

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 25 February 2016

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER, ABSENCE

The CLERK: I advise the house of the absence of the Speaker. The Deputy Speaker will take the chair.

The Deputy Speaker took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

Bills

ROAD TRAFFIC (WORK AREA SPEED LIMIT SIGNS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

Mr BELL: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Second Reading

Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

What I have are some amendments to the Road Traffic Act. Currently, under the Road Traffic Act, there is no compulsion to remove 25 km/h signs when workmen have left the roadwork site, for example, and I am sure that many people in this chamber and I know that many people have contacted my office, people I have spoken to, and people who have contacted me since this was raised in the media on Monday, have also experienced frustration.

As we speak, Frome Street on the weekend had 25 km/h zones at both ends with no activity. On Hawker Street on the weekend, pavers were being laid during the week, but the 25 km/h signs were there on Sunday with no workmen there. Exeter Street, Devon Park at 5 o'clock last night was the same situation: all the work had stopped and 25 km/h signs were left up all night.

I should say at the outset, we all appreciate the importance of restricting speed when roadworkers are present at roadworks and the importance of drivers slowing and obeying signage when work is in process. The point is that the confusion often caused by the fact that these signs are left up when there are no workers in sight can, of course, lead to a devaluing of their importance. People do not tend to obey the signs. I know many times I drive through a 25 km/h road sign when there are no workers there and people overtake me, and I know full well that they are exceeding the 25 km zone. They see there are no workers there; they do not believe the signs should be there, so they ignore the sign, and I think this actually devalues those signs.

This bill would enforce the removal of the 25 km/h signs when workmen have left the site and enables fines to be applied if this is not done. The bill only applies to 25 km/h signs and applies to work sites. It will not affect the 25 km/h zones at school zones, for example. They are very specific: you must reduce your speed to 25 km/h if children are present. This will have no effect on those signs at all. Nor will it have an effect on emergency workers.

If signs are not removed, the responsible officer of the public authority is guilty of an offence. This is aimed at a senior level of authority rather than workers at the site, as with varying layers of supervisors often in place on work sites, it may be difficult to attribute responsibility to one person. The objective is that, if the fines are aimed at a higher level of responsibility, those at that level will

be more active in ensuring that the signage is removed. Where a non-government contractor carries out the work, the contractor commits the offence instead.

The bill would allow 25 km/h signs to be left in place only if workers are on site, if workers will be off the site for up to five hours or less, or if there is an unusually high level of hazard for the road. In this case, the minister can then sign off (or obviously the minister's representative as is the standard practice) on the reasons given for the signs to stay up. Remember, there are other signs that road workers can move to. They can move to 40 km/h, 50 km/h or 60 km/h speed signs; there are all sorts of options for them. The 25 km/h signs specifically were designed to protect workers.

There would not be many road users who have not been confronted with the frustration and confusion of the inappropriate use of 25 km/h signs, with some drivers obeying the signage and then others disobeying the signage. From this point of view, it is also a basic road safety problem. I have a personal concern that the lack of enforcement, as it currently stands, of the signs being brought down when there are no workers on site is devaluing the importance of slowing when the road workers are present, which is the very last thing we want to see. After the media coverage of this issue on Monday, I was contacted by a CFS volunteer who sent me this email:

25 km/h restrictions. I sympathise with the frustrations (that I've often shared) regarding 25 km/h limits on roadworks where nothing seems to be happening. I am especially frustrated because, as a CFS volunteer, the public's frustration boils over and impacts on us when we're trying to do our duty without getting bowled over by people who disregard the 25k signs. Please differentiate between poorly-maintained roadworks signage and emergency services activities.

The intention of this bill is exactly that: to emphasise to people that, when these signs are in place, they are in place for a reason; they are there to protect workers, so you must obey them. If people are not frustrated by the fact that these signs are up and there is no work being conducted, it will have the effect of people taking the signs more seriously and obeying them when they see them.

I want to quote from the Safe Roadworks newsletter of August 2013. This is a problem that has been around for a very long time, the department has been aware of it for a long time and the government has been aware of it for a long time. This is a notice to its regular mailing list, and it states:

Please be reminded the 25 km/h speed limit is only to be used where there is a high level of hazard for workers or persons using the road.

Unnecessary use of 25 km/h signing leads to its inefficacy. Please consider the safety of all roadworkers and road users and only use 25 km/h where required.

That memo went out 2½ years ago and we see that that problem still exists. What I am hoping to achieve with this bill, of course, is that it holds people responsible for actually taking action to make sure that traffic keeps flowing after work has stopped and that these signs are treated with the respect they deserve. It is obvious that the minister's department is aware and appreciates the problems associated with not using the signage properly. They are putting memos out to those who conduct this work, and this bill will put some spine into the act for them so it can actually be enforced and the problem dealt with at a management level.

On this occasion, as with so many pieces of legislation proposed by the Liberal Party, the minister has trotted out a now-tired chorus line of, 'Yes, we are going to do that. Yes, we are drafting legislation. I hope the opposition will support us.' Not only are we supporting you, we are actually making it happen, giving you the opportunity to support this bill in the parliament so this can be law. Not only will there be an increased focus on the safety of workers on roadsides but there will also be less frustration with drivers using our roads who feel that they are being taken as mugs occasionally when they are forced to slow down to 25 km/h simply because there is a sign and no other reason. I urge members to support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Bell.

ROAD TRAFFIC (HELMETS FOR MOTOR BIKE RIDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill comes to the parliament after quite a bit of lobbying and quite a bit of work done by motorcycle riders, the general community, those who are enthusiasts of motorbikes and those who ride motorbikes as their preferred form of transport. I thank the member for Mitchell for the work he has done with those groups prior to my taking up the transport portfolio, but I am very pleased to be able to introduce this bill into the parliament.

I was also pleased to read a media response from a government spokesperson in *The Advertiser* this week when there was a story about the bill being introduced into parliament, the very same day, I should say, that Tasmania actually made the European motorcycle helmets legal and able to be used, where the government spokesman said that 'SA supported the "harmonisation" of helmet laws for consistency across the country.' We are certainly looking forward to support from the government on this bill also.

The state Liberals and South Australian motorbike riders see this amendment as an extremely positive move for motorcycle safety in South Australia. The Liberal Party has worked with SA motorcyclists in ensuring that their road safety concerns are being addressed and actioned at the parliamentary level where motorbike riders feel that unfortunately some legitimate concerns have been ignored by the current government.

The bill proposes assurances for SA motorcyclists so that we have access to the same safety equipment already used by motorcyclists throughout most of Australia. These ECE 22.05 helmets are now legal in Queensland, Victoria, the ACT, the Northern Territory and New South Wales, and on Wednesday the *Tasmanian Government Gazette* also published their legal use in Tasmania. They are also standard and legal in more than 50 countries around the world, including our near neighbours New Zealand, the UK and Germany.

The bill ensures that SA motorcyclists will soon have access to a wider range of helmet shapes and sizes and we envisage that this will go a long way to addressing the 20 per cent of riders who have an incorrectly fitted helmet at the time of their fatality.

We also know that the rate of brain injuries, particularly in low-speed accidents, is lower with the ECE helmets, as opposed to the AS 1698 helmets, and, as a net result of this, injury severity could be reduced in some cases. This should also have a positive flow-on effect with regard to the state budget as fewer severe injuries equates to less time in hospital and recovery care, meaning the overall cost of managing motorcycle injuries could reduce.

The bill will also signal to other Australian motorcyclists that SA will soon welcome them in regard to their motorcycle tourism. They will be able to take in the sights and spend their money here without fear of prosecution for wearing an illegal helmet or what is deemed as an unsafe helmet.

At the moment, if you start a road trip in Melbourne and you travel on the Ocean Road and end up at the South Australian border on your way to my colleague's electorate in Mount Gambier, you may very well be pulled up by police, have your helmet inspected, noting it is a European helmet that was legal in Victoria but is no longer legal in South Australia, and consequently it is either the end of a pleasant time being spent in South Australia enjoying the sights and spending money or alternatively you are off to a South Australian motorcycle supplies retailer to purchase a helmet specifically for use only in South Australia.

It is not an acceptable situation in a state where we have a Premier who claims that we want to be the innovative state, the state that is up to date, the state with the transforming economy, when we are still now one of only two states that do not allow the European standard when it comes to motorcycle helmets.

In the case of a rider being involved in an accident, failure to wear an approved helmet may have consequences with regard to insurance cover. According to the crash.org.au website, 84 per cent of AS1698 helmets tested exceed the 1.5 kilogram weight limit, or the point at which research has demonstrated the helmet weight will contribute to basilar skull fracture (BSF) injuries.

Despite numerous Australian and international researchers over the past three decades having found and demonstrated that over 50 per cent of all helmet impacts are to the facial chin bar region, and have made recommendations for the AS1698 standard to include relevant chin bar tests, no such test has ever been implemented in the standard.

In contrast to this, the ECE helmets have chin bar testing to address this high-impact area, and in fact the test schedule is so well developed that it is now used in Formula 1. Under the AS1698 standard, the energy test allows a total maximum force of 300G to be transmitted through the helmet into the rider's skull and brain in order to pass testing. This force equates to AIS6 level injury, which, in simple terms, is a fatality. In essence, our standard allows helmets to pass testing that are capable of transmitting enough force to kill you. However, under the ECE standard, the maximum allowed force is 250G, which equates to an AIS5 injury category, which is survivable.

The motorcycling community in South Australia have been very active in lobbying the government and other members of parliament, and on social media, promoting the argument for change with regard to this improvement in road safety, and sensible alignment with regulation interstate and overseas. Can I just read from a prominent South Australian motorcycle blog hopeful for this sensible change:

...this bill also signals to Australian motorcyclists that SA will soon be back open for business in regards to motorcycle tourism and as such, it will be the regional communities that will gain the most benefits from the bill as currently, if you are an interstate rider [who] uses an ECE helmet, as soon as you cross the border in [South Australia], you are breaking the law by not wearing an approved helmet and in the case of a rider being involved in an accident, failure to wear an approved helmet may have serious consequences in regards to insurance cover.

Unfortunately, as is often the case with our current—and some might say quirky—state Labor government and their moribund, red-tape addicted bureaucracy, approaches by motorbike riders for change have largely fallen on deaf ears, or at least are met with the usual legislative go-slow.

It is only when the Liberal opposition and others promote important issues that Labor ministers (or more often their faceless spokespeople) tell the media, 'We were just about to do that; yes, we are already looking at changing that.' Unfortunately, 14 years is a very long time to be looking at a situation. As I said, this is not a brand new issue; this has been around for quite some time, and the motorcycle community has been lobbying for this very sensible change for quite some time.

I think South Australians are tired of being last in the queue. There was a time when this state used to lead on many issues, such as education and social progress. Even when South Australia was founded, we were a utopia, free of convicts, and sold as the South Australian company to overseas investors. We were very much ahead of the curve when it came to innovation and progress.

Unfortunately, after 14 years of Labor, we have slipped behind. We are now, in many cases, the last to act on change and innovation. What my bill does is bring South Australia part of the way into the general Australian community, particularly with regard to the safety of motorcycle riders.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Bell.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DRONES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 November 2015.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:55): I rise today to speak on the Summary Offences (Drones) Amendment Bill. I note that we live in a very fast moving world, a world where technology overtakes most of us, especially those born before 1970. Technology is a fact of life and we need to embrace it, at least to a certain extent, or we will be left behind.

The member for Heysen had a discussion with us on our side of the house about being at a function where there was a drone hovering overhead filming the event and streaming the footage direct to another location. As the member for Heysen noted, it was all done at the invitation of the event organisers, and there is no problem with that, or indeed with children being able to play with small remote controlled helicopters which might have a camera attached. For want of promoting a

brand name, GoPro cameras are all the rage, or similar ones you can buy in the market. I know my eldest son has a lot of fun recording his motorbike exploits on his GoPro camera. Sometimes it goes a bit sideways and every way, but that is when he falls off.

The issue around all this technology, especially the issue of drones, is when such technology is used to invade people's privacy. The issue, especially in light of what the member for Heysen is keen to express, is that it appears there is no law in this state which would prevent a media organisation, a neighbour, or any person, from flying a remote controlled drone up to the window of your home, or over your backyard, and filming whatever it can capture.

The little understanding I do have of drones is the simple fact that they can be flown out of sight. How you manage that I am not sure (whether you have a screen), and from what I understand some of them have a homing device. I am sure there are a few that get lost and they become the property of someone else by default. The issue is around privacy laws and the fact that there is no privacy law as such to protect anyone's basic right to privacy, nor is the Civil Aviation Authority going to seek to control these drones, as long as they do not venture into controlled air space.

I note the Attorney-General has indicated he would be generally supportive of some sort of privacy law, but has not moved to introduce any bill to that end. Certainly the proposal by the member for Heysen is that it would be unlawful to fly a drone with or without any camera or recording device attached over any private property without the owner's or the occupier's permission, and that sounds very reasonable to me. I suggest that the limit need only be, say, 100 feet above the property, or 30 metres in metric discussion.

I think that this is a good, middle-of-the road idea so that it does not cut the use of the technology but also it is giving individuals the right to privacy because I am sure that no-one would appreciate a drone flying up to their window, especially, and potentially filming what is going on in their private residence.

It is one of those things that, with the ongoing issue around them, drones are used far more widely by industry. I know that the real estate industry uses them for flyovers of properties. It is a great tool for them so that they can advertise the properties and give a unique perspective over what is going on on the ground. Obviously if they are selling the house I am sure they get the seller's permission to do so because I think that would be highly appropriate.

I think that we do need to manage this, and certainly I have noticed their use in regard to a little committee I am involved in, the River Murray Boating and Recreational Advisory Group, which is just doing the final edits on some safety videos for river use by all watercraft. I must say that Adam Bruce, our chairman—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: A great wakeboarder.

Mr PEDERICK: He is a great wakeboarder. He knows, obviously, a lot of people in the wakeboarding and skiing field, and he has made some great short videos that, before too long, will be released just as safety videos for users of the river because there is not enough compliance on the river. When the big, orange/yellow boat comes around the corner every one tidies up their act for a while until the boat disappears.

Just in saying that, as I have said in this place before, I will again thank the Minister for Transport for his department's contribution of \$20,000 to help us do this project. However, in saying that I think that if this were a government project we would save many hundreds of thousands of dollars, but that is by the by. We have got the contacts through Adam and others on the committee, and the Boating Industry Association is on board as well as the houseboat hirers association.

I saw some of this raw footage and I thought that it was magnificent with respect to what you can do with drones to get those overhead shots, otherwise you would have to hire a helicopter at great cost to do the same thing. It does give fantastic real-time footage of what is going on, especially in this case in regard to filming watercraft on the River Murray. I commend everyone who was involved in the filming. They went down for a day and they filmed about 10 of these videos which, as I said, will be released over time. They are just going through the final edits.

I certainly understand the use of drones and I certainly understand why they have become popular. I note that there was some discussion that was had in the party room around remote-controlled helicopters. One of my boys got one for Christmas and I think it lasted about 12 minutes before it plummeted into the ground and screwed the main drive off. I may have been in control of it, or not.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes. They can be great things but you have to manage them. I saw one that the member for Stuart was showing me the other day. I think that the trade name is Lily, from memory, but it is something that will follow you or go in front of you for a period of time and film what you are doing from the air.

This technology is just getting better and better over time, but in saying that we, as legislators, as we do over time, have to keep up with modernising legislation and making sure that it is appropriate in regard to people being able to have their privacy and not have their privacy interfered with by these drones overhead.

Some people may want to use these drones for nefarious reasons but that is up to them, but they need to be controlled as well. I think this is a very legitimate piece of legislation. I think it is something that we need to proceed with because people's privacy is paramount, but also, as the member for Heysen indicated, we do not want to lose the ability to use this technology for their enjoyment. As I said, the aim is to not impinge on people's private lives and that is the main issue here. I commend the bill and I hope it has a speedy flow through the house.

Time expired.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:06): I rise today to support this very worthwhile bill brought before us by the member for Heysen. From the outset I want to say that I think that one of the greatest iconic films in Australian history is *The Castle*. It helps to underline to Australians that every man's home or woman's home is their castle. The 'vibe' of this bill is very much that we are protecting people's right to quietly enjoy their castle as they see fit, and I think that that is extremely worthy.

This is an issue that I am very passionate about. As someone of a younger generation who has engaged in modern technology, I understand pretty well how that modern technology has been used to break down the barriers of privacy that were otherwise innate in the limitations that technology had generations ago.

Previously, if your neighbour was doing something private in their own backyard and you looked over the fence you could see it, but that was about it, and when you gossiped to your other neighbours, your ability to spread what was happening was quite limited. Whereas now, you can peer over a fence and use your phone to take a recording that can end up being viewed by millions of people around the world.

Indeed, a drone is the same thing: somebody can now take a recording of what you are doing in the privacy of your own castle and broadcast it to millions of people. This is an area where we as legislators need to keep up with the pace of change as it happens around the world. This issue of privacy is very important. It is very important because it is fundamental to social cohesion. The reason that TV shows like—whatever the one is on Channel 10 with Shane Warne that I don't watch—

Mr Pederick: *Survivor*.

Mr KNOLL: That's right, or the other one where they are in the house together—*Big Brother*. The reason these shows become interesting is that when people spend 24 hours a day together in a confined area and have no private respite, their interactions with each other can become quite skewed and abnormal, and lead to emotional and social breakdown. I assume that that is where these shows get their voyeuristic pleasures from, because that is when things get interesting.

Certainly for the cohesion of the broader community, it is extremely important that people have a right to privacy; an ability to go back to their homes and to be able to vent to their loved ones about difficult conversations and difficult people that they have met throughout the day in the full knowledge that those conversations are private by their very nature. So when I go home tonight and talk about the difficulties that I have had with members opposite, I can be sure that the language I

use will be confined to my own home. I think that is an extremely important and worthy measure and something that this bill seeks to enshrine because drones are a new technology.

The member for Heysen was talking about an incident in Melbourne when an unsuspecting real estate agent happened to drone upon an unsuspecting sunbaker in their backyard. They subsequently used those images when it came to trying to sell the neighbouring house, and certainly that person had, shall we say, some unwanted attention. There was also an instance where a woman was prosecuted because she flashed the Google car that came around—

Mr Pederick: In Port Pirie—in Frome.

Mr KNOLL: In Port Pirie, and those images were then broadcast to the world. They are exactly the types of things that this bill is seeking to address. We have already dealt with surveillance devices in this place—and I think that provides a series of protections that are extremely important—but it is topical that this bill has come before us now, and I want to highlight some news stories that have been happening over the past couple of days in reference to a pig farm in Hamley Bridge. It was on the news two nights ago, and I think there were some follow-up stories yesterday about this pig farm at Hamley Bridge and supposed breaches as they were uncovered by self-styled animal activists.

There was footage of a woman, an animal activist—and I do not know her name—who stood up and said that it is important that the public get to see what their farming really looks like. I agree with that statement, except that everything that was done in uncovering that footage did not do that. Indeed, I think the proper process, when animal cruelty is occurring or where substandard practices are being undertaken, is for the appropriate body—in this case, the RSPCA—to investigate that footage.

Our entire legal system works under the presumption of innocent until proven guilty, and I think that is something that should be afforded to anybody undertaking an operation. In this instance, breaches of animal welfare standards need to be reported to the appropriate authority. Once that authority has had the chance to investigate those breaches, they can then go off through a more formal legal process, and attention can be drawn to the farm at that stage.

The difficulty I have is when people with a hidden agenda and who want to turn our country into a nation of vegetarians decide to take footage, sensationalise that footage—and in previous examples I know that footage has been doctored and sensationalised—which is then picked up by the media and broadcast as fact. I have extreme difficulty with that process because it is not giving a fair assessment of what is happening.

The difficulty is that it is very hard to find the people who took the original footage and prosecute them for defamation or prosecute them for trespass because you have to find out who they are first. We are lucky now, through surveillance devices, that we have some protections in that regard because I am not here—and rural MPs are not here—to defend animal cruelty in any shape or form. We are here to defend the ability of people to conduct their business free from interference, free from people who are not unbiased observers and who are not otherwise experts trained in this field but people who have a political agenda, and through that political agenda try to prosecute a case against anybody who disagrees with that agenda.

If it turns out that this farm in Hamley Bridge, through the RSPCA investigation, gets prosecuted for breaches of animal welfare standards then that is all well and good, but for them to be prematurely lambasted in the court of public opinion and the media, I think, is unfair, especially when the veracity of the footage that was taken cannot be verified. This piece of legislation will put another protection in place in that instance.

It will put another protection in place for people to have privacy in their own homes and in their own backyards; and it will ensure that proper process is followed. I know there has been a lot of discussion of late about suppression orders within courts and judges deciding that it is more important for proper judicial process to be observed, overriding the public's right to know up until a matter has been prosecuted when, I am sure, suppression orders can be varied.

The point is that, in this area where there is so much proliferation of media, judges are taking steps to ensure the proper process is observed and, when it comes to people taking footage and

trying to prosecute their own case, the same sorts of protections should be in place. This is not about secrecy; this is not about a lack of transparency. This is about proper process and ensuring that the people who are best equipped to make the decision are able to make that decision before somebody's reputation is completely ruined.

Make no mistake: we hear from the government—and, certainly, we members of the opposition agree—that our food industry is one of the key fundamental drivers of how this state is going to recover and that is incongruous with those who would seek to shut down parts of that industry for their own political purposes. I am very happy to support this bill. I am very happy that it is here and I look forward to its speedy passage through this place and the other place, so that we can all be afforded the protection to be able to sunbake in whatever fashion we feel like in the privacy of our own homes and backyards.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:16): I, too, rise to support the member for Heysen's summary offences amendment bill, put forward by a good local member who has concerns about regulations around drones. The technology of this new device really has put a new dimension on the way we view, use and monitor all aspects of recreation, business or science and how we use it for that competitive edge. I think it is critically important that drones and the technology move along, particularly in this modern-day society.

I note that across Australia there have been challenges in dealing with the laws surrounding the use of drones and the privacy issues they have created. In my electorate of Chaffey, covering the Riverland and Mallee, the use of drones in farming businesses is becoming more and more common. The new generation of farmworker is known as an unmanned aerial vehicle or drone. It is able to follow instructions precisely and I think that describes exactly where farming is going—precision farming, precision agriculture, precision use of technology.

Drones are a great tool for monitoring and keeping an eye on outcomes. They are being used particularly in broadacre crops where they can pick up salinity areas or areas that have been affected, particularly with trials. In today's modern world of food production, farmers are always looking for a competitive edge and they can use drones. Drones can cover significant distances, monitor and have significant input into better farm practice and, just as importantly, how farmers can actually make a dollar.

In today's world, it is becoming harder and harder, tougher and tougher, with seasonal variation—some might say climate change—and what we are hearing and seeing is that seasonal variation is having a huge bearing on seasonal outcomes, particularly in annual crops, which needs to be dealt with on a day-to-day basis. Some of these drones are capable of taking almost 3,000 photographs in a 90-minute flight. They are then processed, and that information and technology can be used in assessing all sorts of aspects, particularly improving efficiencies. That is the benefit of putting drones into dryland and other forms of farming.

Other examples that have been effectively used, particularly in my electorate, are from a professor at Adelaide University who is involved in an organisation using drones to monitor animals and forest activity. The group Conservation Drones have previously assessed orangutan population in illegally logged Asian forests and monitored national parks in other parts of the world. They are also conducting small trial projects, looking at vegetation of Mallee scrub following bushfires at Calperum Station just a few years ago.

They are also looking at some of the impacts that these bushfires are having, particularly on native fauna and flora. We have seen a couple of the Mallee fires as of late that have almost wiped out bird species, and these drones are a very cheap and effective way of going into those areas which have had bushfires and monitoring, because they are not intrusive when it comes to flying through these parks and forests, but they do have a very keen eye as a result of modern technology, cameras and the like.

I know that the Civil Aviation Safety Authority requires permission and certification for flying drones in a good, professional manner, so the professor said, but what it means is that the work that is conducted on this small scale really can overtake the technology that is being used, particularly in helicopters. Powerline inspection and fire monitoring are very expensive to do and to monitor. I know that obviously powerline or power pole insulator inspection is becoming more of a focus, particularly

with insurance companies, because they have been responsible for starting many fires around the state.

For drones to be able to do the work that helicopters were doing is incredibly cost effective. It is saving money for insurance companies and the organisations that are responsible for that monitoring and, in turn, I would like to think that potentially those cost savings would be passed on to consumers: the power users and the landowners who obviously are footing the bill at the end of the line.

Obviously, we know that drones are being used for wild dog monitoring. Another example of the benefits of using drones was in the recent Riverland Dinghy Derby, which was a great event in the Riverland. The Dinghy Derby has now become a world-class event. It is of course dinghies, whether they are a standard format or modified format, that have a set route through the creeks and the water networks up above Renmark and the Riverland. It is now sponsored by Red Bull.

It is viewed right around the world by millions of people. This drone technology is widely used throughout that race because it is very hard to access and to have helicopters everywhere. They did bring up a number of helicopters, planes and huge infrastructure to promote the race. I think it is great for the Riverland, but it is also great for South Australia, giving it exposure to the world.

The purpose of the amendments to this bill is not intended to interfere with any of these examples I have just outlined, because there are also positive and beneficial uses for drones. These amendments do not target, for example, children being able to play with small remote-controlled helicopters which may have cameras attached.

At present, it seems there is no law in the state which prevents anyone from flying a remote-controlled drone up to the window of your home or over your backyard, filming whatever it can capture. We all know about the infamous nude sunbaker in the real estate advertisement. I think most people have viewed that with interest, but it was just something that does intrude on the privacy—

Members interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: It was a very nice piece of real estate. If these amendments are successful, it will be unlawful to fly a drone, with or without a camera or recording device attached, over any private property without the owner or occupier's permission. I note that a 2014 report was undertaken by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs, entitled 'Eyes in the sky: Inquiry into drones and the regulation of air safety and privacy'.

The report highlighted the benefits of using the RPAs for agriculture and mining surveying, aerial photography, bushfire spotting, beach patrolling, sports webcam deployment, and search and rescue assistance to name a few. However, privacy concerns were raised, and obviously that is one of the issues that we are dealing with.

How many of us would want our neighbours deploying an RPA over our backyard while we are attending a family barbecue? There is nothing like having a drone keeping an eye on you while you are having a chop in the privacy of your own backyard. How many of us would like to see the team from our local newspaper or television station trying to get closer to the family during a private moment, particularly if it is a grieving process?

Obviously, there are many issues with drones in today's world. In particular, I think the privacy issue is the number one concern. We do need to move with the times and we do need to embrace modern technology, but there does need to be some form of compliance around a drone, the technology and the intrusion that it could pose to any individual. I support the bill.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of a contingent of serving women police officers. I thank them for coming to join us today and for their dedication to the community.

*Motions***WOMEN IN POLICING**

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (11:28): I move:

That this house recognises the 100th anniversary of women serving as police officers in the South Australian police force.

I rise today to recognise the significant milestone in December 2015 of 100 years of women serving in the South Australian police force. In doing so, I acknowledge the serving women police officers here today who are my guests and, in the other place, those of the Minister for Police, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas.

It was on 27 August 1915 that a number of community organisations petitioned the chief secretary to employ female officers. On 27 September of the same year, an advertisement appeared in *The Advertiser* calling for expressions of interest from women wanting to take up a position in policing. South Australia was already a world leader in women's rights, having granted women the right to vote and to stand for parliament.

The requirement that police be under the age of 29 when appointed was waived to pave the way for Adelaide juvenile courts probation officer, 40-year-old Kate Cocks, to become the first principal matron of women police. Kate Cocks employed as her assistant Annie Ross.

When the South Australia Women Police Branch, staffed by these two pioneering women, came into operation on 1 December 1915, it was the first women's police branch in the British Empire and just the second in the world behind Los Angeles. However, the branch was formed mainly to address what were considered at the time as social and behavioural issues with young girls.

Together the pioneering two patrolled areas of Adelaide where young women were thought to be offering services of prostitution. According to South Australia Police Historical Society president, Bill Prior, they patrolled the streets in plain clothes armed only with a whistle, baton, badge and identification card. Interestingly, they were said to be strong enforcers of a one-yard courting rule where non-married couples had to remain a minimum of one yard apart.

For many years the work of women police officers was directed largely towards preventative policing in social welfare fields where they performed useful, but restricted, duties dealing mainly with matters relating to women and children. The only opportunity for promotion came within the branch and was usually not regarded as part of the general seniority list.

It was not until the mid-1920s that female officers were issued with small pistols and 1953 before they were admitted to partial training courses at the Thebarton barracks. Until 1973, only single women were permitted to join the force and they had to resign when they got married. In 1974, with only 45 women officers, mixed patrols were introduced, and in 1975 the policewomen's branch was absorbed into the main force.

The sex discrimination act of 1975 paved the way for women to be promoted into all areas of the police force. In 1977, they were issued with firearms as part of their general patrol equipment, and from 1979 they were recruited under the same provisions as their male counterparts and received the same training.

Opportunities for women in the South Australian police force further improved in March 1979 when girls from the age of 17 were allowed to join the force as cadets. Until this time, only adult women could join. In later years, like their male counterparts, female recruits were appointed to the rank of constable when they reached the age of 19. Training varied from six to 12 months and female recruits underwent the same selection standards and training as male officers with no formal restrictions as to the career paths or promotional opportunities offered.

South Australia's policemen also became the first in the British commonwealth to receive equal pay. It was stated at the time that they would be treated the same as constables with regard to hours of labour and remuneration. Mr Prior, himself a former police officer, said that although women police officers and their supporters had to fight for every achievement, the South Australian police force had prospered from each successful step.

The significance of this anniversary cannot be understated. When Kate Cocks and Annie Ross became our first female constables they paved the way for all women to serve with great distinction since.

From the brief of helping with a specific social issue, the role of women in the police force has changed significantly over a century. While they were once used predominantly for welfare, family and social-based duties, women are now included in all the roles of modern policing. Marital status is insignificant and part-time employment and maternity leave is available. The majority of women police are now employed in uniform patrol and general duties in metropolitan and country areas and the remainder work in a wide range of specialist areas, including CIB, drug taskforce, prosecution, academy, administration, domestic violence and sexual assault units.

South Australia has a long history of women doing outstanding police work, from working on-duty officers in the frontline and at police stations across the state, to specialist positions and roles in senior management.

Last year, we took another step forward with the appointment of our first female deputy commissioner of police. Deputy Police Commissioner Williams is one of those 17 year olds who took advantage of the changes and joined SAPOL in 1980. She worked her way up through the ranks, along the way graduating with a Bachelor of Laws (Honours) from Adelaide University and an Applied Diploma in Criminology and Police Management from Cambridge University. Like Kate Cocks and Annie Ross 100 years ago, our Deputy Commissioner of Police is a great example to girls and women.

Today, SAPOL is served by more than 1,700 women. The Holden Hill police station, across from my electorate office, has 96 women officers on the roster, and I cannot speak highly enough of the work they and their colleagues do. I move this motion in honour of the South Australian women police who paved the way 100 years ago, and all those who have served our community and our state so well. To the policewomen here this morning, and those who serve and have served in SAPOL, we honour you, your commitment and dedication to our community, and we thank you.

From those humble beginnings when the South Australia Women Police Branch blazed a trail for women, not just in this state but right around the world, we acknowledge a century of women serving in the South Australian police force.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:35): It is a pleasure for me, on behalf of the opposition—and I know that other speakers will do the same—to support the member's motion:

That this house recognises the 100th anniversary of women serving as police officers in the South Australian police force.

I have no doubt that every single member in this chamber strongly supports that motion, as they should. To begin, I would just like to read a couple of things which set some context. Firstly, from the South Australia Police Historical Society website:

The South Australia Women Police Branch came into operation on 1st December, 1915. Miss Kate Cocks and Miss Annie Ross were appointed as Constables, the primary reason being the growing social problem of immorality in the community, particularly in relation to young girls. The Branch was the first Women Police Service in the then British Empire, and the second in the world.

The website also states:

Until 1973 only single women were permitted to join, and they had to resign if they married...

In 1979, female recruits underwent the same selection standards and training as male officers. According to the website, 'There were no restrictions to their career paths or promotional opportunities offered.' I would also like to give a bit of information from an online article written by Mr Brett Williamson for ABC Adelaide, with some other very relevant facts:

On April 27, 1915, a collection of 20 community groups petitioned the Chief Secretary A.W. Styles to employ female officers....

Crown solicitor Charles Dashwood advised there was no legal barrier to employing female officers.

'The only limitation was that the government would need to pay the women exactly the same [wage] as the men and give them the same authority,'...

That was obviously a concern at the time, but quite appropriately, no longer. The article continues:

The ruling to pay female police the same as men was the first time such a thing had been done in the British Empire.

The government of the time, the police of the time, and certainly the women of the time who received equal pay, were leaders, and deserve to be recognised as such. I remember being at the South Australia Police Academy a few years ago for the 175th anniversary of South Australia Police very well. It was an absolutely tremendous occasion. One of the many wonderful recognitions that were given that day was for the women serving in South Australia Police. It was certainly one of the many things that was highlighted, and it was a pleasure to see that.

At the moment, women make up approximately 25 per cent of the total South Australian police force, but we have more than that in very senior leadership roles. We have Deputy Commissioner Linda Williams, Assistant Commissioner Linda Fellows, and Assistant Commissioner Bronwyn Killmier in those very senior ranks, and it is a pleasure to have all three of them with us today, along with other very important female representatives from SAPOL.

Everybody in this house and throughout the community should be made aware (or indeed, if they are aware, remind themselves) that South Australia Police, out of all the police forces through all the states in the nation, is held in the highest regard by the public. Surveys continually show that the South Australian police force is valued more highly by South Australians than other police forces are by other people in other states. I am sure that is, in no small measure, due to the role that female officers play in the broader policing work. SAPOL has been a leader and continues to be a leader in many ways, and that is one of them, and I think the women who serve us in SAPOL can be very proud of that.

Women fulfil many roles. I think, across almost every single area of our current modern day police force, there are women serving in all of the different areas. It might seem like a small thing and perhaps not one of the glamorous roles, but, as the member for Stuart, I am regularly made aware of how often female police officers work on their own in charge of single officer stations in very remote places and communities across country and outback areas, with which I am very familiar, have no hesitation about that whatsoever. It has never ever happened that anybody has said to me, 'Gee, you know, we're a bit remote. They're all on their own. That officer could be put in a difficult situation. I wish it was a bloke instead of a woman.' That has never happened in my 17 years, I think, of living in country and outback South Australia.

Communities appreciate female police officers enormously, even when they are working all on their own. In fact, I would go so far as to say that communities rally around police officers in remote places very well. Communities appreciate the fact that there is a station, they appreciate the fact that there is an officer, and they will do what they can to support that officer, whether it be to welcome them into the community or into their homes in a social way, or whether it be to support them in a potentially more difficult, stressful, confronting work environment. So, there is no hesitation about having female officers in those roles whatsoever.

I will touch on Commissioner Grant Stevens' recent announcement that, as of January of this year, he intends to recruit 50 per cent women into the Police Academy. Again, that is leading the way, from South Australia's perspective, across the nation. I think it is very important we recognise the commissioner has taken that step. I think it is also very important that he has said simultaneously that this will not impede the delivery of service by the South Australian police at all. He has said that publicly, he has said that privately. I know that he means it. I also know that he will have to make some adjustments within SAPOL to deliver on those two commitments, and I will certainly do everything I can possibly do as the shadow minister for police to support him in that. Some of those adjustments will make the South Australian police force better than it has been in the past.

I do not think it is a sexist thing at all to acknowledge that there are some tasks in some areas that women are better at, and some tasks in some areas that men are better at, in general. It does not mean that every single woman or every single man fits that role, but there are an enormous amount of problem solving issues and perhaps even, let me say, intuition. Policing is a science and

operational based, on evidence, but officers need to trust their own beliefs in certain things. There are many areas where women are better than men, on average, and I think that having more women in the South Australian police force will enhance the South Australian police force.

Let me just say on behalf of the opposition, and I am sure every member of this house would agree, thank you to all of the women who have served in SAPOL for 100 years until now. For all of the people, particularly, who are sworn officers at the moment, we appreciate your contribution, your leadership and your hard work in protecting our community, preventing crime and apprehending people who have committed crimes. We value the work you do very highly. So, on behalf of the opposition and, as I said, I am sure every member here, thank you for doing that.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:44): I rise today proudly to speak in support of the member for Torrens' motion which recognises the 100th anniversary of service to the South Australia Police force by women. I welcome the members of the police force who are here today, many of whom I have met along several pathways in my life during various pieces of work, and I am really glad to have you here.

I will speak very briefly and just say some key points from the point of view of a woman who also has had to face many challenges around their gender in terms of being able to succeed in their career. I just say that I am very, very pleased that there is some target being set around recruitment of women in the police force.

It is unfortunate that in the 21st century we need to set targets but those who question quotas and targets have never been a woman. I congratulate the commissioner for doing that, and I know that it will benefit the police force with balance. You are trailblazing women and you will continue to be trailblazing women as you continue to fight for equality and as you continue to fight for equity and access for acknowledgment as a professional within your career.

I have personally come across some inspiring women working in the South Australia Police force, particularly through Victim Support Service and also through crime prevention, and I cannot speak of them more highly. Their innovation, their ability to look at things in a different way and come up with practical solutions is incredible, and I look forward to doing much more work with you in this current career that I am now in.

I understand the many challenges and barriers that you have had as professional women to have to fight within your workplace. I think that, as a working mother, I would like to offer my support to women who are attempting to juggle being a woman, being a mother and also participating within the professional workforce because I know the pressures that are placed on you in order to be expected to work full-time and in order to be able to complete your job.

I declare immediately that I am absolutely confident that, as women, you support your work force and your colleagues and complete your job much better if you are given permission to work at it as a part-time worker. Congratulations on continuing to fight that fight, and I am here for you with that.

One little piece of irony this week is that we are about to continue to debate, I believe, to take the word 'mangle' out of some legislation. Do you all know what a mangle is? It is a very old piece of laundry equipment. I just want to sum up by saying that we have come so far but, boy, have we got further to go, and just know that here we are in support of you. I thank you for your trailblazing, I thank you for your enduring leadership and also your friendship.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:48): I rise today, too, to speak in support of this motion that we recognise the 100th anniversary of women serving as police officers in the South Australia Police force. I know that a lot of the history has been spoken about by members on both sides before me so I will not go into the history of women in the police force, and I know that it can all be obtained online as well.

I would like to take this opportunity as a father of two daughters to commend all the trailblazers and role models who have gone before them in this role. I have a sister-in-law who has been through the academy, my wife was accepted into the academy, but sadly for her she did not pursue that career, and I have a niece who is training at the moment and who is hoping that she will be accepted into the academy.

Again, the people who have gone before have set such a great example for them and I do commend them for that. I also have women friends who are in the force and who have done a marvellous job. I admire one person greatly. After separating from her partner she put herself through the academy. She had five kids and had a lot to juggle. She has four daughters and she is a real asset to those kids and to our community.

As we look back over the history of women in the police force, Kate Cox is a figure in and around the community that I live in and represent who is recognised with a childcare centre in the area named in her honour because of all the great work she did. The thing that is notable about a lot of women in the police force, and that I truly admire—and, arguably, police officers across the board but women in particular—is their ability to do their great work in the police force and then give back to the community in so many other ways, as Kate Cox did way back in the early 1900s.

I would like to mention one other person in my community who has done some marvellous work, very much in the same vein, and she has been absolutely outstanding, and that is Julie Clifton. She was a member of SAPOL and had a career that spanned 14 years. She then went on to become a senior sergeant working across a number of quite difficult policing districts, including Elizabeth; the police communications dispatch, Glenelg, Coober Pedy and Christies Beach; on the front line doing a lot of the more difficult duties along the way.

She also worked with youth and was involved with the Blue Light program and juvenile justice, and she did some great work there. The great thing about it is that that sense of community and giving and the work that she did through the police force has now rolled on to the Bully Zero Australia Foundation that she helps and supports, and does some great work with.

They are just a couple of examples. I know there are many more, but my time here is brief and I want to allow others to speak as well. I applaud all the women in the police force who have gone before and all those who will come after; it is great to have them as role models.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wright, a special place for you today.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (11:51): Thank you, deputy speaker. I am pleased to be able to stand in this place and acknowledge the great women who have served in the South Australian police force and thank the member for Torrens for bringing this motion to the house. I have to say how delighted I am to see so many wonderful policewomen sitting here behind us, the most senior ranks in the South Australian police force.

When I became part of the police family some many years ago now—too many years really to count, back in the early 1970s—we would never have seen such a display of women in uniform and women of such high rank. I moved to Peterborough in 1973, a seven-man station as it was referred to back then, and the positions there were only for married men of course and the sergeant's wife was required to clean the station and provide meals for prisoners. I think they got \$1 or so per meal that they provided. No women. I think the only female officer was appointed to the Port Pirie station and, if required, would be taken out to different stations to interview women mainly or in relation to child protection matters. So it was an interesting time.

As I said, for many positions you had to be a married man. There were single men's posts and married men's posts. A married man was the only one who could occupy a single person station and, again, the wives were required to provide all necessary assistance. Indeed, I can remember going to a divisional dinner once where the then secretary of the association—who did not last very long I might add—asked all the women (the wives) to come into another room so that he could have a discussion with them. He wanted us to tell them if we had any problems with our husbands, if there was domestic violence in the home etc., and he got short shrift on that.

He then talked about the fact that women were exposed to certain dangers, they were required to do strip searches of female prisoners and, if they were injured, they would not be covered by workers compensation. So his question was, 'Will you continue to do that?' One young woman put up her hand very keenly and said, 'Well, no, I won't,' and the inspector's wife turned to her very aggressively and said, 'Yes, you will. You will help your husband.' So that was the environment in which I joined, I guess, the police family, but it had a very long history before that and I have seen great changes.

I had the honour of being the first and only female Minister for Police. I think that for some it struck fear in their hearts because I knew a lot about a lot of very senior officers—I had known them from when they were very young. I had the opportunity of going along to a celebration of women in policing; their final dinner. They had an organisation that was originally for women police officers, but then included women in the Public Service. Again, when I went to Peterborough, they were not called public servants; they were women police auxiliaries, so you had a woman in the office to do the office work in a station.

I shared some of my memories in relation to the progress of women in the South Australia police, and I remember so well the ruckus that it caused when women were going to be put in uniform and allowed to go out on patrols. Most of the aggravation actually came from police wives who did not want women out in cars with their husbands. I suppose the assumption was that these single women were going to be hitting on their husbands, so they obviously held their husbands in great store. I do not know that the women police officers held the same view, but that was the case.

After I had finished my speech, former assistant commissioner Madeleine Glynn got up and spoke, and I was pleased that she was able to reaffirm what I was saying. She relayed the story that, yes, in fact that was true, that before you could go out on patrol with a male officer you had to get the approval of the wife. So, the female officer had to go and meet the wife, talk to the wife and get her approval. Madeleine did not know whether she should be offended or pleased that no-one had objected to her working with their husbands.

We also heard stories about Joyce Richardson. Prior to women going out on patrol and being in uniform, Ms Richardson used to run the South Australia Police service in the city, and there were many women there who talked about how they would have to rock up in the morning with hats, gloves and handbags and would be inspected by Ms Richardson before they were allowed to go out on whatever job they were allocated. They were, essentially, lent out like library books. The male officers would come if they needed a female officer; she would be allocated, and off she would go.

I cannot imagine the frustration they must have felt. They were not allowed to be promoted through the ranks, so I do not think they were allowed to be promoted any higher than a senior constable. You had extremely talented, highly intelligent and committed women who were held down by a system that just did not open up. Of course, our police force now is unrecognisable from those days; the service has taken a monumental leap forward. It is great that the recruitment targets have been put in, but I think there is nothing to stop women now; there are so many in the force, and so many capable leaders in the South Australian police force that there is absolutely no going back.

I thought it would be useful to add my tiny insight, having lived through all of this, and congratulate those women who persisted; those women who were the firsts (and there were so many first-commissioned officers), and acknowledge the big step and the burden that those women carried; the scrutiny under which they were assessed, and how they were able to—and had to—win over the loyalty of the men who served under them.

They were quite amazing women and quite iconic, and I have no doubt there are still more challenges facing women in the service, but I think we are looking forward to a much more inclusive professional service that truly reflects the South Australian community. It is just great that finally the police service recognised that brains were much more effective in policing than simply brawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was almost prepared to move an extension of time to hear the R rated version of what you did not say this morning. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:59): I will be brief because I know that many of the guests in the gallery have a very important morning tea to get to soon, which recognises the service that they have provided to the community of South Australia and to South Australia Police, for which we are all very grateful and of which they should rightfully be proud. I do, however, want to put a few things on the record.

I was the shadow police minister for 18 months and it was an honour and a privilege to spend time working in this area which is so critical to the daily lives of all South Australians and for which those serving officers provide such service to all South Australians. This extraordinary celebration of

100 years of women in South Australia Police is an issue I really enjoyed talking about on a number of occasions last year, and I will be brief today.

Some extraordinary facts and stories have come out today and I do want to pay credit to two women in the South Australian police force who have not been mentioned today. They are Chris Bettess and Patricia Higgs who, of course, wrote the book on it—*To walk a fair beat: a history of the South Australian women police 1915-1987*—the primary source from which many of the stories that are on the SAPOL website and other historical facts are taken.

As somebody who is quite interested in history, I have read a lot of South Australian histories and I would say that this is one of the best texts. It is worth every member taking the time to read it. I thank the Deputy Speaker who lent me her copy—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I gave you one.

Mr GARDNER: You gave it to me—that was nice of you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So he would read it.

Mr GARDNER: In that case, I will not give it back. I thank the Deputy Speaker for giving me her copy, which I read a while ago, but there is also one in the parliamentary library and everyone should get it out and read it, because it is terrifically interesting and has a lot of that detail. I particularly acknowledge the member for Wright's speech which also provided her own primary source of material for the record, and it was probably the best contribution I have heard her make in this place, so thank you for that. I also thank Assistant Commissioner Bronwyn Killmier who was the person who put me onto the book in the first place.

On 7 May last year, a motion was passed in this house commending Deputy Commissioner Linda Williams on her significant career and her appointment as the first female deputy commissioner in South Australia. There was a significant debate then, and I encourage everyone to read the *Hansard* of that debate, which contained a great deal of useful historical information and the tribute of this house to women police at that stage.

In regard to Christine Bettess, I know that she still works for the South Australia Police Historical Society and there was a 'centenary of women in police' edition of *Hue and Cry* (the historical society's magazine) last year which, again, should be in the parliamentary and state libraries for anyone to have a look at. It has some terrific information. I pay tribute to Kate Cocks and Annie Ross, our first female police officers, Madeleine Glynn, our first assistant commissioner, and those assistant commissioners who have followed. I was very pleased to hear a bit more about Joyce Richardson from the member for Wright.

Last November when 400 of South Australia's 1,300 serving female police officers walked through the streets to commemorate 100 years of women in police in South Australia, Joyce Richardson, who served us from 1944 to 1979 and who had an extraordinary career, was there in her 90s, going strong. It was an honour and a privilege to meet her and spend five minutes talking to her about her experiences. There are so many trailblazers, so many women who have served throughout the history of the South Australian police of whom we can all be proud. They deserve recognition, so we are very pleased as a parliament to recognise that service today.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (12:03): I will be brief; I do not think I have much choice now. I want to thank the member for Torrens for bringing this motion. I want to thank all the members for contributing, particularly the member for Wright, who did make a very interesting addition to the primary record, as the member for Morialta said. I want to welcome all the police officers here today and thank you all for your service. As a former police officer myself, I do have some experience—not as a woman, I add, for the member for Hammond, but as a police officer, just to be clear, member for Hammond—

Mr Pederick: As a person.

Mr ODENWALDER: As a person. It is hard work, it is tough work but as, I think, the member for Stuart observed, it is no longer the work of someone who necessarily has to be brawny and pushy, and knock heads together and kick bottoms, as they used to say. Modern policing requires

communication, strategic thinking, problem solving, empathy and to be able to diffuse and to build trust.

In my own experience (and I will be very brief) both as a cadet and as a probationer, I almost always worked with women as my senior partner. The sergeant of my team was oddly enough always a man, but the partners I went out with were almost always women, and I learnt so much from those women about policing in my short career. I remember very well riding around the streets of Elizabeth at all hours of the day and night.

On the odd occasion when I was with a male officer, things would very easily get out of control. They were very easily brought under control, generally, but when I was out with female senior partners, they always used their communication skills and their empathy. Things were diffused a lot quicker, and many potentially violent situations were easily resolved. I did have a lot more to say, but I want to thank you all for coming in. Again, thank you all for your service. I commend the motion to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (12:05): Before I call the member for Torrens, I would just like to add thanks on behalf of my electorate for all you do and wonder at the enlightenment of the police force. I can only hope that similar enlightenment spreads to the parliaments throughout Australia very quickly.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:06): I would like to thank all members for their contribution today and in particular highlight the member for Wright, who was the first and only female police minister in this state. Today, I pay tribute, along with all members in this place, to women police officers past and present in South Australia as we acknowledge 100 years of women serving in the South Australian police force. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

HEALTH REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:06): I move:

That this house expresses its concern at the systematic reduction in acute health services for the people of the western suburbs as a result of the government's Transforming Health program and in particular, the reduction in services including—

- (a) the downgrading of the emergency department and intensive care unit services;
- (b) the reduction in cardiac services;
- (c) change in mental health services; and
- (d) the removal of kidney and other renal care services.

I rise to speak on this motion with pride but with sadness. There is an old saying in politics: you have different friends on different days for different reasons. To now today speak on the demise of health services in the western suburbs of South Australia and to be standing arm in arm with my good friend, the former Labor member for part of the western districts, Kevin Hamilton OAM and his wife, Maureen Hamilton OAM, and attend meetings or protests with former Labor members of the parliament (Murray De Laine, Norm Peterson, Ralph Clarke and federal member Ron Sawford) is an interesting day. It makes for great conversation, but we are at one on a number of things.

I am proud to stand with former members of this side of the house who have represented us in the parliament, both as ministers and former ministers: Dean Brown, the member for Morphett (who has been a shadow minister), our current shadow minister Stephen Wade, and the like. Every one of us, irrespective of our political colours, together with the Hon. Kelly Vincent from another place and other members, have rallied to say that the government's Transforming Health is just one death knell in the coffin of health in the western suburbs.

In the 14 years I have been here, we have seen the demise of maternity and paediatric services, so much so that they relocated a sexual advice clinic out of my electorate down to Woodville in that time. They cancelled the capacity to be able to have any maternity or obstetrics services. So, what can you get in the western suburbs now? You can get an abortion, but you cannot have a baby. That is the reality. That was in the first few years of me being in this place.

Then they did what I thought was the most disgusting kick in the guts to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital: they ripped out the renal unit and the kidney transplant services and took them up to the Royal Adelaide Hospital on North Terrace where it currently is and built a \$15 million new home for that service on North Terrace, even though they had already announced they were going to bulldoze that hospital and move that facility and service down to the other end of North Terrace.

Against absolute stupidity, they insisted in pursuing that objective in the full knowledge that that \$15 million was going to be completely and utterly wasted. When asked why, they said, 'We need to ensure that the specialists in this area understand our new culture,' whatever the hell that was. So that is the situation: we have this obstinate insistence that they are going to crush this hospital, and the things that they were most proud of in providing services.

I will not go back to my grandmother's day working in the Mareeba babies' home at Port Adelaide, but the whole of this area has had a very proud history in the provision of services to the western suburbs. To take these out and to crush these services one by one has been an absolute insult to the people of the western suburbs, who incidentally and statistically are the oldest, sickest and poorest demographic in South Australia. Even compared to some of the very remote rural areas, they are the oldest, sickest and poorest demographic profile of all the areas in South Australia. They need to have acute services and they need to have a diversity of services.

Many patients present to emergency departments and the like with multiple conditions, pre-existing conditions and comorbidity. However expert you are in this field, obviously these people are arriving with a number of conditions which affect those who can treat them and the level of service that they require for acute services. It is a very dangerous situation that we have in reducing services when there is an increasing demand and need in the western districts.

More recently, the announcement of the reduction of cardiac services has brought out people such as Professor Horowitz, a longstanding surgeon and specialist in this area. He has spoken out on many occasions as The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has been systematically stripped and explained how dangerous this situation can be, and indeed is for the patients of this area. He says:

I'm sure the Government is well aware of what I have to say, however, the minister has refused to have any discussions with me at any time in the last five years, I guess because he probably doesn't like what I tell him.

The idea of actually having to either transfer all patients automatically to an overcrowded new Royal Adelaide or, alternatively, shuttle patients back and forth between the Queen Elizabeth and the new Royal Adelaide. Both of these will engender costs which are way, way greater than any possible benefits.

I do not know how many times specialists—people with experience and people who have given their life serving for the good health of others—have to come out and say, 'Transforming Health is a dangerous direction to go in, it will do nothing to assist the services that are currently provided and the costs that are going with it, it will further endanger lives and we cannot allow it to be introduced.' The Hon. Kelly Vincent made a statement on Transforming Health. She said:

It has become increasingly clear to me through my conversations with many professionals in the health sector, as well as many community organisations and individuals, that the data being used to support Transforming Health is grossly misleading, and that the consultation process has been rushed and narrow.

To create a health system that genuinely meets the needs of South Australians, the Government must have a mature and honest discussion with South Australians about all of the possible options, rather than putting Transforming Health forward as a *fait accompli*.

I find Kelly to be someone who is very measured in her contribution and her language, but I think she makes absolutely clear her concern and utter despair when it comes to the government insisting on progressing this. It is bad enough that the minister stands here day after day blaming the federal government for cuts, ignoring the fact that his own Treasurer, who sits next to him here in this parliament, is budgeting for a \$2.7 billion surplus. He still claims that his Transforming Health is nothing to do with money, it is all to do with improving health and avoiding 400 avoidable deaths a year in our hospital system.

So far, the links do not match up. So far, the public have repeatedly, through their petitions and attendance at public meetings, said, 'No, this is not acceptable. You are downgrading our acute services; we are in desperate need of them. We cannot crush seven hospitals into three. Get real! Understand that we have a very high demand in this area, and it won't be remedied by you shutting

down services in the western suburbs.' It will create a very harsh circumstance for the residents there.

I could talk about Cleveland Clinic and the mental health services that are much needed in that area. All of these are acute services which are absolutely critical. You cannot have major surgery without a high level of intensive care unit support, and this stripping away has been very concerning. What is alarming to me, particularly, are the local members. Do we hear from them? No, we do not hear from them.

In 2006, the now Premier sent a letter to his constituents saying that the Rann Labor government is getting results rebuilding The QEH and recruiting more doctors and nurses. He went on to carry on about open space at Cheltenham and all of these other laughable things he promised at the time, but on The QEH he said: 'We're rebuilding The QEH.' That lasted five minutes. Of course, before 2010 that evaporated.

The member for Colton sent a lovely letter to all of his constituents espousing the virtues in April last year of Transforming Health, telling us about the incredible amount of upgrade that was going to be done at The QEH.

In relation to the Emergency Department (ED) at the QEH, in the current proposal, the ED will still operate to serve the local community however people with complex and life threatening conditions will be redirected to the new Major Emergency Departments.

That is what he said. Then have a look at what the member for Lee said. He sent out to his constituents:

I want to be clear that the emergency department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be kept open under Transforming Health.

It is slightly different saying 'It will be kept open.' It then says:

If you are suffering from a medical emergency you can and always will be able to go to the QEH for immediate care 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

There is no mention in here about what the minister has now said and that is, 'You will then be relocated in a bus somewhere, goodness knows where.' Perhaps that is what we got those Darwin buses down here for. We might need those ambo buses, the Darwin converted buses, to bring them up to the Lyell McEwin or to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, assuming you can get in, of course.

In any event, this is what they are telling their constituency. Their constituency does not believe them. They are turning up at the meetings saying, 'This is not acceptable. You promised certain things to us. You have failed us. You are now trying to give us this bulldust in these letters about what services are being preserved and which will be available,' when we have the head of the cardiac unit come out and say, 'There are changes and they are significant. We are not going to turn you away from a hospital. You can't self-diagnose. You should ring an ambulance and somewhere, at some time, somewhere in the state, you will get into a hospital. We can't tell you where, but leave that up to the ambulance driver.'

That is what we are left with. The people present with symptoms of a heart attack, stroke, comorbidity of diabetes, dietary issues, may smoke or been a long-term smoker or have a war injury. There are all sorts of comorbidity circumstances which alarmingly increase the acuity of the condition of patients when they present and increase the need for the services that they require to be able to stay alive and hopefully have a chance to recover.

I am utterly disgusted at the government's insistence that they continue to push and have their little army of apparatchiks, including the local members, go out and try to present this rainbow-coloured beautiful idea of a panacea of a healthy place to live in the western districts, when day by day they are stripping away these services that are necessary for the mature-aged population to stay there, for the young population to invest in and for an even younger population to build a life in and a career and have the opportunity of living adjacent to the ocean, living in a circumstance where they might be close to city amenities, but with no health service. This is absolutely disgusting. I ask the motion be given support.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:18): It is a bit rich thinking that the member for Bragg actually cares about the people of the western suburbs. On this occasion, I will state that the government opposes this motion. It is clear that, once again, those opposite are trying to score political points by putting unfounded fear into the good people of the western suburbs. We have members opposite implying that The Queen Elizabeth Hospital's emergency department is closing when it is not. We have members opposite telling the community, the good people of my area, that their health services are being downgraded when they are not. We have members opposite implying that The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is closing when it is not. These are just downright untruths and downright irresponsible.

The truth is that the people of the western suburbs will continue to have access to the high quality and safe public health services they need. Services will not be downgraded. The state government makes no apologies for the fact that some services will be provided differently under Transforming Health. Having been a member of cabinet for a significant time, I understand the importance of this particular process.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: I understand it. All changes are based on sound clinical evidence and data, and are driven by clinical quality principles that will ensure safer, better health care for South Australians right across—and I will reinforce this point: right across—the health system. In most instances, the people of the western suburbs will receive their public hospital services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, or the state-of-the-art new Royal Adelaide Hospital. These hospitals will complement each other and ensure a full suite of public hospital services are available to those who live west of Adelaide.

I can give a couple of examples of having to take my two sons, as is the case with young men, to the emergency department at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital on quite a few occasions. Each of the problems and difficulties they had at that time will still be catered for at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is important to counter the mistruths of those opposite by reiterating what the Minister for Health has consistently told us. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department will continue to be staffed by doctors and nurses, and will provide emergency care to the local community 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Only patients with once-in-a-lifetime life-threatening emergencies (such as a car accident, stroke or heart attack, which account for a very small percentage of patients currently taken by ambulance to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department) will be taken directly to a major metropolitan hospital like the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In relation to what the member for Bragg said about what vehicle they might be going in, the simple fact is they will be taken by paramedics in an ambulance, and we know that is essentially an intensive care unit on wheels. They will take them to the correct place to get the proper level of service. For everyone else, emergency care will still be provided at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Again, I use the example of my two boys and the numerous times I had to take them to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Contrary to the concerted fear campaign being launched by those opposite, the community will continue to access health services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, such as treatment for ongoing conditions like diabetes, heart disease and kidney disease. In fact, I am advised that the people of the western suburbs will have full access to kidney and other renal care services within patient services provided at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and continuation of all kidney and renal outpatient services currently provided at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, including dialysis.

I am also advised that mental health services for people in the western suburbs are not being downgraded. In fact, in October last year this government announced an increase to the acute mental health care footprint across metropolitan Adelaide. For the people who live west of Adelaide, this includes eight additional short-stay care acute beds at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, as well as five additional beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The people of the western suburbs will also continue to have access to the full range of existing acute and community mental health services currently located in the west.

While most people will continue to receive their health services very close to home, it is true—as it should be, and as is appropriate—that some people who require once-in-a-lifetime, very complex multitrauma and specialist care will instead be taken to a major metropolitan hospital. For people who live in the western suburbs, in most instances this will be the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is around 10 minutes in normal traffic conditions from The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and in a state-of-the-art ambulance staffed by outstanding paramedics.

Once again, despite the fearmongering from those opposite, the government makes no apologies for this, because it is based on sound clinical evidence and data. It will result in safer, better quality health services for the people in western Adelaide. Through the Transforming Health process, it became apparent there was a variation in health care outcomes for major traumas like heart attacks and strokes across our metropolitan public hospitals. Despite the fact that the minister has outlined this on numerous occasions, it would appear that people on the opposite benches do not listen.

When the government and our doctors, nurses, allied health professionals and paramedics looked at this data, it was found that outcomes varied depending on which hospital the patient was taken to, the complexity of care required, the time of the day, and the day of the week the patient was admitted to hospital. Quite frankly, the government could not just sit there and ignore this data.

Currently, specialist staff are only routinely on site at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital during business hours to treat major traumas like strokes and heart attacks. But, we know that heart attacks and strokes do not discriminate; they can occur at any time of the day or night. Under the current system, when a patient presents with a heart attack or stroke overnight, they often need to be transferred to another hospital, or a specialist team needs to be called in to treat them. This can mean critical time is wasted during the ambulance transfer or it could mean the patient does not receive comprehensive care for a stroke or heart attack until the full specialist team arrives at the hospital.

Under Transforming Health, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will have more senior doctors and nurses routinely on site outside of business hours, as well as access to all the specialist diagnostic support needed for their specialties. For the people of the western suburbs, who will be taken directly to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, this means there will be specialist teams there ready to treat them for longer periods of time outside of business hours, when patients with heart attacks and strokes actually present to hospital.

By providing the complex multitrauma care at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, we will see faster treatment at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital for people with less serious health problems. This means better health care for the people of the western suburbs. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital will become a dedicated specialist centre for multiday elective surgery, as well as increasing its provision of elective day surgery procedures. Having a separate dedicated elective surgery centre will mean shorter waiting times for the people of the western suburbs. It will also mean fewer elective surgeries are bumped, as currently happens, because the clinical team is pulled away for emergency surgery.

The dedicated elective surgery centre will ensure clinical teams can specialise and see enough patients to maintain and improve their highly specialised skills, meaning safer, higher quality health services for the people of the western suburbs. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital will become the statewide centre for rehabilitation for spinal and brain injury, with allied health professionals available there seven days a week. The government is upgrading the hospital, building a new hydrotherapy pool as well as new allied health facilities.

In fact, since we have been in government—and this is an important point—we have invested \$136 million to upgrade The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and we are investing a further \$20 million to upgrade its facilities under Transforming Health. Yes, that is right, we are upgrading The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Let me remind those opposite (as if they need any reminding), who keep saying we are downgrading our hospitals, that since 2002 this state Labor government has upgraded every major hospital across the state. Go and see the Modbury, go and see the Lyell McEwin, come down to The QEH. We have invested almost \$2 billion to upgrade every metropolitan public hospital and every major country hospital. Through Transforming Health—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Go and look at Whyalla—we are investing an additional \$250 million in new capital investments across our metropolitan hospitals. I might add, the previous Liberal government had let our hospitals run to ruin before this government took control in 2002. It was this same party who privatised the Modbury Hospital. It was the same party who opposed the building of a state-of-the-art brand new Royal Adelaide Hospital. In 2002, the then minister Dean Brown could not articulate what the future of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was. It was heading down the same road as the Modbury Hospital. The same party is now accusing the government of downgrading our hospitals.

Once again, this government makes no apologies for making changes to our health system. We know that reform is required and our changes are based on improving the quality of health care in this state. Unfortunately, it seems those opposite would prefer a health system that stays the same, a health system that does not change and evolve, a health system that does not modernise and innovate to meet the future healthcare needs of our community.

We have the Leader of the Opposition, who says on 891 radio that we need to run our hospitals more effectively, but instead of coming up with any vision for a contemporary healthcare system in this state, the opposition opposes every change we are trying to make. They have chosen to respond only with negativity. They would prefer to put unfounded fear into the people of the western suburbs. On the other hand, this government, by changing our health system to provide better quality services, by ensuring our patients do not sit in hospitals waiting for an on-call team to arrive, by increasing the provision of elective surgery at dedicated elective surgery centres, by upgrading our hospitals and investing significantly in modern healthcare facilities, is doing exactly what the Leader of the Opposition has said we need to do: making our hospitals run more effectively.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:28): I do not know who writes the speeches for some of those opposite, but I think they should be speaking to the real doctors and nurses, not the spin doctors and not the nurses who nurse the ministers through disaster after disaster. They should be speaking to the real doctors and nurses out there. I can tell the house that they talk to me, they talk to the opposition, and the real situation out there in the South Australian health department is one of absolute fear. This government has put the fear of god into health workers that if they dare speak out and get caught they will be persecuted. The fear of health workers for the future of the health department and the delivery of health services in South Australia is real and getting bigger by the day.

Those parents and grandparents in this place have probably had kids with Transformer toys. These are little toys that turn from an innocuous little car, an aeroplane or a boat into this metal-munching, people-punching monster, and that is what we have got here with Transforming Health. We have got a system, a plan, in place that is turning the health system on its head. We are going to see fewer beds in this state, we are going to see fewer services being delivered in this state, we are going to see people waiting longer and longer in this state.

For many years I have been using the government's own information to show the disgraceful situation in the South Australian Health Department. Let us just quickly talk about the history of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and then I will talk about the disgraceful situation we had this morning at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and some of our other hospitals.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was opened as a 311-bed hospital back in 1954 by Her Majesty the late Queen Mother. The hospital in 2010, according to its financial report, employed 2,500 staff, there were 42,000 emergency department presentations and examinations, 16,000 surgical procedures were undertaken, 36,000 patients were admitted and an astounding number of 175,000 outpatients were seen.

The hospital has been downgraded by this government over the years. We heard the member for Bragg talk about the kidney transplant unit being transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital—a waste of \$15 million there when the new hospital is being built. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has been a very proud hospital. The member for Colton did not mention the fact that he was born there, but now his relatives will not be able to have their children there.

You can go to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and have some procedures but, as the members are admitting, not all procedures will be undertaken at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital under

this Transforming Health. Just today The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, according to the government's own dashboard, has 302 beds, not 311 beds which it says on the other health site. It is in the yellow zone, which is a traffic-light system that is being used to let people have a look at the dashboards to see how their hospitals are coping.

The Flinders Medical Centre is in the white-hot zone; that is well over capacity. This morning The Queen Elizabeth Hospital actually did have some spare space in there, and I understand that there are reasons for that which I will not go into at this particular time. There are some problems with air-conditioning systems down there. The need to look at what is going on in the wards at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital to see how it is coping is just in the government's own dashboards.

Let us have a look at Cramond Ward and mental health. The base capacity there is 21 beds. They have not flexed up any beds there because they have no spare beds. It is in over capacity, it is in the white-hot zone. The only green zone is the surgical stream there, and as I say I think that is because there have been problems with air-conditioning in some of the operating theatres down there.

The need to make sure that the hospital is being managed well is something that this government just does not realise. Minutes do matter. You do not plan a heart attack, you do not plan a stroke. Minutes do matter, and those minutes, coming through traffic getting into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, can matter despite the best efforts of our highly-trained paramedics in our ambulances.

The current state at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is that 480 people are ready to be seen for elective surgery. Unfortunately 73 of those have been deferred and 20 have been postponed, and that was just this morning according to yesterday's dashboards. So we do not know what the current position is at this stage but people are waiting. They are waiting over time, there are delays. As I said, the mental health stream is well and truly over capacity.

Let us look at the emergency department this morning at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It shows on the government's own dashboards, in the bottom right-hand corner of the dashboards, the 24-hour activity at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and can I say that approximately 95 per cent of the time the emergency department has been over capacity. For about 12 hours from midday yesterday until 1 o'clock this morning—I am just interpreting this as I am looking at it—the emergency department was in the white-hot zone.

In other words, that is over 125 per cent capacity. People are waiting, waiting, waiting. Even at the moment, as we speak, this morning, with the capacity of 31 cubicles, there were 28 people waiting there, which is relatively calm for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. If you had gone to the dashboards down there, the pressures are immense for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—immense.

Time after time we see the government's own dashboards showing that this is a hospital that is overworked. You talk to the doctors and they say it has been gutted down there. There are some medical professionals down there who have unfortunately turned their back on The Queen Elizabeth Hospital because they see better opportunities for themselves (selfish opportunities for themselves) in the new box of toys down the road here, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

It is a disgrace that they have allowed The Queen Elizabeth to be treated the way it is, and this is not me saying this, this is doctors and nurses telling me this, who have had many years of experience working at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. If the people of the western suburbs are going to be abandoned by their local members down there, if this hospital is going to be allowed to become a part of a bigger plan where it is a hospital that is not able to deliver everything that a hospital should, well then that is a disgrace for those local members and for this government.

We need to make sure that we deliver the best health services in South Australia and Transforming Health is not doing that. In the western suburbs people are going to miss out; they are going to miss out very badly, and that is verified by the government's own dashboards and anybody can go on to the health website and look at those any time they like, and I encourage them to, because the figures there should not lie.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:36): I thank members for their contributions. It is a sad day for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital but I do urge members to really

dig deeply into their conscience here and support this motion. It seems rather tragic to me that we are recognising Queen Elizabeth with a new rail line in London as we speak—the Queen Elizabeth line—and now back here in South Australia, have a hospital that is stripped to the bone. That is a very sad situation, so I would ask members to support this motion.

Motion negatived.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CRICKET ASSOCIATION AVENUE OF HONOUR

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:37): I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates the South Australian Cricket Association on the wonderful initiative of the Avenue of Honour at Adelaide Oval acknowledging the contributions of more than 25 men and women;
- (b) celebrates the special Women's Hall of Fame area featuring female South Australia and Australian cricketers Karen Rolton, Shelley Nitschke, Faith Thomas and Joanne Broadbent;
- (c) recognises the contribution of women to sport in South Australia and the significant growth of female sport in this state; and
- (d) encourages the public to visit the Adelaide Oval to view the Avenue of Honour.

I bring this motion to the house to acknowledge the wonderful work undertaken by the South Australian Cricket Association to honour the state's greatest cricketers in their contributions to the sport. The SACA Avenue of Honour, unveiled in November last year at Adelaide Oval, was an important moment for South Australian sporting history. I believe it is a part of the bigger picture in finally providing more places of honour for our sporting heroes in South Australia.

The Avenue of Honour really complements what Sport SA is looking to achieve with the SA Sports Museum on North Terrace. Having been at the opening and the launch of it, it will be a truly great investment for sporting memorabilia, and to acknowledge our heroes, but just as importantly it is about recognising the people who have made us feel good, and the people who have excelled in their chosen sports.

For every person who goes to a sporting event, and every person who sits down in their lounge room and views those sporting greats, it gives them a tingle, it puts the hairs up on the back of their neck (well, in my case it does) to see people who have worked so hard and dedicated their life to sport, and have brought home the goods.

What the Avenue of Honour showcases is the contributions to the sport of more than 25 men and women. The Lyn Fullston Lawns, launched in November, is the centrepiece of SACA's recognition to the past cricket greats. A special Women's Hall of Fame area featuring Karen Rolton, Shelley Nitschke, Faith Thomas and Joanne Broadbent is a new feature at the atrium, along with a number of banners recognising our great cricketers.

SACA's President, Andrew Sinclair, said that fans would now be able to walk through a pictorial history of cricket in South Australia, particularly recognising the greats who have played at Adelaide Oval. He said:

It is a celebration of the legends of the game—the men and women who have played for South Australia and Australia over the many proud years at Adelaide Oval.

It's been an important process for SACA to recognise the remarkable history of women's cricket in this state.

The Lyn Fullston Lawns located next to the Favell-Dansie Indoor Centre will serve as a place of reflection and a memorial to the popular player and coach who sadly lost her battle with cancer in 2008 at the age of just 52.

Lyn (Lefty) Fullston was a multi-talented sportswoman and teacher who represented Australia in both cricket and netball. After a 15-year career, she retired as the only female Australian cricketer to take 100 international wickets. Fullston played 12 tests for Australia, snaring 41 wickets as well as 41 one-day internationals, taking 73 wickets in the limited-overs format.

In the Wall of Fame of the SACA Avenue of Honour are significant names that I am sure most people in this place will recognise. Karen Rolton was a batter and occasional medium-paced bowler. Shelley Nitschke retired in 2011 ranked as the ICC's leading all-rounder. Joanne Broadbent

was a left-handed batter and left arm medium-pace bowler, all-rounder, and she played a significant role in Australian women's cricket, and Faith Thomas (nee Coulthard) was a talented all-round sports star. She excelled at both cricket and hockey, representing South Australia in both.

It is something that is rarely seen in today's sporting fraternities, that is, multi-talented sportspeople who are recognised in more than one sport. We know that many of our great sporting heroes are very good at all sports, but rarely nowadays can they actually concentrate on more than one sport, obviously dealing with the professionalism within sport here in South Australia.

I will just touch on a few of the great South Australian cricketers recognised at the Avenue of Honour. There is a magnificent statue of George Giffen behind the western stand. It is a bronze statue that is white because it has been zinc impregnated, and it really is one of the greatest statues that I have seen anywhere in the world of a sporting hero. George Giffen was the world's greatest all-rounder at the end of the 19th century.

Joe Darling was the first batsman to score three centuries in a test series. Ernest Jones was Australia's first genuine fast bowler, and Clem Hill was the world's highest run scorer in test cricket at the time of his retirement in 1912. Of course, Clarrie Grimmett was a record-breaking leg spinner. Then there is Sir Donald Bradman. Now it is pretty hard to ever emulate what Sir Donald Bradman achieved. He was one of the greatest cricketers of all time: 52 tests and nearly 7,000 runs, and an average which we all know of 99.94. A true legend in world sport.

Ashley Mallett was one of the attacking off spinners who reached 100 test wickets. Gil Langley was the first-choice wicket-keeper for Australia from 1951 to 1956, and Neil Hawke was a great medium-pace bowler who was good in any conditions.

Ian Chappell was the leading batsman in the sixties and seventies. One of my childhood memories is of hanging out with my father in the Chappell Bar at the Adelaide Oval test—something we used to do regularly but particularly at the once-a-year test. I remember watching Ian Botham chase Ian Chappell out of the change rooms and he was going to flatten him. I saw both Ian Chappell and Ian Botham disappear into the car park. I did not get to see the outcome but it was something that really did stick in the memory.

Greg Chappell was a leading Australian test scorer, arguably the best Australian test batsmen since the Second World War. Rodney Hogg was a notable fast bowler who made a sensational test debut in '78 and '79. Jason 'Dizzy' Gillespie is now coaching the Strikers in South Australia, making another contribution to South Australia. He was an intelligent fast bowler whose career, sadly, was marred by injury.

Greg Blewett, who is now another member of the Australian coaching team, was another very good contributor to cricket. Darren Lehmann, who we all know is the current Australian coach, is suffering a few health issues at the moment and we wish him well. He is coaching the Australian team to great strengths; reclaiming the number one test spot in the world is a great achievement. Tim May was an off spinner. I think he is now residing in the US, but he was a great contributor to cricket. Wayne 'Flipper' Phillips—anyone who knows Flipper would know that—

Mr Duluk: He made 100 on debut.

Mr WHETSTONE: He tells everyone that. He is a very good MC and, yes, he was the 14th Australian to make a test century on debut and he reminds his audience that he did that at every opportunity.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Wouldn't you?

Mr WHETSTONE: I certainly would.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Right up there with jam-making. It's right up there with winning a ribbon for jam.

Mr WHETSTONE: I've never made 100 on test debut, Deputy Speaker, so I don't know what it feels like. I do know what it feels like to represent Australia, but not on debut. Lyn Fullston made a significant contribution to women's cricket in South Australia over more than two decades—20 years in first-class cricket is an outstanding achievement. Barry Jarman, a very good friend of my father,

was a burly wicketkeeper who spent much of his career in the shadow of the great Wally Grout, but he was a great South Australian. Karen Rolton was four times named as Australian International Women's Cricketer of the Year—another great achievement.

'Great Cricketing Moments at Adelaide Oval' are obviously moments that we all remember and recognise, but some of the great cricketing moments acknowledged as part of the Avenue of Honour include the one run test win by the West Indies over Australia in 1993; Shane Warne's final day magical spell at the Ashes in 2006 (who could forget?); Mitchell Johnson's blistering spell of 7/40 in the 2013 Ashes; of course, Michael Clarke, the former Australian captain making 224 not out against South Africa in 2012; and the bodyline series in the 1930s.

'South Australian Proud' at the Adelaide Oval—I will not go into too much detail but Tim Ludeman scored 50 runs in 18 balls in the Big Bash, a great achievement; Chad Sayers, another great history-making hat-trick in October 2014; David Hookes was a great South Australian cricketer, whose life was, sadly, cut short by an incident at a bar in Adelaide one evening. That was truly a loss to cricket in South Australia, but his name does live on with the David Hookes Terrace Bar at the Adelaide Oval.

In conclusion, I would encourage the South Australian public and any interstate and international travellers to make sure they visit the Avenue of Honour at the Adelaide Oval. This is really a fantastic project and a fitting tribute to the SA men and women who have excelled in cricket. The Avenue of Honour will also continue to expand as this state breeds more and more champions in sport within South Australia.

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) (12:49): I rise to support the motion and I thank you for inviting me to speak on behalf of the government and take the opportunity to recognise the important work of the South Australian Cricket Association, through the Avenue of Honour and the Women's Hall of Fame.

Female athletes have achieved amazing things throughout the history of this great state and country. It is important to take a moment to recognise how far the South Australian Cricket Association and the general sporting community have come in promoting women in sport and in recognising outstanding sporting performances. The Avenue of Honour, located at the magnificent Adelaide Oval, recognises 25 South Australian cricketers and a number of great cricketing moments. The Hall of Fame recognises four special female cricketers—Faith Thomas, Karen Rolton, Shelley Nitschke and Joanne Broadbent—who each made a significant impact on the sport locally and internationally.

Another recent initiative of the South Australian Cricket Association is the naming and opening of the Lyn Fullston Lawns. Lyn 'Lefty' Fullston was a multitalented sportswoman and teacher who represented Australia in both cricket and netball. After a 15-year career, she retired as the only female Australian cricketer to take 100 international wickets.

While male elite athletes are well-paid household names, sadly the same cannot be said for the equally talented and dedicated female athletes. Late in 2015, after 20 years playing in the Women's National Cricket League, South Australia won its maiden title, ending New South Wales' 10-year reign as champions by 54 runs in the final at Sydney's Hurtsville Oval. Disappointingly, South Australian players such as Sarah Taylor, who made 110 runs in the championship-winning final, and her teammates who represented Australia, including Megan Schutt and Lauren Ebsary, are for most not household names, despite their achievements.

Most of us grew up in Australia, which focused almost entirely on the achievements of male sports teams and athletes. The message that most of us received loud and clear was that sport was for men. Weekend television consisted of men motor racing, men playing AFL, men playing golf, men playing cricket and, I might add, men talking about men playing sport. These images were broadcast week after week to girls and boys alike, and the message was clear: women do not matter. The level of sports coverage and respect has improved since my childhood exposure. On Australia Day this year, we could enjoy watching the Southern Stars' first T20 match against the Indian team at Adelaide Oval. This is a welcome change.

In 2013, South Australia's Eleni Glouftsis became the first female to officiate as a field umpire in a SANFL match, and has now umpired 15 games. Eleni will again make sporting history, this time in the AFL, as she becomes the first female field umpire to officiate a top-level men's AFL game. The first AFL game off the rank for Eleni is a pre-season clash with Carlton playing Essendon. I congratulate her on her incredible talent and drive, and in being recognised for her ability at the highest level of her chosen sport.

This great news is hot on the heels of the AFL's announcement of a potential new women's national competition with eight women's teams aligned with AFL clubs planned for 2017. This would include four teams from Victoria and one each from Western Australia, South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland, playing exhibition games in round 1 and state games in round 2. Two matches are scheduled for Adelaide Oval: in round 1 on 2 April, the SANFL All-Stars play, and in round 2 on 5 June, South Australia will challenge New South Wales.

These changes show the beginning of a change in understanding what can be achieved by our sportswomen and how there is great interest in women taking part in the highest level of sport. In South Australia, we have had great success with our national league teams. Adelaide Lightning have won five national championships and the Adelaide Thunderbirds have won two. Yet, unlike Port Power or Adelaide Crows players, these athletes would have needed to work while training to achieve their sporting success.

The government is committed to raising the profile of our female athletes, getting greater gender equity in sport decision-making and attracting more elite women's sporting events to South Australia. South Australia has been a leader in promoting gender equity. We were the first Australian state to allow women to vote and the first to allow women to stand for parliament. We introduced the nation's first Equal Opportunity Act. Efforts to improve equity and mutual respect in board rooms and on the sports field are about continuing that strong tradition in the face of the national emergency that is domestic violence.

The Premier wants all South Australians to contribute to the cultural shift required to reduce violence against women and to promote gender equity. However, there is more to do and this response is just one step, which follows a series of initiatives over a number of years aimed at the respect and safety of women in our community. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier, Katrine Hildyard MP, will be leading the work to improve gender equity in sport, align sports strategy and diplomacy with cultural events, and attract women's sporting events to Adelaide. She will establish a task force to advise and assist.

While there is much still to do, I commend the South Australian Cricket Association for their efforts to acknowledge female athletes and look forward to greater gender equity across all aspects of sport.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:55): I thank the member for Chaffey for moving this wonderful motion. I am a great cricket fan—not always a great cricket player, but a great cricket fan—and strongly support the good work of the SACA in acknowledging the significant contribution of 25 men and women recognised in the Avenue of Honour at Adelaide Oval. There is no doubt that this project would not have occurred without former Australian lacrosse captain, Jenny Williams, and the South Australian Women's Sport Network spearheading this push to organise a petition and working with SACA.

The women's hall of fame area honours Karen Rolton, Shelley Nitschke, Faith Thomas and Joanne Broadbent. All these remarkable women brought something different to the beautiful game of cricket. Karen Rolton holds the record for the most runs scored for an Australian in women's test cricket. Shelley Nitschke is ranked by the ICC as the leading all-rounder in women's cricket. Joanne Broadbent scored 200 runs in a test match against England before going on to coach and mentor younger players, while Faith Thomas was the first Aboriginal sportswoman to represent Australia in any sport back in 1958.

Historically, women have not participated too much in cricket and it has always been a bit of a blokey sport. I think women started—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: Backyard cricket.

Mr DULUK: Backyard cricket, indeed, but women's cricket started taking off in the 1990s. I recall, when I lined up for Marryatville High School's year 8 Bs, there were two women in our team, Alice Johnswood and Michelle Calvert, and they played cricket as hard as the rest of them. Alice went on to play a lot of women's cricket, and I think she still does.

In the last 20 years we have really seen the development of women's cricket in this state, and nationally as well. The launch of the Women's Big Bash League this year has been a huge success, and this season's inaugural WBBL televised matches have had a free-to-air television audience three times bigger than A-League soccer, which has obviously been around for many years, so that is a true testament to the game of cricket.

Not only cricket but sport more generally breeds and encourages excellence through the blood, sweat and tears of competition. One thing that sport does—and I suppose the member for Chaffey's motion talks about sport more generally—is to encourage participation, which is so important. In today's society, it is key to ensure there is active participation in sport, and the role of government is vital in this area.

When it comes to sport participation, the government's role is huge, and it is not just about talking but it is actually about providing funding for grassroots sports and providing funding for women's sport in particular, as we are debating the motion today. It is not just about platitudes; it is actually getting out there.

As the member for Chaffey can account for, we have seen a reduction in community grassroots funding in South Australia from this government, and it is across the board. We get a lot of fluff but not too many feathers from those opposite when it comes to women's sport.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not sure what you mean by that.

Mr DULUK: There are a huge amount of benefits that come from community sport, and we are all better off for the involvement of women in sport and women in cricket. We have female cricket umpires and we have a wonderful domestic competition here. The more kids who get involved in cricket, the better we will be all around.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:59): I thank all members who have contributed to this motion. I was at the opening the Avenue of Honour and I think it is a worthy motion that I have put up today. The SACA needs to be congratulated for the great work and research that they have done and the effort and money that has been put into making the Avenue of Honour. I congratulate all of the members and all of the sportspeople who are part of the Avenue of Honour.

Gender equity is becoming a given in today's society. I wish that governments would treat it that way. We need to understand the needs of women in sport. We do need to provide them with adequate facilities. We do need to give them a better go in the media. We do need to give them the right of reply when it comes to sport.

I do ask the government to treat women in sport with a bipartisan approach. To date, there has been a little bit of, 'This is our initiative and no one else can play,' but the Avenue of Honour is a great drawcard for Adelaide Oval. It complements a world-class facility. I encourage the public to visit. I encourage every person in this building to understand that the Avenue of Honour is there. The Lyn Fullston Memorial Lawns is at the start of the Avenue of Honour. Her family in the Mallee are very proud of that memento. Without any further ado, I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Treasurer to order.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Rights for Children and Young People in Care, Variation to the Charter of

Ministerial Statement

DEFENCE WHITE PAPER

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The release of today's 2016 Defence White Paper is a win for South Australia. I commend the federal government's long-term, significant investment in Australia's defence forces and recognition of industry as a fundamental defence capability. The white paper outlines a raft of opportunities for South Australia. The commonwealth's commitment to a continuous build of 12 submarines, for which we have fought long and hard, is a win for workers, families, businesses and an entire industry sector. It is also a win for Australia.

Eighteen months ago, the commonwealth was talking about defence procurement in terms of short-term, value for money decisions. The defence of our country is now recognised as being more than Army, Navy and Air Force; it now has a fourth partner in the Australian defence industry. This fundamental shift has come after a prolonged campaign by the South Australian government, unions (representing shipyard workers) and industry, through the Defence Teaming Centre and its Australian Made Defence campaign. This is what happens when you stand up for South Australia.

While the good news is a fundamental shift in procurement strategy, there are still a few unanswered questions. We are yet to see a commitment to build the first full submarine fleet in Australia, centred at Techport in South Australia. The white paper reconfirmed the future frigate fleet will be built in South Australia, with a continuous build of nine anti-submarine warfare vessels. It also committed to a continuous build of minor warships, starting with 12 offshore patrol vessels; however, it remained silent on the build location.

While reconfirmation that future frigates will be built in Adelaide is great news for South Australia, it does not address the immediate challenge facing our local shipbuilding industry. The Valley of Death is real. Hundreds of shipbuilding workers have lost their jobs and there are more to come. Other key—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There's something you can do about it. Other key investment decisions in the 2016 Defence White Paper for South Australia include:

- an increase from eight to 15 P-8 aircraft, which are based at RAAF Base Edinburgh;
- confirmation the government will acquire seven high-altitude Triton unmanned aircraft, which are likely to be based at RAAF Base Edinburgh;
- a \$1 billion to \$2 billion investment in enhancing the Jindalee Operational Radar Network, which based at the RAAF Base Edinburgh;
- a \$500 million to \$750 million redevelopment of the Woomera Range, based in the state's north-west;
- a \$1 billion to \$2 billion investment to convert the interim distributed ground station based in the Edinburg Defence Precinct into permanent facilities; and
- a \$1 billion to \$2 billion deployable air defence system to replace the existing capability at the Army's Woodside base.

We look forward to partnering with Defence, industry and academia to successfully deliver the capability challenges facing Australian defence forces, and the innovation needed for next-generation technologies.

*Question Time***HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Minister for Health. In relation to the minister's answer yesterday on a breach of a patient's personal medical records, can the minister outline to the house how identifying the date of an event would identify a person?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:05): It should be obvious and shouldn't require me to explain it to the opposition. I am certainly not going to do it in the house. If the opposition leader wants to speak to me after question time, I would be happy to explain to him the flaming obvious.

The SPEAKER: Before the next question, I call to order the members for Schubert, Mitchell, Unley and Adelaide.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): Question to the Minister for Health: how long after the breaches occurred were they identified?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:05): My understanding is it was fairly quickly.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): Could the minister provide some clarity regarding 'fairly quickly'? Is it in that sort of scale of alacrity that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss will not beseech the heavens; he is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): I think it would be fair to say it was within a month.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): Within a month. How long after the breaches were identified was the minister first made aware of the breaches?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): Again, I'm not going to go into when I was provided with information because to do so would, I believe, tend to identify the patient involved.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): Can the minister perhaps—

The SPEAKER: Will the leader be seated. Before we move on I call to order the leader, the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Morphett, and I warn the member for Adelaide. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. Can the minister outline to the house what the policy is regarding informing the minister of a breach of access to private medical records?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): It would be consistent with everything else. Obviously, things happen. I'm not informed of every single thing that happens and every single adverse event that happens within SA Health.

Dr McFetridge: John Hill said that the buck stops with you.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Indeed, the buck does stop with me, but I am not informed of every single adverse event that happens within SA Health. Basically, the chief executive and officers

within the department need to use their discretion about what information or what things are of such seriousness that they need to be brought to my attention.

That would be the same with every minister here and would be the same with every minister who has ever served in any government in any Westminster democracy around the world. It is simply impossible. Nor would it be useful for every single adverse event that happens within a minister's responsibility to be brought directly to that minister's attention. Some matters are relatively trivial, and I certainly would not expect every single misdemeanour of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition needs to understand that volume is not a substitute for intelligence. Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And the deputy leader in particular needs to understand that volume is not a substitute for intelligence. I would not expect to be advised of every single misdemeanour that happens within the department, nor would any minister. However, there are matters which are of sufficient seriousness, and I would expect this matter to be one of them, that I would be advised of.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks the question, I call to order the members for Goyder, Morialta, Chaffey, Davenport and the deputy leader. I warn the members for Morphett, Schubert, Morialta, Mount Gambier and the leader. I warn for the second and final time the members for Morphett and Schubert. Leader.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Could the minister perhaps explain to the house whether unauthorised access to private medical records is something which is routinely brought to the minister's attention? Also, can he explain to us whether, in the example where two people were sacked, that was brought to his attention and at what time frame relative to the breach?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:09): Well, I answered the question in my previous answer and that simply was that, in this particular matter, the answer was, yes. I will not go into why, but it was a matter of the sort of seriousness that I would expect that I would be provided with information because of the particular circumstances. With regard to the other breaches, not necessarily. I would not expect that I would necessarily be briefed on them, and that is all I can say at this stage.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Therefore the following question is: if you are not routinely informed of a breach or unauthorised access to private medical records, is it quite possible that there are a huge number of unauthorised accesses made on a continuing basis that are just simply not brought to your attention because of the policy of your department?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): I can say probably what has happened in the past with paper records is that there have been breaches, and probably many breaches, and we would never know when and how those breaches would have been done, because with paper records there is very little control over who has access to those papers and who has access to those medical records, how frequently they have done it and whether they have had cause to have a look at those medical records.

Now, with regard to these electronic records, let us make something quite clear: we had a policy in place which detected this breach. People looked at these records who should not have. They were detected and they have been disciplined, and in the case of the other instances where this has happened then, again, that has happened.

I am confident that this is not a widespread occurrence. Certainly it is not a widespread occurrence with electronic health records, because we do have the ability to monitor who looks at those records in a way that we do not with old paper-based records. I can be quite confident that, given the publicity surrounding this case, all SA Health employees will think more than twice before they dare look at a record which they are not entitled to have a look at.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Thank you very much, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. Have the eight patients whose private health records were inappropriately accessed been notified of this breach?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:12): I certainly would expect so. I will double-check with my department but, yes, I would expect that that is what would happen.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Can the minister just clarify that it is the policy of the department that whenever a breach of patient's records confidentiality occurs that the patient involved is informed of this breach?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:12): Certainly I would expect so. It would—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Once again I tell the Leader of the Opposition, volume is not a substitute for intelligence. Mr Speaker—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Minister, I realise the leader is annoying by interjecting, but if you insult him then he will just annoy you even more. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Annoying, I guess, in the same way a flea is—but, anyway, Mr Speaker, we have a policy in place of open disclosure, so that when there is an adverse event—any adverse event, not just with regard to medical records but any adverse event relating to a patient—SA Health policy is quite clear, and that is that SA Health policy has a policy of informing the patient who is affected that the adverse event has happened, and as minister I would expect that in this particular case that would have happened. But, as I say, I will make sure. I will double-check.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): And will the minister come back into the house and clarify that situation with us today?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:13): Clarify that open disclosure is a policy of the department? I don't need to—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is the policy of the department—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There is nothing to clarify.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): For clarity, is the minister saying that he is not going to inform the parliament whether or not the patients whose records were inappropriately accessed have been informed of that, and why is the minister being so secretive about this issue?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:14): Hardly being secretive. I have answered numerous questions. I have done numerous interviews on this particular question. But with regard to—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: With regard to the opposition's question, sure, if that has not happened, I would be happy to come back to the department and advise them of that.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Health. What stimulated the audit in the case of the 13-person breach discussed in parliament yesterday?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:14): I don't think I can—once again, to state that would be to tend to identify the patient involved.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Was it a routine audit?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15): Once again, I think to answer that question would identify the patient.

Mr Pederick: Do you read the paper, Jack?

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

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Was the audit triggered by a complaint?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15): My understanding is no, it wasn't.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Was the breach by 13 clinicians identified as a result of the record being accessed for legal reasons and the inappropriate accessing identified in that context?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15): No, that's not my understanding.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Can the minister outline to the house how many audits have been conducted in the last 12 months?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15): Once again, we went through this yesterday. I'm not about to tell everyone in SA Health—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time. The minister's answer will be heard in silence unless the minister himself somehow transgresses standing orders.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm not about to flag publicly how we go about auditing access to records, in exactly the same way as the police minister wouldn't be flagging where we have our RBT stations. However, I can assure the house and the people of South Australia that when people

in SA Health—clinicians—illicitly look at records, they will be caught, and all clinicians who work in SA Health need to understand that, if there should be any doubt.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): A question to the Minister for Health. How many of the privacy and discrimination complaints received by the health department in the 2014-15 year related to patient record privacy issues?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17): I will have to check and get a report back to the house.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Is the minister aware that there were over 300 separate complaints categorised as 'privacy issues' in the 2014-15 year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17): Given that we see 8,000 patients who have an interaction with our health system every single day of the week, that doesn't particularly surprise me. Those 300 complaints, if that is correct, would not necessarily—in fact, wouldn't—relate to access to medical records. They could be anything.

Mr Marshall: Well, they are categorised as privacy.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There is more to patient privacy than medical records.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, the addresses of patients, the phone numbers of patients, the presence of a particular patient in a hospital. These are all things—they are not medical records; they don't go into—they are not access to medical records.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I mean, the Leader of the Opposition gives us fake laughter but it is a simple fact that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like the answer that those privacy breaches could be any number of things and don't mean that there have been that many occasions of access to medical records.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): We'll see how he goes with this one. My question is to the Minister for Health. How many of the 60 complaints the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner received in relation to health records in 2014-15 related to privacy issues?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:18): I am happy to get a report back to the house, but that would be a question best directed to the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner.

Mr Gardner: Have you had a briefing?

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

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): How does the minister respond to Andrew Knox, the victim of the chemotherapy dosage bungle, when he insists on a judicial inquiry to deal with the culture in SA Health, including the serious clinical governance failings highlighted in the Villis Marshall report?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19): I have met with Mr Knox, and my office in fact has been in constant contact with Mr Knox since that meeting to check on his welfare and his general satisfaction with the actions we are taking. Now there is no doubt—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Was he satisfied?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —that Mr Knox has a particular view with regard to—

Mr Pederick: Yes, funny about that.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —the parliament undertaking a review. I have said to him, as I have said publicly, I'm quite comfortable with a parliamentary inquiry into this matter; it is of sufficient seriousness to warrant a parliamentary inquiry. However, I do caution members opposite, and members in the other place: they shouldn't take any action which in any way compromises either the investigations currently underway within SA Health, the disciplinary processes in place within SA Health or, more importantly, the AHPRA investigations.

We have to remember we have reported the clinicians involved in this particular matter to AHPRA. AHPRA have powers to make recommendations; so it will have sweeping powers with regard to investigating these sorts of matters, and can make recommendations to the Medical Board up to deregistration of medical practitioners. I think it's very important that those processes be allowed to happen.

In the same way we would not have a parliamentary inquiry running parallel to either a police investigation or a trial, I do not believe we should be having an upper house inquiry while these investigations are going on. Now Mr Knox has a different opinion to that, and I respect that. Mr Knox has been through a terrible ordeal, and I have met with him and personally apologised to him for what he has been put through. However, I respectfully disagree with him on that particular matter.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Stuart and warn for the first time the member for Hammond. Leader.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Health. What action has the department taken on Professor Paddy Phillips' recommendation arising out of the review into the tampering of Dr Newbold's radiology record that a communications plan be developed for all SA Health staff regarding their obligations under the State Records Act?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): My expectation is that would have happened. I'll check with the department.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): While the minister is checking on that recommendation, can he also update the house on the other recommendations in that report, and how many have been fully implemented?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): I don't have the report in front of me, but the thrust of the recommendations was that the clinicians involved be disciplined. That has happened. There was speculation at the time about whether the clinicians involved had, indeed, contravened the State Records Act. A referral was made to the Crown with regard to that particular matter. The Crown have advised back but, on advice, I'm not able to provide that advice to the house.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier been requested to appear in the child protection system's royal commission, and if so will he be attending?

The SPEAKER: Could we have the question again, please?

Mr Pisoni: Is that what that meant?

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): There are two royal commissions in relation to child protection: a federal one and a state one.

Ms Chapman: The state one.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I haven't been requested to appear, but I certainly have met with the royal commissioner on an informal basis, and have on a number of occasions (or at least one occasion) with the Attorney. We would be more than happy to assist her in any way that she thought I could, but I haven't been asked to appear.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary: in the event that any ministers or former ministers of your government are asked to appear, will you support their attendance?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): Of course. I think she has the power to compel us to appear, but I think we would be offering our assistance in any possible way that we could. So, yes, of course.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:24): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house what action the government has taken to assist our steel industry and any support received for those initiatives?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:24): I want to thank the member for Giles for his personal commitment not only to the city of Whyalla but also, of course, to the steel industry. South Australia is again leading the nation on industry policy by ensuring all state government projects use steel that meets Australian standards and certification requirements. This policy gives our local industry a competitive advantage against lower quality imports, many of which are being dumped here in Australia from Asian steel mills.

Funding of \$4.3 million has just been committed over the next four years to ensure that contractors comply with these requirements and to assist local steel fabricators to meet the up-front costs of achieving certification standards. The steel industry participation initiative will ensure that all South Australian government projects include contract conditions specifying that steel must be sourced from mills with Australasian certification authority for reinforcing and structural steel and that steel must be sourced from steel fabricators independently certified to the recently created National Structural Steelwork Compliance Scheme.

The industry participation weighting has also been increased from 15 to 20 per cent of the overall tender assessment criteria for state government projects where a significant amount of steel will be used on the project. An industry advisory panel has been established to provide support and guidance to the Industry Participation Advocate—who has done an excellent job, and I pass on my congratulations to him—in the implementation of these measures and to oversee the effectiveness of the grant programs.

To further raise the importance of these initiatives, the Industry Participation Advocate hosted a steel summit last week. In attendance were designers, architects and engineers as well as steel fabricators, welders and others in the steel industry, as well as myself and the member for Giles. The government outlined the new requirements for certification and compliance on South Australian government projects and promoted the small grants program.

The summit was also an opportunity to urge the commonwealth and other states to adopt similar supportive procurement policies. What has been the reaction to our initiative? Let me quote Arrium Executive General Manager, Steel Manufacturing, Mr Neil Gibson, who said:

I again fully commend the South Australian government. They have been the most proactive government that we're working with in Australia and these policies are going to be good for us.

The acting Whyalla mayor, Mr Tom Antonio, highlighted the importance of the federal government getting on board our campaign, saying:

I really take my hat off to Tom and his team and I hope that every side of every party gets behind this initiative and we support it.

Sorry, sir—the Premier's team, of course, I'm talking about. Senator Nick Xenophon also urged other governments to take up the South Australian policy, saying:

The South Australian government's recently mandated approach requiring Australian...steel on government projects is a template New South Wales and the commonwealth should follow.

Further, yesterday the federal Senate passed a motion, moved by South Australian Senator Xenophon and sponsored by Labor Senator Kim Carr, that calls on the commonwealth to support the Australian steel industry. The motion that was passed with the support of government senators calls on the federal government to, amongst other things, ensure that all taxpayer-funded infrastructure projects be supplied with steel made with the Australian standard.

The motion also recognises the South Australian government's procurement policy as a best practice model for third-party certification to ensure steel used is independently tested to Australian standards. I urge all members of the chamber to join our campaign and support our steel. Go to our website supportoursteel.com, pledge your support and get all other governments to get on board and adopt South Australia's procurement policies.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, deputy leader.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Given the minister's indication of commitment to the steel industry in South Australia, will he now ensure that the O-Bahn project is redesigned to enable South Australian steel to be used in that project?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:28): Can I thank the deputy leader for her ongoing interest in this matter. Of course, her suggestion today is slightly changed from her previous position which was that the project should be halted until the particular type of steel that is needed to be used for one part of the project—the sheet piling, which cannot be manufactured here in South Australia—could be manufactured elsewhere in Australia. Of course, that completely neglects the fact that approximately—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The deputy leader and the member for Unley—

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —offered this question to the leader, he turned it away, and now he wants to have his two cents' worth. Make up your mind on the front bench over there. Who asked the questions? Both of them would be dreadful.

Mr Whetstone: How much Australian steel was in all your other infrastructure projects?

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will withdraw from the house under the sessional order for 45 minutes. I remind members that there is the power to name also.

The honourable member for Bragg having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was in the course of saying, around 1,700 tonnes of steel to be used in the O-Bahn project is to be sourced locally and approximately a similar amount (just under 2,000 tonnes) to be constructed of sheet piling. So, nearly 50 per cent of the steel to be used in the O-Bahn project is to be sourced locally, as opposed to the other position of the opposition, which is not to invest in any infrastructure at all, because they regard it as a false economy. Seventeen-hundred tonnes of steel—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: The first offence in the current arrangement was the minister debating—

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated.

Mr GARDNER: Standing order No. 98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Does the minister have anything further?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The point is made, Mr Speaker.

BAND OF SA POLICE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:31): My question is also to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure representing the Minister for Police. Can the minister advise the house on the important role the band and other sections of South Australia Police play in our community?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:31): Can I thank the member for Little Para for his question. I know firsthand how highly regarded the South Australian police band is in his mind, and indeed amongst members of this chamber—at least those on this side of the chamber. The South Australian police band is steeped in history. It is the oldest police band in the nation, being formed in 1884 as a brass band. The band became a full military band in 1974, with the addition of woodwind instruments. After 1974, woodwinds were added to the band. I am not sure when bagpipes made an appearance, but as a member of the Clan Campbell Society of South Australia, I will do my best to try to find out.

There is a long history of critical acclaim for the South Australian police band, with international recognition for its performance, harking back to 1990 at the Edinburgh Military Tattoo. This performance is used by the Tattoo organisers as a demonstration of the standard required to perform at this international festival. These international appearances build pride in our police amongst the local community. They foster goodwill towards policemen and women. We are looking forward to another great opportunity for our police and our police band to gain international exposure for South Australia in May this year, when the band has been invited to perform at the Queen's 90th birthday—

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —to be held at Windsor Castle. The South Australian police band is the only police band from Australia to be invited to play. This is a tremendous opportunity for South Australia. But in Adelaide and in South Australia, the band also builds strong relationships with the local community. It is part of SAPOL's community programs and crime prevention initiatives. They are often on the front line of efforts to engage with our community, and they play an important role supporting SAPOL messages on wise choices, particularly with young people, in relation to safe driving and the dangers of illicit drugs. It is in this manner that our police band are on the front line of crime prevention.

The police band is much loved in South Australia, just as the police greys and the police dogs are. They also play an important crime prevention role and other important operational roles in South Australia. Who could forget when the previous government decided to cut the food budget for the police dogs and the police greys? The food budget was cut so severely that they could not even feed the dogs meat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: The Treasurer is making a display.

The SPEAKER: I warn the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Newland to order and I call the member for Wright to order in the hope that their interjections may be recorded on *Hansard*. The minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What sort of political party would deny a police dog the satisfying sucking sound of jellied meat coming out of a Chum can?

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: I am just wondering if this is taking place in any of the eight police stations the government just closed?

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will leave us for the next hour for a bogus point of order.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Does the minister have anything more to tell us?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am nearly there, Mr Speaker. The fact is, it is only this Labor government that ensures that units like the police band, dog operations and police greys will be adequately funded and supported. The police band and their supporters can be assured that, while we are in government, they will continue to play an important role in our community.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

POLICE STATIONS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:36): Can the minister explain to the house how many police stations in South Australia have closed in the last two years?

Mr PICTON: Mr Speaker, that has nothing to do with the previous answer.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I accept that it was an entirely bogus supplementary. The member for Torrens.

E-CIGARETTES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Can the minister inform the house how the Select Committee on E-Cigarettes' report can contribute to South Australia's smoking reduction efforts?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:37): I thank the member for her question and know that she has a deep interest in the matters of tobacco and alcohol control in our state. Tobacco remains one of the greatest single risk factors to the disease burden in Australia. In fact, in South Australia there are approximately 1,140 tobacco-attributable deaths each year.

The South Australian government supports policies that will reduce the prevalence of smoking and its related harms to the South Australian community. Research from the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute has found that 81.3 per cent of the South Australian population reported that they had heard of e-cigarettes and 1.2 per cent of the population were current users of e-cigarettes.

The tabling of this report comes at a time when smoking rates are on the decline in South Australia. Recent figures have shown a reduction in smoking rates in South Australia from 19.4 per cent in 2013 to 15.7 per cent in 2014. This is the lowest on record. I am particularly pleased to note that daily smoking rates in northern Adelaide, where I have my electorate, have been declining steadily from 17.5 per cent in 2012 to 13.9 per cent in 2014. I know my northern suburb MPs would be pleased with this as well.

Work has begun on the development of the next South Australian Tobacco Control Strategy and, from 1 July this year, South Australia's smoking outdoor dining legislation comes into effect, after a good deal of consultation. The South Australian government takes an evidence-based approach to policies, and we will work to reduce the harm that tobacco and smoking causes for all South Australians.

I welcome the report of the Select Committee on E-Cigarettes, and the South Australian government will consider its report and recommendations carefully. I acknowledge the efforts of the Select Committee on E-Cigarettes, particularly the Chair, the member for Elder, and members who are on the committee: the members for Fisher, Kaurna, Bright and Hartley, although I note the member for Hartley has a divergent opinion. I wonder if he has received any tobacco money.

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I won't take the point of order. I will simply ask—

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: —the minister to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I withdraw and apologise, but I do note the Liberal Party does have a policy of accepting tobacco money, I am led to believe.

Mr Pisoni: You were asked to withdraw and apologise, not to give a spontaneous speech.

The SPEAKER: I call the minister to order and I warn her for the first and second time for not making an unreserved apology and making an impromptu speech at the end of the same.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I make an unreserved apology, Mr Speaker.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Does the minister stand by the former minister's comments regarding Shannon McCoole that, 'there were no indications that would have prohibited his employment'? Recent evidence to the royal commission indicated that McCoole was identified as high risk and very unsuitable during an application process for work with Families SA but was offered work anyway.

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) (14:40): The situation with respect to Mr McCoole is presently the subject of a quite extensive investigation by Commissioner Nyland. We take the view that she is obviously going to be examining this very thoroughly at the present time, and we will await her findings in respect of that matter.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:41): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Given the numerous witnesses who have raised concerns regarding Shannon McCoole, does the minister stand by further comments made by the former minister that:

There was no suspicion surrounding the carer in the workplace prior to police receiving information about his alleged distribution of child exploitation material.

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) (14:41): If I can just repeat what I said before: there is an investigation being presently conducted by a royal commissioner into this particular topic. The royal commissioner is not only interviewing many witnesses but also, I believe, actually hearing from Mr McCoole himself. We think it is appropriate to wait until those findings have been made to consider exactly what transpired in that circumstance.

Dr McFetridge: Three times.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Three times.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is already on two warnings.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:42): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What progress, if any, has the government made in establishing a nationwide database as per recommendation 14.4(a) in the recent baby Ebony inquest?

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) (14:43): Again, I have to say we have a royal commissioner, who is looking at—

Mr Marshall: That's got nothing to do with this. This is the baby Ebony inquest findings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I know.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings. The leader will listen to the answer in silence.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We have a view that it would be prudent, given the fact that we have a royal commission underway, for us to say to the royal commissioner, 'Look, here are the various recommendations that have been coming from various coroners' reports.'

We did, in the instance of the first of those reports—the Valentine report, the one which preceded the establishment of the royal commission in the first place—immediately following that, bring a bill into the parliament dealing with matters inasmuch as legislative change was required, and the progress of that bill has been halted due to differences of opinion.

Since the time of the establishment of the Nyland commission, we have taken the view that, for the government to be out there making policy decisions, implementing them, and then finding perhaps that we have done something which was at odds with what would be recommended ultimately by Commissioner Nyland, would not be appropriate.

The Minister for Education and the chief executive of the department have been doing extensive internal work in terms of consideration of practices in the way they manage things there. But all of the recommendations and all of the questions around the way in which the department is operating are things for which we are essentially awaiting the determination of Commissioner Nyland.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:45): Supplementary: has the minister asked for this to be put on the agenda at the next meeting of the Law, Crime and Community Safety Council so it can be discussed further?

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) (14:45): I believe I have put something on that agenda, because there are—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That particular committee is an opportunity for us to advance interjurisdictional cooperation in a whole range of areas. We are looking at it in respect of domestic violence, and I am pretty sure that we have actually got child protection in there, but I will check. But yes, there is obviously a national interest in these matters. Can I say, too, for those who may not be as familiar with some of these areas as others, that there is a significant overlap in practice between the cases of domestic violence and the cases of child neglect or, in some cases, child abuse, so—

Mr Marshall: Hence the recommendation.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. We are very much aware of the fact that these things are cross-border issues. It is an important matter, and obviously the idea that an individual who is known in

one jurisdiction to be a risk can cross a border and become effectively invisible is not a good outcome, either for the jurisdiction that they have left or the one that they have gone into.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:46): Further supplementary: has the minister written to the chair of the Family Law Council to note the recommendation and put it on the agenda there also?

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) (14:47): I really do not have any recollection of writing to the Family Law Council about this matter, and I am not sure how they would be able to assist me. I will consider that matter, but I have no recollection of writing to them. I am not quite sure how they could help me, other than to provide some sort of commentary. I usually get letters from people like the Law Society without me having to ask for them, so I would expect that if they had a view I possibly might have heard it.

FAMILIES SA STAFFING

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Given the Public Service Association claims that the vacant positions for Families SA workers are as high as 200, will the minister confirm the number of positions currently vacant?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:48): Mr Speaker, I would have to take on notice the precise number today. It is in the order of 120 vacancies. We have been steadily filling positions in Families SA over the last year in a very concerted effort.

Previously, some years back, the practice in Families SA was that each office would go through selection processes, and that is a respectable way of addressing vacancies. More recently, the practice has centralised and we have gone through establishing panels, having a call for positions and then working through filling those positions both for social workers and youth workers, and also for administrative staff. We are catching up and closing in on the FTE cap, but we are not there yet.

One of the challenges, of course, is attrition. So, as fast as you bring staff in, you will lose some. It is no secret that Families SA is a workplace that is going through a high degree of criticism publicly at the moment, and it is not easy for the staff in that area. Not only is it at times, I imagine, quite tempting to go to a different job because of the difficulty, complexity and, in some cases, the very deeply distressing nature of the work that they do, but I also imagine that the degree of public scrutiny over the last year has caused some people to rethink their roles.

We are earnestly working on closing that gap still further, but it is unlikely that we will get to zero, given the constant need to deal with attrition. But we are a long way from the 200 that was previously the case and closing as diligently as possible.

FAMILIES SA STAFFING

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:49): Supplementary: how many people have been employed since the recruitment campaign announced in March 2015, following the Chloe Valentine Coroner's recommendations, and what is the time frame expected for the extra 120?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:50): I don't have the figures from the deadline you have suggested, the baseline being around the time of the inquest report on poor Chloe Valentine, so I will have to take that on notice. Equally, it's not possible for me to say when we will complete these 120 on the basis that the 120 (roughly 120) will vary given that we are both filling positions and losing staff, as in any organisation. So, I can't give you a time for 120 absolute numbers, but we are aiming to fill those positions and get as close to our FTE cap as is humanly possible, and that involves continuous recruitment, given the challenge with attrition.

57 FILMS

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's answer yesterday in relation to 57 Films, and I quote:

The matter of procuring services for government doesn't fall to government ministers; it doesn't even fall to chief executives. It is very much down in the lower levels of the agency.

why did the Premier state in December that his chief executive was ultimately responsible for the contracting arrangements for the film crew accompanying him to Paris?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:51): Because chief executives are responsible for all administrative functions within their agencies. The precise procurement decisions, though, are routinely delegated.

Members interjecting:

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

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG STRATEGY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Does the minister believe that the government has met the objectives of the South Australian Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy 2011-2016 and consider the strategy to have been a success?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:52): Could you repeat the years that you are speaking of?

Mr DULUK: 2011 to 2016.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Thank you. I note the member for Davenport's ongoing interest in this strategy. It is worthwhile noting that, of the 60 priority actions in the strategy, 54 are green (meaning the work is on track or has been completed), five are marked amber (requiring additional effort) and one has been marked red as it is not being pursued at this point in time.

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG STRATEGY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:52): Supplementary: can the minister explain why the National Drug Strategy Household Survey detailed report 2013 notes that illicit use of drugs by people aged over 14 and older has increased steadily since 2007 and exceeds the 2004 level at the moment?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:52): The issue of illicit drug use in all of Australia, particularly in South Australia, is of ongoing concern to this parliament and should be to everyone. It requires linked-up solutions across government and the community. South Australian Drug and Alcohol Services continues to work on harm minimisation with the Minister for Police to ensure that drug harm to the South Australian community is minimised.

VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:53): My question again is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Is the minister satisfied that female veterans will be safe in the proposed new Ward 17 PTSD clinic at Glenside, given that their private spaces in the facility will be in their bedrooms, separated by only a swipe card?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:53): The consultation period for the draft build and development of the Glenside veterans' mental health precinct has only just closed. I am waiting for an initial briefing on that. I am certainly sure that the new facility will better address the needs of veterans than the current facility at the Repatriation hospital.

VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:54): Supplementary: has the minister viewed the published plans, which do not have separate recreational and consulting rooms or gardens for women?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:54): I am aware of the plans that went to consultation, and I look forward to talking to the member outside the chamber if he has any additional information from the community that has not been lodged in the public consultation process.

VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:54): That may be so, and I thank the minister for the opportunity, but have you viewed the plans?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:54): I was at the launch of the plans, and I am aware that there are many different views and that it is a draft plan.

Mr Pengilly: But you haven't seen them?

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:54): I take it that you haven't. My question is to the minister once again. What resources has the government committed to advance postvention and lived experience strategies in line with the South Australian Suicide Prevention Plan?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:55): The Labor government, led by the Premier, has met its election commitment in the suicide prevention space, but we will endeavour, and we are in fact working with several councils already as well as not-for-profit organisations (NGOs) that service these areas, to advance the work of suicide prevention and postvention in this state. It is a serious matter. In fact, I talk regularly with a member of the Liberal Party in the upper house about what great work we should continue to do, because it is important to all South Australians.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:55): Thank you, sir. My question is directed to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you update the house on the detection of Mediterranean fruit fly in Clarence Park and what the government is doing to maintain South Australia's fruit fly freedom?

The SPEAKER: Presumably that is not freedom for fruit flies. Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:55): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Ashford for the question and acknowledge that today an outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly has been detected in Clarence Park in Adelaide's inner south in the member for Ashford's electorate.

What the team from Biosecurity South Australia will be doing is informing people within a 1.5 kilometre radius of that outbreak of steps that they can take to ensure that the fruit fly outbreak does not extend beyond the quarantine zone so that we can remain fruit fly free.

In fact, we are the only mainland state in Australia that is fruit fly free and phylloxera free, and that is something that we should be very proud of. We spend \$5 million a year combating fruit fly coming into our state, because the horticultural industry in South Australia is worth \$1.1 billion. It is part of the \$18.2 billion that food and wine represent here in our state. We work hard at keeping things out of our state.

It is very important, and we call on the public to help in that. We were alerted to this outbreak of fruit fly by a member of the public who phoned the fruit fly phone number to report it. We get about 400 calls to that number each year. We go out and have a look at what is happening, and thankfully most of them are diagnosed as just being garden pests and that is a good result.

However, if people do see maggots or they see suspicious flying creatures around fruit and vegetables we do want them to let us know, because we must all be vigilant. We have really reduced the number of fruit fly outbreaks in South Australia since 2002 and that is something we want to

continue to do, because the rest the world looks at South Australia and we get a big tick for our fruit fly free status.

We know that we do not have to undergo some of the measures that food producers in other states do to be able to export their produce into some countries. In fact, China still insists that we cold treat all our citrus, and that costs the South Australian citrus industry about \$15 million a year and it is actually not necessary. For about 15 days they have to put their citrus in cold storage so that they can eradicate fruit fly that is not there.

We had a meeting last year with the agricultural department of China when we were in Beijing, and with us was Con Poulos, who was then representing the citrus industry and the Citrus Board here in South Australia. Now he is the chief of staff to Senator Anne Ruston, who is the Assistant Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources. So, it is terrific to have Con in that position. He knows what needs to happen from an industry point of view, and we have now got him in with the federal government working with us to try to get that approval.

Another thing that we are doing is spending \$3 million on a sterile fruit fly facility up at Port Augusta, and the member for Chaffey, the member for Hammond, the member for Stuart and Senator Anne Ruston were all with me when we turned the first sod, I think, last year. That facility should be open in October this year. They will be able to breed 50 million sterile male fruit flies a week. That is a staggering figure. They will be Queensland fruit flies because we can get our Mediterranean fruit fly from the breeding program that they have in Western Australia. Queensland fruit fly have basically infested the eastern side of Australia. The Mediterranean fruit flies are in the west of Australia. South Australia, as I said, remains fruit fly free, and phylloxera free.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:00): My question is for the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse: why doesn't South Australia operate a dedicated 24/7 drug and alcohol hotline? The National Ice Taskforce's report, released late last year, identified that SA is the only state that doesn't operate a dedicated 24/7 drug and alcohol hotline despite having the highest proportion of treatment episodes related to methamphetamine. There is evidence to suggest that methamphetamine users are not necessarily likely to seek assistance only between 8.30am and 5.00pm.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:01): I am happy to seek advice on that matter and come back to the house.

POLICE TRAINING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): Another question for the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Can the minister confirm if SAPOL has adopted the Mindframe program set of mental health guidelines born from the Hunter Institute of Mental Health, for police guidelines and training for its officers, particularly those performing frontline duties?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:01): I am the minister representing the Minister for Police in this house. I will take that question on notice and I will come back to the member for Stuart with an answer.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Stuart.

POLICE TRAINING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): Can the minister also take the following question on notice for the minister in the other place: will he also advise what suicide and self-harm prevention training SAPOL officers receive?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:02): Yes, I am happy to take that on notice and come back to the member with an answer.

CLIPSAL 500 TICKETS FOR VOLUNTEERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier tell the house how many CFS volunteers and SES volunteers will be receiving tickets to the V8 races next week? Is it for the Thursday, when there are no V8 races, or will they be given tickets for the Saturday when there are actually V8 races?

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) (15:02): I thank the member for Morphett for the question. We do look after the volunteers in South Australia. This is a practice that started a few years ago when we went out and made tickets to the Clipsal 500 available to CFS and SES volunteers. It is a terrific event and great entertainment over the entire four days. I know for example the Robby Gordon—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sir, I will answer the question on my terms, not on the member for MacKillop's terms.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is innocent!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry, the member for Morphett. There is plenty to do for the whole family for the entire four days of the Clipsal 500. So Robby Gordon Stadium Super Trucks—those ones that go over the jumps—are there Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. The V8s are on the road—

Mr Knoll: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on two warnings.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —on Friday. They do their qualifying on the Friday and then there is a 250-kilometre race on the Saturday and then another race on the Sunday as well, so there is plenty there for the whole four days. We've got concerts on every night and this year we have made available to volunteers 1,000 tickets to the V8 Supercars—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —and I must say that I have been out there in previous years and I have caught up with the volunteers, and they have been extremely grateful for the opportunity to go out there. There is action on all four days of the Clipsal 500. It is a terrific event. It brings in \$60 million to the state's economy. It is a tremendous outing, and I have got to say that the volunteers that I have caught up with from the CFS and the SES are extremely grateful for the opportunity to get out there and see these great cars in action. We've given away 1,000 tickets to the volunteers. As to which days they are spread out over, I'm not sure, but I'm happy—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I'm happy to have wound down the clock.

The SPEAKER: The Alan Knott of the house has taken us through to stumps.

Grievance Debate

RECREATIONAL FISHING

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:05): I rise today to speak about the current state government's review into recreational fishing in South Australia, and I would like to put on the record that last night I attended a meeting at Glenelg. To date, that is the one and only meeting held in Adelaide which represents probably over 180,000 recreational fishers. In my role as the shadow minister for recreation and sport and as a recreational fisher, I will be at the meeting tonight at Renmark.

At the meeting last night, there was quite a sentiment of: this is already a done deal; this is already a review much like the review of the marine parks and sanctuary zones, and there is complete

disharmony, complete distrust in the government from recreational fishers in South Australia. They are being unfairly targeted or tarnished with what the fisheries department, the state government, are calling a demise in fish stocks. Yet we have very little evidence; very little concrete data.

A lot of the answers to questions last night were: 'it was about', 'we think' or 'we're not sure', and there was a lot of grey area when it came to the data. Obviously, the slide show at the meeting demonstrated how important recreational fishing is to South Australians, particularly as a pastime. There are recreational fishers who are doing the wrong thing. Sadly, they are probably tarnishing it for the people who are doing the right thing.

We know that over an extended period of time, the state government has put mistrust into the fishing sector, both commercial and recreational. The previous consultation period with marine parks and sanctuary zone was an absolute no-brainer. These people were going to get rolled over, and it was going to have an impact on the fishing fraternity and tourism—the economy of our regions.

There are a lot of villages, a lot of towns in South Australia along the coastline that people would not access simply to go and visit. They go there for a simple reason: they want to enjoy being there, to be able to catch a fish, and just be part of one of the great sports known to mankind. That is: to be a recreational fisher and to enjoy bringing a fish into a boat, onto the jetty, or onto the beach, and to be able to put it on a plate and eat it. There is probably no better feeling. What I am seeing—and it is very clear—is that the evidence last night showed that there was a comparison between commercial fishers and recreational fishers, and it is clear that there is a wedge being driven through this review.

One very good question asked last night was about the number of dedicated compliance officers. It was very clear. People in the room were asked, 'Who has been pulled aside and had their catch checked? Do compliance officers come up to them?' Out of about the 140 or 150 people in the room, there were four people who put their hand up. Again, the question was put to the room: 'How many people have been a part of the survey that will show who has caught the fish; how many fish; the number of whiting fillets in particular that have actually been caught in South Australia?' Again, there were three people who put their hand up.

How good is the credibility that represents the 277,000 recreational fishers here in South Australia? How good is that credibility? By the way, it is the Victorian government that is doing this survey. A Victorian RecFish department doing a South Australian survey! The government claims that South Australia is not good enough to undertake such a survey.

Again, there is not one piece of social and economic impact assessment in the review, and history shows us that reducing bag limits, reducing boat numbers, reducing boat quotas is simply not working. We look at the bag limits, and they were introduced in the mid-70s; we look at boat limits that were introduced in the mid-90s; and it is clear that all of these measures along the way—reduction in fish numbers, more and more regulation on the recreational fishers—is clearly not working. What we are not seeing is the impact of fur seals on fish stocks. As I understand it, almost 400 tonnes of fish per day are eaten by the fur seal population in South Australia.

I listened to the member for Colton who was having a red-hot go at the government about the intrusion of stormwater flowing out to sea, wrecking our seagrass, having a detrimental impact on our environmental waters—freely flowing treated wastewater going out to our gulf.

Time expired.

WRIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (15:10): I want to address a local issue that is causing some concern in my electorate, and I expect I will be making a number of contributions in relation to this as time goes by. Artwork that was much loved by families at a Golden Grove park has been destroyed—

Mr Pederick: Shame.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes—with a severed horse's head being the only piece remaining.

Mr Pederick: Shame.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: It is terrible and I thank the member for—

Mr Pederick: Hammond.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —Hammond for his support. You would expect that some vandal had performed this atrocity but, no, it appears to have been arranged by the local Tea Tree Gully councillor. To give this house some understanding of how horrific this is, the wonderful play sculptures—a horse, a whale, a mermaid and stepping stones—were all sculpted from felled trees from the area when it was developed. They were so very special. They were crafted by renowned South Australian artist Silvio Apponyi. For those who do not recognise his name, he was the artist who sculpted the wonderful bronze whale's tail at Victor Harbor.

They were much loved by children who had the opportunity to play in an environment that was adventurous. They could use their imaginations, be creative and be connected to the environment. Locals are ropeable. Over 100 people have contacted me. They are extremely angry that they were not consulted and that is despite the local councillor claiming that, in September and October last year, she was out doorknocking about the play sculptures' restoration.

Their restoration has amounted to literally giving them the chop. All that is left is the horse's head. It is as shocking as it sounds. The poor old horse looks very upset and kids coming to the park are equally distressed when they see what has occurred to their beloved pony. I have written to the Mayor of Tea Tree Gully twice, firstly, seeking information about how this could possibly happen and, secondly, stating very clearly that the community wants the sculptures replaced.

Councillor Paula Leuthen-Soper has been Facebooking in September and October last year that she was doorknocking, seeking people's thoughts on the 'restoration of the play/sculpture area, glorying in the lovely weather'. It all sounded very positive, but lo and behold, come December, she posts a photograph of herself sitting on a new iron bench under a tree claiming, 'Castle Eaton beautification.' There is no play area left, no sculptures: it is all replaced by two garden beds, a dolomite path and an iron bench.

It would seem that she is upset that residents are upset. She is upset that I am upset and that I am actually seeking residents' views. From the 800 letters sent out—and I am glad that the member for Chaffey raised surveys and their credibility—I have had over 100 responses with only two supporting their removal. Does Councillor Leuthen-Soper apologise? No. She claims she has been hard done by. Apparently, I showed little respect and understanding of council's due process. She says in this week's *Messenger*:

Council process was followed from the moment I forwarded local concerns regarding the restoration of the play sculptures to the council.

That is a different story to what she was putting on Facebook. Having concerns about the restoration is quite different to her post in November in which she said:

Maintenance has begun on Castle Eaton Reserve—we are looking to restore current the sculptures and update safety aspects of this small park in keeping with surrounds.

I reiterate—'looking to restore current wooden sculptures'. Restore them. Now she is saying she forwarded concerns about their restoration. Yet it has been confirmed her concerns notice was lodged in May last year—that is, concerns about their restoration. She met on site with staff and asked that work be delayed until she could speak to residents. How could she then be claiming to be restoring them in September, October and November when she had lodged a complaint about the restoration in May?

Play both ends against the middle and you are sure to get caught, and that is just what has happened. Councillor Leuthen-Soper can be put out all she likes; she has been caught out. As I said, I will have more to say about this saga in the near future as more information comes to hand about exactly what council processes were followed.

PARKLANDS PRIVATISATION

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:15): I am delighted to have the unexpected pleasure of the opportunity for a grievance this afternoon. It will come as no surprise to you, Madam Deputy Speaker,

that I am going to grieve about privatising our Parklands around Adelaide. As a proud South Australian, I am aware that when you look, for instance, in the back of your diary (if anyone, like me, still keeps a little diary) you have maps of all the major cities, and included always in the map of Adelaide you see the lovely Parklands ringing our city.

Of course, they were originally designed by Colonel William Light, Surveyor-General way back in about 1837 I think originally. He did not quite get here—I think Kingston was actually meant to help him with the design, but he was a bit late getting here as well. Those Parklands that ring the city are to me an intrinsic signifier of what makes this city so precious and so special, because we are the only city that looks like that. All the others, having grown out of penal colonies (unlike this state of course), grew up rather haphazardly, whereas we have this wonderful planned city with broad boulevards and the Parklands surrounding it.

I am not some purist who thinks we should not utilise our Parklands. I actually think it is good to have playing fields, parks and all sorts of things happening on the Parklands. I make no objection to the fact that we have the oval and so on on the Parklands, and indeed over time we have had some other things—the railway station, for instance, being converted to the casino, but that is an active use of an existing building—so I am not a purist when it comes to the Parklands. I believe that the Parklands are there not just to be native grasses and trees ringing the city, but lovely areas that people really can go into and utilise.

But when I discovered that this government in fact is starting to privatise those Parklands, I became extremely concerned. When I say 'privatised', what I mean is this: the government is currently in the process of going through what is going to happen with the Parklands, particularly the area now occupied by the Royal Adelaide Hospital site, generally to be known as the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. There have been all sorts of things on that whole site, bounded by Frome Road, North Terrace, the river and Hackney Road, but the old hospital going down to the new hospital is going to mean that there is a redevelopment opportunity.

There are some heritage buildings on the site, and there is the potential to put lands back to Parklands and indeed to the Botanic Gardens. In fact, I understand that the Premier just before the last election promised the Adelaide Parklands Authority that it would be substantially returned to Parklands, but instead of that, this government (now at stage 2 of the planning process) has four consortia, and those consortia are all proposing the sale of private apartments on that land.

They will have it hidden amongst other things. There will be lots of other things, no doubt—cafes, and there will be some space returned to the Botanic Gardens, I understand—but at the end of the day, there is to me an intrinsic difference between what has happened up until now with the Parklands and what the government is now proposing. In allowing private ownership, what they are doing is allowing a select few to have exclusive occupation to the exclusion of all others, and really, our Parklands up until now have been part of the public domain. Whether it is going to the Museum, the State Library, the Art Gallery, or whatever it might be, it has been public domain, and happily so.

As I say, I am not a purist who says it has to be all just native vegetation and no-one bothers to go there, but there is an intrinsic difference in the step that this government is about to take in allowing private ownership for a select few individuals. They will try to justify it in a couple of ways, I have no doubt. They will say first of all that it is the price of progress, that the only way we can pay for the redevelopment of this site is to allow this private ownership of these things.

The other thing I think the government will say is: 'It's long-term lease, it's not sale,' but anyone who has heard the debates in this chamber over the last 20 years would know that, in reality, giving someone exclusive occupation, whether it is by a long-term lease or by actual ownership of the fee simple is the equivalent of private ownership. It does not matter what you call it, it is still private ownership. It is still allowing certain select individuals, a wealthy few in this state, to gain exclusive private ownership, to the exclusion of all members of the public, for a long, long period of time. Once you take the first step on that very slippery slope it is my belief that it will continue, and then our Parklands are genuinely at risk.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:20): I rise today to speak about a fantastic event hosted in my electorate during the past week. I was honoured to attend the Aberfoyle Community Centre's Bushfire Ready forum on Thursday evening last week. I would also like to offer on their behalf my thanks to the newly-appointed emergency services minister, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas MLC, for his attendance.

The Aberfoyle Community Centre is really the community heart of Fisher. It is managed and run by 85 dedicated volunteers and, during 2015, had 28,000 community visitors. They are very connected to the local community and put on a great range of events. They also run many classes. The community development officer, Ellen Jezierski, really is the powerhouse of the centre. She leads its programs with such innovation, drive and energy, and really sets a cracking pace. I quickly also want to send my thoughts to her today as she undergoes surgery—hurry back, Ellen!

As a CFS volunteer in the past, Ellen knows only too well the risks and dangers that fires can pose, so it is no surprise that she sees bushfire awareness as a priority. The community centre was incredibly hospitable and, along with volunteers from the Happy Valley CFS (no strangers to the community barbecue), they put on a fantastic sausage sizzle for the attendees. Their enthusiastic support for the event was great to see. It is really good to see the extent to which they will go to help the community and support giving residents the information they need.

There are some parts of my electorate of Fisher which are really quite obviously bushfire-prone areas. However, information I heard on the night, as well as some reflection on my observations of the Pinery fireground, really opened my mind to the question of: 'What does it actually mean to be high risk in terms of bushfire regions?' As I witnessed on the way home from a Riverland trip through the Pinery fireground, it really does not have to be full of vegetation and trees, it can actually just be a fairly flat, grassed area. That really confused me in terms of what the high-risk terminology meant. It was also a bit of an eye-opener for the people there that night to talk about this.

We were honoured to have Laura Gemmell from the CFS community engagement team come to give the presentation. I have heard Laura speak several times in the past when she was in a previous role working with very high-risk youth in detention. She is a very skilled presenter and really engaging. The residents at the forum found it very useful to hear what they need to do to ensure that their house is bushfire ready. Some of the key points that she shared included: ensuring that long grass is mowed, clearing flammable undergrowth from their properties, pruning overhanging branches from their homes, cleaning up everything that will burn from around the home, as well as cleaning out flammable leaves and debris from the gutters.

They used a very confronting piece of vision that was taken from inside a CFS appliance. This appliance was moving through quite high-density areas in both suburban and non-suburban bushfire zones, and it really did hit home about the dangers. The use of some still shots of burnt areas were helpful as well in terms of demonstrating to the locals how to help clean up around their houses. Vision of things such as doormats that were sitting on decking catching alight, mops leaning on walls and towels left hanging on the stair rails provided some easy reminders. It was pointed out that night that embers not only jump fences, paddocks and streams but they can travel some 20 to 25 kilometres, given the right conditions. They will also start a fire then if they land on items that are readily fuelled and have oxygen.

The reinforcement of the message to leave home early—in fact, leave the day before if you know of the impending risk of fire the next day—were vital, as were reminders to have things like fireproof blankets for all passengers in the car and the need to have a battery-powered radio, fire-safe long-sleeved and long-legged clothing, as well as water. This information was handy for everybody, whether they planned to stay or not in the event of a bushfire. Minister Malinauskas and the Happy Valley CFS were very generous with their time and they were available to answer any other questions after the presentation, especially for some people who wanted some local advice.

I would like to thank them for their hard work and thank the team at the Aberfoyle Community Centre, as well as the CFS, for their dedication to our community. I would like to note that some of the members of the Happy Valley CFS have gone to fight bushfires in Tasmania recently. I thank

them for assisting those who are in need, wherever they are. It was a great event to attend and I would like to thank everyone finally who has helped make that happen.

MARILYN JETTY SWIM

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:25): Picture this, Deputy Speaker. It is Sunday 7 February and I am sitting on my paddleboard providing water cover for the Brighton Jetty Classic, South Australia's most successful open water swim hosted and organised by Brighton's Surf Lifesaving Club. After two hours of watching swimmers from a myriad of age groups complete the 400 metre loop of the jetty, the landscape suddenly changed.

On the beach, a warm glow emerged. A blonde haze began to gather at the water's edge. From my vantage point in the water, I was able to hear the Royal Australian Navy band march down Jetty Road, and now I could see who they were leading to the beach—a group of 107 Marilyn Monroes. It was an amazing sight.

The Marilynswimmers made it to the water's edge, each with a blonde wig, brilliant white swimsuit and an Australian-themed rubber ring hugging tightly around their waist. I had spent two hours watching hundreds of rubber-capped amphibians slice through the water and now my vista was about to change—the Marilynswimmers had arrived.

The Marilyn Swim, an initiative of Brighton local Sarah Tinney who joins us in the gallery today, raised over \$53,000 in 2016, taking the accumulative total over the three swims since 2014 to \$113,000. In 2014, there were 57 Marilynswimmers, in 2015, there were 100, and in 2016, it rose to 107. The Marilynswimmers have not only had statewide and national coverage, but their story has also been covered by international news networks. There is no doubt that the Marilynswimmers have become a phenomenon, but the story of their genesis is as important as their present day success.

Back in 2006, Sarah Tinney's mother, Esther, living in Michigan, discovered that she had cancer. Living in Australia, Sarah felt far removed from the situation, but wanting to do something she contacted South Australia's Cancer Council and ended up running a Biggest Morning Tea event to honour her mum's battle. This was the beginning of an incredibly fruitful relationship.

Not long after this, Sarah's mum passed away, but not before Sarah told her mum she was going to help cure cancer, channelling her grief into action. Several years later, following a discussion with Brighton surf club's stalwart, Robyn Parsons, Sarah decided to participate in the Brighton Jetty Classic dressed as Marilyn Monroe. Upon reflection, she thought, 'Why one Marilyn? Why not multiple Marilynswimmers?' And so it began. Sarah invited every woman she knew to become a Marilyn, cajoling them into fundraising action.

In 2016, she was even joined by her daughters, mini-Marilynswimmers, Ingrid aged 10 and Isla aged 4. Outside of the swimming Marilynswimmers, there are around 60 other volunteers involved. They are led by Sarah and her next door neighbour, Sarah Ventress, along with Sally Day, Fiona Blinco, Shelly Woodward and Katharina Howard. All of these women live in the local area and bring their own special skills and experience to the committee.

Back to the swim on 7 February. I am sitting out on my paddleboard and the Marilynswimmers begin their 400-metre jetty jaunt. This is a swim, but I am not sure if any of those Marilynswimmers were swimming. They were floating, splashing, kicking, bouncing, bobbing metre by metre towards me, a living wave of blonde wigs and white bathers, one of the most bizarre, hilarious and fantastic sights that I have seen. I do not know the collective noun for Marilynswimmers, perhaps it is a peroxide of Marilynswimmers, a vibrancy of Marilynswimmers, a laughter of Marilynswimmers or a spectacular of Marilynswimmers. Whatever it was, there it was in all its glory three weeks ago.

Out in front was my good friend and Marino resident, Cheryl Gardiner, who, travelling regally and swanlike through the water at a considerably faster pace than the others, made it first across the finish line, saying that it was the first time she has been early to anything in her life. To conclude, I am about to do something that I never thought I would do in my parliamentary career—I am going to quote Marilyn Monroe: 'Imperfection is beauty, madness is genius, and it is better to be absolutely ridiculous than absolutely boring.'

I can confidently say that the sight of a hundred Marilyns laughing, paddling, splashing, giggling, and thrashing around Brighton Jetty was splendid and ridiculous, and as far from boring as you could get. To Sarah Tinney, Sarah Ventress and their merry band of Marilyns, congratulations on your fantastic efforts, and thank you for bringing fun, colour and vibrancy to our great coastal community. As you often quote, 'Be bold, be fabulous, be a Marilyn.'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I can understand why you did not mention the winners of the swim when all of this was before you, but I understand Craig Caldicott was the club champion that day.

Mr Speirs: In one of the age groups.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know; that is a grievance for another day. Member for Giles.

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:31): I rise again to talk about Whyalla and the profound uncertainty that we face as a community. Uncertainty stalks the steelworks and the iron ore export operation, and it does so despite the concerted efforts on the part of the workforce to reduce costs. The human cost of the unavoidable costcutting is high. The jobs lost to date are many and they are growing, and those job losses are likely to continue. Indeed, another 30 job losses were announced today, with the prospect of the mine workers having to accept a 10 per cent cut in their pay.

Families that thought they had secure jobs—especially younger families—are now finding they have mortgages and other debts that they are finding difficult to service. I say 'younger families' because they often bought houses at or near the peak of the market and now have negative equity. There are hundreds of houses on the market. The impact of the job losses and the ongoing uncertainty are cascading through our community and will, in one way or another, impact on all sectors of the Whyalla community.

The decisions that got us to this point were not made in Whyalla; those decisions were made in Sydney, but it is the people of Whyalla who are paying, and will continue to pay, a very high price. The sheer scale of the collapse in steel prices driven by the record 110 billion tonnes exported by China in 2015 has hit steel producers around the world. The collapse in iron ore prices adds to our profound challenges as a community.

This is beyond politics, or at least petty political pointscoreing. I am sure nobody wants to see the steelworks go under, given the devastating effect that will have in the Whyalla community and the wider ramifications for the regions and the state. The last time the steel industry was under real threat in Australia, in the mid-eighties, there was a clear political response from Canberra and the Hawke/Keating government. Real leadership was demonstrated with the development of the Button steel plan and the tripartite agreement between the federal government, the union movement and BHP.

The plan and its implementation helped secure the future of the steel industry in Australia. We are now at another crossroad when it comes to the future of steelmaking, and we need clear political leadership. BlueScope, with its different product line based on flat product, looks like it has turned the corner. Our structural steel producer has not—at least not yet. The latest announcement on refinancing by GSO Capital Partners, and whether that refinancing is signed off by 5 April, raises a whole series of questions.

What happens if the parties do not agree and there is no sign-off? What happens if there is a sign-off and an American private equity outfit assists or dominates in determining the direction of the company and the nature of its restructure? My fear is that community interest will not figure strongly in its deliberations.

I say we need clear political leadership, and I know that at a state level there is a strong commitment to do what is within our power. I hope that the commitment is there at a federal level. When it comes to the clarity of leadership, there is now some murk as people assess the potential implications of the GSO financing proposal. People can draw their own conclusions about the implications, but I know the workers in Whyalla will continue to do their best to work toward ensuring a viable steelworks. We need to do what we can to assist them in that endeavour.

Other communities in my electorate have also suffered big job losses. Roxby Downs, over a two to three-year period, lost a lot of jobs. Those job losses inflicted a lot of pain. It is now going through a consolidation phase and we can probably expect incremental job growth in the future. There always appeared to be a light at the end of the tunnel in Roxby. Whyalla is in a race between a one-company town vulnerability and opportunity. It is a race forced upon us by the collapse in steel and ore prices. We face the prospect of an existential crisis. We need to do all we can to back opportunity and make sure opportunity wins the race.

Bills

OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 February 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:37): Industries relevant to this bill welcomed the initiative of the new prime minister, Tony Abbott, and his commitment to turn around this situation and at the COAG meeting on 13 December 2013, with the support of COAG, resolved to dismantle this national scheme and get rid of this ridiculous idea that had emanated from the Rudd administration.

Indeed, NECA, the national body involved in the training for trades and licensing, had this to say on 5 September 2014:

In what can only be described as one of the more sensible decisions by government, COAG has refused to sign-off the national electrical licensing scheme proposal. NECA has described the proposed scheme as 'inferior' and 'potentially life threatening...another pink batts debacle waiting to happen'.

It goes on to say:

The proposal was not supported by industry and would have undermined electrical safety across Australia. The industry, with NECA at the forefront had repeatedly put forward a proposal for a system that was aimed at achieving a quality national licensing scheme. The release of the proposed system by the Federal bureaucracy would have only served to lower existing standards and increase the likelihood of further safety concerns. The change in the definitions of what was to be installation work would have allowed unlicensed and untrained people to do electrical work.

There are many other comments in relation to that industry. Similarly, when the local industries were consulted about the passage of this bill, the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, for example—which had, for a long time, proposed that the national scheme was not going to be of benefit to its members and, in particular, the standard of training and licensing that would be expected—welcomed the proposed repealing of this national scheme.

It certainly made comment. Similarly, its concerns were along the lines that, in opposing the initial model at a national level, it had considered that there would be diminished educational standards for real estate agents. What is important to remember here is that again we get back to this lowest common denominator scenario where, in attempting to achieve a national model, there are a lot of back and forth negotiations as to who has got the best model.

One would like to think that when you are working out a national model you pick the best from all the states and have a scheme that ultimately is superior. Sadly that is not always the case, and I have given examples in a contribution to date. However, the South Australian representative body considered that if we had gone down this path its real estate agents would have ended up with a standard in respect of their licensing equivalent to something out of a Wheaties packet.

So there was wholesale rejoicing amongst industry groups who were responsible for ensuring that the licensing and training and standards of the occupations that were the subject of this were going to be at a high standard. They insisted that they be at a high standard. They considered that this model had thrown up a standard for a number of industries which was inferior and in some cases potentially dangerous. With those few words, I do seek to go into committee in respect of this bill, and I have a few questions of the minister.

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) (15:41): This is one of those happy occasions where we all appear to be in agreement, and that is good. I for one have always been sceptical about the merit of this.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I may well have done, but I did so with considerable scepticism. I was very happy to meet with the real estate industry over a period of time and listen to its requests and to appropriately slow down progress so as to not threaten its people with unsatisfactory training arrangements. I am very pleased that it appears that this will go through, and I thank all who have contributed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

The CHAIR: There are only nine clauses, so do you want to speak for 15 minutes before we pass it all?

Ms CHAPMAN: Look, I am happy to raise it. It is largely in relation to the costs, contribution and dismantling.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Ms CHAPMAN: As I indicated in the second reading, the Attorney has provided a letter to the Hon. Rob Lucas outlining the background as to why the national scheme was being dissolved, and further questions were put in respect of the detail as to how much money and assets were being distributed. The response was four paragraphs and regrettably does not detail any of the particulars sought other than in general terms to say that there is an agreement to dismantle the fund that currently exists and that it was to be distributed on an equal per capita share basis. We know from the *Hansard* contribution of the Hon. Gail Gago in another place that, in the years 2009-10 and 2010-11, contributions of \$140,000 and \$370,000 respectively were put into the national fund from South Australia. My question is: how much money has been put in since?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that South Australia made total contributions to the fund of \$420,000, of which we expect to be refunded approximately \$140,000 after deducting our share of the disestablishment costs.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it correct, then, that the \$140,000 and \$370,000 were just towards establishment costs and that they are separate from the \$420,000 that you have just referred to?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm afraid the only information that I have is what I have just shared with the house. There is a further comment here that a recent reconciliation of liabilities indicate that South Australia's share of the disestablishment cost would be in the order of \$70,000 and then, as I said before, we have apparently made total contributions of \$420,000. We expect a refund of about \$140,000 including the fact, I assume, that we are paying about \$70,000 towards disestablishment.

Ms CHAPMAN: Do I assume from that then that we are expecting a net of \$70,000 back?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We are expecting \$140,000 back.

Ms CHAPMAN: What has happened to the income from each of the industries in the meantime; namely, have they continued to simply be paid into the estate bodies?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that it never actually got started, so whatever was going on before had continued to go on and now will continue to go on.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of other occupations, which were proposed to be in a second tranche of national regulation or licensing, is that now going to be abandoned?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes; happily the whole thing is being abandoned.

Ms CHAPMAN: Are there any other national schemes that are either operating now or proposed in respect of the licensing or registration of professions that are to be disbanded or not progressed now?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The only thing I can say is that, insofar as anything was contemplated to come within this framework, this framework is being demolished and nothing is going to happen in that space. Whether there are other professional associations which, independent of this framework, are negotiating some arrangements I cannot say, but what I can say is that, whatever work this was going to be doing, it will not be doing, and so I guess we are left in a situation where it is as if this had never even begun.

Ms CHAPMAN: With the agreement at COAG to pursue other alternative efficiency measures, what else has the government done or is it doing to improve the mobility arrangements, for example, which is one of the objectives that was being sought? For example, is it proposed that there is some agreement to have a uniform standard in relation to licensing which each of the states will pursue in their own jurisdiction? There was an agreement to do something, and I am really asking: has the government done anything yet or is it proposing to do something?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that there have been talks about mutual recognition, and I do not believe they have actually progressed very far. To the extent that they were there, they were there against the backdrop of this project being undertaken, and this is now gone.

I personally am of the view that there is probably some scope for some form of mutual recognition which should not be too difficult. That said, even mutual recognition schemes would ultimately confront the same problem, which is that there are differences from one jurisdiction to another. I am happy to take that up through the forum for ministers for Consumer Affairs—I think there is one coming up in March or April.

To give one example—and this may not be an accurate example, but it gives you an idea of what I am trying to say—in South Australia, if you hold a ticket as an electrician, that might also mean that, as part and parcel of becoming an electrician, you have done training in certain things that enabled you to install water heaters or solar panels or something of that nature. However, in another state, they may not be training modules for the acquisition of a roughly equivalent licence.

There will always be these sort of marginal differences between the curricula, for a start; not to mention the standards or the degree of training that is attached to these matters. It is something I think we should look at, but in the end this whole process has exposed what a complex problem that is.

Ms CHAPMAN: Between houses, would the minister consider making available to the Hon. Rob Lucas particulars of any proposed changes to the current state scheme that are consistent with the commitment made at COAG 2013 that each of the states would work via the Council for the Australian Federation (CAF) on the basis that it was to 'develop alternate options for minimising licensing impediments to improving labour mobility'? Mutual recognition of standards and those types of things, as you have pointed out, may or may not be on the drawing board. We would just like to know in writing between the houses if they are on their way and, if so, what they are.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will undertake to do my best to supply as much information on that as I possibly can.

Clauses 5 to 9 passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

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) (15:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION (PARENTAL LEAVE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February 2016.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:53): I am pleased to speak on the Southern State Superannuation (Parental Leave) Amendment Bill, and I do not intend to take an enormous amount of the house's time. However, I do want to put a couple of things on the record in regard to the second reading speech which perhaps the Attorney might consider responding to in his answer, or perhaps more likely between the houses through the Hon. Rob Lucas who will be representing the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council and is, indeed, the lead shadow minister in this portfolio area which, I assume, is industrial relations.

The Southern State Superannuation (Parental Leave) Amendment Bill relates to parental leave and superannuation matters—unsurprisingly, given the title. Up until 2012 when we passed in this place the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Superannuation) Bill for which the Hon. Michael O'Brien, of blessed memory, was the relevant minister and Iain Evans was the shadow minister, superannuation had been payable to members of Triple-S on parental leave payments.

In 2012, the government introduced that bill, which amended the definition of salary so that superannuation did not have to be paid on parental leave payments. The government argued that that was to bring us in line with the requirements of the commonwealth Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act 1992. The bill passed the parliament and has been the law for 3½ years.

This bill seeks to reverse that 2012 decision in relation to parental leave by reinstating superannuation to members of Triple S on parental leave payments. In his second reading explanation, it was the Attorney's suggestion that some states—Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia—have continued to pay superannuation on parental leave despite the federal legislation, and we would like some clarity as to what in fact has been occurring in South Australia's departments.

The government also claims that various enterprise agreements that existed at the time of the 2012 bill included provisions that 'existing conditions of employment' would not be reduced. If this bill were to pass, as to the commencement in clause 2, this act will be taken to have come into operation on 19 November 2012 immediately after section 13 of the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Superannuation) Act came into operation, effectively making it retrospective, so that the aspects of this bill apply to the act as if the previous bill had never taken effect.

Again, we are keen to find out whether that means that, in effect, the previous bill has never been put into operation in terms of those aspects relating to superannuation on parental leave. Has superannuation continued to be paid to those members of Triple S on parental leave payments? Are superannuation contributions still being made? This question is particularly pertinent because the government claims that there will be no budget impact as no budget reductions were made to agencies in 2012.

If that is the case, and I have no reason to think that it is not, some agencies may have used the budget saving to meet the general budget savings target for the agency; they may have used the money for other things; or they may have continued to make these payments. We would like to know the situation for each agency: whether the application has been consistent across agencies and what has been happening with the money. If the superannuation was not payable to members on Triple S on parental leave payments, then surely there is a budget impact. If so, how much is that budget impact? How much is this going to cost, and what is the relevant cost to be applied?

I am certain the Attorney can answer some of those questions between the houses if he wishes. He can answer as much of it as he likes or is able to now, if he has the figures or the answers at hand. The Public Service Association is on the record as being strongly in support of the bill and the Liberal Party will also be supporting this bill, albeit with the request for that information, which may be pertinent to the debate in the Legislative Council.

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) (15:58): I thank the member for Morialta for his contribution and his indication of support for the bill. I have an understanding that there have been no payments withheld, but I will check that between the houses and, if that understanding turns out to be incorrect, I will correct it in writing to the honourable member. As I said, I appreciate the fact that the opposition will be supporting this measure which, really, when you think about it, is just fixing up what was an unattended potential anomaly in the otherwise intended scheme. With those few words, I look forward to the passage of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being a quorum present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GENDER IDENTITY AND EQUITY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 February 2016.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (16:01): It is my pleasure to speak in support of this bill. I think this is a very sensible proposition that has been put forward to the house. I would firstly like to congratulate the Law Reform Institute for the work that they have done on this, and there is also another series of reports to come before the government and the house. This is probably the least controversial of those amendments, and this is essentially focused on changing the language in a lot of our statutes that refer to one particular gender or the other and trying to amend them so that they are gender-neutral terms.

That is something that I think is eminently sensible. It is something that hopefully is not too controversial before the house. It is something that, at the very least, does not do any harm that I can see. It is not going to cause significant problems and is not going to change society in any meaningful way, but what it will do is make life easier for people who are in that particular situation. We do know that people who are, for instance, transgender find dealing with government bureaucracies from time to time enormously difficult, so having these legislative changes I think will be one step further to making their lives easier.

I know when I worked in federal government—I was chief of staff to the federal attorney-general—this was something that former senator Louise Pratt quite often raised with us: the need to amend the federal provisions regarding gender-specific terms, which is very important at a federal level as well where you cover things like passports and Medicare details, as well as Centrelink issues. To be honest, I think that is something the former Labor government probably needed to do more on than what we ended up doing. There was some action taken, but I do not think it was to the extent of what this house is doing for our state laws, so we should congratulate ourselves for taking this action that has not necessarily been taken right around the country or nationally.

From my perspective, I look at it in terms of personal liberties. There are a lot of people, particularly on the other side of this house, who talk about the need for government to get out of the way of people's lives and for people to have their own personal liberties protected.

It is certainly true that they support that when they talk about economic things, but sometimes when it comes to these personal things about how you define yourself—whether it is how you define yourself in terms of your gender, who you love or a whole range of other things—they want the government to be more involved and more prescriptive. I think these are actually issues for people to determine themselves, and we as a government should be willing to let people make their own decisions and have our government systems adapt to that.

I have listened to some of the debate that has happened in the house on this subject already. There have been some good contributions, but there have been a few silly contributions as well. There has been a lot of discussion about the sections of this bill referring to pregnancy. I think there has been much more time devoted to discussing that section than is probably worth discussing. I do not think it is the most meaningful clause of this bill, but I am not naïve enough not to see that it is good banter to talk about in this house, on talkback radio or in other forums. Obviously the banter will happen, but I do not think people's concerns about that should prevent this bill from going forward.

The other thing I found quite strange is that there has been such a long discussion about change rooms. I do not see anything in this bill at all that refers to change rooms and I do not think that we have any legislation in South Australia governing change rooms or toilet facilities whatsoever. For that to somehow be a debate in terms of the definitions of this bill seems to be a complete red herring, but it probably helps people get to 20 minutes of discussing this bill and probably helps razz up some of their constituencies by talking about that. I do not think either of those issues is anything that should limit us passing this bill today.

There has also been a bit of discussion about the Safe Schools program which, as I understand it, is something that has been developed by a national youth organisation with funding from the commonwealth government, funded by the former Labor government, and also the Victorian government. My approach to that program is pretty simple: we need to do everything we can to prevent students being bullied at school, and this is a program designed to do exactly that. People might niggle with one or two words in the voluminous details of the publications that have been released, but we should not stop this program and we should not victimise this program as in any way doing harm, when it is actually out there to do good for these people who are being bullied in schools.

We know the statistics in terms of the suicide rates for young people from the LGBTIQ community, and the statistics are much worse in terms of mental health issues and suicide risk. To have this national debate going on as though there is something wrong with them as children in schools, which is the message that lots of people will be getting, I do not think helps in any way our efforts to combat that bullying in schools. I am very worried about the debate we have seen on that program in the last couple of weeks and I am hoping that some common sense will prevail and that we will actually get on to doing the good work of trying to prevent bullying in our schools, which is something that surely we can all agree on.

I support this bill. This bill is not going to change the world, but it will tidy up some areas of our laws that do need tidying up, and it will go a long way towards making the interactions of certain members of our community with our bureaucracy much easier.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (16:09): I also rise to make a few comments in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Gender Identity and Equity) Bill 2016. I was not necessarily going to speak on this bill, but the member for Reynell convinced me of the merits of making a small contribution. I sort of agree with the majority of speakers who have been addressing the chamber on this bill. There is a lot of merit in the concept that the law should not discriminate and that everyone should be treated equally before the law.

The member for Kaurana, in his contribution, was referring to previous speakers talking about change rooms and the like. I am not sure if the member for Kaurana was at the briefing held recently, but I will put it to the house that there was no sandwich lunch provided which made it a lot more difficult for me to participate in because my blood sugar levels were a bit low. Some of the members

did talk about the slippery slope and what this did mean for those people who, for whatever reason, would seek to exploit loopholes in these amendments and for whatever reason would want to use some of the changes in terminology to be a peeping tom and go into change rooms and claim gender identity as an issue.

To that extent, I think it is an important matter that was raised yesterday by the member for Hammond, and perhaps the member for Schubert, because in a lot of legislation that we do pass there are some unintended consequences, so I think that was a very worthwhile contribution. I think, as we were seeing with some of the other legislation we have debated last week here around parenting presumptions and the like, there is, of course, unintended consequences in much of the legislation that we pass.

As to the bill itself, like I said, I am comfortable with the majority of amendments across the board. Of course, there is possibly, on this side of the house, some members who might have an issue when it comes to gender balance for nominations appointed to boards. I would argue, as most on this side of the house would argue, that gender and how you define yourself, whether it be male, female, intersex or any other terminology, has absolutely nothing to do with your ability to serve on a board.

Indeed, serving on a government board, just like serving this house, should be on merit, and I know that absolutely every single member of this house has got here on merit, notwithstanding quotas on the other side of the house where safe seats have to go to old, white union members—but I digress.

Merit should always be the basis for appointments to boards in that respect. I would love to see discussion around that in terms of merit being one of the most overarching principles that we should have in any of our legislation.

Some members yesterday—and I am sure across the debate and in the committee stage—were also talking about the amendments to the Correctional Services Act 1982 where someone who is subject to that act might use gender as a reason not to be searched, but I am sure common sense will prevail when it comes to the application of that bit of law to ensure that all is undertaken in a practical way.

It is funny how the world has changed over the last 100 years or so. One of my constituents has recently given me a book on Tom Price who was, of course, Labor's first premier in this state. I was just reading the opening of the biography on Tom Price talking about the penal system that was in Liverpool in the 1850s and 1860s. Dare I say that there was no choice for who was giving you the search in the 1860s within the British penal system.

My office has already received a fair amount of correspondence around the issue of the amendments that seek to remove the word 'woman' when it relates to pregnancy. As the Premier indicated, it is an amendment which probably is not required. I think we all know, regardless of how one identifies, that it is ultimately women who are the ones who are involved with childbirth, and as the member for Schubert alluded to yesterday, he certainly would not ever be able to deal with childbirth.

In yesterday's debate, I was disappointed with the personal nature which some members went into. I thought, by and large, it was a very civil and mature debate, but I felt that the member for Colton did get slightly carried away with some of the words that he used with regard to those on this side of the debate. The member for Colton got very liberal in his language. He spoke about the need for liberties and civil rights, and how those on my side of the house quite often talk about economic responsibility and the rights and responsibilities of the individual—and rightly so.

The member for Colton then continued to chastise those members on my side of the house who, on a conscience matter, do not necessarily support all amendments and all parts of this bill. It dawned on me that while those who come from the left—and I think the member for Colton will not take any offence when I say he is a good old-fashioned lefty—talk about individuals having the right to choose, the Labor Party (and especially those in the hard left), never allow the right to choose.

I was reminded about that this week when I popped down to the Adelaide University for O'Week. I was reminded of the member for Kurna, who of course was heavily involved in student

politics back in his day. The Adelaide University Liberal Club, in their O'Week stall, had a wonderful little sticker which I have put on the back of my deputy whip folder, which says 'I Love VSU'. I know the member for Morialta in his heyday was a strong supporter of VSU and the right to choose.

When we debate in this house, it never ceases to amaze me how we cherrypick when we want to be libertarians, we cherrypick when we want to be conservatives, and we cherrypick when the debate suits us.

Mr Picton: That's right, you do cherrypick!

Mr DULUK: I don't cherrypick; I just merely sometimes represent different views of my constituency. I never, ever cherrypick. But, in the member for Colton's contribution yesterday, he was having a go at people on this side of the house who would choose differently—

Mr Gardner: And on his own side.

Mr DULUK: Well, the irony was that the very wise whip of this house, who spoke immediately after the member for Colton, probably did not agree with any of his contribution. The member for Colton had a go at people's right to choose. He did talk about how the law should not discriminate, and I certainly hold and share his views there—but when it comes to union membership, we certainly see that there is no right to choose on that side of the house.

One thing I do like about this piece of legislation is that it is actually removing discrimination in wording and legislation. Many of us in this house enjoy politics, so just before I went to sleep last night I was watching a replay of yesterday's question time in the Senate, looking for some inspiration. There was a very good question from Senator Lindgren, who is the new Indigenous senator for the LNP in Queensland. Senator Lindgren asked a question to minister Cash on the role of inappropriate language used by the CFMEU on worksites. For the sake of this house, I will not use the language that Senator Cash used in the Senate, because—

Mr Gardner: In her quotes!

Mr DULUK: In her quotes—because the President of the Senate ruled that to be unparliamentary; therefore, I assume the Deputy Speaker would also use that language. But, to say the least—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Aren't I one of those 'good old-fashioned lefties' too?

Mr DULUK: I am not prepared to test the ruling of the Deputy Speaker because—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, don't.

Mr DULUK: —you are all wise, Deputy Speaker. This was in relation to evidence tendered to the trade union royal commission. The language used by the CFMEU officials, when it comes to gender-inappropriate language, was absolutely incredible. I do commend those on this side of the house, and I also commend the member for Reynell for introducing this legislation and having the carriage of this legislation. Truly, if the Labor Party was serious about this bill and removing gender discrimination then it would not take a single dollar from the CFMEU, a union that pretty much has a blokey attitude, as the education minister agrees, a very blokey attitude. I saw you nodding your head.

Members interjecting:

Mr DULUK: You do not believe there is a blokey attitude in the CFMEU?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You are speaking to me, member for Davenport.

Mr DULUK: Sorry, Deputy Speaker. The blokey and sexist attitude of the militant wing of the CFMEU, which is one of the largest donors to the Labor Party. So, on the one hand, we have legislation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now we know why you stayed up late.

Mr DULUK: It is a crazy life. On the one hand, we have legislation in this house which is looking to remove gender inequality, gender discrimination, and on the other hand, from the same party that moves this legislation and has this agenda, we have one of the biggest financial donors to

the Labor Party which will never ever change its culture. It is a militant union. Historically, it has not supported workers of other nationalities on the basis that it takes so-called local jobs. If you look at the history of the CFMEU there is no doubt about that, and I think the history of the CFMEU (it started as the BLF)—

Members interjecting:

Mr DULUK: It is the price you get for asking me to speak, I suppose—is coming along—

Members interjecting:

Mr DULUK: I merely bring to the attention of the house the inconsistency within the Labor Party on—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we need to get back to the substance of the debate, which is about gender inequity.

Mr DULUK: I think we are talking about gender inequity.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have been really patient. I do not want a history on other things. Let us get right back to the point.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, for bringing me back to the point. I suppose this bill is about doing what we can do to remove discrimination on the basis of gender in our jurisdiction. It is one thing to bring in legislation, it is another thing to make sure the legislation receives (in public) the endorsement and the intent of that legislation. Perhaps the best thing we can do in supporting this legislation, in removing discrimination from our statutes, is to ensure that in our workplaces we do not have this type of discrimination.

I would definitely call the building site a workplace for many Australians. It would be wonderful to see, at the national conference—because I do watch the Labor Party national conference when it is beamed live on ABC24 on a Saturday—the member for Reynell get up there and champion what she is championing, because I know she is a very passionate—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: —person on this issue, and also highlight some of the limitations of people in her own party. I commend the member for Reynell for bringing this bill to the house. I am going to enjoy the rest of the contributions from other members and I look forward to the committee stage.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:23): Deputy Speaker, I wish to make it clear that although I am sitting on the front bench today I am not the lead for this bill and, therefore, by speaking I am not closing the second reading debate. I do, however, welcome the opportunity to speak on the bill. I have sat through most of the second reading contributions to date, not all, and they have varied enormously. Some have strayed rather remarkably from the topic of the bill. Some have been very on point.

Mr Gardner: That's a reflection on the Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Without wishing to reflect on the Speaker, and I apologise if that was the implication.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it is alright, I will look after myself.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Some have been very heartfelt and very thoughtful. Some have been quite revealing, I think, about the anxieties that people have about language and its power. My view on this bill is that, essentially, there are two rationales for it. On the one hand, it is, essentially, a question of tidying up the language in our legislation. Although I consider myself in many ways a fairly conservative person linguistically and grammatically, language does modernise. We do change the way in which we use it and legislation ought to try to keep pace with that, our official language ought to try to keep pace with that, and we are, by no means, alone in seeking to do that.

In looking up what other languages and cultures are up to I noted that the French have officially removed the word 'mademoiselle' from their documents in order to not require women to signal their marital status in any official documentation. To still a greater degree the Germans are having a bit of a lively debate about whether they should remove the genders that are used in their language—they have three: he, she, it for want of a better term—when they refer to all of the nouns in their language.

I do not think it will happen but it is an interesting debate to occur and it is for a reason, and that is that, as we advance in our understanding of how other people are affected by words, we recognise that over-gendering language, over-emphasising where not necessary, whether something relates to a man or a woman, is not only disrespectful to the gender that is not included but also at times can have perverse outcomes.

On the whole I think that what this bill is trying to do is a straightforward tidy up where the idea of distinguishing between a man and a woman is not necessary and does not contribute anything. We are better off using the word 'person' or 'someone' or whatever the correct grammatical term is for the replacement. But there is another element to this and that is that in some cases the language that is used is used in a way that wounds people or excludes them.

In thinking about that I was contemplating the great event in our household over the last few weeks which is that our first born has started high school. So anyone who knows me knows that that has been a source of great fixation amongst our household leading up to preparing for that and starting. In the first week the English class started reading *Animal Farm*, which I was delighted at, again being fairly conservative in terms of language and grammar and also in literature.

I was delighted that they started there and I urged that, once *Animal Farm* was finished, which it was within the first week because my first born is a quick reader and enjoys reading, the next book be *1984*. I think that both those books have much to say about the power of language, particularly the latter but also the former. What you see in *Animal Farm* is the use of language to categorise and in categorising to ascribe value.

So, the four legs good, the two legs bad which of course ends up being very ironic and which is a way of distinguishing between animals in order to say who is good and who is bad, who has value and who does not. Of course, what is at the heart of the argument about language in *1984* is this question of state intervention (totalitarian intervention in that case), of controlling how and what people think through the use of language.

The reason my mind turned to both those books is that in some instances there is language we are using that does cause harm and hurt to people, and it does absolutely no harm to anyone to alter that language. So to go from saying 'woman' to 'person' we can harm no-one because self-evidently women are people, but for people who are identifying as male and who are therefore excluded when women are spoken of that does cause them harm and distress.

For that reason and despite the use of some levity around some of the proposals that are in this bill, when matters pertain to pregnancy, child carrying and also to termination of pregnancy I can think of no objection to referring to people; and I know that there are individuals to whom clinging to using a gender term causes pain too. Much like the medical profession, I believe in this house and in this parliament we have an obligation first to do no harm and where we see harm to address it.

I would like to note some of the contributions that have made this bill possible, and above all, of course, is the outstanding Professor Williams who has been mentioned by other contributors. Professor Williams has led a review of our legislation in a very thoughtful and considered way. He has more to say, and he has more to say on subjects that will be more contentious than this. I look forward to the institute's further reports and considerations of where discrimination in practice, rather than just in language, still sits within our legislation, but I thank him for the very sensible approach he has taken to this one and I see no cause for mockery in any of the clauses.

I would like to very briefly turn to what I believe some of the people in this chamber have been responding to, which I do not believe is actually in this bill, but it has conjured up a concern for them. It appears to have conjured up a concern that if people become aware of a possibility then they will be drawn to making a choice themselves. It is sort of a contamination by information.

I had the same challenge when people raised concerns recently about the Safe Schools Coalition, where there is a sense in some of the correspondence I have received that if children know that it is possible to be gay, that will somehow in itself cause them to be gay; that if children know that being transgendered is something that can occur, that that knowledge in itself will change their own pathway.

I do not believe that that is true. I believe that information and knowledge respectfully given can only advance us as a tolerant society. What I do know is true is that when you are different, and whatever is conjured up by that word 'different'—for some of us women, we are different because we are in professions that are dominated by men. Occasionally, rarely, fortunately, I am different because I am a Port supporter and not a Crows supporter. I am often different because I am vegetarian by choice. So I have few claims to difference. I live in a world of enormous privilege, but occasionally I have that experience. For some people their experience of difference is far more profound, and the discrimination against them, the labelling of them, is far more serious than any I could experience as a vegetarian or a Port supporter, both of which I am extremely proud of.

Mr Pederick: There is nothing wrong with being a Port supporter.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There is nothing wrong with being either a Port supporter or a vegetarian. But some people are in a category that people are challenged by, that they are fearful of in some ways, largely, I think, through ignorance. For those people, the language that we use and the discriminations that we have are deeply and profoundly hurtful.

So children at school who know from a certain age (usually from an early age) that they are same-sex attracted know that they are entering a world that is not welcoming of that, and they know that every piece of language that is used ignores the fact that that is a possibility, and every piece of language that is used—for example, where 'gay' is used as a term of denigration—is hurtful to them. It is not just a fleeting pain, it is not a fleeting irritation such as I feel when anyone ever criticises the Port Adelaide team; it is profound and it is deep. It can cause depression, self-harm and thoughts of suicide.

For me, anyone who criticises work that is done to address that head on—whether it be in this chamber through legislation, whether it be through tidying up our language, whether it be through pulling down prejudice, whether it be through programs in schools that address bullying based on ignorance—needs to consider carefully the impact of their choices.

As many people in this chamber will know, my brother is proudly, happily, a gay man in a very happy relationship in New South Wales, but it was not always so happy and easy for him. It was, in fact, a very painful experience for him to be at school in the 1980s and 1990s because we did not have those conversations, because we did not tell children that it is not okay to make people feel bad for being different.

This piece of legislation does not do all of that. This piece of legislation is essentially a tidy up, but it is a step towards not continuing to denigrate, to differentiate unnecessarily, to give a lower value to the 'other'—whoever that may be: the transgendered 'person' or 'woman'; a person who is homosexual. I ask people to consider carefully that while we have had some fun in this chamber, and it has been an entertaining debate at times, that passing this bill is a sign of tolerance, understanding, and maturity, so that we are able to see that people, at the end of the day, are people.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:35): I am really glad to have a chance to make a brief contribution to this very important bill. At the start, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Law Reform Institute and Professor Williams. There is some fantastic work being done in here and, while I actually think this is a very simple piece of legislation, in spite of its complexities, there are a few things I want to point out. I will share a brief story with you as told by a friend of mine.

This bill does not affect people unless the people are specifically affected by the legislation, and I think that language change is very important for these people in our society who battle constantly against people who refuse to acknowledge their identity, and how they themselves feel about their identity. It is a sign of a mature society when we can actually have open and frank discussions about things like this and do it in a way that is going to prevent the mistreatment and the bullying that can happen by people who refuse to understand and acknowledge that language.

As was mentioned by people yesterday, I also have many constituents who would identify as conservative and as being opposed to many of the concepts or notions that are within this legislation. But those people, I know, are not going to be negatively impacted by any of the changes within this bill. They will go on with their lives without being scared, or worried, or bullied, or intimidated by other people who perhaps do not take time to understand them.

Those people will just continue with their lives, whereas the people who are deeply affected by this language, such as those who identify as intersex or transgender—people who have for their whole life struggled with this identify—will continue to be affected if we do not put this bill through in its form to change the language that we use when referring to people who identify differently than some of us. I think we do affect them negatively and impact them negatively, so I always judge the work that I am doing here, representing people in my community, by how this affects them, in what way, and whether or not it is a positive thing. That is what I am judging this by, and I do believe it is positive.

Over the last 24 hours, I have heard some ridiculous conversations here and on radio, and they are shameful conversations making fun of the language used in identifying a person versus using 'woman' in a sentence when talking about a woman giving birth. What is the difficulty with changing the wording to a 'person' giving birth? I am a woman; I have had children; I am not bothered by being called a 'person' having children, but if I had some gender identity differences, it would bother me. It would bother me deeply to be called a 'woman'. It would deeply affect me to be called a woman if that is not how I identify. Again, we use that measure of how it affects people.

I think we have to be very careful not to make light of this subject, because it does deeply affect people. I just want to make quick mention of the discussion around Safe Schools that was brought up yesterday and continues today, because I have had conversations at about 10 governing councils in the last two or three weeks about the Safe Schools program with many teachers, with many parents and with many students, because there has been some organised campaign being rolled out where you receive the same email from the same people over and over again.

There is a very small number of people involved in it, but these families at schools and teachers do not know of any of this indoctrination that is being spoken of; they do not know anything about this role-play that is being spoken of. All they know is that, in my electorate, around seven or eight young people are being cared for by their schools in an inclusive way, providing them with appropriate bathroom facilities to use, and the teachers and the families just continue as if it is part of their normal life, because that is what it is: it is actually just part of your normal life.

This is what our society is. This is no different from a young person who is overweight or a person with a disability—another minority group—being harassed and pestered because we tolerate awful language like 'cripple' or 'fatty' or whatever it is you want to use. It is no different. It is about taking those words out of our language and referring to those people appropriately. I want to finish off by sharing with you a story that a very dear friend of mine shared last night and I hope this helps you to understand a little bit where a person comes from. This young man—he is still young; he is younger than me!—is a professional. He is a leader in his profession, and he shared this:

As disgraceful homophobic government MPs apply pressure to axe the Safe Schools LGBTI education program, I've decided to share the shocking realities of what it's like being gay in high school. (Not many people know the extent of the bullying I received when I was a teenager.) So here's the truth: it occurred almost daily. I went to school each morning, terrified about what could happen to me. I was bullied physically, verbally and emotionally. Spat on, punched, screamed at. My school work was smashed and destroyed.

I withdrew from sports classes because the bullying was so severe. (As a result, I never learnt how to swim!) I was forced to withdraw from Maths and Chemistry subjects in VCE because I was tormented so badly; which meant that I couldn't apply for certain University degrees when I graduated. When I went to the teachers for help, I was told they couldn't watch and protect me all the time. I felt completely alone. To protect myself at lunch-times, I even hid in the library and bathrooms! I was depressed, withdrawn, and suicidal. I couldn't imagine continuing my life like this.

Every day was absolutely terrifying. I suffered from nightmares every single night, which occurred so routinely that I even thought this was normal. (I was surprised when I found out that this didn't happen to everyone!) Fortunately the nightmares disappeared almost instantly when I 'came out'. It was a tough time for me growing up gay. Yes, I survived. And I realise this occurred 20 years ago. I'm not asking for sympathy; I've shared my personal story to promote UNDERSTANDING.

Life goes on, but the emotional scars remain. For example, even as an adult, if I seem 'sensitive' at times, it's actually a protective reflex from being attacked all those years ago. (Some things trigger innate fear in me, although I've learned to be less reactive. And I still find it hard to trust people.) So, in summary, I believe that if the 'Safe Schools' program prevents even ONE child from experiencing a daily hell like this, then it is definitely worth it! All kids deserve to feel safe at school. They need to know that they matter, and that life gets better.

I say, do not hide behind the excuse that a small number of people in your community may not agree with this bill, because it is for the greater good, and if it stops one person being hurt, then it is worth every bit of paper it is written on. Thank you for listening and I hope this bill passes through the house speedily.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE PRECINCT LAND DEDICATION BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

Adjournment Debate

MORIALTA CITIZENSHIP AWARDS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:46): On this occasion, I wish to tell the house about the fine young people in my electorate who have received Morialta citizenship awards in the 2015 year. As I do every year, the Morialta citizenship award is offered to every school in the Morialta electorate for a fine young citizen who demonstrates the traits of good citizenship as a role model for their peers and as somebody who demonstrates that sense of service that puts one's peers and one's community and one's global community above one's own self-interest.

As ever, there were a range of excellent nominations put forward in each school, with all of these students who receive the certificate from myself along with \$100 per school, which some of them split up and some of them give to one student in the form of a book voucher. I like to record their achievements in *Hansard* for posterity so that others may look at their achievements and see that role-model behaviour and so that their families and the students themselves can have it recorded for posterity.

In the Athelstone School, the recipient this year was Braxton Conradi, a year 7 student who shows exemplary behaviour and generous support to the school community. Braxton is polite, well mannered and helpful, works hard, gives his best in everything and has good academic performance. He showed good leadership skills in his role as an SRC executive and shows respect towards staff, students and all of his peers at the school.

Basket Range Primary School I was regrettably unable to attend at the end of last year, owing to the fact that the school assembly for graduation was in the same evening as two of my other school assemblies, and it is physically impossible to get to all three. But I am very pleased on this occasion to acknowledge that Marnie Houston was the winner of the Morialta citizenship award at Basket Range Primary School. Marnie was identified as working independently and confidently and being caring and thoughtful to those around her. Marnie has shown great community spirit and has great pride in the school.

Charles Campbell College is broken into three awards: one for the senior school (years 10 to 12), one for the middle school (which they identify as years 7 to 9), and one for the junior school (reception to year 6). This is, of course, a public school in the state system that, given the opportunity, has identified the value of middle schooling, with year 7 being taken in that middle school context. Hopefully, other schools in our public school community will have that opportunity in the future, but Charles Campbell College students are very lucky that they get that opportunity now. Anyway, I digress.

The recipient of the senior award at Charles Campbell College was Jasmin Peach. Jasmin is a friendly, respectful and hardworking student with excellent relationships with staff and students. She is a leader within the college and the wider community. She is a positive role model to all her peers and encourages participation in extracurricular activities around the school. She was the sports

captain for 2015 and was involved in the development of the specialist sports program for both AFL and netball. The Newton Jaguars Netball Club and the Norwood (Redlegs) Football Club have formed this excellent coalition with Charles Campbell College that the students, the club and the community are benefitting from. We thank Jasmin for that work.

The Charles Campbell College Middle School winner was Abigail Guez. Abigail is a bright and friendly student who is always welcoming to new students, participates in a variety of school activities and achieves at a very high standard academically. She exhibits the school values of learning, respect and excellence at all levels, both at school and in the community. I am hopeful that Abigail will potentially be a future recipient of the Morialta Citizenship Award again in her senior years, and she has a couple of years to go.

The recipient at Charles Campbell College for the junior years was Larissa Collins, an all around role model student both academically and socially who has been committed to steering leadership amongst her peers and encouraging others to succeed in their endeavours as well.

At Norton Summit Primary School the award was split this year between two fine students. Norton Summit Primary School is, of course, a school well known to this house, as spouses of two of our members of parliament both work as teachers there, one from either side of the chamber. I know they are both excellent staff members at Norton Summit. We are grateful for their work and I was very pleased to see them on the day. At any rate, I digress again.

The recipients of the Norton Summit Primary School Morialta Citizenship Award for 2015 were Grace Playford and Miranda James. Grace and Miranda worked together over the year in helping a younger child with playing safely, mentoring him in appropriate break time play activities. They also consistently maintained the tidiness of the school's round room and were excellent buddy group leaders. Grace and Miranda were both very deserving winners of the Morialta Citizenship Award for 2015.

Norwood Morialta High School is also split into two awards, one for the senior campus (years 11 and 12) and one for the middle campus (years 8 to 10). The senior campus winner was a fine young woman called Shona Swart. Shona has taken on leadership roles within and outside of the school. She was president of the student representative council in 2015 and a vice sports captain in 2014 and 2015. Since 2014, Shona was a youth group leader at Knightsbridge Baptist Church. As a leader, she shows enthusiasm, displays initiative in proposing ideas and encourages others to get involved.

She is also an academic achiever with a passion for languages and an extensive extracurricular history, often relating to helping others who are less fortunate. She has participated in many fundraising appeals, such as the Red Shield Appeal and for the earthquakes that struck Nepal early in 2015. With a passion for human rights and global issues, she participated in the Young Diplomats Forum, the debating team and attended the Evatt all this year. She was a member of the social justice committee.

The middle school winner was Trent Cannons, a fine young man. Trent continually demonstrates a mature and dedicated approach to his schoolwork. He is very responsible and reliable, who helps other students within the community. He also engaged in a range of extracurricular activities during his years at the school. He is an active member of the SRC, and supports all the events and assemblies. Trent is an active member of the pedal prix group; the computer club, which he has promoted to students; and is a member of the jazz band and the musical. He is very community minded, as evidenced by his extensive involvement in a variety of school and community-based activities, and is a fine winner.

At Paradise Primary School, the winner was Alissa Booth. Alissa is a dedicated and positive senior student who has demonstrated the school values of excellence, responsibility and respect. She has excellent leadership and organisational skills. She was a house captain on sports day, leading SAPSASA sports teams, a monitor for traffic crossing and sandpit equipment in the sports room, and is a class representative on the SRC. Alissa has contributed to student voice, the festival of music and also to community events, Sunday morning barbecues and is an excellent role model for other students.

At Rostrevor College, the winner was Matthew del Corso. He was active in the social justice group for a number of years and is the social justice prefect for 2016. His warm, friendly nature is very much in evidence as he supports students of all ages and backgrounds within the college and the wider community. He completed a placement as a volunteer at St Patrick's Special School in 2015 and was highly commended for his ability to build relationships with staff and students alike. These qualities were also seen in his involvement in the Special Olympics project. Matthew is an extremely hardworking student who frequently supports others and is liked by his peers for his friendly attitude and positive demeanour.

There is a much smaller biography for the winner at St Ignatius College, but it is no less of an achievement. Thomas Pham, a year 7 student at St Ignatius College, identified as being a worthy recipient of the Morialta Citizenship Award for 2015. Thomas raised \$1,300 for the 40 Hour Famine this year and has contributed to the wellbeing initiatives within the college. Thomas Pham is a very worthy winner.

We have two schools left. At Stradbroke School, the award is split amongst three recipients. Karia Spear was a UNICEF ambassador, a monitor in the library, canteen and sports shed, and a traffic monitor. She is a senior executive of the KidsMatter Representative Council and provides leadership on being a positive role model to the younger students. She also organised a range of projects for other students.

The second recipient of the Morialta Citizenship Award at Stradbroke School was Parveena Kaur. She spent countless hours engaged in community and service activities to assist others at Stradbroke. She is an extremely passionate and organised leader who embodies the core values which are promoted at Stradbroke. She is a house captain and canteen monitor and helps assemblies run. She has the extra responsibilities of traffic, sports shed and buddy.

Sevanah Hagidimitriou was the third recipient at Stradbroke. She is an outstanding year 7 student who worked tirelessly for her school community. As a house captain, she committed time to organising a team for sports day, organising activities for the PAL lunch time program and was a guide on open night. Another UNICEF ambassador, Savanna actively volunteered for committees to organise fundraising activities. Enthusiastic, dedicated to community service and friendly to her peers, Savanna has a positive outlook on life.

The last school is Sunrise Christian School's Paradise campus. The recipients were John Paul d'Assumpcao and Tahlia Calabrese. John Paul saw the devastation of Vanuatu on the news and led a stationery drive to collect books and writing equipment for donations to the College dLamap, a school in Port Vila. He appealed to the students in the school, spoke at the school assembly and church, and raised a lot of money. Tahlia Calabrese is somebody who has been a leader for sports day, an education leader, has helped at the Mother's and Father's Day breakfast and helps around the school. I congratulate all of the recipients of the Morialta Citizenship Awards for 2015. May they go on to great things.

REYNELLA ALL ABILITIES IN2CRICKET

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:56): I rise today to speak on a brilliant local story in my community. I have been involved with this group for a little while watching from the sidelines and it has been amazing to see what they have done. I am speaking of the Reynella All Abilities In2Cricket group.

It was my great pleasure earlier on in February to be at Flinders University to see the Special Olympics cricket tournament, and two of the young cricketers from the Reynella All Abilities In2Cricket team were playing in the South Australian side, which was just so great to see.

I would like to congratulate Jimmy Eustance-Smith and Callum Niederer who both represented, as I said, South Australia in the Special Olympics cricket tournament. They played four games over three days and had two great wins and a very narrow loss to the New South Wales/ACT A grade side which meant they ended up third overall.

Earlier in the tournament, both of the lads took two wickets and made some runs in the game against Queensland. Jimmy, in particular, took two important catches as well which was absolutely outstanding. Both of them played important roles in the opening ceremony as well, with Callum

carrying the Olympic flame and lighting the torch which was great to see. Well done to the lads on that front as well.

I would also like to commend a couple of people who have helped organise this from the get-go. What they have done and what they have achieved in their community in raising the profile of this All Abilities In2Cricket group and engaging with people who were looking for this special nuanced cricket program has been outstanding. The people I speak of are Jenni and Ned Niederer. They have done a marvellous job. In fact, on New Year's Eve they were recognised as SA Community Cricket Regional Volunteer Award winners at Adelaide Oval, and they had a wonderful night there. The SACA sent them a letter congratulating them, as I said, for all the great work they have done in developing this program so a big congratulations to them for what they did.

I did mention that when this first started out, when Ned and Jenni were getting this organised, I went along and gave them a little bit of a hand. I probably got in the way, to be honest, but I just joined in the fun with what they were doing with these young kids. The program is designed to bring people of all abilities into playing the great game of cricket, getting them engaged and getting them to love what goes on with cricket. Ned and Jenni did a marvellous job in establishing this group and getting people interested and involved. They have gone on to have such great success that two of the cricketers, as I have said, have gone on to play and represent South Australia at the tournament at Flinders University. It was sensational to be there.

It is a very fun and rewarding program that they put on, and I know that coming up they have a centre wicket game on 29 February, the Monday night there. That is a parents' match as well, so that is going to be plenty of fun.

Coincidentally, I was also at the Rotary Club just the other day and was chatting with Kevin Donaldson, who is heavily involved in the Edwardstown Rotary Club. Kevin pointed me in the direction of Dream Cricket, which is another quite similar program. It is supported by the Bradman Foundation, and has the Hon. John Howard as a patron.

Again, this is another group that is doing some marvellous work in a similar area for children with disabilities, getting them to play cricket and building confidence and self-esteem through movement and participation. This is another group that is doing an absolutely outstanding job, primarily on the eastern seaboard, and I think Kevin is keen to get it moving in South Australia as well. So, there might be an ideal dovetail between All Abilities In2Cricket and the Dream Cricket program.

It is great to see sport as a wonderful enabler in our community. I must really commend Kevin for his initiation and pickup of the Dream Cricket program and his push for that and, as I mentioned, Ned and Jenni for the great work they have done in Reynella around this program. The Reynella Cricket Club is a wonderful cricket club. David Green is heavily involved there, along with Matthew Hehner. They have a great junior program—under 11s, 13s, 15s and 17s. They have had wonderful success this year, and all their senior grades are also very strong. So, we wish them well heading into the finals.

I look forward to a long and continued association with the Reynella Cricket Club and all the sporting clubs down at Club Reynella. They do a marvellous job in my community. To all the volunteers involved, I thank them very much for their support.

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:01): I rise today to talk about a topic that weighs very heavily on the hearts of everybody in the Upper Spencer Gulf. I speak as both shadow minister for mineral resources and energy and also as the member for Stuart, being primarily Port Augusta-based. This issue is the challenges facing Arrium/OneSteel at the moment.

They are in a very, very difficult situation, and they are, as an entire corporate body from the ground all the way up, trying to do everything they possibly can to address the challenges that they face. We have already lost nearly 2,000 jobs in the Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback. Between jobs gone from BHP, Santos, Alinta, Arrium and several other companies, we have already lost nearly 2,000 onsite jobs. Compared to the 1,600 jobs that will go from Holden in 2017, it really does put things into perspective. There is the very real threat of losing thousands more from Arrium.

Let me just say, we in the Upper Spencer Gulf have a very healthy competition between the three primary cities, but we are also a very tight family and we stick together as well. We all understand that our futures in the Upper Spencer Gulf, between Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla, are intimately linked. We will succeed together or we will fail together, and we know that we need every one of the major industries in the Upper Spencer Gulf to thrive for all of us to succeed.

As a Port Augusta-based member of parliament, I take the challenges in Whyalla very seriously, as I know the other members of parliament do. In Whyalla we have Arrium, in Port Augusta we have Alinta, and in Port Pirie we have Nyrstar. Alinta has made it very clear that they plan to leave. Nyrstar has had its challenges, and at the moment is certainly working very well through those challenges. It is important to say that another very significant employer in the Upper Spencer Gulf is the Port Augusta Prison. When Alinta leaves, the Port Augusta Prison will become, by a long way, the largest employer in Port Augusta.

We value all of the industrial employers in our region, and we value incredibly highly the opportunities that their employment provides for other businesses in the district, to again provide more employment. We are very much all in this together. Let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, it does not go without noticing that we have a Liberal member of parliament, in myself; a Labor member of parliament, in the member for Giles; and an Independent member for parliament in the member for Frome.

We clearly would have a wide range of opinions on many issues, but on this area we are united. On this area we work very strongly, very actively and very cooperatively together and we do that in concert with the three mayors of the Upper Spencer Gulf cities and with the member for Grey, the federal member, Rowan Ramsey. We see the challenges that are facing all three of the Upper Spencer Gulf cities as challenges that we need to work together on so that they can be met. It could be nothing further than each of us only sticking up for our own cities and our own areas and not worrying about the others, but nothing further from the truth exists because we know that we need to work together.

I call very earnestly and very genuinely on the state Labor government and the federal Liberal government to apply everything they possibly can, every piece of strategy, every piece of financial resource they can spare, every piece of energy they have at their disposal at the moment, to support Arrium/OneSteel in Whyalla to overcome the difficulties they have. I have been to the mine, I have been to the steelworks, I have met with Arrium senior management, I have met with Arrium workers in both places, I have met with Arrium senior management here at Parliament House on several occasions. They deserve all the support we can give them from whatever quarter of government is possible.

There are nearly 3,000 people still working with Arrium/OneSteel in Whyalla. Arrium/OneSteel combined represent about a third of the employment in Whyalla, so this is a very serious challenge which all of us, from the ground up, all the way through to the Prime Minister and the Premier, need to address in unity so that we can overcome these challenges. Thank you.

At 17:07 the house adjourned until Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 11:00.