkat is a great place to go camping. I have not been out there for a little while. I had an interesting trip once with my wife, who was fairly pregnant at the time, heading north from Tintinara through the back of the park. This was in an old three-speed Toyota which I got from a guy called Magnet at Frances, but that is beside the point. It was a good old rig, but I made sure I had enough food and drink to last us for a while, and I did say to my friends, 'If we don't get there by a certain time, come looking for us.' You know what happened: we got there on our own, but once we lost the front axle, and we had a flat tyre about 400 metres from the campsite. That was alright; my wife was only starting to show small amounts of stress.

It is a great place to go. You can do the Border Track, which is something I have not done, but I have certainly come in on various tracks from the Geranium and Parrakie side and the Pinnaroo end as well. It does play a vital part as a national park. It is a very large expanse of parkland. As part of that, the role that Kirra has played in there as a quarantine station is vitally important; it is in an ideal spot for this kind of work. This type of legislation is sensible legislation, and as far as the Tatiara council maintenance on the track into Kirra is concerned, it is probably just validating what they have been doing over many years. I commend the motion.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:32): I too rise to speak about the changes to the boundary of the Ngarkat Conservation Park under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and put on the record my support for these changes. I note that the consultation has been undertaken with those who may be impacted, but that there is very little impact on the land, the council and the conservation area that Ngarkat represents.

As the member for Hammond has said, the Ngarkat Conservation Park covers about 270,000 hectares. It is located in the electorate of Chaffey, and a small part of the conservation park is part of MacKillop. I thank the member for Hammond for his gracious handover of Ngarkat before the 2014 election; it was very kind of him. Ngarkat is, in one way, a very beautiful park, but in other ways it is a very harsh piece of country. It is flat; I think the highest point is a 132-metre little point called Mount Shaugh. Obviously the vegetation is very low and very compact, but in the times that I have been through Ngarkat, I have been through with quite diverse weather conditions. I have been there on a 50°C day. It is very, very arid; it is very harsh country. I have also been through there with thunderstorms going through.

One of the unique experiences of going through Ngarkat with a thunderstorm is that, because the expanse of country is so flat and vegetated, it is quite beautiful to be able to see expanses of lightning and rainclouds coming across that piece of country which, historically, has been regarded as under a rain shadow. It has been a piece of country that has dealt with the people who have tried to adapt to it very harshly.

Ngarkat was part of a group of four conservation parks declared in 1979 to protect the remnant of the original 90 Mile Desert in the Mallee and is linked to Mount Rescue, Scorpion Springs, Mount Shaugh and Ngarkat Conservation Park. The Ngargad people were the original inhabitants of that area and their artefacts have been located around the freshwater soaks. Pastoralists attempted sheep grazing in the late 1800s, but those leases were abandoned after a decade. As I have said, it is a very harsh piece of country which is very dry and which does not have the reliable rainfall that the pastoralists need.

The area is flat and waterless. As I have said, the highest point is 132 metres, but the vegetation is very complex, as I understand it. There are about 12 species of mallee trees or bushes and fauna in the park which do present some real beauty. Some of the native flowers that come to life after a rain, or particularly within season, are quite majestic. There is some native wildlife, but not a lot. There are obviously a lot of kangaroos. We do have a lot of birdlife. There are about 120 species of birds: thornbills, honeyeaters, malleefowl and the western whipbird. One of the species of bird that has been almost wiped out to extinction, mostly by bushfire, is the mallee emu-wren. That was highlighted after a recent fire that went through Billiatt and Ngarkat Conservation Parks. It had an absolutely catastrophic impact on that species of bird.

Some people might remember that the Billiatt park was almost totally burnt. I think a lesson that needed to be learnt, not only by the department and the people who were managing that park but by the people who were managing the bushfire program, was that a lot of the cold burns that were meant to be implemented, particularly in Billiatt, were not. A lot of those prescribed burns were attempted as a cold burn and they did not take, but where that back-burning and those cold burns did take is where the park was least impacted.

Of course, the fire also jumped into Ngarkat and had a real impact. You can only imagine the effect on small birdlife, or any form of native wildlife, that is being impacted by harsh conditions and then all of a sudden a fire travels through at extraordinary speed. I know that we have seen other fires. The recent Pinery fire went through pasture, cereal crops, some minor tree areas, scrub and wooded areas, but when it hits a conservation park there is fuel for fire. There is no turning back once you get a fire in there, particularly with hot windy conditions, as it just takes off.

I think that was obviously a real concern in the 2014 fires which were started by lightning. It had a huge impact as 71,000 hectares were burnt at Ngarkat and the fire in Billiatt burnt out over 92,000 hectares of grass, scrub and stubble. It also had an impact on the farming communities. We were very lucky there were not the deaths that could have happened, although a lot of property was damaged.

I pay tribute to the neighbouring landowners who went above and beyond in helping the CFS and the DEWNR bushfire teams, because their on-ground knowledge was instrumental in preventing that fire from having a much greater impact. I note that some of the landowners are fully equipped to deal with those fires. They have their own fire trucks and their own equipment; some even have planes to go up and spot what is going on.

I know the landowners were relying on some of the information from the department, but they are totally reliant on action and an action plan when it comes to bushfires, particularly those that come out of conservation parks or scrub, because they are big, fast-moving fireballs that could destroy their livelihoods, their homes, their livestock and, potentially, human life. Those fires are probably one of their biggest concerns.

On the positive side, this boundary realignment will give some continuity to managing Ngarkat, particularly now that that small piece of land is going to be aligned into Ngarkat. It will allow the continuous management of Ngarkat and it will also capture the fire management plan. Prescribed burns can now occur on that piece of land, which will help Ngarkat to be managed as one parcel, instead of that one piece of land being excluded from prescribed burns.

Ngarkat has a huge association with the apiary industry. The industry is very heavily involved. At the moment, there are 290 commercial sites in Ngarkat where bee colonies are looked after. Ngarkat is used as a refuge for working bees, so they can rebuild their colony strength, particularly after, in many cases, being used in horticulture.

They are used in what is now one of the big, booming industries that is very reliant on bees—the almond industry. The commercial sector goes mostly into almonds with fully-stocked hives, so they can pollinate those trees, which are almost gold machines at the moment. The almond industry is going through a boom, particularly due to the drought that is going on in California.

The hives are full when they go into the almonds but, as they work the almonds, pollinating and cross-pollinating, the bees use the honey and they use all their strength. Once the almond flowering is complete, those bees are exhausted—totally spent. They have been working as hard as they can, so a lot of them are taken into Ngarkat, as I said, to rest, rebuild, get the colonies back up to strength and refill those hives with Mallee honey.

That is very important to South Australia's economy and to our reputation for having disease-free bees. We are now seeing mites and viruses starting to impact on bee sites in a lot of countries, and South Australia can be very proud of its reputation. We have had some disease scares with bees but, essentially, this has been one of the benefits of Ngarkat over time.

I do note that about 70 per cent of sites are being used by the commercial sector of the apiary industry. I would like to see the state government promoting the apiary industry much more strongly, filling up those conservation parks and making them a benefit to our commercial economy in

South Australia. That has been put to the government and, to date, it has not been endorsed strongly enough by the minister. I urge him to consider that bees and pollination play a very important part not only in nature and but also in that commercial sector.

The wild dog management organisation will also now use this piece of land. Rather than having that buffer that the wild dog management used to look after Ngarkat, they will now be able to use the management regime over this realigned boundary, which will make it much easier for the department and the park rangers to be able to go in there and keep our parks and areas of land wild dog free.

This area that is coming into Ngarkat is commonly known as block 11. Its habitat will also assist the mallee emu-wren. I mention the mallee emu-wren because it is of significant importance here in South Australia. It is reported that there are currently only 100 of these mallee emu-wren left in existence in the Murray-Mallee, particularly after the fires. What it will mean is that the mallee emu-wren will now be able to be part of a translocation into the park.

It will allow breeding with a very high element of security so that, if we are finding these emu-wren, they are caught, captured and monitored and can be brought into Ngarkat so that we can breed them and increase their numbers so that they are not potentially going to be one of these extinct varieties of birds which, quite sadly, is a real issue for today's native species of birds. As I said, after these big fires, birds are probably one of the most impacted species on the planet. With that contribution, I support the boundary changes and recommend this motion to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:46): I rise to speak on the motion before the house to request the Governor to make a proclamation in respect of the excising of land, a portion of which is currently in the Ngarkat Conservation Park. This is a park which abuts the South Australia-Victoria border. I defer to the intimate and personal knowledge in the contributions of the member for MacKillop, member for Hammond and member for Chaffey, who clearly understand the historical and current significance of this conservation area.

I just place on the record that I have visited this park on one occasion as the guest of the member for Hammond to investigate a number of matters: firstly, the aftermath of a recent fire at the time. Sadly, a lot of our conservation parks only get noticed by the rest of South Australia if they are incinerated by a fire. Similarly, in this situation, I was taken to areas where there had been substantial damage to the wildlife and, in particular, flora which, as explained by the member for Chaffey, is low-level bush and is obviously the home of a number of fauna and flora species which are important to South Australia's preservation.

I was informed at the time of its history. Most significant was an area that was quarantined from development as part of the Ninety Mile Desert in the Tom Playford era to open up lucerne and other agricultural produce as a result of pipelines being taken down to that area under the Playford administration. This has been confirmed to be a multimillion dollar industry for which we are very grateful here in South Australia.

Importantly, to facilitate that industry, beekeeping has been a necessary adjunct, obviously, for the cross-pollination capacity of our bees, and we would not have an industry in this region if it were not for them. Therefore, to have a sanctuary for bees as a winter resort which, apparently, a portion of this park has been, but also to have access to the fauna for the purposes of feeding the bees in their general activity, is critical. With that, we also had a look at a number of the areas of the local CFS, courtesy of the member for Hammond who introduced me to modified vehicles.

Mr Pederick: Yes, that's right.

Ms CHAPMAN: 'Upgraded', I think you described them as, but modified is what I would call them. I am not entirely sure that they all met all the approval processes of the hierarchy of the Country Fire Service, but they seem to be excellent in being able to clear land at a low level; minimum impact to low bush but effective. I think that is the ingenuity of the local people there, and I thank the member for Hammond for that.

I would like to make two points in relation to this motion. Obviously it is a process we have to go through if we are going to change the boundary of a conservation park, but I ask this question: notwithstanding that we know that Kirra Station is landlocked within the precincts of this conservation

park and that there is other private land south of this region that has some heritage agreements over it, I still do not know who owns Kirra Station. It appears to have had an interesting history and has made a very valuable contribution to South Australia by being a sanctuary for bees and by being, from time to time, a quarantine facility for new breeds of sheep and the like (and other members have made contributions in this regard), but I do not know whether the Department of Primary Industries owns this or the Department of Lands or Tom Brinkworth; I do not know.

I have no idea who actually owns this property and I do not know what its current use is, but I think that is a question we should have a response to from the Minister for Education, who is presenting this motion in the house, as well as advice on what activities are currently happening there. We know that Torrens Island is effectively closed down as a quarantine sanctuary in South Australia; all our livestock (I think even our cats and dogs), except for a few birds, all have to go through the quarantine station in Victoria out of Melbourne, so I would like to know what its current use is.

I would also like to know why, after what appears to be years, this road is now going to be formalised as an asset of the park and there is going to be a transfer of other land back. As I understand the background to the motion, this track, which is identified as the proposed new road reserve, is a track that is currently being used and has been used for some time; we are simply going to swap this with a portion of land to formalise this arrangement. It seems as though the existing road reserve—which apparently has been unused for a long time, in any event—will transfer, and I would like to know what is going to happen to that. Are they going to let weeds grow all over it or let it go back to native vegetation? What is going to happen there?

As it abuts the northern boundary of the huge area of heritage agreement land on private land south of the Ngarkat park, I would be concerned if it were closed. I am a great advocate of ensuring that we keep roadways open for accessibility for tourism or for four-wheel driving or for the protection of flora or fauna, or for whatever purpose the conservation park is principally involved in. It needs to be accessible and it needs to be protected. If there is an existing road there, even a dirt track (which most of these are, other than the Ngarkat Highway I think), then I think that needs to be maintained.

I do not know who is going to do it but I think it should be maintained, and we need to be able to have access, especially if Kirra Station were to come under threat or if a fire came up through the private property on the southern boundary of Ngarkat Conservation Park. I would also like to know, if it is the government that owns Kirra Station, what is it planning to do with it? Is this formalising of the boundaries and transfer of the roads all part of a plan to ultimately sell it, or, if it is in private ownership, have they applied or are they proposing to sell it? I do not know. If it is privately owned and not government-owned land, are they making a contribution to the costs of transfer of the land swap in this regard?

I appreciate that the local council has, apparently, been maintaining this road, and it is seeking some kind of formality. I expect that is a lot to do with risk and a lot to do with who gets sued if there is an accident on it, and all those things. I am not against formalising this, but there has been no explanation given to the house in what I have read to date regarding why we are doing this now and what the intention is of the owner, especially if that is known to the government, or if, in fact, the government, through one of its instrumentalities or departments, is the owner of this property, what it is intending to do with it.

Is it going to go on the long list of assets that are in the fire sale auction house of the SA government? If it is, I think we need to know about it. If it is in private hands, I would like to know what contribution is being made by the private owner for the cost of resurveying and the transfer of this land and, obviously, all the legal costs associated with its transfer.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge our guests in the gallery from the Redeemer primary school. Welcome to parliament. They are guests of the member for Schubert. We

hope they enjoy their time with us today and go back and tell their mums and dads how wonderful parliament is when they go home tonight. Welcome.

Motions

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau:

That this house adopts the following statement of principles for members of parliament—

1. Members of parliament are in a unique position of being accountable to the electorate. The electorate is the final arbiter of the conduct of members of parliament and has the right to dismiss them from office at elections.
2. Members of parliament have a responsibility to maintain the public trust placed in them by performing their duties with fairness, honesty and integrity, subject to the laws of the state and rules of the parliament, and using their influence to advance the common good of the people of South Australia.
3. Political parties and political activities are a part of the democratic process. Participation in political parties and political activities is within the legitimate activities of members of parliament.
4. Members of parliament should declare any conflict of interest between their private financial interests and decisions in which they participate in the execution of their duties. Members must declare their interests as required by the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983 and declare their interests when speaking on a matter in the house or a committee in accordance with the standing orders.
5. A conflict of interest does not exist where the member is only affected as a member of the public or a member of a broad class.
6. Members of parliament should not promote any matter, vote on any bill or resolution, or ask any question in the parliament or its committees, in return for any financial or pecuniary benefit.
7. In accordance with the requirements of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983, members of parliament should declare all gifts and benefits received in connection with their official duties, including contributions made to any fund for a member's benefit.
8. Members of parliament should not accept gifts or other considerations that create a conflict of interest.
9. Members of parliament should apply the public resources with which they are provided for the purpose of carrying out their duties.
10. Members of parliament should not knowingly and improperly use official information, which is not in the public domain, or information obtained in confidence in the course of their parliamentary duties, for private benefit.
11. Members of parliament should act with civility in their dealings with the public, minister and other members of parliament and the Public Service.
12. Members of parliament should always be mindful of their responsibility to accord due respect to their right of freedom of speech with parliament and not to misuse this right, consciously avoiding underserved harm to an individual.

And that upon election and re-election to parliament, within 14 days of taking and subscribing the oath or making and subscribing an affirmation as a member of parliament, each member must sign an acknowledgement to confirm they have read and accept the statement of principles.

On adoption of this motion, a message will be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 3 December 2015.)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:56): I welcome debate on this motion, the opportunity to add my voice in support of the introduction of a statement of principles, sometimes called a code of conduct, concerning members of this house. I do so because this statement, in my view, is a vital element of a suite of recent measures we have introduced which go to the question of integrity, and that is critical if we are to in the public's mind lift the regard with which politics and politicians are held in this state.

It is no secret to say that politics and politicians are not highly regarded, and we need to take whatever steps we can to reverse that proposition. The reason this is critical is that, in my view, this is one of the highest callings that any person can aspire to—that is, to be elected by their peers to represent them and act in their interest. To be a servant of the people is one of the highest callings, so we need to do whatever we can through our own conduct and through our own processes to elevate the status of this house and the people within it so that we properly fulfil and discharge what is a very significant honour which has been bestowed on each and everyone of us.

The passage of the statement of principles by this parliament would also honour the late Hon. Dr Bob Such, a former minister, Speaker, and member for Fisher, who cared and thought deeply about this topic. Indeed, it is this statement of principles which was in large measure authored by Dr Such, and it is with a great deal of respect for Bob and his contribution that we advance our support in this matter. Bob believed that we should always hold ourselves to the highest possible standards. He sought to do that, and we should follow his pattern.

I believe the statement of principles is valuable because it outlines the fundamental and immutable relationship between parliamentarians and electors. That relationship is that the former serve at the pleasure of the latter, necessitating full and open accountability. Some might see the responsibilities parliamentarians have to their electors or to the community at large as obvious or implicit and therefore might question the need for a statement of this sort; but I believe it is important that they be spelt out, that the members have the means to remind themselves of the particular qualities and behaviours that are expected of them.

It is especially useful that we make clear in this statement that the work of parliamentarians does not occur in a vacuum. Many of us are members of political parties and we take part in political activities. These are legitimate and integral parts of the democratic process. They are legitimate and integral parts of the role that many of us play as members of parliament. This statement of principles also, in an important way, enshrines and elevates the role of parties in our system. That is proper and it should be acknowledged.

I also applaud the emphasis in the statement on the need for us to act with civility. Civility is sometimes seen as a quaint notion in this day and age, but I think it is important that we behave with respect to one another, that we do not express ourselves rudely, contemptuously or arrogantly to one another in this place, and certainly not to members of the public or public servants, who are simply trying to do their job, because it can be damaging and, once again, it diminishes our standing in the broader community. It might seem like great theatre here and it certainly might produce great copy or great vision, but I do not think it does anything for our standing in the community. It can erode public trust, which is the very bedrock of the parliamentary system, and it undermines the fact that a large measure of what we achieve in this place is achieved through dialogue and agreement and that much legislation is passed without dissent because it is seen as manifestly in the public interest.

Indirectly, it can have the effect of discouraging talented and worthy people who might otherwise be willing to pursue a career in representative democracy, whether at a local, state or federal level. It is sometimes said that women in particular are dissuaded from putting themselves forward for public office because they find that element (the combative, negative and destructive element that is often represented about proceedings in this place) deeply unattractive, and that, of course, diminishes this chamber and our representative democracy to the extent that men and women who are dissuaded by that conduct choose not to offer themselves for public office.

The scale and complexity of the challenges facing South Australia in 2016 are such that we should be doing everything in our power to put in place a system that attracts the best and brightest minds to politics. To the extent that members will breach the standards and expectations in this statement, I expect that in the vast majority of cases such breaches will be inadvertent, but that does not mean that we should not have a clear set of guidelines covering the conduct of members in this place and in public life generally.

As I suggested at the start, this statement of principles should be seen in the context of a range of other initiatives that we have put in place in recent years to safeguard and improve the integrity of our system, which include: the 2012 legislation allowing for the establishment of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption; the 2013 act relating to political funding, expenditure

and disclosure; and the bills that we are promoting this year, including legislation to deal with lobbyists, the fundamental rewrite of the Development Act and improving the transparency of rules relating to parliamentary remuneration.

As was explained in the Governor's speech at the opening of parliament on 10 February of last year, South Australia was founded on the basis of freedom of expression and of citizens taking part in social and political debate. Our ability to maintain a functional and effective political system requires us to constantly refresh and regenerate that organic democratic ethos. This statement of principles is one means by which we can build trust, provide clarity and improve the quality of governance in our state.

It is no exaggeration to say that one of the key attributes of a modern and successful economy is the integrity of its Public Service, its public servants and its elected representatives. All of these things make a contribution to the sum total of the attractiveness of this place as a place where people can do business and invest. More importantly, people want to live in a place that has a civilised democracy, where people are ruled by reason and not by capricious decision-making. So, on behalf of members on this side, I again acknowledge the admirable legacy of the late Dr Bob Such. I commend this motion to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call on the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of Mrs Lyn Such. I welcome her to parliament and thank her for being with us for this important debate. Deputy Leader.

Motions

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Debate resumed.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:04): I rise to speak on the motion of the Attorney-General, which has been supported by the Premier today, and to confirm that it was on 17 July 2003 that we made a contribution to discuss at the time having a select committee to consider by both houses of parliament a code of conduct for members of parliament.

In October 2004 that committee concluded its deliberations and provided a report recommending that there be a statement of principles as outlined in the motion that is before us today. That committee comprised the Hon. John Gazzola (the Chairman), the Hon. Rob Lawson and the Hon. Nick Xenophon of the other place and me and the Hon. John Rau of this chamber. I think that there are only two of us still here in the parliament and, sadly, of course, we have lost the Hon. Bob Such—

Mr Picton: John Gazzola is still here.

Ms CHAPMAN: —not in this chamber—who was the Independent member of that committee. Can I say this: I have not heard, either from the Attorney-General who formally moved this motion that is now before us or from the Premier, as to why, firstly, there was a failure on the part of the government to move this motion ahead when the Hon. Bob Such moved this motion back in 2012, which I spoke to then encouraging the government to post haste move on with this motion and let us have a code of conduct, let us have a statement of principles.

Back in 2004 the Hon. Bob Such made it clear to this house that when we were doing that investigation already six jurisdictions around the country had a code of conduct or similar level of integrity rules that were to apply. He asked the government of the day to consider and support this motion to be progressed, and I am saddened that that was not sufficient to encourage the government to then progress it.

I am sad that he is not here today to be able to see us accept responsibility for what we are here for and to conduct ourselves in a manner consistent with these principles to those who elect us to office. I am very saddened by that, and at least we know that Mrs Such, I am sure, will be pleased, to see its passage.

However, just let us consider what happened post 2012 while the Such motion sat languishing on our *Notice Paper* with a failure of commitment from the government. Since then the newly-appointed Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, His Honour Mr Bruce Lander, prepared an annual report after the first part year of his operation, and he recommended to the parliament that it have a code of conduct.

Again he pointed out in his report—what appeared to be obvious to everyone and we all knew—that there ought to be a code of conduct. He made the observation that Public Service employees, police officers, protective security officers, elected members of local government, employees of local government, ministers of the Crown, all of them, had in one form or another codes of conduct. He made recommendations in his report at that stage back in October, I think it was, 2014, and he subsequently gave evidence to the standing committee of this parliament, the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, setting out his position on that and answering some questions about it.

We had that evidence back on 31 October 2014. When the Premier finally indicated that he would move the motion himself in late 2014—again which languished on the papers before us, again which never got a vote, again which lapsed—we then have another commitment from his government that he is going to advance it. So, we welcome it. It might be 12 years later, but we finally have it.

I wish to place on the record two important pieces of correspondence that I have sought and received from the Attorney-General and from the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption to outline matters relating to what overlap or independence the area of responsibility the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption might have in respect of any misconduct on behalf of a member of parliament. In particular, what involvement, if any, would the commissioner have if there was any finding by a privileges committee of this parliament, for example, that there had been a failure to comply with a statement of principles? I read first the letter of 2 December 2014 from the Attorney-General:

Dear Ms Chapman

I refer to your letter of 21 October 2014 headed 'Statement of Principles—Members of Parliament'.

You have sought clarification of the Government's position on the role of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption ('the Commissioner') in dealing with matters concerning misconduct by a Member of Parliament.

The existence or otherwise of a Statement of Principles or Code of Conduct of Members of Parliament is irrelevant to the exercise of the powers of the Commissioner. A complaint of misconduct made to the Office for Public Integrity and assessed to fall within the definition of maladministration, misconduct or corruption in public administration under the *Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012* ('the Act') could be investigated by the Commissioner.

When the Commissioner appeared before the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee on 31 October 2014, he was asked by the Honourable Stephen Wade whether 'if something was misconduct in the general sense by a Parliamentarian, it could be investigated by the Commissioner'. The Commissioner answered, 'I think it could be investigated, but no disciplinary procedure could be taken by me because I don't have that power. It would go to the Privileges Committee to be [dealt] with, I would have thought' (page 12 of the Transcript of 31 October 2014).

As you correctly point out, the decision to take a matter to the Privileges Committee is not made by the Commissioner. However, should the Commissioner determine a complaint about a Member of Parliament to be within the jurisdiction of the Act, the Commissioner could draw the matter to the attention of the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council as the appropriate public authority under Schedule 1 of the Act. The Commissioner could not, however, direct the House of Parliament in relation to the matter (see section 38(4) of the Act).

I hope this has helped clarify the matter.

Yours sincerely

John Rau

Deputy Premier

Attorney-General

The letter from the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption dated 9 December 2015 reads as follows:

Dear Ms Chapman

Statement of Principles for Members of Parliament

Thank you for your letter dated 4 December 2015. I have read the motion proposed by the Attorney-General and the proposed Statement of Principles.

On Tuesday 10 November 2015 I appeared before the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee when the following exchange took place (based upon the draft transcript that I have been provided):

The Presiding Member: I note that at page 51 of your report you raise the issue of codes of conduct for both Parliamentarians and local government. In terms of state Parliamentarians, how would you see that being enabled and, for that matter, monitored. I would have thought that is a role for Parliament itself, and privileges committees generally come to mind.

Mr Lander: I think that's right. This is the only state that doesn't have a code of conduct for its members of parliament, as I understand it. I think that it would be in the public interest that Parliament did adopt a code of conduct or statement of principles, I think it was, that the Premier mentioned in 2014. If Parliament does adopt a statement of principles or a code of conduct it will be for parliament to ensure that its members behave in accordance with that; it won't be for me. I don't want to be seen to usurp the powers of Parliament.¹

I remain of the view I expressed to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee.

Parliament does, and should, have the power to deal with its own members. Indeed, Section 6 of the *Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012* ('ICAC Act') provides that:

[n]othing in this Act affects the privileges, immunities or powers of the Legislative Council or House of Assembly or their committees or members.

I am obliged by Section 24 of the ICAC Act to deal with potential issues of corruption, misconduct and maladministration in public administration in particular ways.

Putting aside potential issues of corruption which I would ordinarily investigate or refer to another law enforcement agency to investigate, matters of misconduct or maladministration are to be dealt with by way of:

1. referral to an inquiry agency (being relevantly the Ombudsman or the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment (section 24(2)(a));
2. referral to the public authority concerned (section 24(2)(c)); or
3. Investigation by me using the powers of an inquiry agency (section 24(2)(b)).

First let me say I would not in any circumstances entertain a complaint or report relating to the conduct of a member of Member of Parliament in Parliament. I see that as clearly a matter for the Parliament.

I cannot envisage a matter concerning potential misconduct by a Member of Parliament that I would refer to an inquiry agency. Similarly, while I cannot foreclose the possibility, I think it highly unlikely that I would exercise the powers of an inquiry agency to investigate the conduct of a Member of Parliament. Certainly if it was a matter of potential misconduct or maladministration that was already being considered by Parliament, I would not be minded to interfere.

In the vast majority of cases of potential misconduct and maladministration in public administration, I refer the matter to the relevant public authority pursuant to section 24(2)(c).

Under Schedule 1 of the ICAC Act the public authority responsible for a Member of Parliament is the Member's House. It follows that if a complaint or report were made to the Office for Public Integrity relating to potential misconduct or maladministration concerning a Member of Parliament, I would ordinarily refer the matter to the relevant public authority, which would mean I would be referring the matter to the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council (depending on the House to which the member belongs).

Section 38(4) of the ICAC Act provides:

The Commissioner may not give directions to the to the House of Parliament or the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee in relation to a matter concerning a public officer.

Accordingly, even if I were to refer a matter or potential misconduct or maladministration concerning a Member of Parliament to the relevant House, I could not give any directions to the House concerning that matter. The action to be taken (if any) would be entirely for the House, including the question whether or not the matter ought be taken to the Privileges Committee.

I trust this addresses the matter raised in your letter.

I have no objection to you providing a letter to your Parliamentary colleagues.

Yours sincerely

The Hon. Bruce Lander QC

That is there now in the *Hansard* for the viewing of any future commissioner upon what one day I am sure will be the retirement of the commissioner—not something that I wish to occur in haste; many of us may go before that occurs—but, in any event, it is clear.

It is not to say that members of this parliament have not been the subject of scrutiny as a result of another role. There was a member of the other place who has in recent years traversed through the criminal prosecution courts, and some would argue, and I would be one of them to say that his involvement in that and subsequent conviction was a matter of great shame for me as a member of parliament to be, I suppose, lumped in that profession with someone who has now been convicted and is paying the price for a heinous crime, and I think it is a sad day when that happens. That is a criminal matter and it is independent of this. This is a separate matter; this is for members of parliament.

Similarly, but not in a criminal element to the extent of child pornography, the ICAC provided a report to this parliament on the Gillman land deal, about which many statements were made in respect of what were findings of maladministration among public servants and very significant criticism of the conduct of at least one minister of the government who is still with us, and the scathing report and findings in respect of the evidence given and the conduct of that minister, particularly toward public servants, is all on the record. It is a matter of record, and it relates to an inquiry in respect of a particular action. And, as a minister of the Crown at the time, namely, the minister for housing and urban development, that minister had to front up to the ICAC commissioner.

I mention both of those because they are recent examples of where there has been scrutiny of persons who are members of this parliament but they have a different role, or they have exercised conduct unbecoming in one area, and criminal in another—which is the best and most kind I could describe them as—of which they have received the appropriate attention of the authorities. I distinguish those, and we all should in this debate, as to action and relation to other authorities that deal with the criminal behaviour of a member of parliament.

Can I just say one other thing while we are commending the Hon. Bob Such for bringing to our attention important law. The Hon. Bob Such was also keen to ensure that we have legislation dealing with the sexting phenomena, which we debated back in 2012 along with this motion. That is, where we were having to deal with people who filmed or distributed images that were humiliating—they were disturbing examples at the time—the Hon. Bob Such urged the government to ensure that we have legislation to protect people against revenge texting and the like.

One thing he said at the time—and I supported him in this house, as did the Hon. Stephen Wade—was: 'Be careful when you draft this legislation that you don't inadvertently capture children who are offenders.' We do treat our children differently when they are offenders: we have a youth criminal justice system; we give them a fair go; we give them a second chance; and we treat them differently. And we should. The Hon. Bob Such was very strong on that point, and I endorse his comments which I have heard so many times outlined in this house.

It is a great disappointment to me that here we are again, an announcement was made by the government in the dying days of last year—I think it was 30 December, actually—when the Attorney-General finally said, 'Yes, I want to deal with revenge sexting, and I'm also going to tidy up this issue of how we might capture children who will end up on the Child Sex Offenders list.' He made a public statement at the time that there was no child on that list yet, thankfully, but that when he dealt with revenge texting he would do it; he would tidy this up so that we would make sure that children who were stupid in doing something were not unfairly put on the list.

The submissions finished on 5 February on the public consultation list, and we still do not have a bill from the Attorney-General. It is one thing to say that we recognise the significance or contributions of past members of parliament who have brought worthy recommendations to the parliament, outlined a persuasive case to justify legislative reform asking a government to act on it, and then years later it is not even dealt with, and I think that is shameful. I hope that the government wake up to themselves and advance not just this motion but the legislation in respect of revenge sexting and ensure that, when our children act stupidly they receive punishment, but are not branded

with being listed on the Child Sex Offenders Register for life, which they do not deserve. May Bob rest in peace.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:22): I rise today to support the statement of principles being proposed which is designed to ensure that all state parliamentarians, current and future, are held to a standard which is beyond reproach and which benefits the high standards that we are expected to hold as legislators, representatives and community leaders. The statement has been put by the government today which follows on from its longstanding commitment to ensure that members of this house, as part of a package of anticorruption reforms, ensure the integrity of this parliament.

This included a rewrite of the Development Act to make our planning system more transparent, a bill to regulate the dealings with business and lobbyists, and changes to improve the transparency of parliamentary remuneration. These build on past successes of the government in this area, including the introduction of an Independent Commission Against Corruption and political donation reform.

It is only 12 months that I have been a parliamentarian, and while I have been strongly connected to service to my community—both as a registered nurse for 30 years this August and as a volunteer, community activist and advocate where, funnily enough, I have written many codes of conduct for various purposes—becoming a parliamentarian has not been a deliberate lifelong journey for me which makes me a little different to many in this place. However, it really is of no surprise to family and friends that I have arrived here, and also of no surprise to them that I openly declare my own statement of personal values to constituents on a regular basis.

I make this declaration often as a way of reassuring the many people who loved my predecessor, Dr Bob Such MP, that in me they also have a person of principles: a person who will be honest; a person who is transparent; and a person who will listen. They know I cannot always do everything exactly as they would all like it to be done—that is impossible. We cannot possibly please everybody all of the time, but they do know that I will not be compromised, and I will always maintain the highest degree of integrity wherever I am serving them. This is important in all electorates, and definitely important in Fisher.

I am aware it has been a long journey towards getting to this point here today where we are discussing this statement of principles with a joint committee on a code of conduct first proposed in a motion in 2004. With this, I would like to acknowledge the hard work undertaken by many members to deliver the statement, especially Dr Such, who was eager to see the statement put in place. I know he would have been very happy to see it being presented to the house today. Dr Such was a crusader for parliamentary integrity. He wanted to see our parliament have the highest possible standing in the community and it must be with a mixture of deep pride and sadness (which I understand) that Lyn Such (Dr Such's loving wife) sits as a witness to the debate on these very important principles.

The considerations first put as terms of reference which first guided the joint committee are important to reinforce, that is, integrity of the parliament, the primacy of public interest over the furthering of private interests, disclosure of interest, conflicts of interest, independence of action, use of entitlements and public resources, honesty to parliament and the public, proper relations with ministers and the Public Service, confidentiality of information, government contracts, and duties of a member of parliament. All of those I have no trouble following.

It is worth assessing today whether we have a statement which meets its goals as initially outlined. I will be supporting the statement as I believe it does meet these goals. The statement defends the integrity of parliament by a strong set of clauses which details members' duties in relation to interests, the protection of information, ensuring that public resources are not used for private benefit, and ensuring that they behave in a manner befitting an MP in this place while not restricting free debate.

The proposed statement of principles provides MPs with guidelines on their conduct in parliament and in their public life generally. This should, of course, also cover behaviours in the media, social media particularly. It is not intended to be a comprehensive code of conduct regulating the behaviour of MPs given that MPs are already subject to comprehensive laws and rules, nor will it be enforceable against MPs. Instead, this statement of principles aims to provide MPs with a

reference point to assist in the discharge of their duties and to educate the public of the duties and obligations of MPs. For the seat of Fisher and Bob Such, I commend the motion to the house.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:27): I also rise today to support the motion and to touch on briefly what the Premier alluded to. It is extremely important, as members of parliament, that we discharge our duty with the utmost honour, and it is quite a significant honour that is bestowed on all of us. I also acknowledge Mrs Such in the gallery and also all of the fantastic work that the late Hon. Bob Such did in this area.

We are here to serve the people we represent in South Australia and it is extremely important that this place attracts the best and brightest minds to politics and that there is a clear set of guidelines. As the member for Bragg pointed out, we have been talking about this issue for many years. The government has been slow to implement these principles that we have been calling for, and Dr Such had been calling for, for some time. You do have to ask the question: why has it taken the government so long to do something about such an important area?

We have seen a number of issues in recent times raise this exact concept of a statement of principles. Obviously, we had an ICAC investigation this year into the Gillman land sale where there were several findings in respect of the behaviour of many on the opposite side of the chamber. That particular example made it crystal clear to the government, and to us, that a statement of principles was needed. It is better late than never but I have no doubt that this will be an important step in making sure that all MPs will be held accountable for what they do.

The statement of principles touches on many fundamental important themes such as accountability, honesty, how members conduct themselves in political parties and outside, conflicts of interest, what is a conflict of interest, what is required if there is a conflict of interest that arises and how to act if there is a vested interest in a particular matter.

The statement also covers how to handle gifts and how to utilise public resources for the best use of the community. It covers not only resources but also information. Obviously, from time to time we come across official information that is not necessarily in the public domain and it is extremely important that, as members of parliament, we utilise that information for the best reason and for the public. The statement also covers freedom of speech. Obviously, we do have certain immunities that other members of the public do not. With that immunity, we need to make sure that we use that tool for the right purposes. If this statement of principles helps to crystallise those kinds of issues then I am more than happy to support it.

The government before this government did propose a code of conduct and, as the member for Bragg alluded to, there was a joint committee of the parliament that was convened, I think, in 2003-04. That committee recommended a statement of principles rather than a particular code of conduct. It seems like the Premier's motion is very similar, if not the same, as what was recommended by that committee 10 years earlier.

The ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander, in his 2013-14 annual report recommended that there be this kind of code of conduct. I am led to believe that South Australia has fallen behind the rest of Australia, because in many other states these kinds of statement of principles or codes of conduct exist. Obviously, parliament does and parliament should have the power to deal with its own members in respect of their behaviour. Overall, I am disappointed that it has taken the government so long to react to this; however, better late than never. I am happy to support what is a good motion.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:32): I rise to speak today on this statement of principles for members of parliament, a move that goes to the heart of what we are all here to do with and for the communities we have the privilege of representing. It is with great pleasure that I acknowledge Ms Lyn Such in the gallery, who is here today to see and hear her much-loved late husband's legacy being made a reality. I know he would be proud of the work we are doing here today and I thank her for her ongoing commitment to seeing these reforms passed by the house.

This statement of principles is essential to ensuring that the conduct of our parliament and parliamentarians is a reflection of our community's values and expectations. South Australians have a right to the best representation at the highest levels, and we all must uphold the highest standards as we go about our work both in this place and in our South Australian communities. It is a privilege,

not a right, to be a parliamentarian and one afforded only to a select few. As such, we have the honour and also the duty to ensure that the way we act in all aspects of our work is reflective of what our community values and wants from us.

As the member for Reynell, I have always felt and now deeply know that one of the most important parts of our job is talking with rather than just talking at our community, listening to our community, reflecting on their views as we do our work and acting with integrity by duly considering those views. Our electorates are the most important interest that we must take into account as we consider the issues affecting our state. I both enjoy and take pride in reflecting with my community on issues that are important to them.

As we all do as members of parliament, I live a very busy life. As I am sure is the case with many other members, I am often kindly asked how I fit it all in and whether I am tired or need a break. My answer is always the same: if I ever do feel tired I go and doorknock or visit a local shopping centre and I am immediately revived by chatting with the many, many good people in my community who spend their time volunteering, looking after people, and giving to others and our community groups, clubs and organisations in many different ways. These people are the lifeblood of our communities and we must always remember that they deserve us at all times to be connected with them, energetic for them, and authentically representing them and their needs, hopes and desires.

The fact that our new statement of principles begins with a reflection of the deep privilege and responsibility that comes with representing our communities with integrity, honesty and authenticity is heartening and it is right. The faith our electorates place in us, and the power they have to remove us from our privileged positions, must be central and paramount to any discussion around standards of behaviour in this place and in our communities.

Our responsibility to the public is of utmost importance to the work that we do here, and we at all times must work in a manner that respects that trust. Our work must be done with honesty and fairness and, it should go without saying, should be subject to the laws of the state and the rules of parliament.

Whilst much of what we are passing today is what I would describe as common sense, it is important that we take time to reflect on our role and on the best way to fulfil that role. Our credibility as members of parliament is judged by how we fulfil our roles and how we represent those who chose us to represent them. I am proud to vote in favour of this motion today, a motion and statement which reflects the values that this house and indeed our communities believe are important for our role. I hope this motion today, and its subsequent publication, seeks to inform the public of the duties and obligations that we in this place have to them.

I acknowledge the important work of the late Dr Bob Such in this area. I know that at his heart he wanted what we all want: a parliament of which we can be proud, one of which our community can be proud, and one that is an exemplar to other states and territories. We want to exhibit the best practice that a parliament can. I acknowledge the work of the Premier in making this a personal commitment to both his parliamentary colleagues and the people of South Australia. It is the mark of a great leader to make self-discipline and integrity a pillar of your agenda, as well as to lead by example.

I also acknowledge the work of our Attorney-General, the Hon. John Rau, for his work on progressing these issues in the house. I understand it has been the work of over a decade, an impressive investment of time. I also thank and acknowledge all of the members who have spoken and will speak in this debate for their reflections and their shared commitment to ensuring our parliament is the best it can be.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:37): I will be very quick. I support this motion moved by the Attorney-General. I pay my respects to the late Bob Such and to the great work he did not only for this house but also for all of regional South Australia, and also thank him very sincerely for the assistance he gave me when I first came here in 2009, and I have put that on the record previously.

Bob Such was always a person of integrity, and that is one of the reasons he wanted this code of conduct to be put before this house. When members of parliament are elected we are the face of the state for our electorates, and we need to be acting at the highest possible standards, both

in behaviour and in our image. Also, we must retain our humility and remember to be civil, as the Premier indicated before. We must also remember that we are no different from anyone else in our communities. We are there serving people.

I know there are sides in the political sphere, but when we are elected we have to look after our parties. As we all know, Bob Such was an Independent and I am an Independent. If you are a party person, whether it be Liberal, Labor, the Greens or whoever it may be, you must look after your party, but once we are elected we are there to represent all people across the electorate that we represent.

Once elected we must, first, serve the people out there. Bob Such taught me very clearly that no matter who you are or where you are coming from you are all equal out there. We can disagree with each other in this house here, and perhaps we can disagree with the debate that eventuates. The general public does not have a good image of politicians in general, and I am sorry to say that. You only have to look at question time nationally—a lot of people watch it, but I certainly would not take my school children to see it.

Speaking from personal experience, when we have a debate in this house we debate the issues and, irrespective of the results, we should be able to walk away, but we have to have adequate communications coming out from those debates.

We must believe how the image, and the acceptance of members of parliament in general by the community, are taken is pivotal. We are not highly regarded by the general community, and we need to build up that trust because trust in our political leaders, whoever and wherever they may be, is very pivotal.

I want to put a couple of sentences on the record for the late Bob Such. Bob, as the member for Bragg indicated, had been trying to get this through for many years. We are here today to pay tribute to his request. We are here today to debate this, and I would hope that both sides accept this and that we move forward in a positive manner.

I would also like to pay tribute to the late Bob Such's wife, Lyn. In our field, we have lots of issues and lots of time away from our families. I know that Bob was a very devoted family person and I know that Bob was a very devoted member of parliament. Bob was also a very devoted and committed person to whatever he did. So, to Lyn and the family I pay my tributes and respect, but I certainly agree with this motion coming forward and I would ask everybody to vote for it.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:41): I rise to speak on this motion with somewhat less enthusiasm than has been expressed by some of my colleagues in this place. I will be quite blunt: it states nothing more than the bleeding obvious and, to my mind, I think it is totally unnecessary. In my mind, I have a serious question mark over the motive behind this motion even coming to the house, but I will not go into that at this point.

I want to very quickly make the point that we are here at the behest of our electorate. We are here in a very public way and we are responsible to our electorate. There is nothing in this statement of principles that is not bleeding obvious to all of us and to our electorates. It really does concern me, and in fact in some ways it offends me, that the house would even go down this path.

I live by the credo that there is only one conscience I need to satisfy. When I put my head on the pillow of a night-time and close my eyes, I fall asleep because I have a clear conscience. I am not responsible to anybody else in this place, but I am responsible to my electorate, and I make sure that in everything I do I act in good faith for those very kind people who have sent me here and returned me here on numerous occasions.

If any of us thinks that this statement of principles will make one iota of difference, I think that person would be delusional. I have seen some outrageous behaviour from members of this place, both inside and outside this chamber—absolutely outrageous behaviour. Not one word in this statement of principles I believe will ever change that, and that sort of behaviour will indeed continue. That is one of the reasons why, as a group, we are not seen in the best light by the communities we represent—because too many of us do not behave as we should. I do not believe that this is going to make any difference.

I do not believe that the house should take on the responsibility of trying to curb individuals' behaviour. I think that is the role of the electorate. That is what democracy is about. We are here representing our electorate, not our neighbouring electorates. We are not responsible to those who represent other groups and other electorates: we are responsible to our electorate. I would wish that, as a group, we behave more honourably, but indeed I think I will go to my grave still wishing that because I do not expect that it is going to happen.

Notwithstanding that, I understand that the house is going to pass this motion, but I wanted to put on record my thoughts. I remember a word that Don Dunstan used many years ago which I thought was a terrific word. He had hopped off an aeroplane on his way back from an overseas trip and in the answer he gave to a reporter he used the word 'persiflage', and that is the word I would use to describe this statement of principles and everything that is happening about it. It is unnecessary, it will achieve nothing. I guess this will make some members feel warm inside, and good on them, but to the voting public I do not think it will make any difference and, to the behaviour of those people who behave abominably, I do not think it is going to make any change to that either.

I would like to take the opportunity to put on the record a correction. The member for Fisher talked about this government's record and mentioned ICAC. As everybody who has been in this place for more than five minutes knows, this government was dragged kicking and screaming before it acceded to the will of the parliament and the people of South Australia to have an ICAC established in this place. I do not think that the government's record with regard to ICAC is a very proud one at all. I wanted to take the opportunity to correct that. I am proud that the Liberal Party fought a long and strenuous battle to get an ICAC established here in South Australia; indeed, I think the work of that ICAC has shown the importance and the need for that here in South Australia, and that we were right.

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (12:46): That is a tough act to follow from the member for MacKillop. I guess on the one hand it certainly will make future readers of *Hansard* more interested in the colour of this debate to have some opposition to these principles which I think are widely supported by all members of parliament. Even if you look at what the member for MacKillop said in terms of a lot of the principles that he enunciated, that we are responsible to our electorates, that we should act in the best interests of our electorates, that we are accountable to them, that is exactly what this statement of principles is enunciating today.

I know that all my colleagues are very honoured to be members of this house and we understand that we need to be mindful of the responsibilities that we have, to use the positions for the benefit of the state in our electorates in an honest and fair manner and to uphold integrity at all times. Ultimately we are judged by our real bosses, the 24,000 or so people who elect us every four years. They have the ultimate ability to decide whether or not we should continue to represent them in this house.

On the one hand this statement of principles is a very significant step that we should adopt, but I also agree that on the other hand a lot of these are common-sense principles that most of us have been adhering to ever since we were elected and, by enunciating them for the house, we are just cementing the fact that these are the principles that we have always been guided by.

I think it is appropriate that we pay our due respect at this time to Dr Bob Such and, like other members, I acknowledge Lyn Such here today and thank her for being here. This is one of the many motions that Dr Such promoted in this house time and time again and tried to have this brought forward and passed by the house. I am glad that we are finally doing that today in the same wording that Dr Such provided. Of course, he was also on the select committee that developed these particular words in 2003 and 2004.

There have been a number of other integrity measures that have been brought in and this is just one of them. We have had a ministerial code of conduct ever since this government was elected in 2002. We expanded the Freedom of Information Act back in 2002. We now have proactive disclosure of government information, as well as open government data. We have implemented the ICAC which absolutely was passed by this government. We have reformed electoral funding regulations and introduced public funding which, I believe, is a very important public integrity measure for this state.

We have also recently regulated lobbyists, which is an emerging issue for integrity across this state and also across the country and the world. We are also hoping to limit the power of the planning minister with regard to the urban growth boundary, and we are hoping that the Legislative Council will agree to that. This is not the only integrity measure that we are passing; this forms the basis for a whole series of integrity measures.

As with any such principles, over time they will be looked at and evolve and we will consider them as situations arise. However, I think the number of the principles will hold true at any time in terms of the fact that MPs are responsible to their electors and also it is important that these principles say that political parties are a legitimate part of the democratic process—it is important that these principles say that.

I noticed when reflecting on some of the debates by Dr Such when he was promoting this motion previously that he talked about how some of these things, if interpreted to their limits, could get a bit silly so we need to be careful. The example he used was: if you were given a ticket to the IceArena, would that be a gift that you had to declare? I think all of us would agree that that is not. Of course, the principles themselves refer to the declarations required under the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act and that should be the guiding principle when interpreting these statements.

I reflected on that recently when I attended the Seaford District Residents Association and was presented with a bottle of Yellow Tail shiraz (which I think retails at \$6.95 at Dan Murphy's outlets) and if that was something that needed to be declared or not—which I guess I am to the house in an official way. These things need to have a common-sense interpretation applied to them. The other thing where common sense needs to apply is with declarations of interest. One of the new things that we have not really reflected upon is that we are now saying that members need to declare to the house when they have a declaration of interest with regard to a particular matter, which probably has not always happened over the last 150 years or so.

We need to make sure that all members are aware of their responsibilities in that regard but, at the same time, that the principles clearly state that they are about financial interests and merely being a patron or a member of a sporting club or something like that should not be interpreted as a financial interest. That has been an issue from time to time in local government, with declarations of interest, where people have been pushed to the limits, going over the top about declaring things and having to leave the room when there is no financial interest at all.

I hope that this house passes this motion and also hope in particular that the Legislative Council, the other place, passes the same wording for principles—and I see no reason why it should not. That would then set a good standard for members across both houses of parliament. As has been mentioned by a number of other speakers, we know that politicians do not have the highest reputation of any profession out there, and I do not think passing this by itself is going to change that totally.

However, I think it is one of a number of steps that we need to make to set the standard of behaviour that people should expect from their members of parliament in going about their duties and having a high level of integrity. We also hope that more and more South Australians will see this as a profession that they want to enter into and will make a decision to run for parliament and take part in this contest of ideas and policies that we have in this house. I support the motion.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (12:53): I was not planning to speak; however, having listened to some of the contributions, I thought I would make a brief contribution. In particular, I wanted to make it very clear to the house that my understanding of the member for MacKillop's comments was not that he was in any way not supporting this motion but, rather, that he was making two points: (1) that this statement of principles is nothing less than a sort of code to which we should all be living anyway in our private and public lives; and (2) that the electorate will decide for us whether our code of conduct has been appropriately upheld by us in our personal and public behaviour.

I do not think that there is any sense in which the member for MacKillop was opposing the motion. He was simply pointing out that the electorate ultimately will make its decision about the behaviour of any person who holds office as a member of parliament, be it in this parliament or the federal parliament.

The reason, however, that I was prompted to comment was a couple of things. One that springs to mind immediately was the fact that the Premier made much of the need for civility. Just last week, the member for Mount Gambier addressed the house in a grievance debate after question time and when he did, the member for Mawson became very agitated. Indeed, he came across the chamber and approached him very aggressively afterwards.

I will not repeat what the member for Mawson said. Suffice to say that the minister, who was upset by the comments made in the grievance debate, was far less than civil. My question to the Premier would be whether he is intending to in any way reprimand, not just a member but a minister of this place, for his unbelievably uncivil behaviour towards a person on this side of the house who did nothing more than get up and in a perfectly polite way make a point on a policy issue. That is the first question.

The second, also involving the member for Mawson in fact, concerns the issue of conflict of interest. Personally, I think that when we come into this place, people should have some schooling in what constitutes a conflict of interest. There is provision in these principles that says it is not a conflict of interest if you are just the same as someone else. If you are a member of a sports club, or whatever it might be, then that is all very well. You are treated just as a member of the public; you are not expected to be taken out of all your normal community involvement and so on, simply because you are now a member of parliament and you must not have a conflict of interest.

I think it can be confusing what actually constitutes a conflict of interest, but as it happens, I never seemed to be able to get across to the member for Mawson, or indeed anyone on the government side of the chamber, that it seemed to me that there was either a conflict of interest or a very real perceived conflict of interest when the member for Mawson was in fact living with a person who was appointed to the board of WorkCover.

Not only that, but that person was also receiving the benefit of contracts from WorkCover for the provision of rehabilitation services and indeed, as I understand it, received more of those contracts than anyone else. It seemed to me to be a pretty blatant case of a conflict of interest, which should not only have been declared but absolutely avoided. I thought it was so blatant that something should have been done, but clearly this government chose to simply ignore that particular issue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, it is really important not to be particular—unless you want to raise it formally—if you want to be general about things rather than specific. If you want to be specific, you can raise it as a motion yourself.

Ms REDMOND: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have spoken to the table, and we are all of that same opinion. You only have a minute to go, and I do not want to cut into your time—or are you going to seek leave to continue your remarks later?

Ms REDMOND: Thank you. No, I will not seek leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You do or you do not?

Ms REDMOND: I think that my remarks to date have been entirely within the scope of the debate and have been no more particular—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Except that you have been naming people. We are not going to go into it. We have asked you not to name people. You are quite welcome to range as wide as you want about the actual issue, but just not name people.

Ms REDMOND: The issue is conflict of interest. As I was saying, I believe that when members come into this place it would be entirely appropriate for us to have some schooling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is fine; we just ask you not to name people, that is all.

Ms REDMOND: Coming out of the law, I think I probably had a better idea of conflict of interest. Having attended Australia's first anticorruption conference, when I was fighting to get an ICAC in this state—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was with you shoulder to shoulder, as I recall, in some places.

Ms REDMOND: Not at that conference, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, but I was in Brisbane at the time you were.

Ms REDMOND: I attended that conference. I fought hard to get an ICAC in this state, and I am very pleased that we now have one, but as I say, I believe there is a lot of ignorance about what constitutes a conflict of interest. Therefore, I believe that when people come into this place there should be some education, so that instead of simply signing on the dotted line, they actually acknowledge that they understand what is meant by a conflict of interest and take steps to avoid it. I will conclude my comments there.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2016

Message from Governor

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE SITE AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SURVEILLANCE DEVICES BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Premier and the Leader to order for conversing aloud during the visit of His Excellency's representative.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Remuneration Tribunal—Determination of the Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Annual Report

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Lobbyists—General

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—Colonel Light Gardens State Heritage Area

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board—Report to the, on the Valuation of Long Service Leave Liabilities as at 30 June 2015 Report

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Services (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Rules made under the following Acts—

Authorised Betting Operations—Gambling Codes of Practice—Account gambling—
Variation Notice 2016

By the Minister for the City of Adelaide (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Capital City Committee Adelaide—Annual Report 2014-15

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

South Australian Public Health—Notifiable conditions

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Police Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report as at 30 June 2014

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Southern State Superannuation—Salary sacrifice

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

Industry Advisory Group—

Alpaca Annual Report 2014-15

Apiary Annual Report 2014-15

Cattle Annual Report 2014-15

Deer Annual Report 2014-15

Goat Annual Report 2014-15

Horse Annual Report 2014-15

Sheep Annual Report 2014-15

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Fisheries Management—Berleying

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Electoral Commissioner—Local Government Election Report 2014

Ministerial Statement

STEEL INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The steel industry around Australia is responding to increasingly slender margins and increased price competition from China and other steelmaking countries. South Australia and Arrium are not immune to these global market pressures. Arrium's challenges are compounded by its mining operations that have also felt the brunt of the fall in iron ore prices.

South Australia is the birthplace of the nation's steel industry. As a nation that has a vast abundance of iron ore, as part of our national security, we have to ensure we have a sustainable steelmaking capacity in this country. We simply cannot be one of the largest iron ore producers in the world and not manufacture our own steel. South Australia and, indeed, the nation, have an interest in ensuring a long-term future for the creation of structural steel.

I believe ensuring that we have a secure capacity to create structural steel is a central part of our nation's capacity to assert itself as having an independent sovereign status. The Anti-Dumping Commission recently confirmed fears that the local steel industry has been damaged by cheap imports from China being dumped into Australia. Federal industry minister Christopher Pyne has asked the commission to undertake an inquiry into steel imports in response to industry concerns about dumping and its impact on their business. I look forward to the commission taking appropriate measures to remedy this unfair competition.

The South Australian government continues to stand by Arrium and the Whyalla community to ensure that steelmaking remains a major contributor to jobs and economic prosperity in South Australia. As a demonstration of that support, the South Australian government has launched a Support Our Steel campaign to urge all states, territories and the commonwealth to mandate the use of Australian standard steel and accredited fabricators in all taxpayer-funded projects. To further assist Arrium, the government established steel task force led by the same team that worked with Nyrstar to secure the future of Port Pirie.

The government has indicated its willingness to provide further support to Arrium, and the task force is in ongoing negotiations with them around the nature of that support. Arrium yesterday announced a recapitalisation through GSO Capital Partners as part of its strategy of reducing its debt exposure in response to a low iron ore price.

The state government has already agreed to extend for a further 10 years the environmental authorisation provided to Arrium to operate its Whyalla steelworks waived royalties on magnetite used to feed Arrium's Whyalla steelworks, and signed a memorandum of understanding with Arrium agreeing to work together to create a multi-user port at Whyalla and generate new investment opportunities in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

This government stands shoulder to shoulder with the people at Whyalla. We will be working with Arrium to narrow down the appropriate options for sustaining the life of the steelworks and encourage investment in Whyalla and more broadly in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leave was granted to the Premier to make that ministerial statement. If there is something in it with which members disagree, they can ask questions about it either without notice or on notice. However, it was met with a torrent of interjections, so I call to order the members for Hartley, Hammond, Chaffey, and the deputy leader. I warn the deputy leader and the members for Hammond and Hartley and I warn for the second and final time the deputy leader and the member for Hammond.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SITE INCIDENT

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Last Saturday, 20 February, a worker tragically died as a result of a workplace accident at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site. My thoughts and prayers are with the family of Mr Stephen Wyatt at this distressing time. I also extend my thoughts to all other workers at the site who have lost a friend and colleague. SafeWork SA and SA Police are currently investigating this incident, and I am advised that SafeWork SA is providing support to Mr Wyatt's family through the investigation process.

The government has spoken to SA Health Partnership, the CFMEU and the CEPU to offer whatever support is required. Safety must always be paramount at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, both for the patients who will move into the hospital and for the workers who are building it. Once again, on behalf of the government, I offer my deepest condolences to the family, friends and colleagues of Mr Stephen Wyatt.

COPPER MINING STRATEGY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This afternoon, the state government launched its long-term strategy to produce and export more than \$8 billion of copper a year and entrench South Australia as one of the world's most important and significant suppliers of copper. Copper is critical to lifting the living standards of countries in our region and combating the effects of climate change through the spread of renewable energy.

South Australia holds 68 per cent of Australia's copper resources within our copper belt, which is home to Olympic Dam and Prominent Hill. We also produce copper from Kanmantoo in the Adelaide Hills, and progress is being made towards developing the world-class copper discovery at Carrapateena. Our copper strategy sets out a clear pathway to support the industry to triple its copper production to one million tonnes per year within the next two decades. By trebling our copper production, South Australia has the potential to create up to 10,000 extra jobs, increasing the workforce involved in the sector to 15,000 people.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This strategy emerged from a copper summit I hosted in May last year. At that time, I set out the challenge of tripling production and asking industry and other stakeholders what measures we needed to take to achieve this objective. Currently, this state produces and exports \$1.9 billion of copper and, last year, the copper industry employed about 5,000 people in exploration and production.

We can build on this strong foundation. To do so, we need to encourage new discoveries and harness innovations to ensure we have more efficient and productive copper producers, and we must improve community engagement to ensure that South Australians continue to support our world-class resources industry. The government has already taken several early steps to implement the strategy, including providing \$20 million for PACE Copper and \$10 million to support innovative research into the process of improving copper-in-concentrate.

Last week, the Premier opened the new \$32 million Drill Core Reference Library at Tonsley, which will be a world-leading research and discovery facility. The state government will also continue to work to identify infrastructure needs and develop innovative approaches, including finding suitable water supplies and transport opportunities to support existing and future mines. The government aims to attract major international resource and service companies with deep mining expertise and technology.

Through the copper strategy, we will support international information exchange programs with Chile and China, which are world leaders in copper production. As part of the consultation process, three action themes were identified which aim to bring forward exploration and discovery of new copper reserves, improve productivity and efficiencies of local copper producers and improve the industry's capacity to engage with the South Australian community. It is an ambitious target, but South Australians, when we work together, can achieve great things.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Hartley for the second and final time for interjecting during that ministerial statement.

COST OF LIVING CONCESSION

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:15): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: More than 27,000 tenant households across South Australia will start receiving the government's cost of living concession from tomorrow. The concession is being provided one month earlier than estimated and is part of the government's commitment to help ease the cost of living pressures faced by people on low or fixed incomes, as well as pensioners.

Many in our community find their finances stretched, and this is why the government is providing the cost of living concession to those who need it most. The concession was introduced last July, replacing and expanding the former council rates concession for eligible homeowner households.

The new cost of living concession payment of up to \$200 was provided to eligible homeowners in September 2015. However, the government recognised that tenants also face a range of cost of living pressures, so we have extended the concessions to vulnerable and disadvantaged tenants, who can apply to receive up to \$100 annually. Tenants were not eligible to receive the previous concession.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The concession provides flexibility for people to use it whenever it is needed in order to support themselves and their families. Since payments for the 2015-16 financial year began last September, almost 150,000 homeowner households and retirement village residents have received the cost of living concession. Eligible tenants who applied for the concession will start receiving their payments directly into their nominated bank account.

Applications will open for the 2016-17 cost of living concession on 1 July 2016. The state government will always fight for and protect our most vulnerable citizens, which is why we continue to offer a range of concessions, including energy, water, sewerage, the emergency services levy and transport. The government is proud to stand by the vulnerable members of our community, and we do not want to play political games with those people.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Morialta for interjecting during that ministerial statement.

Parliamentary Committees

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:18): I bring up the 22nd report of the committee, entitled 2015 Regional Visit to the Riverland.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:19): I bring up the 541st report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2014-15.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SITE INCIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Thank you very much, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. What steps is the government taking to ensure that scissor lifts are used safely on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site as we await the investigation of the tragic death of a second worker at this site?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:20): That is probably more a question better directed towards the Minister for Industrial Relations, but, nonetheless, I spoke to SAHP yesterday and they indicated to me that they were reviewing the use of scissor lifts. I think it is a good chance that scissor lifts will not continue to be used on the site at all. Certainly from the union's perspective it has put a workplace ban on the use of scissor lifts indefinitely. So, I guess, one of two things will happen: the CFMEU will have to be

convinced that they can be used safely, and, if not, they will not be used. I think that most likely it will be the latter.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SITE INCIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary: is the minister suggesting that the scissor lifts will not be used on this site at all going forward?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21): Well, it is not for me to answer on behalf of the builder, but I would speculate that, yes, that is quite likely.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Thank you very much. My question is to the Minister for Health. Is the government satisfied that workers on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site are safe and that the project time frame is not leading to an undermining of workers' safety?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition asked this question. The first thing I should say is that this terrible accident is being investigated by SafeWork SA, and I have full confidence, and the government does, that it will get to the bottom of how this accident happened and what may have been the factors around it happening.

I know that it will take the appropriate action if some culpability or negligence is found as a result of this. Now, with regard to the timetables for completion of the project, I do not think I could have made myself clearer before this terrible accident happened; as recently as a couple of weeks ago, when asked whether I could guarantee that the hospital would not be delayed, I said, 'No, I won't guarantee it.'

My overriding concern and that of the government has always been the safety of patients and, of course, the safety of workers working on the site, and we have always made very, very clear that we expect the builder to provide a safe workplace. Now, if the builder is having difficulty meeting the deadlines and then the time lines associated with the project in a way that is safe for the people working on that site, we expect them to come to us and speak to the government about their inability to meet the deadlines.

There is only one person in South Australia who has been saying something different, and that person has been saying that the government has not been hard enough on the builder, that we should have gone in harder, in fact that our penalties were nowhere near strong enough against the builder for lateness, and that person was the Hon. Rob Lucas, who had quite explicitly said that we should be fining the company for being late.

We have not taken that approach. We have always been quite open to sit down with the company and to negotiate a revised time line, because from my perspective both the safety of the patients who we need to transfer into the new hospital—which is going to be a project of extreme complexity—and the safety of the workers who are working on the most ambitious infrastructure site undertaken in South Australia's history and one of the largest in our nation's history, has to be absolute paramount. We certainly won't be pushing the builder to meet some political deadline in a way that would compromise either of those things.

The SPEAKER: Leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SITE INCIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary, sir. Can the minister advise the house whether the SafeWork SA investigation into the previous death in November 2014 on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site has been completed and whether that is publicly available?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister

for the City of Adelaide) (14:25): In relation to the last incident—and this was the incident which occurred in November 2014—it is my understanding that SafeWork obviously has been involved in the investigation of that matter and is involved in this one. But the information that I have in front of me suggests that, in respect of both of these matters as they are presently being investigated, there is no public material that I can assist you with, other than to say this.

The circumstances of the two accidents were different and, in the case of the earlier incident, that particular worker was alone at the time of that accident, whereas in this particular case, as I understand it, the person who was the victim of this particular accident was working with another person on the lift. Another person was actually driving the lift. So there are differences in the circumstances and they are not indicative of any particular common theme other than that these are obviously pieces of equipment which, if not used safely, obviously present a risk.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SITE INCIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Can the Attorney-General inform the house whether or not it is routine for these reports not to be provided, whether there were recommendations covered in that SafeWork SA report, and whether all of the recommendations have been fully implemented?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:26): My understanding is that in respect of that first incident, my advice is that charges were laid on 27 October last year, and a directions hearing was apparently held on 28 January this year, and the matter is next listed for court on the 21st—

Mr Marshall: The recommendations based on the report—the SafeWork SA report—not the criminal proceedings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will have to take that on notice for you.

Mr Marshall: I would have thought with the focus on this, the deputy might have taken a look at the SafeWork report.

The SPEAKER: Would the leader like to ask a question?

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Yes, thank you very much, sir. I would like to ask a question to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise when the ambulance shuttle will start transferring patients from the Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27): I am very happy to take this question, because I know that one of the great complaints about the proposals in Transforming Health was the concern some clinicians had over the time it took sometimes to transfer patients if they had to wait for an ambulance and the significant delay on occasion in waiting for people to be transferred. So what is being investigated is to have a dedicated ambulance that will be able to transfer patients between the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals, and backwards and forwards.

I will double-check. I don't think that it has gone beyond the investigation phase but, contrary to reports that such a service would cost \$15 million, my advice is that, running seven days a week, 24 hours a day—it is unlikely that it would have to run 24 hours a day—it would cost \$1.5 million, about 10 per cent of the \$15 million that was originally indicated. But I am certainly of the belief that such a service—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Obviously those opposite just do not like having better services for those people who live north of Gepps Cross.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order; the minister will be seated.

Mr GARDNER: It was a very straightforward question: when is it going to start? The minister is debating the answer. Either he doesn't know the answer or he is not trying to.

The SPEAKER: The minister is indeed debating the answer and the minister will stop debating the answer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I was having a lovely deluge opposite, Mr Speaker, but, nonetheless, I am always happy to follow your advice. This would be a very important service. It would assist us in moving patients backwards and forwards and, given that there were concerns expressed about the delays associated with moving patients between hospitals—

Mr Gardner: The longer you talk the more obvious it is that you don't know the answer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, at least let me off the leash to attack the indolence of those opposite.

The SPEAKER: I will deal with those opposite at the end of the minister's answer, and the minister will supply information to the house.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Okay; and very happily. Given that there were clinicians who had expressed concerns about delays associated with moving patients between Modbury and the Lyell McEwin Hospital, this is a project that I think is well worth good investigation and formulating a very good business case around, because I think it would address those concerns that have been expressed by clinicians.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is called to order and warned; the member for Morialta is warned for the first and second time; the member for Davenport is called to order and warned; the member for Hartley is warned for the second and final time; and the members for Mitchell, Goyder and Morphett are called to order.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): A supplementary, sir. Will this shuttle begin this month?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30): I am more than happy to get that information for the house.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): How many patients will be transferred each day via this shuttle?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30): In response to feedback from clinicians during extensive consultation, consideration has been given to provision of a dedicated ambulance service to transfer patients between Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital to ensure patients receive timely and appropriate care close to home. Media reports suggesting that the cost of a dedicated ambulance would be \$15 million per annum are exaggerated: the actual cost is closer to \$1.5 million. The Northern Adelaide Local Health Network currently transfers patients via the SA Ambulance Service across the northern network and other networks on a daily basis. Reduction in costs for this transport will offset the proposed dedicated service transfer cost.

Under Transforming Health the services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and Modbury Hospital work more closely together to ensure north and north-eastern residents receive the best care first time every time closer to home. While both hospitals will continue to operate emergency departments staffed by specialists 24 hours a day seven days a week, the Lyell McEwin Hospital will be the major hospital for the north. For patients needing emergency medical treatment, ambulances will deliver

them straight to the most appropriate hospital. Presentations to the Modbury Hospital emergency department—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the first and the second and final time; the member for Mitchell is warned for the second and final time; and the member for Florey is called to order, sorely provoked though she was. The minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Presentations to the Modbury Hospital which require more complex care or long-stay admissions are to be transferred to the Lyell McEwin Hospital or other specialist hospitals; for example, to the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the case of burns victims. To accommodate patients who need to be transferred between Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital, NALHN is currently working with SAAS regarding the provision of ambulance transfer 24/7.

A dedicated patient transfer service is not a new concept to South Australia. The Southern Adelaide Local Health Network has a non-SAAS-operated dedicated patient transport service to transfer patients between some of its facilities. Patient transfers from Modbury to the Lyell McEwin Hospital currently occur daily. Between 1 January 2015 and 1 February 2016 approximately 1,100 patients were transferred by ambulance from Modbury to the Lyell McEwin, so there is already a significant number of patients being transferred at the moment.

In the same 13-month period approximately 2,000 patients were transferred from Modbury to other metropolitan hospitals, including the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Of course, the public is advised to call 000 in any medical emergency to ensure they can be taken to the most appropriate facility.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order and warned; the member for Chaffey is warned; and the member for Finniss is called to order. There are many members who are now about to be ejected under the sessional order.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My supplementary is to the minister. Will the minister commit to coming back to the house today to tell us when the shuttle will begin and how many patients will be transferred per day?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34): My advice is that this is still in the investigation phase. I will be more than happy to do so once that investigation phase is finished.

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

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Can the minister advise the house what the time frame is for this investigation?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34): I'll get advice, but it would be in an appropriate period—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I would imagine we would conclude it sometime in the next couple of months, but we are still in the process of consulting with clinicians about all of these changes. I would have thought—

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I would have thought members opposite would have something to say if we produced all these changes simply as a fait accompli. We are going through a consultation phase, and that will be done when it's done.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:35): Supplementary: did the minister, in his answers, tell the house that they would be using non-SAAS patient transfer services? Is he going to privatise the ambulance service between Modbury and Elizabeth?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:35): No, the member for Morphett does need to listen a bit more closely. What I said was that with the current service that operates in southern Adelaide—so in southern Adelaide—at the moment, patients are transferred between Noarlunga, Flinders and the Repat, and they do have a non-SAAS operated dedicated patient transfer. It doesn't necessarily mean that it is appropriate for every patient, but it happens already. It happens already; it happens in southern Adelaide.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Can the minister confirm to the house that SA Health staff have advised staff at the Modbury Hospital that there will be a reduction in the number of medical department inpatient beds from the current 48 down to an 18-bed acute assessment unit?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:36): Obviously, we have released information to clinicians as part of our consultation with these quite sweeping changes to our health system, not only in northern Adelaide but across metropolitan Adelaide. Obviously, with a changed profile for the Modbury Hospital there will be different workforce and bed needs. What I can assure the house is that, overall, in northern Adelaide there will be more doctors, more nurses and more hospital beds. But I do caution the house. We do have to change the rhetoric around health. We do have to stop talking about inputs as if they are good, in and of themselves.

The health system is not defined by how many doctors, how many nurses and how many hospital beds. What it is defined by is its outputs: the results for patients. How long they spend waiting for elective surgery. How long they wait in emergency departments. What are their outcomes when they are discharged from hospital? We need to stop talking about, and the health debate being framed around, inputs and start framing the health debate around outputs. On any measure, South Australia spends more, and has more doctors, more nurses and more hospital beds than anywhere else in Australia. But what we don't do, where we don't match that, is in the results.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have people waiting longer for elective surgery. We have, in many cases, far higher mortality—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —and we also have longer waits in our emergency departments. Yes, I put my hand up. Yes, this is something we are trying to fix; but we're not necessarily going to fix that just by employing more doctors, employing more nurses and putting in more hospital beds because to date—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: To date that hasn't worked. That hasn't worked. We need to transform our system to make sure that our outputs match what taxpayers are spending on the system to make sure people spend less time in emergency departments, to make sure they spend less time waiting for elective surgery and make sure that they are less likely to have a bad outcome, a poor outcome, when they are discharged from hospital.

I know the line of questioning the Leader of the Opposition is going to pursue in this, and I know he is going to be talking about how many doctors, how many nurses, and so on. But the Leader of the Opposition, only several weeks ago, said that we spend more than enough on the health system. The fact is we have to do it better. So, it would be nice for the Leader of the Opposition, for his actions to reflect—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: For his actions to reflect his rhetoric, and actually take a more bipartisan and cooperative approach rather than just talking constantly about inputs.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey and the member for Davenport are warned for the second and final time. The member for Hartley will leave under the sessional order for repeatedly interjecting—and for the full hour for interjecting 'less hospitals' when he should have interjected 'fewer hospitals'.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Supplementary to the Minister for Health. Given that the staff at Modbury Hospital have been informed that there will be 30 medical department inpatient beds lost on that site, can the minister inform the house when these cuts will begin?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): Mr Speaker, as I have said, across northern Adelaide there are actually going to be more, because we are going to need to do more activity. In fact—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, I am talking about Modbury Hospital. Modbury Hospital will be seeing 3,000 more patients every year under these reforms—more patients, not fewer. They will be seeing 3,000 more patients because we will be able to do things at the Modbury Hospital far better than we currently do. These reforms have been tried and tested. They have been done interstate and they have been demonstrated to work very, very well. The opposition might put its head in the sand over the need for health reform but the fact is we need health reform and we have to make things better.

The final point I would make is that, with these changes, where workforce requirements change, I can guarantee we will find employment for all of our doctors and nurses. No-one is going to be sacked. We are very confident that we will be able to place doctors and nurses in different positions and in new roles and better roles as the profile of these two hospitals' changes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Mitchell, Chaffey, Davenport, Schubert, Morialta and Hammond, and the deputy leader and leader are all on the maximum warnings. Leader.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary to the Minister for Health. What steps are being taken to inform the people who live in and around the Modbury Hospital catchment zone to which hospital they should present after they have self-diagnosed their condition?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:41): I don't know if the Leader of the Opposition is advocating self-diagnosis but, certainly from the government's perspective, self-diagnosis is generally not a good idea. We do not suggest people self-diagnose. The best thing is to get professional medical help. I should say that people should always go—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: People should always go, if they need a hospital, but it's not something—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

Mr Marshall: Which hospital? What do you do? Do you go to Modbury? Do you go to Lyell McEwin?

The SPEAKER: If the leader makes another utterance outside standing orders, he will join the member for Hartley.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, if they are self-presenting, people should always present to the hospital that is closest to them. I can't be clearer than that. If they believe they have a life-threatening illness, they need to call an ambulance and the skilled paramedics will make a determination on what is the most appropriate hospital. If people are self-presenting, go to the nearest hospital where a nurse and a doctor can properly assess you. If they believe you need to be transferred to a high acuity hospital, they will arrange that. So, if self-presenting, always present to a close hospital, the closest that you have available.

The Modbury Hospital will be open seven days a week, 24 hours a day with exactly the same profile of doctors and nurses on staff that it currently has. We will not be making any changes to that. Doctors and nurses will be at the Modbury Hospital and, if you present there and it is something they believe is going to require an admission that is going to take some time and is not appropriate for the short-stay facility, they will arrange a transfer to the most appropriate hospital—which happens at the moment.

Modbury Hospital is not in a position, currently, to deal with every single presentation that comes before it. We already have, as I indicated in a previous answer, many patients who are currently transferred either to the Lyell McEwin Hospital or, often, the Royal Adelaide Hospital because they have a particular illness or disease that the Modbury Hospital is not equipped to deal with. This comes down to a fundamental fact about patient safety. If the opposition sat down and took time to listen to the clinical experts in these sorts of areas, they would know—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: The minister is now clearly debating.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the minister is debating the matter. He should supply the house with information.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Very well. Mr Speaker; the simple fact is that what the experts in these areas tell us is that clinicians and clinical teams get good at dealing with injuries and illnesses, particularly of the highest acuity, when they see those sorts of presentations constantly.

If you are having a stroke, you do not want someone who sees stroke patients once every now and then. You want a team who sees stroke patients all the time, and the same goes for trauma, heart attacks and any number of high acuity injuries and illnesses. You want to be seen by a team that is going to see those sorts of presentations all of the time. You do not want to see a team who only does it every now and then, and that is no criticism of those who do.

They are very good, but for these high speciality areas, high acuity areas, they are very specialised and they require people who see these presentations on a constant basis, not just on an occasional basis. That is why it is important that we allow our hospitals to specialise so that they can develop the expertise and take better care of patients in those very high acuity areas, and that is at the basis of these reforms.

The SPEAKER: The members for Kavel and Stuart are called to order, and the member for Morphett is warned.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Supplementary: should a member of the public living in Hope Valley exhibit symptoms consistent with a heart attack, should they present themselves to Modbury or should they present themselves to the Lyell McEwin Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:46): They should call an ambulance. I don't know how many times I can say this. It is a simple fact. If you think you are having a heart attack, do not drive yourself to hospital: call an ambulance.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Look, you can scream out as much as you want. You are a dolt and an embarrassment. The simple fact is—

The SPEAKER: The minister will—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Here they go.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. The minister will withdraw his unparliamentary reference to the leader as a 'dolt'. He will withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I withdraw and apologise, but Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Before the minister goes on, the leader will depart for half an hour under the sessional orders for repeatedly interjecting.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, it—

The SPEAKER: Let's just wait until the leader departs.

The Leader of the Opposition having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Our advice is always that if you think you are having a heart attack, don't self-present: call an ambulance. Of course, there will be some people who, no matter how much advice we give them not to self-present, do nonetheless. If that does happen, Modbury Hospital will be able to look after them and will be able to make sure that they are kept safe and, if they need to be transferred, they will be transferred.

Some people presenting with chest pains do not necessarily need a high acuity hospital because they need to be kept for observation whilst determining whether they are having a heart attack or whether they are not. Of course, once the heart attack is confirmed then, yes, they need high acuity care, but for those people having chest pains that are not related to a heart attack and there is some other cause then, no, they will not need to be transferred and Modbury Hospital will be able to look after them. Not every chest pain patient will necessarily need to be transferred, but that is why it is so important to call an ambulance.

Ambulances have the equipment on board so they can determine, not always, but generally, whether a patient is having a heart attack or whether their chest pains are not necessarily that and those paramedics can always make that decision, but I cannot emphasise how important it is that if a South Australian does think they are having a heart attack, don't self-present: call an ambulance.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Health. In respect of the investigation by the Chief Medical Officer on management removing a radiologist's comments about hospital management from a patient's medical record and the actions then taken by SA Health, will the minister now tell us the outcome of crown law's consideration of that investigation?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:48): I will have to check, as it was from a little while ago, to see what the latest information is.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Supplementary to the Minister for Health: when you check in respect of this matter, which has been already outlined to the parliament, will you inquire as to whether a report on that matter can be tabled in the parliament?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:49): Again, I will check. Normally, legal advice that comes from the Crown is not something that we would table or make public but, again, I am more than happy to check. There is no doubt that the action that, I think from memory, several clinicians took in changing that patient's record should not have been done. The fact is, however, that because of the electronic health record that we had, while they were able to make it nonvisible, they were not able to actually destroy the record, so the record has now been restored to how it was. I will need to get some advice on what is the latest information on what is happening in this matter.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Final supplementary, if I may: could the minister also inquire as to what action, if any—disciplinary or otherwise—has been taken in respect of the person who was involved in changing that record?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:50): I am pretty sure we might already have made that public, but I will go back and check the record and just see whether it was made public at the time or not.

BUS SECURITY SCREENS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house what became of the negotiations that commenced with the Transport Workers Union and the Adelaide metropolitan bus companies in October 2013? In 2013 the Premier put out a media release entitled 'Safety blitz on public transport'. The release said, and I quote:

...the Government will also begin discussions with the three private bus contractors and the Transport Workers Union about whether safety screens for bus drivers should be introduced.

A recent survey returned to the Transport Workers Union identified that 80 per cent of drivers surveyed felt threatened by the behaviour of passengers on their buses.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:51): I thank the member for Unley for his question. His question was: can I update the house on discussions which occurred between the bus companies and the union? I don't have direct information to that; but he then went on to explain that he was interested in whether security screens have been rolled out for bus drivers in buses, and I can confirm, Mr Speaker, that that is underway.

TRANSIT POLICE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:51): Can the minister advise the house how many transit police in total are employed to operate on Adelaide's public transport services?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:51): If the member for Unley is after an exact number, I would have to confer with my colleague in the other place, who is the Minister for Police, who would then seek some advice from the police commissioner; but my understanding is that we made a commitment in 2012 to fund additional transit police positions, and that's my understanding of what has occurred.

TRANSIT POLICE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:52): Supplementary, sir: the minister put out a press release in January this year, where he claimed that there were nearly 100. Do you stand by those comments you made in that press release?

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is called to order. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:52): I thank the member for Unley for his question. That's certainly my understanding, but the member for Unley in his previous question asked for a

specific number, and I've indicated that I would have to seek the most up-to-date advice. The advice that I've always had is that we made a commitment in 2012 to significantly increase the number of transit police. We provided that funding, and my understanding is that that recruitment occurred.

TRANSIT POLICE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:52): Was the ALP document that was released before the election, claiming that there were 114 transport police, correct at that time?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:53): I haven't seen that document, let alone know whether that figure is indeed in that document, let alone that that—

Mr Whetstone: You retweeted it.

The SPEAKER: Well, there's been a lot of retweeting today. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps the member for Chaffey would like to ventilate his interjection more broadly, Mr Speaker.

ARRIUM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. When the minister publicly stated on Friday 19 February that, and I quote, 'The commonwealth government should be doing a cost-benefit analysis of investing in Whyalla,' had he already been briefed by Arrium that they were in discussions with an equity partner for more than \$1 billion worth of private investment, which was announced on 22 February?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:54): I am not going to reveal my private conversations with Arrium to the house, but I will say this: it is important that we have a partner in the commonwealth government to invest in Whyalla. The point I was trying to make to the media and the people of this state is that if the steelworks were indeed shut, the social cost to the state and the country would be dramatically higher than any cost of an investment in Arrium to maintain the ability of the local community to work and be prosperous.

In terms of any negotiations we're having with Arrium, as I said publicly on radio, we are in deep discussions with Arrium about what it is they are attempting to do as, I understand, the opposition have been briefed by Arrium as well. If they haven't, they should say so, but it is my understanding that they have. People need to be able to come to the treasurer of the state or the government and talk about issues facing their company without it being canvassed publicly in the chamber after the event.

Either way, whatever private equity raising Arrium is conducting doesn't change the fact that there needs to be an investment in the city of Whyalla, and that investment needs to be in a manner that maintains the long-term interests of the state by having the steelworks operational in Whyalla. It's no good being a nation that is one of the largest iron ore producers in the world if we can't manufacture our own steel.

The New South Wales government has done its part by giving payroll tax concessions. We give tax concessions in terms of royalties and other concessions to Arrium, and I have heard members opposite say that we should have done that. We have been doing that for years, and our concessions are larger than those offered by the New South Wales government to BlueScope.

We are committed to the people of Whyalla. The local member of parliament, the member for Giles—

Mr Pederick: How much Chinese steel have you brought in?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is committed to the people of Whyalla and I will point out that, while members opposite are talking about Chinese steel, I note in *The Advertiser* today that Liberal treasurers across the country were asked whether they would adopt South Australia's procurement processes to buy the highest quality Australian Standard steel, and the one successful Liberal government in the state refused to do so.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that the chief of staff of the Minister for Transport last week sent an insulting email to a senior member of the South Australian business community?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:57): I will take that on notice.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Supplementary: is the Premier aware that the Deputy Premier has just indicated that he will take on notice the following question, namely: 'Is the Premier aware that the chief of staff of the Minister for Transport last week sent an insulting email to a senior member of the business community?'

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:57): I am aware that the deputy leader has taken that question on notice, yes.

Members interjecting:

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Fine—he can dismiss it. My question now is to the Minister for Transport. Is the Minister for Transport aware that his own chief of staff sent an insulting and offensive email to a senior member of the businesses community last week?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:58): Can I thank the deputy leader for her question. I am sure that my chief of staff is in constant contact with several members of the business community. I am surprised to learn that any of those members believe that they have been the recipient of an offensive email from him but, now that you've raised it, I'll investigate that.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. In the event that the email that has been referred to is brought to his attention, what action will the Premier take against the ministerial staffer in respect of the allegations made in that statement?

The SPEAKER: It seems hypothetical to me.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:59): After the deputy leader considers that question and gives a response to the house, and after the minister has a communication with his chief of staff and finds out the content or otherwise of any said email, presumably, an analysis will be made of the issue and the appropriate steps will be taken. As I said in the debate earlier today, I think it's an important matter that members of this house conduct themselves in civility and that also goes for people who act in our name, that is, people who are employed as ministerial staff.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): A supplementary to the Premier: so, do I take it, Premier, that you stand by your position as outlined in this place in 2014 that, and I quote: 'people who are going about their work in the employment of this government should behave respectfully and decently and should not behave in an aggressive or threatening manner to anyone...?'

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:00): Yes, I think that's good advice. I think it's advice that should be heeded by members on this side of the house and, of course, all of our relevant staff and officers.

DISABILITY JUSTICE PLAN

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:00): My question is to the Attorney-General. Would the Attorney-General update the house on the implementation of the Disability Justice Plan?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:01): Specialist training for investigative interviewers working with vulnerable witnesses is a key initiative of the Disability Justice Plan. The Centre for Investigative Interviewing at Deakin University has been selected to provide specialist training to interviewers working in South Australia Police, Child Protection Services, Families SA, the Department for Education and Child Development, and Disability SA.

On Friday 5 February this year, Assistant Commissioner Linda Fellows launched the training program at Fort Largs Police Academy in a half-day event involving approximately 70 training participants. Participants also heard from Margie Charlesworth, convenor of Women with Disabilities South Australia; and Professor Martine Powell, founding director of the Centre for Investigative Interviewing.

Deakin University is comprised of world-class researchers and trainers in investigative interviewing and will provide access to specialist resources and customised training to develop and maintain interviewer competency. Under the partnership with the Attorney-General's Department, Deakin will also undertake new world-leading research into interviewing people with a disability. The results of this research will further enhance techniques for interviewing people with a disability in the existing training program.

Importantly, the training will give effect to the policy and intention of the Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Act 2015 passed by the parliament with all parties' support and receiving the royal assent on 6 August 2015. The act is intended to come into operation on 27 June this year, by which time the first cohort of interviewers will have been trained.

It is anticipated that 100 interviewers will be trained per calendar year over the initial two-year period with Deakin, following which the government has the option of two 12-month extensions, based on performance. The training is central to the implementation of the government's Disability Justice Plan and will work alongside other elements such as the Communication Partner Service.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Has the minister ever attended any meetings with Adelaide Capital Partners and, if so, when?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:03): Can I thank the deputy premier—deputy leader—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —she should be so lucky—for her question. This is a matter that she first tried on a couple of years ago. At the time, the principle was raised that those of us who may have engaged in other professional activities before coming into this place should not be held to account for what those activities were.

Since that time, we have had a series of inquiries. Whether it's been a very detailed case which has been pursued through the courts, we have had a very lengthy and detailed report by the ICAC commissioner and, throughout all of that, I note that the particular matter that the deputy leader refers to hasn't received any attention or ventilation.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): So, now that the minister is the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, have you met with this company who are partners in respect of the contract to purchase the Gillman property?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:04): It takes a particular type of questioner, Mr Speaker, to come to this place, ask a question and then steadfastly refuse to listen to the answer. If the deputy leader did listen to the answer that I just provided the house then she would not have felt the need to ask that second question.

Mr Pederick: He's still reading the transcript from this morning.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think so.

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): As a supplementary to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development: has the minister been involved in the evaluation, at all, either before or since becoming the minister, of the Adelaide Capital Partners Gillman proposal?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:05): Well, sticking to the principle that was outlined in my first answer to this line of questioning, Mr Speaker—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As the deputy leader said, it's a good principle and I stand by it, Mr Speaker.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Supplementary: as the Minister for Housing and Urban Development responsible for Renewal SA, which is managing the Adelaide Capital Partners—

The SPEAKER: Could we get to the question?

Ms CHAPMAN: —purchase, will the minister confirm whether the first \$45 million due under that contract has been paid and, if not, does he expect it to be paid by 30 June this year?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:06): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As the deputy leader would be aware after a sustained line of questioning on this basis, certainly last year, where the details of the arrangement that had been entered into between the government and between Adelaide Capital Partners had been spelt out in some documents which have been tabled in this place, there are a certain number of requirements both on the government as well as on that party, on ACP, before the land contract is not only successfully entered into but executed. My understanding is that it has not yet been executed. As to when I expect it to be executed, I will have to take some advice and come back to this place when I am in a position to provide further information.

WOMEN'S AUSTRALIAN OPEN

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport. Will the minister update the house on the recent Women's Australian Open golf tournament held in Adelaide?

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) (15:07): I thank the member for Torrens for the question. In this year's state budget we put an extra \$35 million into the tourism sector. A lot of that money was aimed at getting new events for

South Australia, and for the first time since 1994 South Australia played host to the Women's Australian Open down at the Grange Golf Course and it was an outstanding success.

We only won the right to host the event late last year, so we had a fairly short lead time. Golf Australia was predicting that about 15,000 people would turn up, going on the numbers that it had in Melbourne and Canberra in previous years. I am really pleased to tell the house that 31,000 people turned out over the four days to see the best golfers in the world.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How did you go when you did your demonstration?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes. And so we had many of the world's best golfers here, including the world No. 1, Lydia Ko. She is a New Zealander and just 18 years of age, the youngest ever person, male or female, to be the No. 1 in the world of golf, and just an outstanding sportsperson and human being.

She was beaten into second place by the Japanese golfer Haru Nomura who shot a seven under for an overall total of 16 under to finish four shots ahead of Lydia Ko. What we learnt from this is that golf is popular not only with South Australians but also with people from around Australia and, indeed, overseas, and it was great to be out on the course running into visitors from Korea, Victoria and other parts of the country, and what we want to do is to build on that.

Of course, this is an exciting time to be in South Australia, with the Fringe going on. We want to bring the arts more into the golf tournament and the golf tournament more into the arts precinct, and we have got some good ideas on how we can do that next year. I happened to be playing with Mick Molloy, one of the great comedians, in the pro-am—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —he is a very straight driver and a straight talker—and with Lydia Ko on the Wednesday in the pro-am. He suggested that there are a lot of good golfers among the comedians and that, maybe, we can do some sort of special event that crosses over both things.

I think in the area of sports diplomacy, which this government is getting better and better at, that we should probably invite the ambassadors from Korea, Japan, China and some of the other countries that are involved in the game. We have players from 26 nations taking part in the Australian women's golf open and it is an enormous opportunity to show off Adelaide. It was televised throughout many parts of the world to an audience of 200 million people.

I must congratulate and thank the ABC for telecasting the event around Australia, with an audience of a million people tuning in to see beautiful South Australia. To the Grange Golf Club, well done on presenting your course in an immaculate condition and providing people from around the world with a wonderful experience.

Next year the tournament will move to Royal Adelaide and the following year it will be played in Kooyonga. We are looking to build on this event and working with the major sponsor, ISPS Handa, and I thank Dr Haruhisa Handa and his executive assistant, Midori Miyazaki, for their contribution. This event was worth AU\$1.85 million, which makes it the richest purse for any golf event, men's or women's, anywhere in Australia this summer.

I think it is terrific to see women's sport at this level, where the prize money is better than the men's, because we need to lift the standards, and that is something that we are doing as a government. We've done it with the women's Tour Down Under, bringing that up to world standard, and we want to bring even more top-class elite women's sport to South Australia.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Is the government cutting the Adelaide Festival's funding by a million dollars or not?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:11): Obviously the arts has a savings task and we are going through, or the department, the Office for the Arts, is going through the process of how we will achieve those savings. We have obviously talked to agencies within the arts about how we might do that, but

nothing has been as yet decided. We will work through this with the many agencies who are funded out of the arts portfolio.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:11): Supplementary: as that's being worked through, has the minister, his office, or the head of Arts SA told the new directors of the Adelaide Festival that their budget has been cut by a million dollars?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:12): I can't recall having had a conversation along those lines with them myself, but certainly I am in no doubt that as part of the recruitment of the new festival directors it would have been made clear to them what the expectations might be with regard to the funding of the festival. It would be unfair for them to take on the job without a realistic appreciation of what the future budgets might be. So I wouldn't be surprised if a discussion had been had with them along those lines, but certainly I don't recall having had the discussion with them myself.

HOUSING SA

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing—

Mr Pengilly: The man of the moment.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is warned.

Mr GEE: How is Housing SA implementing a new service model to assist low income and vulnerable clients?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:13): I thank the member for Napier for his question and also his interest in this topic. Housing SA is currently improving the way it does business to better meet the needs of its clients and community expectations. The organisation's capacity to respond to our changing customer base is the main focus of the new service delivery model which has been progressively rolled out across all areas of the state.

The core business of Housing SA is not just about finding accommodation; we want to see this as the first of many steps in the right direction for our clients. The new service delivery model, connecting people to place, provides a more intensive level of support for vulnerable clients, based on an understanding of the risks they face. The reform includes new tools and work processes focusing on risk and vulnerability to assist both customers and staff. For example, the risk and vulnerability framework assists in identifying and responding to people whose safety and/or tenancies are at risk of failure, to help prevent a cycle of homelessness and of crisis care.

During home visits, housing officers are also required to sight all children under the age of five who are known to reside at the property and to inquire as to the whereabouts of any absent children. This information is now used in assessments conducted by the Multi-Agency Protection Service. Following implementation of the model, more than 1,500 individuals and families have been connected with support services—both internal and external—to help sustain their tenancies. The model links with activities outlined in the Northern Economic Plan to ensure our investment in housing maintenance and upgrades supports employment opportunities for local residents.

The work that the government is doing in social housing shows that not only can we deliver an accommodation service to the most vulnerable in our community, but we can work to address long-term issues as well. The economic transition issues of the north will not be simple or easy to address, but this work by Housing SA, in cooperation with the work done by Renewal SA, will be part of the solution.

ARTS SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. How much did the rebranding of Arts SA to Arts South Australia cost?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:15): I will get a report back, but I would imagine it would be fairly minimal.

ARTS SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:15): I have a supplementary to the minister. What were the reasons for the rebranding?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:15): I think the main reason for it was that Bill Muirhead, our Agent-General in London, has often spoken of confusion about SA—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The cultural attaché will be heard in silence.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —internationally, when you use the acronym SA, as to what exactly that is referring to. I would say that the Executive Director of Arts SA, in consultation with the sector, thought that Arts South Australia was more reflective, gave a better reflection of what the agency was about and where it was located.

ARTS SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:16): A further supplementary. Can I ask, then, when we will see the rebranding of Music SA, Renewal SA, Brand SA, and every other agency that uses the same moniker?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:16): Simply because Arts South Australia has particular international focus, that is not necessarily the case for other agencies. If this is the best the opposition can come up with in question time, God help us.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:17): Does the Premier have any further information about the email raised earlier in question time?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:17): I am not sure if I have the same email. If I have the same email that is in front of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I think it is addressed to a member of the business community and it says this:

Just saw the transcript of your interview on FIVEaa and claims there is an 'absolute absence of a holistic transport plan'. Simply not true and I draw to your attention [a website address that has the transport plan]. In addition, during the development of this plan we conducted extensive consultation across the state with more than 2,500 people attending engagement events and meetings. Almost 1,500 submissions were received from councils, local government and development bodies, key industry organisations, community groups and members of the public. It is a shame we cannot have a debate on transport policy based on facts. Kind regards [Chief of Staff].

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What distinguishes this communication is its courteousness; it is firm but courteous, just as I expect from members of my staff and members of my ministry, and indeed members of the parliament on this side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It did not even scale—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the heights of conversational swearing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when she is left alone in the home by herself, given the keys, has driven the opposition into the ditch.

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG STRATEGY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Can the minister confirm if the South Australian Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy 2011-16 annual progress report for 2015 has been provided to her office and when she expects to release that report?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:19): I will take advice from my advisers and come back to the house.

INTERNATIONAL WHEELCHAIR DAY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:20): My question is directed to the Minister for Disabilities. As we come up to International Wheelchair Day on 1 March 2016, how is the government supporting wheelchair users in our community?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:20): I thank the member for Ashford for her question and note her interest in improving the lives of people with disabilities in South Australia.

International Wheelchair Day will be celebrated on 1 March 2016, and members may be aware that International Wheelchair Day was first launched by Mr Steve Wilkinson in 2008. The day commemorates the birthday of his late mother, Joyce, who helped him cope with the challenges of growing up with spina bifida. Many of us, as we go through our lives and daily activities, will be touched by someone who lives with disability every day. We know that improving access and inclusion across all areas of the community provides real differences to the quality of lives and wellbeing of people with a disability.

As members, we would be aware that government funds provide a range of services and support for people who use wheelchairs for mobility—a hugely important thing for everyday wellbeing. Wheelchairs are provided through the government's Domiciliary Equipment Service, known as DES, and comprehensive equipment and home modification services are provided, additionally.

For people with complex issues, DES provides an in-house Wheelchair and Seating Service, a network of specialist suppliers to undertake work across the state, and from 1 July to December last year, DES supplied 1,032 wheelchairs, including 809 refurbishments. The comprehensive refurbishment program offers great results, faster supply times and better uses of resources across the state.

DES also completed more than 2,500 on-road wheelchair repairs last year. Importantly, Housing SA modifies social housing to enable people to have full access to their properties and utilise the facilities to retain their independence, and in the 2014-15 year, 3,569 modifications were undertaken to roughly 2,586 properties across the state.

Disability Access and Inclusion plans are also being introduced across the state and in local government agencies. Through this initiative, government departments and councils have introduced a recharge scheme whereby a dedicated power point is provided to those who use electric wheelchairs or scooters, providing recharge facilities at these points. Points are now available at over 50 locations across the state and the metropolitan area, including one at the Goodwood Community Centre, which services the member for Ashford's electorate, which I'm sure she is aware of.

Furthermore, the Adelaide City Council, through the Adelaide Aquatic Centre redevelopment, has also installed new accessible change and bathroom facilities and improved pool access for people who use wheelchairs. We know the participation of people with disability in recreational and leisure activities can also be restricted due to the natural environment, and the beach raises particular challenges for people who use wheelchairs. Recently, it was announced that Seacliff has become the state's first wheelchair-accessible beach due to community action, including the support of the member for Bright, and I congratulate him on that.

In closing, I would like to encourage all people in parliament to join me in celebrating International Wheelchair Day on 1 March, and acknowledge the valuable contribution that people living with a disability make to our community as a whole.

*Grievance Debate***ARRIUM**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:24): I wish to take the first opportunity that I have to address the parliament on the situation that is unfolding relating to the future of steelmaking in Whyalla. Last week, Arrium, the company that operates the steelworks in Whyalla, issued a market statement about the future of their operations in this state. Ominously, this revealed that one consideration the company may undertake is to place the steelworks into what is termed 'care and maintenance'. What this means, in layman's terms, is that the plant would be shut down indefinitely.

Yesterday, we heard that Arrium is discussing a recapitalisation plan with a major international investor. This is positive news but does not mean we should sit back and simply hope for the best. It has become all too common in recent years to hear of longstanding South Australian businesses now finding it too difficult to compete, for a variety of reasons. General Motors Holden will be closing down in just over 12 months' time. The Port Augusta power station is set to close, with the Leigh Creek mine that services it already shut down.

We simply cannot lose the steelmaking industry from the South Australian economy. I want to say clearly in this chamber that the Liberal Party stands ready to work with the government on whatever is required to ensure the industry's future. This is a matter which will impact the state's economy for decades to come and is far beyond party politics. When we talk about the Whyalla steelworks closing, we are not simply talking about the future of Arrium workers. We are talking about the future of a community—schools, a hospital, sporting clubs, shops, pubs. The list goes on. We need to ensure a bright future for Whyalla, and the key to that is doing everything we can to help Arrium and its workers.

Arrium is a good business which employs talented, hardworking South Australians. However, it is struggling to compete in a globally competitive market. We know that steelmakers can succeed in Australia as evidenced by BlueScope's success in Wollongong but, in order for companies like Arrium to succeed, we need to address some of the key barriers which exist within the South Australian economy. We have to be realistic: there is no silver bullet to solve our economic woes.

I have welcomed the initial findings of the nuclear royal commission and encourage us to debate the opportunities expanding that opportunity will bring to our state. Equally, if we treat the nuclear opportunity as another Olympic Dam, hoping that one single thing will turn our economy around, we are failing to understand what our challenges are now and that no one single hope will be our total salvation.

We need a new mentality in South Australia about how to build a strong, resilient and diversified economy underpinned by jobs in a vast array of industry sectors. We need to be lowering taxes, removing red tape, fostering entrepreneurship and investing in productive infrastructure so that businesses have the right policy settings to compete and to thrive. We need to resolve the issues that are causing volatility in our energy markets and continually pushing energy prices higher and higher in South Australia, in the meantime costing us jobs and opportunities in this state.

South Australians are resilient and resourceful. With the right government policy settings and industry support, we can turn our economic troubles around and start creating the sustainable long-term jobs that our community needs. The state Liberals are committed to working with all stakeholders, including Arrium and the federal and state governments, to ensure that the necessary changes can be made and the appropriate support is made available to protect the jobs of the people of Whyalla and to ensure Arrium's South Australian businesses continue on the path to becoming successful operations once again.

COMMUNITY HEALTH ONKAPARINGA

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:28): I rise today to speak about the work of Community Health Onkaparinga, an important community group located in Christie Downs in our southern suburbs. This group focuses on engaging all community members and bringing them together to build their health and wellbeing in many different and often very creative ways. Amongst many other activities, they

bring local people together through their renowned Wednesday night community dinners designed to include all community members and create social connection over healthy food.

Their creative and compassionate staff, Richard Schirmer and Elizabeth Becker, and their many, many generous volunteers understand how to nurture and empower community members to take charge of their physical, emotional and mental wellbeing. They are a much-loved presence also at many of the events in the south, particularly those focused on how we can work collectively as a local community to support our most vulnerable community members. They are masters at understanding how to collaborate and work well with so many other groups in our community.

Community Health Onkaparinga is currently doing incredible work at the coalface of our collective fight against the scourge of domestic violence, work that gives all community members an avenue to be active in this fight at the local level.

Community Health Onkaparinga, in partnership with Southern Domestic Violence Service, run an innovative project, Food for Freedom, which brings good nutritious food to women and children who are fleeing domestic violence. Food for Freedom takes healthy meals to women and children in crisis accommodation in our southern community several times a week. With crisis accommodation sometimes being motel rooms or quite basic, the work that they are doing is incredibly important and makes a real difference at what is generally the most difficult time for a woman who has gone through domestic violence and had to flee her home.

Women and children in these scenarios are unlikely to have access to cooking facilities and most often will have fled from violence with not much in the way of possessions. Kitchen equipment is certainly not a priority. Domestic violence victims who find themselves in these kinds of situations often have no choice but to accept a poor diet. There are often extreme limitations around finances and transportation. Additionally, women in crisis, for safety reasons, are often not able to move unrestricted in the community and, even if they are able to, may, sadly, be afraid to do so.

These factors combine to create a scenario where women and children are often left eating food which is not nutritious, is fast and easy, or can be prepared with limited kitchen facilities. Clearly, if this continues for any extended period of time, it will have negative health effects on the family.

I was proud to start collecting food for Community Health Onkaparinga's Food for Freedom program at my office just before Christmas and continue to do so. I am proud to be a supporter and invited community members to donate also. As always, I was inspired by the many local community members who took the time and used their resources to donate. Our community makes such a difference when we work together to support fellow community members when they most need that support. If any of my fellow parliamentarians would like to donate, I am sure their contributions would be most welcome.

At this point, the program aims to meet 50 per cent of the nutritional needs of women and children in crisis accommodation: a gigantic target that many people are involved in ensuring is achieved each and every week. As my colleagues know, I will always stand up alongside and for those who experience domestic violence and will advocate for organisations that are involved in assisting them or helping to prevent horrific occurrences of it in our community. I believe it is incredibly important for all of us to take personal ownership over this issue and do whatever we can to ensure we are supporting those who experience it.

As mentioned, Community Health Onkaparinga, through Food for Freedom, delivers fresh nutritious meals up to three times a week to women in crisis scenarios. They are doing crucial work that I have pleasure in recognising and acknowledging on behalf of our community. I am proud to advocate for their work here and in all other forums, and would like to place on the record my sincere thanks and support for Community Health Onkaparinga and Southern Domestic Violence Service, not just for the work they do through Food for Freedom, but for the work they do each and every day to make a difference in our beautiful southern community.

While putting on record my thanks for their incredibly important work, I would also like to thank Amy Feldman for her work on this speech during her work experience in my office. Thank you, Amy. Thank you for being such an extraordinary young woman, who impresses me in so many different ways through your cleverness, kindness and compassion, your grasp of issues and how

they affect people, and your willingness to work on them. Thank you also for your incredible public speaking ability, which I saw through the Rostrum Voice of Youth in this house.

Time expired.

COUNTRY HEALTH SA

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:33): I wish today to raise some matters relating to Country Health SA. I indicated a couple of weeks ago in this place that I would have more to say. I would particularly like to talk about Transforming Health and how the axe is about to fall on contract employees of South Australia's Country Health.

This is information that has been given to me from within the department, and it is most alarming. I am informed that some time in March, contract employees of Country Health are going to be told that, when their contracts expire, they will no longer be employed. This is going to have a devastating effect in my area, but more particularly across the state. I ask the minister to perhaps pick up the phone and talk to me about this in due course. It is alarming, what might happen.

I have two health services. I have the South Coast health service and associated hospital at Victor Harbor, and I have the Kangaroo Island Health Service and hospital in Kingscote. These are major employers in both areas. The contract staff are, I believe, unaware that this axe is going to fall. If it is incorrect, I believe the minister should come into this place to say so immediately. If it is true, then members of parliament outside of suburban Adelaide who have health services in their areas need to be most concerned about what is going to take place. There are some other matters about the South Coast hospital that I wish to raise in due course.

One of the matters that is of major concern at the moment is that people with private health cover who are being admitted to the public hospital at South Coast are not being transferred to the private hospital after their assessment. They are being kept in the public hospital against their wishes. It is simply not good enough that, if they are paying private health cover, they are not being admitted to the private hospital, which runs separately to the public hospital but under the same roof with its own board and, I might add, a board of directors that knows what is going on rather than the government's health advisory councils, who simply get told what the government wants them to know and regrettably, with the best intent in the world, have no control over the operations of those units.

I think there is something shonky going on there. They are trying to justify the existence of the public hospital by keeping private patients there who want to go into the private hospital and want their private health care. The minister needs to think about where that is going. I do not think enough thought has gone into that. I do not know whether it is a directive from the local administrative side of the hospital or whether it is from the regional director, Debbie Martin, but it is not good enough. I have named bureaucrats in this place before and I will name them again, because it simply needs to be said from time to time. That matter on Transforming Health and how it relates to contract employees under Country Health in South Australia needs some explanation, and I would certainly like some assurance sooner rather than later.

The other issue that I will speak about concerns some comments attested to Mr Richard Zachariah on radio FIVEaa last Sunday week, which I thought were demeaning and highly insulting to the residents of Victor Harbor. Mr Zachariah, certainly in decades past, has been well known. He resides, I believe, in Woodside now. He has not done his homework. He does not understand the way things tick. He does not understand that there are more than about 6,000 or 7,000 people in Victor Harbor—there are 14,000 plus—and he is at serious variance with what the majority of the community want down there. I guess he is getting paid for what he is saying, but he is wrong, wrong, wrong.

COLTON ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:38): On Monday 15 February, cabinet met in my electorate somewhere in Kidman Park. This cabinet meeting gave me the opportunity to invite our Minister for Education to visit two of the excellent learning institutions in the seat of Colton. I have to say that I was very pleased to have the minister attend the Barbara Kiker Memorial Kindergarten (not spelt the same way as my name) in the morning, and later that day visit Kidman Park Primary School. I can

also say that the Barbara Kiker kindergarten and Kidman Park Primary School are indicative of the outstanding schools and early learning centres located in my electorate.

At the Barbara Kiker Memorial Kindergarten the minister and I met with its director, Steven Cameron, and two of the parents. This kindergarten was established when the Kidman Park area was opened up. Kidman Park, like so many other areas, is being reinvigorated and rejuvenated through this regeneration. Historically, it was an area of primarily Housing Trust houses and of course there is some development going on in that area.

We toured the kindy, seeing firsthand the work that has been done internally and also the relationship between the internal learning facilities and the outside learning areas. Under the auspices of the director, Steve, and with the support of the teaching staff and the kindergarten community, the grounds have been overhauled with the planting of a native nature garden and, at the other side, an orchard. It was pleasing to see the linking of the natural environment to the children's learning.

We all know how important the early childhood centres are in providing the foundation for lifelong learning. To me at least it is obvious what makes a good kindy or school a great kindy or school: excellent teaching staff, a conducive and engaging learning environment and, importantly, a supportive and active school or kindy community. Barbara Kiker Memorial Kindergarten has all these ingredients, making it the great kindergarten it is.

In the afternoon, we visited Kidman Park Primary School and were accompanied on that visit by the Minister for Disabilities, who toured the school and the facility with us. Kidman Park Primary School is an outstanding primary school and it is operating, I think, at capacity. Regrettably, Principal John Clarke, a very good principal who was deputy principal before becoming the principal some time ago, was involved in an accident a week or so earlier. Despite the fact that he tried, he was unable to get there, but he was ably represented by the Deputy Principal, Karen Duval, whom I first met when she was at Grange Primary School. She, like John, is an outstanding educator and administrator.

Our guides were the year 7 school leadership group—all outstanding young students. Like me, the ministers were certainly impressed with our visit to an area they call PEARLS located in the former art room. Originally, it was called the Joy Room and it operates under the auspices of teacher Desy Pantelos. PEARLS stands for 'positive education assists real life skills' and it is, I think, an outstanding program. We have seen significant improvement in the behaviour of the students. The number of students on year 7 detention has plummeted from nearly 100 a few years ago to fewer than 10, I am told. It is simple but effective; it is about being respectful, being nice and saying nice things.

Deputy Speaker, I know you are used to receiving nice things said about you, but you yourself would know that it is also nice to say nice things to other people and that is the basis of it. It is good to receive compliments, but it is just as good to be a person giving compliments. It is an outstanding room which the children go to even during their breaks. I was lucky enough to wear the 'grateful glasses'. You put them on and you say what you have been grateful for on that particular day. I was very grateful to be at a school that is doing so much for young people and grateful to be hosted and shown around by some of the young students who were there. It is an outstanding school in that regard.

To finish off, we also attended the learning unit for students with severe and multiple disabilities and to see the work being undertaken there under the auspices of what is called 'conductive education', which was outstanding. What is equally important is the involvement of the broader school community in the support that is provided to these young people with what are the most severe disabilities that any young person can have. I had a great time as, I know, the minister did and we are very proud of the schools we have in our area and our state-based system.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would be grateful if you would write up that concept of the glasses for our suggestion box. Member for Hartley.

CAMPBELLTOWN ROTARY CLUB

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:43): I rise today to speak about the Campbelltown Rotary club, which recently celebrated its 50th year, and I had the pleasure of attending that celebration. The club has raised literally millions of dollars over the years for most worthy causes, and it has improved the lives of thousands of people around the place. It has provided much fellowship for locals, and I have no doubt that it will continue to be a fundamental pillar of our area.

President Damian Leach opened the meeting, and that was followed by an invocation by Stephanie Martin. A toast to Rotary International was given by Tony Lagozzino, and Dick Wilson responded. Tony Uren introduced guests that night, and then Glenys Fereday gave us a wonderful snapshot of the years 1966 to 1975, when the club achieved so much.

We were then treated to a film of the early years by Eric Webb, followed by a snapshot of the years 1976 to 1985 by Peter Rumbelow, which was fantastic. Ian Reddy and John Schubert followed with a snapshot of the years 1986 to 1995, and then Eric Webb continued, putting on a display of the recent achievements as well. A 50th year anniversary cake was cut, and then we were also given a snapshot of the years 1996 to 2005 by Garth Holmes and Margaret Northcote, followed by a wonderful snapshot of the years 2006 to the present by Brian Stevens and Jim Silvestri.

There were also many awards presented that night, and I want to touch on them because many members have made huge contributions to the club over the past 50 years. Paul Harris Fellow awards were awarded to many members: firstly, Mr Ralph Holmes. He joined the club in 2009 and served in the club service role of public relations officer in 2009 and 2010. He served on vocational fundraising and membership committees as well as performing many other duties. He is a gentleman who is always willing to volunteer, especially at the shed and Carnevale. He has always been significant, and it was an honour to see him presented with that award.

Gwenda Schubert—I believe she is the partner of a member—joined the family of Rotary some 39 years ago. Again, she is always willing to help and is still, to this day, significantly involved at the shed. Babu Kanagasabai joined the club in 2002. He is a wonderful man with a gentle heart who is always there to help. He has been membership director, has chaired the Carnevale committee and also has served in fundraising, international, vocational and membership capacities as well. I congratulate him.

A number of Sapphire Pins were also awarded. Don Marcioinni, who joined the club in 1977, served on the board as a director (fellowship) in 1982. His major contribution to the club, as we saw on the night, was actually repairing, restoring and building some of the shed. He is a craftsman, and he is extremely generous with his time and skill both within the club and also at the North Eastern Community Hospital where he has been regularly called upon. His family have been extremely generous. They have hosted two exchange students. I would like to congratulate Don, his wife and his family for their contribution to the club and the community.

Joe Hudspith joined the club in 1982 after membership with other clubs situated where his employment was at the time. He has been the secretary, director of membership and has served on basically every standing committee. I thank Joe.

Stan McPhee joined the club in 1981, serving as a director in 1986, 1987 and 1992. He was auction chairman in 1990. He has served as property officer and photographer. There is not much that he has not done. He has even served as song leader repeatedly, and that was certainly a point of contention on the night, but you have to have a sense of humour in this club. His major contribution to the club, amongst others, would be the organisation of the children's Christmas party and the club Christmas meetings. These are festive events where there is always a lot of fun.

Tony Eddowes joined the club in 1976, serving as public relations officer. He has gone on to serve as director of the club in 1986, 1992 and 1997, serving as vocational, community and international service director. I would also like to congratulate Tony Lagozzino and Benny Bosman, as well as the Double Sapphire award winners—Reg Neale, Eric Webb, Barry Donaldson and David Richards—who have basically contributed most of their life to a wonderful club.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:48): For some time now, I have been researching the issue of access to medical cannabis for those suffering from a serious medical condition or conditions, treatment of a serious medical illness—for example, chemotherapy—or those with a terminal illness. In this research, I revisited the work in New Zealand following their 2013 Psychoactive Substances Act and also their regulations in 2014. The philosophy behind this legislation is that prohibition of drugs does not work. Untested, unproved and self-medication, whether for health or recreation reasons, should be avoided, and that testing of substances avoid people getting injured or overdosing on those substances. Manufacturers through that legislation are to prove that their products are safe for human consumption.

I was particularly interested in an article by Mr Avinash Tharoor, a journalist, who supports drug law reform. This article was in *The Huffington Post* in September 2013. He offered some interesting points, I thought, in relation to the New Zealand legislation. First of all, he said that drugs are safer to consume if they are legal and raised the question of purity of drugs such as cocaine, MDMA, ketamine (or colloquially as he calls them 'bath salts' drugs) that come in the form of indistinct white powder.

He also says that the Psychoactive Substance Act ensures that newly-legalised drugs will be vigorously tested, their contents clearly detailed on packaging and the purity guaranteed. He also says that regulations protect children and educate users. The legislation does not accept that under 18-year olds are allowed to avail themselves of these drugs, but I am told that dealers very rarely ask for their buyer's ID in any case.

So, under this provision there is actually a clear regulation and legislation that you must be over 18 years. Also, there is information about how the drug is to be used and to avoid overuse. He goes on to say that the belief that legislation encourages drug use amongst young people is largely unfounded, and he cites a number of comparative research events that have happened to show that, for example, marijuana use amongst teens is higher in the US than it is in the Netherlands where it is legally available but restricted to adults.

There are a whole lot of other research projects that refute more people using a drug if it has been decriminalised. He says that the sale of a legal drug does not fund criminal enterprise. He believes that the New Zealand legislation will allow the entire supply chain of production, transport and sale of the many synthetic narcotics to be taxed and regulated, and I think this would be attractive to any Treasurer if there is taxation through the whole process.

Unlike the sale of illegal substances the profits of selling these legal drugs will be directed to legitimate businesses—and I am not sure what he means by 'legitimate businesses'; I mean, tobacco companies are legitimate businesses, but, anyway—as well as government initiatives that will be available through these taxes.

Mr Tharoor says that this sort of legislation could lead to the reduction in violent crime that is associated with the drug trade, and that profits from synthetic drugs do not empower violent gangs. Criminalising synthetic drugs is a futile battle, he says. Synthetic drugs are made by people. He says:

...under traditional prohibition, when the government outlaws a synthetic drug, manufacturers simply have to make a slight alteration to the product's chemical composition to avoid the law.

With the creation of new drugs it is difficult to keep up with the laws and policing is just not going to keep up with those new drugs. I am advised that under the New Zealand provisions consumers have the opportunity to have knowledge about a range of drugs available. Effective drug laws give people faith in the system. He finishes by saying that Albert Einstein made it very clear that 'nothing is more destructive of respect for the government than passing laws which cannot be enforced'.

Bills

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 10 September 2015.)

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

This is one of those, unfortunately, reasonably common groundhog-day moments where we get—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The CHAIR: The member for Hartley may not want to continue interjecting.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —to relive the criminal injuries compensation legislation yet again. I do not know how familiar you are with the film—

The CHAIR: You know I am extremely familiar with the bill, and I am horrified that you would suggest I would be otherwise.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Every time we deal with this particular theme, I can hear Sonny and Cher going in the background, you know, like when the clock—

Mr Treloar: *I Got You Babe.*

The Hon. J.R. RAU: *I Got You Babe.* Exactly, member for Flinders. Bingo! He's seen it too; the member for Flinders has seen it.

The CHAIR: Are you sure it's not *If I Could Turn Back Time* by Cher?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Is that in there too? Well, anyway, so here we are. For those of you who have been in the parliament for a while, this is an old friend come back to visit, and for those of you who have not, you will get used to it, and you will see it a few more times perhaps before you leave. This is all about, obviously, looking after drug traffickers and not getting on with business.

What has happened is that yet again unacceptable amendments have been foisted on this legislation in the other place. They know full well that these amendments are unacceptable, because this is about the fourth time that we have done this, if I recall correctly—maybe the fifth, I am not sure. So even though there is an element of *deja vu* about this, I will go through, basically, the four amendments and summarise what the problems are with them.

The four amendments are basically these: the first one deals with the fund and what happens to the fund which results from the acquisition of these criminal assets. The second thing is some additional matter relating to appeals after one of these orders has been made. The third relates to the DPP providing guidelines, and the fourth relates to an annual report and a three-yearly review. This is sort of the current fashion accessory from the other place where, every time a piece of legislation goes through, instead of painting a moustache on it, or an eye patch, you add an annual report and a three-year review or a five-year review or something else.

All that is happening then is there are masses of paper and masses of reports being required to no particularly good purpose, and these reviews are regularly coming up. I can understand it if it was absolutely critical for there to be such a thing—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Or a completely new bill or something.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, or if it was completely new. Indeed, were it not for the other three, and this were the only matter of contention, I would, in order to get the bill passed in an acceptable form, accept this amendment and be done with it. Unfortunately, all of these others are there as well, so since the legislation is going to be unsatisfactory anyway, I do not see why a matter which detracts from the legislation should be accepted on the basis that it is a concession when there is no concession forthcoming in the other direction. So that basically deals with number four.

As for the first one, this basically says that all of the moneys collected have to go to the Victims of Crime Fund. The first point: this money is not money which otherwise would have gone to the Victims of Crime Fund. It is not money which is being deflected from the Victims of Crime Fund and, in fact, it is money that is not presently being collected at all. This is a completely different source

of money. What we have said here—and I think we have been prepared to make some compromise about this—is that it goes into a fund which can be used for broader justice purposes.

If you have a look at the restrictions placed on moneys being drawn down from the Victims of Crime Fund, it is fairly clear that there has to be a reasonably close nexus between a crime victim and the expenditure. To give an example, if a victim of crime needs to have a new security door put on the front of their house, or something of that nature, as a result of a crime, and they are fearful for their safety, that is pretty direct, and it is not uncommon for the victims' commissioner to say to me, 'Look, I think with so-and-so we should put a new security door on their house,' or something of that nature. That is a reasonably direct drawdown. However, what about a rehabilitation program for that offender? What about that? That is not directly helping any particular victim even though, in the fullness of time, that program might render that person less likely to reoffend, perhaps.

So point number one, as I said, is that this is not money that is being taken out of the Victims of Crime Fund, it is not money that would have been collected by anybody at all in the past. Point number two is that we do not want that money to be locked up in a highly prescriptive fund, which the Victims of Crime Fund is; we would like the fund to have more flexibility in terms of what we are able to expend the moneys on. Incidentally, I have heard the deputy leader, in particular, wax on about the size of the Victims of Crime Fund and the rate at which it is accumulating. It is not short of money; the deputy leader has actually made the point many times that it is not short of money. In fact, I think the point she has been making is that it has plenty of money.

So the Victims of Crime Fund is not a fund that is stuck for dollars, and there is a whole range of programs which are presently not necessarily foreseeable and activities which are presently not capable of being reduced into a statute, because I have not examined every single possibility in terms of rehabilitation or some other form of offender management or offender education or whatever it might be. I just want a flexible fund, to be able to do things flexibly, and the Victims of Crime Fund is not flexible.

This is a bogus argument about sending all this stuff across to the Victims of Crime Fund because it is all about victims. That fund has plenty of money, it has plenty of money rolling in. It is a highly prescriptive fund in terms of the purposes for which the money can be spent, and this money is not money that is being taken away from victims: it is money that is not being collected at all. So in relation to that, the answer is that that is unacceptable—and it always has been, and it is well known by those in the other place that it always has been—amendment to the bill.

The second amendment is something a little bit novel; I do not think we have seen this particular one before in the several iterations of this being dealt with. This one is to do with appeals. It is my advice that this would make that bill practically unworkable. The amendment would give a court the power to vary or discharge an order completely without any structure, except by the vague notion of 'in the interests of justice'. What exactly does that mean? The answer is that it means whatever the judge who is hearing the application cares to think it means, without any guidance whatsoever.

Bear in mind that one of the important deterrent qualities of this legislation is the fact that if you do the crime you get convicted, and that is where you have your hearing. When you are charged with the primary offence you do get a hearing. You can argue anything you want. You can argue you were not there, you didn't do it—anything you like.

In the end if you are pinched and you are actually convicted, you have had a trial and either a jury or a judge alone has made a decision about your guilt or innocence. If they have found you guilty, we say the policy position is: there are severe consequences that flow from a finding of guilt, consequences which you should have taken into account before you started entering into the business of trafficking in drugs. That's it, full stop.

To put it another way: if you were ever to drive in excess of the speed limit—and I know, Madam Chair, you do not—but if you did, or somebody you knew did, and they were 10 ks over the speed limit and a policeman pointed a radar gun at them and a traffic infringement notice was issued, imagine what chaos that sort of scheme would look like if everybody thought that in the interests of justice they should be able to argue the toss about their speeding fine. I tell you what you would have: you would have a lot of people arguing about it, I can tell you. The point is, this is a known

consequence of a conviction for a serious criminal offence, namely, drug trafficking. This is all about making the bill, basically, worthless, so that is an unacceptable amendment.

Then the third amendment, or the fourth, given that I dealt with the fourth first, is the one about DPP guidelines. The publication of such guidelines has a number of problems with it—leave aside the complexity of putting them out in the public domain. First of all, any offender who wants to insulate themselves against the consequences of this type of thing would only have to have regard to the published guidelines in order to ask their accountants, or whoever else, to construct their affairs in such a way as to place themselves outside of those guidelines. It is a monumental example of expecting the state to telegraph all its punches and enable the wily criminal to avoid them because they know where and when they are coming.

The second thing is: it is also, obviously, not possible to predict every circumstance that might arise, and we get into this: how much discretion do we give to the DPP? How prescriptive are we? It raises all sorts of questions about how the matter should be administered and, quite possibly, it occurs to me, might even involve the DPP being drawn into judicial review proceedings—and constitutional issues as well, as Mr Evans reminds me. This is another own goal; a real sort of own goal.

Taking all of these bits and pieces together, what we have is amendment Nos 2 and 3, which have the effect of rendering the whole scheme useless; amendment No. 1, which has the effect of putting the money somewhere where it is useless and unneeded, because there is already a large amount of money there; and the fourth amendment is tedious and annoying, not ultimately destructive but serves no useful purpose. But, in the context that the acceptance of that is not going to render this a bill that is going to meet the agreement of both houses at this point in time, there is no point in accepting that because it is not going to get us there.

The CHAIR: So that is a no, no, no and no?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, no, no and no, but if—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If we got to the point where there was a withdrawal of the first three, I would be prepared in the spirit of compromise to say I will accept the fourth amendment, not because it does any good, not because it is a good idea, but because its harm is minimal compared to the others.

If there has to be some detriment attached to this bill because it offends the opposition's notion about the freedom of drug traffickers not to have their assets taken off them, let it be a little detriment like amendment No. 4, not fundamental destruction of the whole arrangement like the first three. With those few words, I am afraid the amendments are just not acceptable and I guess we will see where the matter goes from there.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Attorney has correctly outlined the four issues which the Legislative Council has considered and felt to be an improvement and, hence, we have the amendments before us reflecting those four requirements. Can I just make comment on each of them, firstly, the concept that we need to in some way ensure that the confiscated asset proceeds are going to find their way into the Victims of Crime Fund and not general revenue. There has been much discussion about the government having access to this money other than it finding its way to provide services for victims of crime.

If the Attorney takes the view, which I do not agree with, that the terms of the Victims of Crime Act are so prescriptive that he is finding it near impossible to be able to provide services to victims which can use up some of this money, I am happy to talk to him about changing some of the terms of reference. I do not actually accept that they are that prescriptive: I think he has a fairly general capacity to spend that money. I think it is disgusting that there is something like \$220 million sitting in that fund and it is going to be used yet again in the June budget to prop up the Treasurer's balance sheet.

The CHAIR: You don't know that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do know that, because we know that it sits there and we know that it is taken into account, just like the boating facilities fund, and there is an open space fund sitting somewhere. These funds have got millions of dollars in them and they all sit as a basis to support the financial balance sheet position of the government and its associated entities.

We have a bill before the Legislative Council to deal with an increased amount of funds for victims in individual claims, which is languishing up there sitting behind another bill which the government insists on dealing with, notwithstanding that the government say that they not only want it to happen but they have accepted an amendment we have put to it and everyone is ready to have it processed.

We will find, if we are lucky and it gets back here in March or April, the chance of any money coming out of that fund, even in this financial year, for all the cases waiting for that new regime to take place is zero. The reality is: yes, there is a lot of money in that fund, but there are a lot of people out there waiting for compensation and there are plenty of ways that the government could be addressing the application of those funds to suit the much-needed requirements of victims.

Consistent with the principle of fines from road traffic offences going into funds to deal with road safety, similarly, when you take away and confiscate assets, we put it in the Victims of Crime Fund, and that is what we want. Some discussion took place as to how we might vary that, namely, to add a portion of it for drug rehabilitation and a portion of it just for victims generally. Ultimately, the Legislative Council took the view that this was best contributed to by the Victims of Crime Fund, and the insertion that has gone in is:

The Attorney-General must ensure that in each financial year an amount equal to 50% of the proceeds of confiscated assets of prescribed drug offenders from the preceding year is, instead of being paid into the Victims of Crime Fund under subsection (1), applied as additional government funding for drug rehabilitation programs (and such money may be applied without further appropriation than this subsection).

If that is not a compromise, I do not know what is. I think that it is just petulance on behalf of the government that they should not allow for a contribution to be made in that manner.

As to the question of appeals, as the Attorney refers to it, let's just go back a stage. This is a process which is going to allow the DPP—who has a very important prosecutorial role, obviously, on behalf of the people of South Australia and whose principal role is to be an independent Director of Public Prosecutions—to have an extra job when making a determination in prosecuting cases involving serious drug offenders when making a decision about whether a confiscation order, in the terms of this legislation, should apply. That, like prosecuting, is to have a level of independence and we respect that, but what we say on this side of the house is: whoever makes the first judgement ought to be the subject of some capacity to be reviewed.

If it is a member of the Public Service, it is frequently under administrative appeal processes. The SACAT, the new South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, has a significant role in this space now which has transferred from the District Court and the Supreme Court. If it is a minister who makes decisions then, yes, there can be some administrative appeal, but there is also accountability to this parliament and, of course, ultimately, to the public.

If it is a judicial officer, a judge of the Supreme Court or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who makes a decision, he is reviewable by the Full Court of the Supreme Court, and, ultimately, the High Court. Even the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is a person who is in service to the people of South Australia and whose decision is reviewable.

The biggest problem with not having a review process for the decision that the DPP is being asked to make, in this instance, is that, understandably, his decision, essentially, will be in secret. I remember we had this conversation during the debates in this house when we considered whether the head of the Department of Corrections should have a role in determining matters as to the release of prisoners. It was a bill to transfer the power of doing that from the minister across to the head of the department, in this case the head of the Department of Corrections.

Instead of being a ministerial decision which, of course, is able to be transparent to the extent of being accountable here in the parliament, decisions were to be made by the head of Corrections. Some of them were small things, like the right to be able to withhold pocket money or questions in respect of their storage of chattels (whether they had too much gear to store at the prison). These

seem to be basic administrative things that were quite reasonably transferred to the head of the prisons. They had a hands-on role and that was reasonable.

There were some that were very concerning to me and they were decisions to be able to place a prisoner in solitary confinement and the risk that you have when a departmental head, without the scrutiny of parliament like a minister would have, makes those decisions when he or she might be under enormous pressure to deal with the discipline or bad behaviour of a prisoner, even though there are a whole lot of international conventions which supposedly protect prisoners from being put in solitary confinement as a disciplinary measure.

The point was made at the time. Let's be clear. If you have got someone who is administering a prison, whilst they might have the understanding of the day-to-day arrangements, there is a good basis upon which those decisions may be made consistent with the convenience or pressure of the day—namely, prisons are overloaded, the need to deal with that by release, home detention, behavioural management, putting them in solitary confinement. These are the sorts of things we have to be careful about here in the parliament.

What is being asked here is that we do not need a judge to make an order of confiscation. We will just get the DPP, who will go through the files—tick, cross, tick, cross—of the serious drug offenders as to whether it is appropriate that we take his beach house, or his plane or his speedboat, and we are going to leave that role for him. The government is saying that that is a role that he is to have and that it is unreviewable. We are saying that, with the Legislative Council's blessing, what is appropriate is that a judge ought to have the right to review that on application, ought to be utilised to do that, and a judge is restricted to the extent of it being in the interests of justice.

In other words, you cannot just do it as boldly as the Attorney would have us think, that is, whatever the judge thinks. That is a nonsense and an insult to a member of the judiciary who might be in this position. They do have to be satisfied that it is in the interest of justice. Sure, someone who is a convicted drug offender either knows, or should have known, or certainly would get advice from their legal representatives as to their risk and the penalties that might be attracted—imprisonment, fines, confiscation and the like—and they might know that their beach house, or their speedboat, or their racehorse, etc., is about to be confiscated; but that is not and should not be without any kind of capacity to review. The Legislative Council agrees with us, and it is important.

Remember, going to a judge for review of this is not without the risk of penalty—costs and the like—and, therefore, there is sufficient protection against just arbitrary reviewing on the basis that someone wants to be difficult.

The other thing is that on my understanding—and I may be wrong on this, and the Attorney will soon set me straight if I am not—more often than not, on current confiscation orders, which apply to direct proceeds of crime under our current two sets of confiscation laws, it is a rare time indeed that somebody actually objects. What happens at present is that the order goes out, the edict is there, the confiscation is undertaken, and guess what? The person who might be sitting in prison, or might be now moving interstate and setting up somewhere else, does not come back to argue the toss over what has been taken. I think it is about \$8 million a year that comes into our public funds as a result of confiscation.

Certainly, those who are in this space—serious offenders who are convicted of serious crime and who have this unexplained wealth, for example, or who have proceeds and assets from ill-gotten gain—just abandon and move on to the next lot. That is my understanding. If I am wrong on that—and there is a massive amount of litigation happening in the courts which suggests that there is an abuse of that—then you can tell me.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

Ms CHAPMAN: On that matter, I will just continue, if I may. On the third issue—

The CHAIR: You have three questions on that.

Ms CHAPMAN: —on the DPP guidelines—I do not have questions because this is an amendment from the Legislative Council, so I do not need to ask the Attorney what his position is: I just need to put to you, Madam Chair, our position. What is in this amendment are the DPP guidelines and we support them. We say that they are similar to the Commissioner of Police's guidelines for dealing with car chases in relation to people who terrorise our streets and neighbourhoods.

They often steal a car or go for a joy ride and then find that, some kilometres down the track, they have caused havoc and carnage on the way—sometimes, sadly, killing themselves and other passengers in their vehicle and, even more tragically, killing other pedestrians or road users. The police have to make a judgement about whether they chase the car of an occupant who, with reckless abandon, drives around the streets and causes this damage and danger to the public, whether they put up the helicopter and follow them until they run out of petrol or whether they put tacks on the road to burst their tyres as they scream across a road.

They have to make a judgement about what is the safest thing they can do but, at the same time, undertake their responsibility to apprehend, take into custody and, ultimately, convict the offending parties. It is a hard call sometimes, so the Commissioner of Police has a set of guidelines outlining in what circumstances there ought to be a chase. It does not cover all circumstances, but it tries to give options about the level of risk that is observable and at what times and in what circumstances it is reasonable to get in a car and chase down this person, resulting in a very heightened level of further danger.

Why do we do that? Why do we ask the police commissioner to have these guidelines? It is because about 40 people a year, I think, die in car chases and that is a tragedy in itself. The public demands that there be some threshold, some level of assessment, some rules that apply before a trigger-happy or heavy-footed police officer gets into a car and starts screaming down the road following a 14 year old or a 16 year old or an older person who might want to outrun the police.

That is why we have these rules or guidelines, and it seems to me that, in this instance, we are going to allow the DPP to make that assessment, as he currently does on whether there is some likelihood of there being a successful prosecution. He has to go through and make a determination about whether he is going to prosecute a case that has been sent over from an investigative body—usually the police, but sometimes others—and say, 'Yes, we're going to proceed with this case,' or 'No, we're not.' I do not doubt for one moment that he has to exercise his mind on questions such as: 'What is my budget? What are the resources I have available? Have we got any witnesses? Have we got a body? Have we got a confession?'

These are all things that the Director of Public Prosecutions has to assess for the purposes of sensibly applying the budget that he has, bringing about justice, protecting the community, etc. If there is going to be some review of this, then the DPP guidelines ought to be in place. This is an initiative, I think, coupled with the review process, which is important, and I thank the Legislative Council for doing it.

As to the review, quite simply, the Attorney-General knows full well why we have reviews. If you are going to introduce something that is novel, or has been introduced in other jurisdictions but we need to have a look at how it is going to work and before there has been really a reasonable time for review of that, let's put in a time frame of our own.

Why do we do that? It is very simple. If we do not do that, then we have got to go through the whole process again of justifying bringing in a bill and seeking to have some review. This is a way in which you either have a sunset clause or a review process, and you have annual reporting so that you can monitor how that is going; that is why we have this.

You cannot trust the government to do it. They just want to flick this through the parliament, put it over in the done basket and not deal with it again. We are not going to have a situation where there are going to be actions taken by executive officers in secret with the funds disappearing into the control of the Attorney. No, we are not going to have that.

We are not going to have him propping up judges' wages or pretending to build another court and then cancelling it yet again. No, we are not going to have that. We are going to have proper management of the proceeds of this initiative, which we otherwise support. It is going to be reviewable and, frankly, the Attorney needs to suck it up.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I just wanted to say thank you to all concerned. I thank the deputy leader for her much more concise, punchy contribution on this today, but we have done it before, so I guess we both have some experience in this area.

REFERENDUM (APPROPRIATION AND SUPPLY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February 2015.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are looking at the deputy leader, to continue her remarks.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:34): Do I still have some time?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have established that the member for Bragg was the lead speaker, and so—

Ms CHAPMAN: I couldn't remember whether I had concluded, but if I am allowed I do want to add something. My recollection is that I spoke on a number of concerns we had about this referendum bill, in particular the bona fides of the government about whether it has any intention whatsoever realistically of progressing this bill to referendum.

I pointed out that there was nothing in the documents that had been tabled in the parliament to date, namely, the state budget, or the annual report of the Electoral Commission, or I think I referred to the Mid-Year Budget Review, which sometimes has an extra few little pearls in it—usually things that are getting crunched, but nevertheless there were no additions there—and no indication from the government as to any allocation whatsoever for a referendum, or indeed in this case two referenda as foreshadowed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy leader, I am sorry, you did conclude your remarks, so unfortunately you will need to sit down.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will do it in committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Attorney speaks, he closes the debate.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:36): Can I say a couple of words and then adjourn it without concluding everything and go on motion or something?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: He could seek leave to continue his remarks.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I say a couple of words and then seek leave to continue my remarks?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. If you wish, I am advised you can.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you. I am jumping up to conclude the debate and then I am going to seek leave to continue my remarks. Can I just say very briefly about this matter, the reason there is nothing in any of the budget papers presently specifically in respect of costs associated with a referendum is because we do not have the bills passed and—

Ms Chapman: Come on, that never stopped you before.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: But that said, I think I have provided some information today to the deputy leader that indicates that the coincidence of these referenda with a general election means that the cost is not particularly significant, because all of the polling places are already hired, all of the polling staff are already there, everything has already been done, but there are some additional costs, and the estimate I received today was that they could be of the order of \$1.9 million, give or take a bit.

There is something in that number to incorporate some sort of education or promotional opportunity, because obviously the Electoral Commission would want people to understand that they are going to be asked these questions and have some idea how to vote in a referendum. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

REFERENDUM (DEADLOCKS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 October 2015.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:38): I am tempted to say, really, all of what I said on the referendum bill we have just dealt with to the extent that it has been adjourned, namely, this is a bill—this is the short version, you will be pleased to know—that is necessary if we are to amend the constitution in respect of deadlocks, and that if it were to pass the upper house it would be necessary for us to follow it with this bill, which would provide for a referendum for the public to vote in a referendum before ultimately the constitution reform bill was presented to the government.

So, for all of the same reasons, we will need to go to a referendum, and this bill purports to pose the question to the electors: do you approve the Constitution (Deadlocks) Amendment Bill 2015? And similarly, as I put in the previous referendum bill, that would require an explanatory memorandum being prepared in the 'yes' and 'no' vote to be put to the public.

There would need to be appropriate public forums, there would need to be persons available to undertake the explanation to the public and to be able to answer questions, there would be advertising in various mediums from which the public could get information, on which they could make a contribution to the discussion on that to present their case. Political parties would sometimes follow with material that they publish, which would be at their expense, and they may make submissions and the like.

If we were to compare the cost of doing all of that with what the government has indicated would be an extra \$1.9 million to do it at the general election with both referendum questions being presented to the public, with the cost of the extra money that has been given to former governor Scarce (that is, Royal Commissioner Scarce) in respect of the nuclear industry issues that he has tentatively reported on, he has now been given an extra \$3 million to go on a roadshow and present the arguments, presumably for and against, or the information of his tentative findings for public comment to, in the Premier's words, 'test the validity of the findings that he has tentatively made.' I think 'test the accuracy' was the position of the Premier on that.

If we were to compare the cost of putting those questions to the public, presenting as to the plus and minus of those, with similarly having to do that to the same population, the same voters, in

respect of these constitutional amendments which are quite complex, then I cannot possibly imagine the government's estimate (which, yes, I have received today) of approximately \$1.9 million to do the referendum preparation and resolution. Remember, that whilst the public might cast their vote on a day, all of the public meetings and advertising and promotional material, communication documents, etc. would have to be done, plus you need somebody to count the referendum votes afterwards, collate the material, etc.

I find it quite extraordinary that the government is coming up with a \$1.9 million cost. Recently, in this last year, the Australian Electoral Commission undertook a referendum of about 60 or so households up in the Skye district in my electorate to ask them questions about whether or not they wanted to join up to the water supply provided by SA Water. SA Water engaged the electoral commission to undertake that job and they had to issue the ballot papers to each of the residents and provide them with the information about what they were voting on, give them the information, receive them back under a postal vote arrangement, collate them and provide a report to SA Water. On that particular issue it was determined that above 75 per cent of the vote was supportive and the project in mind was progressed.

My recollection was that that cost something like \$1 million and, taking into account the extra cost in that instance of SA Water departmental people to go through that process as well, it seems to me a very light-on estimate that we have just received today. I would like to know from the Attorney, although I have this paragraph of information which says:

I advise the amount estimated at this stage to conduct two referenda at the general election in 2018 is approximately \$1.9 million.

The letter tells me that the amount for the Electoral Commission of South Australia to conduct it would include advertising and communications. I would like to know from whom he obtained that advice, when he obtained that advice, and whether in fact those moneys in that amount are in the budget.

He says, as he indicated in the previous bill, 'Look, these things haven't passed the parliament yet so we haven't actually put them in the budget.' That is a complete nonsense. We have the forward estimates and we have disclosed in the budget measures a provision, and under the Electoral Commission there is nothing there for the 2017-18 year, which is when the next general election will be; there is no provision in that at all.

The government proposed this like they do everything else; I can remember with the natural resources management legislation they had not only budgeted for what the funding was going to be but had actually gone out and advertised for members of the natural resources management boards. Before 30 June of the year they were proposing them to be implemented, before the legislation was passed in the parliament, they advertised and appointed these people who were going to go on the boards. They set up the whole machinery. They were making announcements about who was going to be the chief executives, or equivalent, of this new structure.

So do not come to this parliament, Attorney, with this nonsense about saying, 'Look, we don't make provision in our budget for things until legislation is passed,' because that is just a nonsense. Every day we deal with legislation in this parliament and frequently there is an identified item in the budget and/or in the budget measures that highlights why it is necessary to make provision for an initiative which may or may not receive the passage of legislation. In fact, the entire budget is presented on the basis that people still keep being paid, initiatives start, and the legislation sometimes does not pass until nine months into the financial year. That does not mean that the provision has not been made and, in many cases, applied before the legislation even passes.

If I were to use the most absurd contemporary example it would be the fact that we still have, stuck in the other place, legislation to make provision for government lands to be applied for an Anzac walk just out here in North Terrace, to commemorate the centenary of ANZAC as an important initiative of the state, local and federal governments. It is a \$10 million project to put in a walkway from North Terrace down to the Torrens Parade Ground, and they are digging it up as we speak, while the legislation is still sitting in the other place.

So, Attorney, do not come in here with this nonsense about saying, 'We have not made provision for this because we haven't seen if the legislation has gone through or not.' They know this

has a snowball's chance in hell; the snowball would melt before it ever got through the other place, this legislation. They have not put it in there; they just want to waste our time in this parliament with another frivolous red herring to debate and divert attention from their own incompetence in running a government. So yes, we will oppose this accompanying bill, this consequential bill, that goes with the Constitution Act reforms to introduce the new deadlock procedure in the event of there being an intransigence between both houses of parliament.

The other matter I would like to know about, in respect of this money, is whether the estimate has come from the Electoral Commissioner as to what the cost was of previous referenda. I cannot even remember the last state referendum; I think we had one at the federal level, obviously, as to whether we kept the Queen as our head of state, and before that we had a referendum on whether local government was to be recognised, I remember that one. I was too young to remember the one about whether Aboriginals should be in the census.

We have had a few over the years, admittedly Australia-wide, and clearly we must have had a referendum at the time we amended the constitution to make provision for the Electoral Boundaries Commission. So I am assuming there have been referenda, and I would like to have some data on the costs of those—again, on the basis that I assume the Electoral Commission has provided that advice.

Now we do not actually have an electoral commissioner at present: we have an acting electoral commissioner, and there are processes underway to deal with that. But the Attorney might address his mind, when he comes back to respond on this matter, to why he has not tabled the electoral commissioner's annual report which, as I have said on the last bill, had been put on the website last year. Clearly, it has been written and signed by the Acting Electoral Commissioner last year.

Whether a copy of it is still sitting on the Attorney's desk, I do not know, but the proper process is that it is to be tabled in this parliament, and I would remind him to get on with it. I am advised by the table clerks here that there is no evidence of it being tabled. I thank the Acting Electoral Commissioner for at least putting his copy on the website last year. On this bill, again I make the same acknowledgment and ask the Attorney to get on with what he is supposed to be attending to in that regard. I oppose the bill.

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Davenport.

Adjournment Debate

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (16:53): I rise today to discuss the need for entrepreneurial skills to be embedded in South Australia's curriculum. As we hear on the news, almost daily, South Australian young people are at risk of unemployment. The current unemployment rate of youth in South Australia is about 15.6 per cent; higher in our northern suburbs. This is appalling, to say the least, and reflects terribly on this current government.

I feel for all parents of young people who, after all their hard work putting their children through high school, see children facing unemployment. Long gone are the days of expecting to leave school and have a job for life, but I think that young people would find that quite boring these days anyway.

These days, young people are masters of technology; we are globally minded and prepared to find solutions to the challenges that we face. As a society, we should be encouraging young people to try out new ways of finding work, and I believe teaching entrepreneurial skills can be just the place where young people should start on that journey.

Oprah Winfrey was not a girl born into privilege. She did not have an expensive education or anyone to rescue her as she made her way through the entertainment industry, yet today she is worth billions of dollars and is an inspiration to many women and men alike. She said:

For every one of us that succeeds, it's because there's somebody there to show you the way out. The light doesn't always have to be in your family; for me it was teachers and school.

Imagine teachers and schools showing young South Australians how to be entrepreneurial, showing by word and deed how to think up new ideas and reach niche markets and opportunities. Imagine young people in South Australian schools starting up businesses with ideas that suit their personalities and qualities, therefore keeping them out of the 15.6 per cent of unemployed youth and reversing and stemming the brain drain of our best and brightest across so many fields.

We see on a daily basis that young South Australians are leaving this state. As we head into O'Week at the beginning of the academic year, there are hundreds of young South Australians who graduated here last year who are beginning their further education and job prospects in another state and another city. I have talked about my sister for many years who has been living in Melbourne, and this week my brother starts university in Melbourne, and he represents another part of that brain drain.

He is doing that because he knows that in his chosen field there will be greater opportunities in another state rather than our own beautiful South Australia. He is not alone. I know the member for Chaffey has talked about this issue with his own kids, about young people leaving South Australia, and it is endemic. It is really a poor reflection on this government—

Mr Whetstone: Two of them just have.

Mr DULUK: Two of the Whetstones are no longer in South Australia. We all have that experience. If this continues, how can we ever expect to find the solutions to many of South Australia's problems if we do not have the next generation of our best and brightest staying in this state?

Back in 2006, University of South Australia Emeritus Professor Denise Bradley wrote in *The Sunday Mail* about her vision for South Australia. Among many excellent points, she advocated for entrepreneurship to be taught at all levels of the education system. I agree with Professor Bradley that all children throughout our state education system would benefit from learning to think up new ideas for our current problems.

In January just gone, Dr Neil McGoran, Chief Executive of the SACE Board, acknowledged that young people need to be ready for the future economy where innovation and entrepreneurial skills will be highly valued. By teaching young people to think as entrepreneurs, we would be teaching them to solve problems, and that is invaluable in this modern workforce.

In its 2014 Charter for a More Prosperous South Australia, Business SA documented the need for the study of entrepreneurship to be embedded into the secondary school system. In the charter, point 7.1 says:

The study of entrepreneurship should be embedded into the secondary school curriculum to provide all students with an understanding of what is involved in starting and operating a business.

I think we all acknowledge, certainly in this house, that small business is an important part of our economy. The Liberal Party has always been the party of small business. Teaching young South Australians those skills involved in running a small business is invaluable, in my view. Small business is a major employer in South Australia. In my own seat of Davenport there are hundreds of small businesses that service the community, employ local people and sustain the family.

Small business is the lifeblood of the community in my electorate. My constituents love living in Blackwood and the surrounding suburbs, not just because of the lovely environment but because they are fiercely local and parochial. They support local small businesses first and are always keen to try out new businesses in this area. Many small businesses want to hand down the business from one generation to another but, of course, this cannot happen if young South Australians are leaving this state because they do not see those opportunities of the future.

What better training and breeding ground for our next generation of small business owners than in our schools? Our young people often get their first job in small businesses such as local bakeries, takeaway restaurants and fruit and veggie shops. All those local small businesses are great training grounds for many young South Australians and, of course, this is the training ground that leads to people starting their own business. By teaching entrepreneurial skills, young people will have a chance to learn about how businesses work and how they can put their ideas into action, action that will see prosperity for the state and reduce long-term unemployment.

Speaking at the recent InDaily SA Business Index Top 100 launch, Professor Jana Matthews, Director of UniSA's Centre for Business Growth said that the country was 'missing an opportunity to tap into and nurture a pool of young business talent'. She added that 'you've got to start further back down the pipeline' in education. Indeed, we should be starting in primary school. We should be focusing on the fundamentals. We should be focusing on what we are good at.

Business people, academics and ordinary South Australians want to see our schools teach young people how to think up solutions for the future. Young people have the drive and energy. They have an understanding of technology like no other generation. They know what services they would like to buy, what products are good, and which trend is on and which is not. They are the best people to drive new businesses. Let's teach our young people how to prosper, how to get an idea off the ground and what to do, and let's do all we can to reduce unemployment and the brain drain in South Australia.

MEARES, MS ANNA

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:00): I would like to rise to say a few words about a great South Australian sportsperson whom I look up to, not only when I turn on the television to watch cycling, but at every Olympic and Commonwealth Games that I have watched, and to congratulate Anna Meares OAM on a wonderful career and recognising her achievements as the most successful female track cyclist of all time, particularly after winning her 11th world title last year. Anna Meares' favourite quote sums up her attitude to her chosen sport:

I've lost more races than I've won. You cannot have, nor appreciate, success without defeat.

Not only is Anna a wonderful athlete, but she is a great role model for aspiring cyclists. She is a great role model for aspiring sports people in general, particularly in the female arena. I would be here all day if I was to read out all of her achievements as it is a very impressive and long list.

Anna started cycling at the age of 11. She saw Kathy Watt compete on television in the 1994 Commonwealth Games and followed her sister and Commonwealth Games gold medallist, Kerrie, into the sport. Amongst her honours, she received the Centenary Medal in 2003 and an Order of Australia Medal in 2005 at the age of 20, which I think is just astounding. She was the first woman to win gold for Australia in track cycling at the Olympics.

She was also the winner of the Australian Cyclist of the Year in 2008 and 2012. She was People's Choice Cyclist of the Year in 2008 and 2011, nudging out Cadell Evans in the year he won Australia's maiden Tour de France victory. She was AIS Athlete of the Year in 2007 and 2011, and the Australian Elite Female Track Cyclist in the years 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011, and it just goes on. Off the track, she is an ambassador for the charities, the National Breast Cancer Foundation, Little Heroes Foundation and the Port Adelaide Community Youth Program.

Anna Meares is one of Australia's favourite sporting heroes and one of the most talented athletes in the world. She is a three-time Olympian and two-time Olympic champion (gold and silver in London in 2012, silver in Beijing in 2008, and gold and bronze in Athens in 2004). She is a 10-time world champion across four different events and a five-time Commonwealth Games champion. She was also the flag bearer for the Glasgow 2014 Australian Commonwealth Games team.

She is also a 31-times Australian track champion and is the holder of Olympic, world, commonwealth and national records. She has competed in countless Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games winning 110 golds, 54 silvers and 29 bronze medals over her career.

Having personally met Anna and having had a quiet conversation with her, she is an absolute true Australian and world champion. She does know how to let her hair down. She does know how

to let things go while she is having a break in the off-season, but her attitude to her chosen sport and the look in her eye tell the story.

It is one of the true privileges to have met Anna at the SASI and other sporting awards in my role as shadow minister for sport, as it is to meet any sports stars. I have risen today to congratulate her. She will be leading the charge in Rio at the 2016 games. What it really does show is that she has longevity. Cycling is a great world sport that she has succeeded in.

I wanted to give a few examples of what she has done. In the 2012 World Championships in Melbourne, Anna won the world title in the keirin and the 500 metre time trial, breaking the world record in the 500 that she had lost in 2009, setting a new benchmark of 33.01. This win took Anna's career tally of world titles to 10, putting her equal to France's Felicia Ballanger as the most successful women's sprint cyclist ever. Obviously, South Australia is regarded as the capital of cycling, but Anna Meares heads the pack when it comes to cyclists and the cycling program at SASI. I congratulate Wes Battams in heading up the SASI facility at Kidman Park.

If South Australia is going to produce these world champions and world class athletes who are going to go through the SASI program it needs to get with the program. We have to make sure that we support these athletes. We have to support the programs that breed these athletes, and we have to have facilities that are world-class so that we attract athletes to South Australia to excel, so that we can be one of the great sporting states in this country and the world.

Recently, during my trip to Western Australia to have a look at the Western Australian Institute of Sport, I was absolutely blown away by their facilities, by what the state government is doing to promote sport. Just as importantly, they are now breeding more world class athletes, world class track and field athletes. Their rehabilitation program is second to none. Their whole sporting precinct is an absolute picture. It showed me that the government is prepared to back its sports men and women. The Western Australian government has had a windfall through the mining boom, which South Australia missed out on.

It is about investment today for the long-term future, so that we can be proud of our athletes. Governments, of many persuasions, always seem to turn away from putting money into sporting programs and sporting facilities, because it does not seem to be targeting their voters. I think that we need to see governments putting their money where their mouth is, particularly when we want to stand up and take credit. We know that the government likes to take credit for anything that is good news. Well, this could be a really good news story—being able to champion our champions, being able to say what a great job we have done in supporting our sporting programs and facilities.

After visiting New South Wales and Victorian sporting facilities, and having a look at what is happening in Queensland at the moment in setting up for the upcoming Commonwealth Games in 2018, I am thinking that South Australia, too, could come to the fore and put some money into creating even better and greater sporting facilities, so that we could be proud to bring those sporting heroes, those potential sporting champions, to this great state and make South Australia an even greater sporting state.

Over the years great coaches and great athletes have come to South Australia; but we are starting to see other states invest in their sporting programs, invest in their athletes and invest in the good news that governments are always looking for, and we need better facilities that will make South Australia a drawcard.

I note that the Western Australian facility, which is a world-class model of excellence in high-performance sport, did come at a cost. It came at a cost of \$34 million, but I can assure you that it is money well invested. I can assure you that they are breeding champions. I can assure you that they are attracting the best coaches in the world. They are attracting athletes from all over the country. They are attracting athletes from all over the world to look at excellence. They are attracting athletes of all shapes, forms and sizes in all disciplines to go there and use their world-class facilities.

If South Australia is not careful, we are going to miss out. We are going to lose our coaches and our athletes. We are going to lose our funding from the Australian Institute of Sport—the Australian government—if the South Australian government does not step up to the plate. I call on the South Australian government, I call on the minister, who loves good news, and I call on the

Premier, who loves good news too, to look at ways we can support our programs and promote South Australia as a great sporting state.

At 17:11 the house adjourned until Wednesday 24 February 2016 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***INDUSTRY ROAD MAPS**

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (27 July 2015). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I am advised:

1. In response to the first question, a number of industry roadmaps are currently being prepared or have been completed in the following areas:

- Functional and luxury food—a study into functional and luxury food value chains with a focus on Asian markets is underway (due for completion in December 2015).
- Assistive technologies—an industry roadmap for assistive technologies has recently been completed by the University of Adelaide in collaboration with Germany's Fraunhofer Institute. The findings have been presented to industry. Opportunities and projects identified in the roadmap will be further developed by industry, the research community and government under the auspices of the Innovative Manufacturing CRC.
- ICT Roadmap for Minerals and Energy Projects—roadmap reports from CSIRO and Deloitte have identified a number of opportunities for ICT in minerals and petroleum projects in South Australia. Three projects have been funded to date through the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence. Three ICT roadmap industry roundtables have occurred with over 400 industry attendees resulting in further projects that are under development.
- Cellulose Fibre Chain Roadmap—the Cellulose Fibre Roadmap has been completed. The Cellulose Fibre Value Chain Study, along with the \$27 million South East Forestry Partnerships Program administered by Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA), has contributed to increased collaboration and a renewed confidence within the forestry industry. Industry is investigating and making investments in higher value added forestry activities with support from the program.
- A photonics value chain analysis has recently commenced with the University of Adelaide's Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing as a first step in developing a roadmap for establishing South Australia as a globally recognised centre for photonics and sensing.

2. The commonwealth government has made no contribution towards the development of industry roadmaps.