

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 10 March 2016

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (10:31): By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:33): Having noted that this issue is now being dealt with in government business, I withdraw my Private Members Business, Bills, Notice of Motion No. 2.

The **SPEAKER:** It stands withdrawn.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD MARRIAGE) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Children's Protection Act 1993 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to introduce a private member's bill to amend the Children's Protection Act of 1993 to enable a court to make orders to protect a child on reasonable grounds if it suspects that a child or children are to be removed from the state to be coerced into a child's marriage. Provisions would include: preventing a party or parties from taking the child from the state, that the child's passport be held and, if appropriate, examination or interview be undertaken of the child.

The current act—the Children's Protection Act of 1993 (South Australia)—already covers the issue of female genital mutilation at section 26B. Amendments will also be required to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act of 1935, which deals with the penalties for the offence, being imprisonment of 15 years, or 19 years for an aggravated offence—defined as a child under the age of 14, which is consistent with the child pornography aggravated offence. The Youth Court has jurisdiction under the Youth Court Act of 1993 (SA) to hear issues relating to the Children's Protection Act and deals with such applications.

Plan International Australia reported a figure in 2014 that there were 250 cases of children being forced into marriage over a two-year period in Australia. It is prohibited under article 16(2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. The issue comes into prominence periodically, as with the case of Rania Farrah in New South Wales. She was told by her parents that they were going on a trip to Egypt. Upon leaving Australia, she was held captive in the Middle East. Her passport was confiscated and she was told she would be living with the family of her proposed husband, a man more than 15 years her senior. Her new family controlled her whole life.

For some young girls, even being in Australia does not provide adequate protection, so in 2013 the federal government passed legislation making the coercing of someone into marriage a serious crime, punishable by up to seven years in prison. There are a number of examples, as in June 2010 a 17-year-old girl saved herself from a forced marriage in Lebanon by calling the Australian Federal Police. The Federal Magistrates Court issued an order restraining the family from taking her out of the country.

I would also refer to a recent phone call to my electorate office from a neighbour of a 16-year-old girl who came to her for help, claiming that her mother wants to send her overseas for marriage. There is no doubt that this is highly distressing, and there could be serious ramifications for this young girl's safety and wellbeing if it were to be carried out, highlighting the importance of this bill.

Prior to this situation, I had also been notified of a young girl attending a school in my electorate whose parents were wanting to send her to Western Australia to a distant and much older male relative to be home schooled. This also rang alarm bells for me and I believe such a bill will draw the community's attention to the fact that children in our state are being placed in danger of being sexually abused either in or out of marriage right now in our community.

I have consulted with the following organisations: Anti-Slavery Australia, Plan International Australia, the Australian Lawyers Alliance, Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, the Law Society of South Australia, the South Australian Bar Association and Civil Liberties Australia. They are all in support of this bill and we made amendments where they put forward suggestions. I call on members of this house to support this private member's bill and to be involved in informing the community of the danger of forced child marriage in Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

NATIVE VEGETATION (ROAD SAFETY AND ROADSIDE FUEL REDUCTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991.

Second Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Members in this place will be familiar with my very strong stance on bushfire prevention and the need to undertake fuel reduction not only on people's properties but also along road verges. This bill is very similar to the two I have introduced in this place previously. It is a common-sense piece of legislation. I am very pleased that, since the last, very similar bill was defeated by one vote in this place, I have had an opportunity to talk to other members in this place, members of councils and mayors of local government around South Australia.

Like a lot of issues we see in this place, it takes a while for people to realise that this is a common-sense proposal. People's lives will be saved by this. As I have said with previous bills, I look forward to the opportunity to give evidence to a Coroner's inquiry into the aftermaths of bushfires. We all pass our sympathy on to the families of the two people who lost their lives in the recent Pinery bushfire.

I will say that the Pinery bushfire was a unique fire. It was really a five-hour fire with a fire danger index of over 200. That fire would not have been stopped by my bill, but let me tell you that fires like Sampson Flat and, unfortunately, the inevitable bushfires that will occur in our Hills will be, if not stopped, reduced, and escape paths will be made available to people on properties.

It bothers me that people still are leaving too late, and not taking the advice of the CFS, but those roadways and road verges need to be cleared in a reasonable fashion. People are not going to napalm the road verges. They are not going to get the D9 out and bare earth the road verges. This

is reasonable clearing of the road verges—not only for road safety, but my main aim is for fuel reduction.

I just hope that members in this place look at this again and understand where we are coming from. There are some CFS members who have said, 'We don't really want this to happen. We don't want owners to do this.' I first signed on with the CFS 30 years ago next week, in fact. I am a life member of the CFS, and I have been a captain of a very busy brigade where we used burning off to train new recruits and to reinforce training.

There are some members of the CFS who say, 'We don't really want property owners to do this.' Let me tell you, I happen to disagree very strongly with them because, now, CFS brigades are unable to use this to the extent they used to. They are not able to clear the road verges or to reduce the fuel loads, and they are not able to use this as a training tool.

I very strongly support the fact that South Australians can be trusted not only on this bill but other bills we are going to be debating today. I actually think that South Australians are very sensible people and that they should be given the choice of clearing up the road verges because they may need an escape route, or just to reduce the weeds and hazards that are along their road verges.

I can give a local example of our family farm down at Meadows. Mallawa Road is a dirt road. The Mount Barker council come in and try to clear up the verges, but it is impossible because there are fallen branches and there are trees. There is phalaris 1½ metres high. The fuel height is normally about one-third of the flame height, so you have got flames over four metres high coming from that phalaris, and the radiant heat from that is seriously intense. People get killed trying to escape down those sorts of roads.

It has happened time and time again. We need to stop it. We need to give people the opportunity to undertake reasonable clearing of the verges. I hope members in this place speak in support of this. I hope the government sees the reason behind this, particularly after the fires that we have had in recent months at Pinery and Sampson Flat. There is nothing more certain that it will happen again. I do not want to see never mind property lost because the fuel load has been so intense; I do not want to see lives lost.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

DISABILITY SERVICES (INCLUSION AND MONITORING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Disability Services Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As the shadow minister for disabilities, I take great pleasure in representing that sector, a sector which for many years has been unable to achieve the full wants and desires of the people they represent. The state government have gone some way in advancing the wants and the needs of people with disabilities. There is a state Disability Access and Inclusion Plan 2014-18 and also there is the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan toolkit which has been put out by the government. That is a good thing and nobody can doubt that.

We have had other legislation go through this place in support of people with disabilities in the justice system and in access to many areas. We have obviously got the federal legislation, the Disability Discrimination Act, and COAG agreements that are assisting people with disabilities that were signed by the premier Mike Rann back in 2004 when it was a national agreement.

I will say that, in many ways, my legislation is a mirror of the New South Wales' legislation which was passed in 2014. The New South Wales government have not found it difficult to implement this legislation and certainly the local government in New South Wales have not found it difficult to implement this sort of legislation.

What my bill calls for is not just a disability action plan in a brochure going out to the government departments. This actually puts into legislation the action that is needed to be taken by state and local government and other authorities.

My bill continues to then give the Ombudsman the power to investigate some of the issues associated with people living in supported accommodation because what is happening in Australia—and I know there is some argy-bargy about the funding at the moment—is we are going through a massive transition in our attitude towards funding and supporting people with disabilities. The National Disability Insurance Scheme has raised expectation higher, as high as the sky, but unfortunately the funding is nowhere near available at that level. We have to make sure that we have raised those aspirations and put our mouths out there and the words out there, but now we have to put the money out there.

This legislation starts this some way on a state basis. It is good state legislation and I hope that when the government looks and reads this legislation they will actually put aside government time to pass this legislation through this place, because it is needed to be done now because we are entering into a transition stage with the NDIS coming in in South Australia on 1 July 2018 when 33,000 South Australians, on current estimates, will be coming into the NDIS. They will need to know what services and what opportunities are available to them.

This bill introduces a disability inclusion plan that has to be prepared by the state. The minister must prepare a state disability inclusion plan and that plan sets out the whole-of-government goals that support inclusion in the community of people with disabilities and improves access to services and facilities for people with disabilities. The plan continues to be under review every four years and a report is tabled in this place. The plan is enshrined in legislation, in as much as, it has to be done, it has to be reviewed and it has to be improved.

My bill continues on to have disability inclusion action plans being prepared by local government and other authorities. The New South Wales Local Government Association have said this was not a problem for them because they were doing a lot of that. So far, I have anecdotal evidence from people in local government whom I have spoken to. We have contacted the Local Government Association for consultation feedback on this and I am willing to amend it if there are problems I have not foreseen.

Local government in New South Wales has been able to put in place disability inclusion action plans and I think local government here will be able to do that, because many of them are doing it, anyway. They have got a lot of it in place. This just puts it into legislation and gives them a clearer view of what they actually should be doing.

It is things such as providing access to buildings, events and facilities, providing access to information, providing information about accommodation and accommodating the specific needs of people with disabilities. It is not an onerous task, by any means, but we owe it to people with disabilities, particularly now that we are giving them the opportunity through the NDIS to go out and make their own choices about the services they choose and the lives they want to lead. Let us not get in their way now that we have given them this big opportunity. Let us take the 'dis' out of 'disability'. Let us give them the ability to choose and get on with their lives.

This is good legislation. I know the new minister and I have a very good working relationship and I hope to work with her in a bipartisan way. I stood on the stage at the Novita Christmas party a couple of years ago with the Premier and I said, 'If you can't be bipartisan about disabilities, what can you be bipartisan about?' This is one area in which I hope we can work together. Just because I have come up with this legislation—I have not: I have just produced a South Australian version of the New South Wales legislation, which is good legislation, to assist people with disabilities and the state and local governments in moving forward.

This is good legislation and I hope the government does consider putting aside some of government business time to debate this legislation. I do not think it will take a lot of debating, quite honestly, because it is good common-sense. There are good resources on the net and people can contact my office. The Disability Access and Inclusion Plan 2014 to 2018 is the South Australian version. There is the Disability Inclusion Plan, which is the New South Wales version, and the New South Wales Disability Inclusion Action Planning Guidelines. They are good documents to read.

Read the bill. It is not one of these bills where you need to go to the Acts Interpretation Act to see what means what. This is about giving people with disabilities a real opportunity. I look forward to the support of not only this side of the house but the whole of the parliament. It is a good thing that we are doing here today.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. P. Caica.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February 2016.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:52): I am so pleased to be able to stand in this place and debate this legislation yet again. This piece of legislation is down to a number of people in this place over the years. The late Dr Bob Such, obviously, was one of the stalwarts pushing and championing this issue and now we have the Labor champion on the other side, the member for Ashford.

The member for Ashford is a good friend of mine. I do not have many friends in this place. I hope she does not mind my saying that. She is a good friend of mine. I think she is an honest, decent person who stands by her values and represents not only the people of South Australia but also the people of Ashford to the best of her ability. We still want to replace her, obviously, with a Liberal member, and I will not hand out how-to-vote cards for her, but, in the meantime, she is as good as you are going to get. The member for Ashford deserves full credit for having done all the hard yards and taken all the flak on this and I am more than happy to act as a human shield, in some part, if she requires it. I am more than happy to do that.

This is legislation that needs to be passed in South Australia and it needs to be debated in this place, and that is the whole point of my speech today. It needs to be debated in this place. I ask everybody in this place: are you like me? I was elected 14 years ago, on 9 February 2002, as the member for Morphett. Why was that? It was because I doorknocked over 16,300 homes and got to know what my constituents wanted. I speak to my constituents as often as I can. I have got a petition out at the moment about the closure of the Glenelg Police Station—five days a week, what a ridiculous thing! I keep in touch with my electorate. I am not their delegate. My views are not their views. I am their representative. I am here to represent their views as each and every one of you in this place are here to represent the views of your constituents.

If you do not have the courage of your convictions, having put your hand up as a member of parliament to stand up for what your constituents want and you want to hide behind some furphies that I am going to hear and that I have heard so many times before about why we should not proceed down this path, well, bring it on. That is all I can say. But have the courage to do what over 80 per cent of South Australians want. They want the choice. They want to have this legislation put through so they can have the choice.

This place gets called 'coward's castle' far too much, but do not be cowardly now members of this place. Stand up for your constituents. This is not your opinion, this is their opinion that you have to represent. Let me tell you, if you have problems with this legislation take it to committee. I dare you. Take it to committee. Let the member for Ashford and let me do what we can to answer all of your questions so that you can then do what your constituents want you to do: represent them in this place and pass this legislation.

'The slippery slope' and all the furphies we are going to hear. We hear them all the time. I am so fed up with them because they are just distractions and diversions and delays. That is all they are. Do not be a coward. Do not hide behind the fact of, 'I'm a member and this is a conscience vote. It is my conscience.' No, it is not your conscience: it is the collective conscience of your constituents.

Represent your constituents in this place, and if you do not do that, well, be it on your head. But today you make that decision, you cross that line in the sand today, 'Am I going to hide behind the furphies out there? Am I going to stay quiet? I'm not going to put anything on the record in here in case somebody finds out what I'm actually saying or what my opinions are.' Put it on the record. Debate every clause, every line.

We spent how many hours in the last two days in this place debating gender equity. Did 'he' mean 'she'? Is a 'woman' a 'person'? How many hours did we spend on that, and there were some very cogent arguments put in this place over that issue. This issue is one that needs to be debated. I hope that people in this place have the courage to look at this piece of legislation, look at what it means, look at what it is going to do.

It is not compulsory, it is about people making the choice. So, please, do not be afraid. Look, I can tell you, you will get a lot more votes out of this than the few you might lose because of the people out there with views who are against this. You will. I tell members in this place, 'Go and talk to your constituents.' You will get lobbied by those who are strongly in favour and strongly against, but as we know, marginal seat campaigns are all about winning government.

There is this massive block of voters in your electorate. Most of them are quiet but they want that choice. We live in a democracy. It may not be the best system in the world, so people say, but it is our system and we have got to make it work. But I remind you and I will continue to remind you every time you stand up in this place that this is not your conscience: this is the collective conscience of your constituents. Your views do not have to be their views, but you have to represent their views.

This legislation is straightforward. There is no convoluted understanding. As I said, you do not need to go and get the Acts Interpretation Act to understand this piece of legislation. If you have any doubts—and I am starting to repeat myself a bit here—take it to committee. Have the courage to take it to committee and let us have the debate in this place about it. If it takes all year to debate it in committee I do not mind as long as we get it debated so that we—and when I say 'we', the member for Ashford and I and others in this place who are supporters of this legislation—can show those of you who are not supporting it why you are wrong, because let me tell you, over 80 per cent of South Australians think you are quite wrong.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (10:59): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I rise to talk on this motion as well. It is one that I have struggled with, I have to be honest, on many sides of the argument. I can see both sides and the points that they raise, and it brings into question where people stand with moral, religious, philosophical, legal and human rights issues all bundled into one, so it is not an easy topic.

I concur with the member for Morphett's point that many times in here we spend an inordinate amount of time discussing legislation which I think is of a lower priority, but that is, again, my opinion, and it is on some of these tougher issues that we really need to stand here and debate in a respectful way. Very good friends of mine have come to see me and lobbied for their point of view to be put forward, and I have many constituents in my electorate who lobby the other way.

I guess a main concern is the slippery slope argument as well as the vulnerable persons argument, and as soon as you start that process, will that lead to an expanding of the application of voluntary euthanasia? I have set about doing a fair bit of research on this issue, or as much as I can. I have spoken to both sides and I am sure like many other members in this place their pigeonhole is filled with information on both sides of the equation.

I guess I have resolved in my own mind many of the issues in terms of the slippery slope scenario, and evidence does not bear out that that has occurred in other countries. To be fully honest with the house, the issue that I still have not properly resolved with myself is around the definition of 'unbearable and hopeless', and not applying to a terminal illness. I would feel perhaps a little more comfortable in an initial phase if a terminal illness was part of the criteria, but I also understand many of the arguments against that.

In terms of the Voluntary Euthanasia Bill, the main criterion that I want to have on the record is, of course, that you do need a medical condition. I do not want to see a situation where somebody who is simply—or not simply, because it is a very complex issue—severely depressed with the loss of a loved one, particularly in a later stage of life, being a main determinant in enacting a voluntary euthanasia clause or action.

The person obviously needs to decide that their suffering is unbearable but that it takes two separate and independent doctors to confirm that there is no further treatment for the person's situation and that it is in fact hopeless in their opinion. I am also very conscious of the need for no financial allocation or coercion from medical practitioners, and this bill alleviates my mind of some of that; that there cannot be any monetary allocation to either of the two doctors who prescribe that situation as hopeless.

I am, I guess, a little relieved to see that this bill does have the need for an independent witness in there and, if in doubt, the need for a psychiatrist if one of the doctors suspects coercion or the person is not of sound mind.

Of course, there are the other aspects of the bill: there needs to be oral and written application; the need to wait 48 hours; a report to the Coroner; and the relationship between the doctor and the patient is the key safeguard in this bill.

If there is no underlying medical condition—and I want to make sure that this is on the record—for which there are no further treatments, the person is not eligible for assisted dying or assisted euthanasia. It will allow the doctor and the patient to legally discuss end-of-life choices, including facilities for improved palliative care.

Going back to the two concerns I had, which was the slippery-slope argument and the fact that there are 12 jurisdictions around the world where voluntary euthanasia or physician-assisted dying is legal, 170 million adults have access to that. In the United States of America, one in seven adults have access to it. There is no evidence from the research I have done and had provided to me that has increased the scope for voluntary euthanasia.

I believe there are safeguards put into this bill. I reiterate my concern about the condition being terminal: it is one thing that I have not quite reconciled with, although I have been speaking to opponents of that. With that, I conclude my comments.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:07): Today marks a very important day, and I do want to acknowledge in the gallery the former President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Anne Levy, and a large contingent of visitors from the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society.

As with many members, this is an issue that has caused a great deal of thought for a lot of people. My earliest thoughts of euthanasia were brought about by my first meeting with Mary Gallnor, a wonderful champion of all sorts of things, and well known to many of you on the other side, of course. She was quite a dynamo when I ran into her in my then employment in a federal Labor member's office.

In her normal and methodical, logical way, Mary led me through the steps and the arguments around voluntary euthanasia. Of course, it was something that as a kindy mum I had not given much thought to, I must admit, but it did make me think. Having reconciled in my mind that Mary seemed like a fairly logical, sensible sort of woman, I took on board everything that she said to me. I have spent many years since, more years than I can remember—and I am trying to think how long ago it was I met Mary, and it must have been in 1989, I would think—but since then, I have had a lot to do with debate and discussion on both sides of the argument, and at the outset it must be said that we respect everyone's opinion in this debate; there is absolutely no question about that.

The important thing to consider I feel, though, is the person's right to choose. In the discussions that have ensued about all sorts of things to do with voluntary euthanasia, palliative care is an issue that comes up quite a lot, and I think these two are both necessary in end-of-life decisions. At this point, the thing that we must consider is the right of everyone to choose how they wish to be treated with their health care. This is why it has led me to the conclusion that voluntary euthanasia is part of a suite of treatments that must be available to people, and that they have a right to discuss every step of their treatment with their doctors and families, and that their rights to choose and make a decision themselves must be respected.

At the outset of the debate here in the house on euthanasia, we have always had a plethora of bills—I think it has been quite a smorgasbord in fact—and it has been very hard to work through each individual bill. I have had trouble reconciling why we could not always have just one bill. This is something I am sure a lot of members have been faced with and have shared. At the outset of the

bills, of course, the member for Ashford, who is someone we all deeply respect in this place, has worked tirelessly to make sure the bill has addressed the concerns as best she can of everyone involved in the debate.

I am not sure which bill it was, but I remember saying to her at one stage that we did need a cooling-off period. I am not sure that was actually in the initial bills that were brought up. As I said to one of my constituents who had come to see me about it, you have a three-day cooling-off period to buy a house or even a set of saucepans; why is it that we can't have a cooling-off period for a decision that is going to be so vital for someone? Many people said to me, 'Any delay once you have made that decision is cruel and unnecessary.' However, I felt that it would be a safeguard that perhaps everyone could tolerate in the process if we felt more comfortable in what was about to be taking place.

The other really important issue for everybody was of course that Aunt Dora was not done away with for her property or money, and this is something that is clearly of great concern to everybody. I do not know what you can do to stop people being dreadful, but I would hope that Aunt Dora would not be alone in the whole world and that the doctors who are now going to be required to stand behind their decisions and their authorities will be answerable to that sort of problem in the process.

If we consider the fact that we are doing everything we possibly can to protect someone from being coerced into this decision, we have provided as many safeguards as possible, and we have provided a cooling-off period for this as well, to me, it becomes a matter of choice for someone to have the right to make a decision for themselves. That being said, we have all the information on every possible aspect from both sides of the argument. It would be fair to say we have spoken and corresponded with people from all sides of the argument since this started, and this has to be for the entire 18 years of my time in this place.

I have always found, when it has been possible to speak to someone face to face, even though they may not agree with the position I have come to, they respect the fact that this is the position that is, overall, what I have had come into my office. There is no way you can put aside the views of the people who want passionately the right to choose, nor do I wish to disregard the views of the people who want to have the right to say no. They have the right to say no for themselves. I do not feel, however, I can give them the right to say that for everybody else.

With the immense amount of work that the member for Ashford has put in, we know all the precursors to getting to the point where voluntary euthanasia is considered. I also believe that, in most countries where this is available, very few people choose this as the option. The mere fact that they know they have this as the option is enough for them. I do not wish to speak out of place here, but we all know that the Hon. Bob Such was a passionate crusader for voluntary euthanasia. In his own battle with ill-health, voluntary euthanasia did not come up, as far as I know. It was not a choice he wished to make, but he always wanted to make sure that choice was there for others. That, to me, is one of the strongest points I have to deal with when I think about it.

We understand there are 12 jurisdictions around the world where voluntary euthanasia (or physician-assisted dying) is legal; 170 million adults have access to this, and one in seven adults in the USA. Not that we necessarily want to use the USA as the example, considering what might be happening there shortly, but it is a large country with a large number of people who very passionately guard their right to choose, or bear arms, as the case may be. We have extensive reporting in each of these jurisdictions, going back 20 years. You would think in 20 years we would have discovered a problem if there was going to be a problem, but I am not sure I have heard a voice raised at all about there being problems in those countries.

We know that people who hold passionate views about the right not to have euthanasia available cite objections to change to the law. Of course, we understand Aunt Dora, whom we mentioned a bit earlier. I do not have an Aunt Dora; I am just using that as an example. I hope no-one in the gallery has the name 'Dora' today, and is feeling a bit threatened.

We have no evidence that this bill has been used in any way to coerce elderly or disabled people into making this request and that is because we know we have the two independent doctors who are responsible at all times for putting their names to this sort of procedure for their patients.

There is also a great deal of concern about babies being killed. We have no evidence of that either and, as you know, you must be over 18 to request this procedure.

The doctor-patient relationship, which is sacrosanct in all of this, is what we have to look at. Palliative care, as I have mentioned, is not going to be discarded, downgraded or put aside: it is still available to people. There will always be people doing great research and making great leaps in procedures for palliative care, and I am sure that will continue.

We have all watched several loved ones pass away. We want palliative care to be much better and we want death to be an experience that people do not fear as much as they do, where death can be peaceful. In terms of the culture of death developing in countries or states, we cannot uphold that objection either. Oregon is much like South Australia and there was a popular vote to achieve and retain the legislation. Then they sought a vote of their parliament or their elected representatives to vote for the people themselves.

In summing up my contribution today, I hope that everyone can respect each person's decision around not only this vote but also their end-of-life choices, support their loved ones in whatever they may decide to do and make sure that, whenever their death comes to them, death itself is a peaceful process.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. P. Caica.

ROAD TRAFFIC (WORK AREA SPEED LIMIT SIGNS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 February 2016.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:17): I rise to make a contribution to the Road Traffic (Work Area Speed Limit Signs) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill addresses a quite common issue in my electorate, particularly on highways, whether they be federal highways or state highways, and on council-responsible roads. It seems to be an issue that I am quite often confronted with particularly at night, and I know that the issue is specific to 25-kilometre road signs. We are not talking about 40 or 50 or 60 or any of the other speed restrictions.

A number of times, I have been confronted with 'Roadwork ahead' and the signs normally progress from 110 to 80 and eventually down to 25. Too often, I see that, particularly where there are roadworks on the highways, the signs are still up. It is normally quite easy to see and quite easy to deal with in daylight hours but at night time, when it is hard to see, or when we have rain, that is another conflicting issue. And this is not just about roadworks.

Many roads have regular vegetation trimming or vegetation clearance on the sides of the road, so of course we do need to be mindful that those machines are operating. We also need to be mindful if there is equipment on the sides of the road spraying weeds and the like. There might also be graders, particularly with unsealed roads, or graders that are grading the rubble back into areas on the side of the road next to the shoulder. Way too often, signs are left up in such circumstances.

Currently, under the Road Traffic Act, there is no compulsion to remove the 25 km/h signs when workmen have left the roadwork site, for example overnight or over the weekend. I note that the bill enforces the removal of the 25 km/h signs when workmen have left the site, and enables fines to be issued if this is not done. The bill would allow 25 km/h signs to be left up if workers had been off site for five hours or less, or if there is an unusually high level of hazard for road users due to ongoing roadworks or machinery that is working on the road or on the verges of the road, and the minister consents to signs being left up.

There does need to be a clear distinction between 25 km/h signs for the safety of people conducting work on the roads and reduced speed limit signs for potential hazards on the road following and during road works. A number of people have raised concerns with me. Normally, when I am out and about somewhere, people would say, 'This is just ridiculous. I have had to slow down for 500 metres, up to a kilometre in some cases, and no-one is there. The signs are up but no-one

is there.' It might be something that is forgotten or it is a mistake. If this bill is enforced, it would make sure that people are well aware that the signs must come down.

I want to touch on a couple of local issues where this issue has been raised. In one of my local newspapers recently there was a text to the editor. The person was quite upset, and I quote:

I understand you need to be safe when there are roadworks, but driving for over 600 metres with nothing happening at 25 km p/h between Loxton and Berri? No wonder people get impatient

It is not just the impatience; it is about the message that it sends. People say, 'Look, there are no roadworks. I will just continue along at the speed I was,' and all of a sudden they are confronted with roadworks or machinery. I know there are currently significant roadworks going on between Truro and Blanchetown on the Sturt Highway, and those road signs are left up day and night. I can see that there is a need for the signs to be left up where there is a severe hazard because there is between a two and three-foot drop. The bitumen has been cut with equipment so that they can put in a passing lane. That is a place where we can understand that there needs to be an exemption.

I know that in 2013 the Berri Barmera Council was actually forced to flag speeding motorists down as they drove through roadworks in Crawford Terrace, and then considered closing the road as motorists were not obeying the 25 km/h speed limit. There really are mixed messages going out. There needs to be a clear definition: if there are no roadworks occurring within a 25 km/h zone it is safe to continue and perhaps even at an increased speed through that zone. If the signs are going to be put to 60 km/h, which is cautionary, then so be it.

To slow cars down to 25 km/h, particularly at night, particularly when it is raining, does create a hazard. There was a death on the Sturt Highway about 12 months or so ago. It appears that a vehicle slowed down for what was potential roadworks at night. The truck did not see that vehicle slow down, so they ran the car over and killed the people inside the car.

Again, I think common sense should prevail. I think that we need to maintain safety on our roads, but we also need to maintain common sense. I think common sense is something that I use on a regular basis. I do a lot of kilometres on all of my roads, particularly backwards and forwards from Adelaide up to one of the best electorates in South Australia of Chaffey, but we also want to keep it a safe electorate.

To keep it safe, I think we need to have a consistent message. Having road signs left up overnight when there is no-one there, for no reason, is sending a confusing message, and people will start to question whether they need to slow down or whether it is just another one of those 'bloody signs' that have been left up and not taken down while works have been underway.

Without going on about it further, I think this is about sending a clear message. It is about making sure that the 25 km/h signs are not left up through either laziness or forgetfulness. If there is a clear message to the contractors and to the department doing those roadworks that they cannot leave the signs up, then those operators know that, when there are no roadworks and there is no risk to safety, the signs need to be removed.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (11:26): I rise to speak against this bill for a number of good reasons. Firstly, I think this is an issue which has received quite a bit of attention over the last six to nine months. Particularly from the government's side of things, we have been proactive in identifying this as a problem that needs to be addressed, and that problem is the disruption and congestion of traffic for people, for motorists, for commuters but also for those people who derive an income from the use of the road network—the freight industry—when it comes to roadworks which are not being properly attended to.

It requires a response which is not a small, targeted, one might say, minuscule response, which is what the member for Unley's bill does. It requires a response which is a comprehensive approach to making sure that all people who are involved in conducting roadworks have a far more stringent and robust regime by which they have to abide. Merely limiting the use of 25 km/h speed signs does little to address the full suite of issues that need to be tackled in making sure that roadworks are not imposing the sort of social and economic costs that they unnecessarily can do

from time to time, whether it is across federal highways, whether it is across state highways or whether it is across council-controlled roads.

I have spoken several times on this, not just when it has been an issue of some interest from the media during the annual Clipsal road closures or during some of the roadworks associated with the government's record infrastructure spend, such as the Torrens to Torrens works, or what we are about to see with the large commencement of the Darlington project and, of course, the interaction with Port Wakefield Road and the Port River Expressway associated with the Northern Connector project. There is then, of course, that other critical project to improve both the road network as well as the public transport network: the O-Bahn project.

It is not just about 25 km/h signs. I am interested, as the speaker against this motion, to follow the member for Chaffey and his comments about how he has encountered a frustration, either directly or via his constituents, with roadworks that are being inappropriately attended to and the restrictions they impose on the road network, because one of the key failings of the member for Unley's bill is that it only considers 25 km/h speed signs. It does not consider the inappropriate use of other speed restriction signs, whether it is 40 km/h, 60 km/h or 80 km/h.

Those other three ones, in particular, are often used in regional areas. They are used in regional and remote communities during the course of roadworks or sometimes, frustratingly, after the end of roadworks and from time to time they are left out and unnecessarily impede and restrict the flow of traffic. It is an acute problem in regional areas, not necessarily because their road networks encounter the same volume of traffic that we would have here in metropolitan areas or even in regional centres, like Mount Gambier or Port Lincoln, but it is an acute problem when these signs are left out on the state or federal highways or even council roads during periods of time like harvest. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:31): I move:

That this house condemns the government's decision to cut services at the Modbury Hospital and, in particular, to downgrade emergency departments and cut vital cardiac services which provide lifesaving treatment to hundreds of residents in Adelaide's North-East to—

- (a) ensure patients do not have to travel 14 kilometres away to the Lyell McEwin Hospital for important medical care;
- (b) ensure residents are not faced with long wait times; and
- (c) ensure emergency surgery remains available to residents in their local area.

As a young child, my mum, dad and two older brothers moved to 85 Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South. I think it was in 1956 because there was only Elizabeth South and Elizabeth North then. The Philip Highway was a dirt road. The Pinnock sewing machine factory was the first factory built in Elizabeth across the road from us in Hogarth Road, and I remember the Holden factory being built. There was a farm there and I remember playing around the old buildings as a kid. For many years it was a place to paddock goats that were on their way to be slaughtered. Holden coming along was just a complete change.

Elizabeth grew and we moved to Salisbury in 1960, but I did go to Elizabeth South Primary School for those early years and I have very many fond memories of living in Elizabeth and then Salisbury. My mother still lives at Elizabeth Vale, in behind Calvary Central Districts Hospital. My brother now lives at Hillbank and I think that was formerly Elizabeth East. So I still have family out there and very many fond memories of a wonderful childhood in Elizabeth.

My younger brother, Stewart, came along in 1960. He was born at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. It is a wonderful hospital. It was a wonderful hospital then. It is a great hospital now and it has been expanded, but just go onto the hospital dashboards and look how overcrowded it is. It is a great hospital and people want to go there, but the demand that is put on that hospital is just overwhelming, and that is why I have real concerns, not only for the people of Modbury but also for the people of

Elizabeth, about the increasing demand that is going to be put on to the Lyell McEwin Hospital as a result of the Transforming Health changes.

Modbury Hospital has been serving the area around Golden Grove, Modbury and Tea Tree Gully for a number of years. It was built in 1973 and, depending on which figures you read from which website, the numbers of beds vary, but all I can say is that those beds will not be providing the same range of services they do now or providing the same services to people of the Golden Grove, Tea Tree Gully and Modbury area. Many people will be forced to travel across to Lyell McEwin or into town. It is going to be an absolute disaster.

I am not exaggerating that and I am not trying to use shrill language to be alarmist. I have been following the health department's own websites. I have been following them for years and years and, every time I look at them, there is an evolving crisis. Even today, you can look at the number of mental health beds we are short of in South Australia and the numbers of people waiting for elective surgery, then take out Queen Elizabeth Hospital with all eight operating theatres shut because the air conditioning did not work.

At Modbury, we have a wonderful hospital. Let me read to the house the list of services that have been provided at Modbury. They include: cardiology; diagnostic imaging; ear, nose and throat surgery; emergency medicine; gastroenterology; general medicine; general surgery; geriatric evaluation and management; gynaecology; haematology; high dependency critical care unit; hospice and palliative care services; neurology; oncology; ophthalmology; orthopaedics; renal and transplantation.

I did not know about that, and I am not so sure that is still going on there. I would be surprised if it was with the money that this government has spent on the old Royal Adelaide when they transferred renal transplantation from the Queen Elizabeth into town—which they are going to bulldoze, which is another crazy decision by this government. Continuing the list of services at the Modbury hospital, there are: respiratory medicine; rheumatology; urology; and, of course, Woodleigh House mental health unit.

All of those services are there and, to add to the provision of those services, provided by hardworking doctors and nurses in South Australia, there are over 100 volunteers. I am hearing stories about the volunteers being replaced by contracted workers at Spotless, the people who provide the hotel services and nonclinical support in some of our hospitals. They are going to replace even the volunteers. If that is the case, that is a disgrace. Whether it is at the Lyell McEwin, Modbury or the Lavender Ladies down at the Royal Adelaide, if those volunteers go, this government is acting in a disgraceful and shameful way. In the past, they have raised money, given comfort to patients and given continuing support to not only the patients in the hospitals but also the staff. That would be a disgrace.

Under Transforming Health, Modbury is going to become one of three general hospitals in South Australia. The minister can come in here and say it is going to be alright because we will be able to transfer patients across from Modbury to the Lyell McEwin but he needs to go back and talk to the people who have been providing and receiving those services at Modbury or, better still, stop listening to the spin doctors and start listening to the real doctors and nurses out there. They are worried and afraid that there is going to be a real issue with the changes you are putting in.

In 2008, the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine put out a report on the number of deaths in Australia as a direct result of delays in emergency departments which said that 1,500 Australians were dying every year as a direct result of delays in emergency departments. South Australia's share of that is about 8 per cent, which is 120, more than the road toll. More than the road toll, every year in South Australia, are dying, already, as a direct result of delays in emergency departments. If I am wrong, minister, come in and tell us what the situation is in South Australia, because that is a completely unacceptable situation.

Go and look at your own dashboards, minister, and see the crisis. See the number of times at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Modbury, Queen Elizabeth, Flinders, Royal Adelaide, Noarlunga, and the list goes on, on your traffic light system, that the emergency department is in the white zone. You need over 125 per cent capacity to get into the white zone. You have people waiting and waiting and waiting.

What we need to make sure we avoid, at all costs, is the Mid Staffordshire syndrome coming to South Australia. The Mid Staffordshire NHS area in England adopted a policy of less than four hours wait in emergency departments. People were being looked at within those four hours, according to the computers. They were either being admitted or discharged and, because of the bed pressure, some of those people were being discharged from hospital earlier than they should have been.

In one year in the Mid Staffordshire NHS region in England 1,200 people died as a result of that policy. This policy of Transforming Health is something that should be giving grave concern—and I use those words 'grave concern'—to the people of South Australia because lives are already at risk because of the current system, the delays that are there.

An ambulance bus will not help—an 'ambus'. Triaging patients in an 'ambus', well, you have got category 1 patients who are going into resus, you have got category 2 patients who need to be seen within 30 minutes, you have got category 3 patients who need to be seen within 90 minutes. I might be wrong on those figures, but you are categorising those patients, and you cannot pick and chose your patients who are going on that bus if you are at a major incident. You cannot pick and choose them, so a bus is not going to help.

Ambulances will be ferrying people back and forwards on that trip between Modbury and the Lyell McEwen. As good a hospital as the Lyell McEwen is there are only so many beds. The traffic is getting heavier and heavier out there because people love living out at Elizabeth, they love living out in the northern suburbs. They are great areas to live in. Mum is out there, my brother is out there.

The issue we have got here is that we need to make sure that we are delivering the best health service that we possibly can for South Australia. We have had the Menadue report, we have had other reports and now we have got the Transforming Health. I am very afraid, people should be very afraid and I am very alarmed that this government is not listening and is in denial over the fact that there is a looming crisis in health because of its changes.

Go, minister, look at your dashboards today. Go and look at them and you will see your own figures supporting what we are saying. The Lyell McEwen is a hospital in great demand. The doctors and nurses are working their backsides off down there to produce the results they are getting. It is high-quality health medicine in South Australia, but you cannot keep squeezing more people into the beds that we have got in South Australia.

It is a disgrace to see that the clinicians are being ignored. There are a few out there and I do not know where they are coming from. I really do not understand. Look, I am just a humble veterinarian and I look at what is happening. I know the complex situations they are dealing with. It would be nice to be able to specialise in one species and part of one species. I thought that would be great to be able to do that. My son is a doctor and I call him the specialist vet dealing in one species, and my daughter is a veterinarian.

We understand that is a wonderful thing to be able to do, to be able to specialise in one species or part of one species and get those results, and our doctors and nurses in South Australia do get those results, but they need the time to do the correct assessment of the patients, the diagnosis, the work-up and then the treatment and the surgery. They need the time to do that. They cannot do that if there is pressure on with people continuing to arrive at the front door.

There is bed block that we know about. We have been going on about it for years. It is a real crisis in our hospitals, and I am not going to sit back here and watch it be allowed to unfold without protesting about it and continuing to remind the minister and this government to look at what they are creating because be careful what you wish for.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (11:42): The one thing that I would agree with the member for Morphett about is that the north and the north-east of Adelaide are great places to live, and it is nice to hear that he has still got some family living out there, but that certainly does not make him an expert in the health services that are being provided out in our area.

Needless to say that the state government opposes very strongly the motion put by the member for Morphett, and I venture to say that there is not one local member representing that area

who has not welcomed the massive injection of funding by this state government into our health services out in the north.

Again, we have the opposition happy to play politics with fear. It thinks it is okay to frighten the people in the north and the north-eastern suburbs for its own political advantage, and in the main it is elderly people who are being frightened by the messages that it is putting out.

Certainly, I went along to the public meeting, as did you, Deputy Speaker, and as did the member for Newland when the Minister for Health came out to the north together with Professor Dorothy Keefe. A team of Liberal Party members came along and threw questions at the professor, which she was able to answer clearly, articulately and, really, I think, astounded people with the processes that are being put in place to ensure that we do have the very best health services out there in the north.

The Liberal Party are getting around implying that the services are going to be downgraded or that services will no longer be available or, worse still, that the Modbury Hospital and emergency departments are closing. It is irresponsible and it is misinformed. I well remember, as I know you do, when the Liberal Party privatised Modbury Hospital. We were inundated on a daily basis with complaints about the treatment that people were getting in that hospital. I had my own horrific experiences with my elderly father in that hospital under the private management, under the management of the state Liberal government.

The Modbury Hospital, as the member for Morphett said, was built by the Dunstan Labor government and opened in 1973 to service our area and, contrary to what the opposition would like the community to believe, this government is committed to the people of the north-eastern suburbs and we will continue to invest in Modbury Hospital. Since 2002, we have shown our commitment by returning Modbury Hospital to the hands of South Australians in 2007, after that disastrous privatisation experiment and investing \$30 million to improve the services and infrastructure.

Under Transforming Health we are investing a further \$32 million to upgrade Modbury Hospital so people in the north and north-eastern suburbs can have more health services as well as faster and better quality services close to home. I note part of the member for Morphett's motion refers to the 14 kilometres that people have to travel to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. When there was concern about the maternity services going to the Lyell McEwin, people came to see me about exactly that concern, and when we did a Google Maps search we found that in fact it was quicker to get to the Lyell McEwin than it was to get to Modbury Hospital, so again it is just a fallacy that they like to put up.

The way our hospitals provide some services will change but we make no apologies for this. All changes are based on clinical evidence and data and are driven by quality and ensuring the local community has access to a full range of public health services every hour of the day. Our community has grown and changed. The current configuration of our health services no longer reflects the population shifts towards our rapidly growing northern suburbs. We know that only around 55 per cent of northern and north-eastern residents receive care at their local hospitals compared to around 88 per cent in southern and central Adelaide.

We need to make changes to ensure fair and equitable provision of health services right across metropolitan Adelaide. This government believes the people of our north and north-eastern suburbs deserve the same access to the full range of public hospital services as their southern and central counterparts. Through changes the government is making under Transforming Health, the percentage of northern and north-eastern residents receiving care locally is expected to increase from 55 per cent to around 80 per cent.

Services at Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals will work together and complement each other. There will be more health staff, more health services provided closer to home for our residents under Transforming Health. Both hospitals will continue to operate emergency departments staffed by specialists 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Contrary to what those opposite would like the community to believe, most of the patients who currently attend the Modbury Hospital Emergency Department will continue to be seen at Modbury. The emergency department will continue to treat asthma and orthopaedics, including adult and paediatric fractures as well as chronic disease.

Senior doctors and nurses will continue to be available to respond to deteriorating patients anywhere in Modbury Hospital. Acutely unwell patients can continue to be referred either to Modbury or Lyell McEwin emergency departments, as is currently the case. As it happens now, if a patient presents at the Modbury Hospital Emergency Department, they will receive care from a fully functional emergency department staffed by specialist physicians who will be able to diagnose, stabilise and assess all patients. Only those suffering from ongoing, complex, life-threatening emergencies will be stabilised and transferred by ambulance to another hospital with diagnosis and management already in place.

Under the Liberal government, people would be taken by an ambulance; they would head towards Modbury, and patients would plead not to go to Modbury: 'Take me to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.' The people of the north and north-east will still be able to access other local health services at Modbury Hospital, such as mental health services, treatment for ongoing conditions—like diabetes, heart disease or lung disease—as well as geriatric medicine and palliative care services.

Despite what those opposite would have us believe, all current specialty outpatient services accessed by the local community at Modbury Hospital will continue. That is right—the people of the north-eastern suburbs will continue to receive the health services they have come to expect and deserve under a Labor government.

As well as a continuation of all these services, Modbury Hospital will become the elective surgery centre for the north and north-eastern area carrying out around 1,800 more elective procedures a year, including scopes. This will give the north and north-eastern residents faster access to elective surgery with fewer delays as can currently occur due to clinical teams being pulled away for emergency surgery.

Under Transforming Health, Modbury Hospital is expected to see an additional 3,000 patients a year. We know that around 80 per cent of the surgery currently carried out at Modbury Hospital is elective. The expansion of elective day surgery at Modbury will build on the expertise and exceptional service currently provided, and enable people in the north and north-east to receive day surgery closer to home.

Under the changes there will be an expanded one-stop breast service at Modbury Hospital, giving women access to a breast surgeon, a radiologist and a breast-care nurse in the same location, speeding up diagnosis and treatment. This service will enable patients to receive their biopsy results straightaway and access radiology services on the same day, rather than require two or three separate appointments.

Modbury Hospital will become a major rehabilitation and subacute service centre for the north, ensuring north and north-eastern residents have greater access to rehabilitation closer to home. We will see an increase in the number of rehabilitation beds and supported services, a new rehabilitation centre, rehabilitation gym and a hydrotherapy pool. Allied health will be available seven days a week at Modbury Hospital to ensure the local community can get the treatment they need, as soon as possible.

Building on the wide range of high quality public health services that will be provided at Modbury Hospital, Lyell McEwin Hospital will also service the people of the north and north-eastern suburbs treating major emergency and trauma patients, supported by 24-hour senior doctors and nurses, and diagnostic and imaging support. This will include a comprehensive 24/7 orthopaedic trauma surgery service, providing faster access to orthopaedic services.

This government is investing heavily in Modbury Hospital. We have invested heavily in the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and we will continue to ensure that many people who currently travel outside the north and north-eastern area for health care will have far greater access to high quality public hospital services closer to home. I am astounded that, with their record, the Liberal Party could bring such a motion to this house.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:53): I want to speak in support of the motion that the member for Morphett has brought to the house. This is a very important issue. It is not only important for those residents in the suburbs of the north-eastern area of Adelaide, particularly the electorates of Florey, Wright and Newland, but it is also a very important issue for the residents in my electorate,

particularly the northern areas of my electorate—Woodside, Gumeracha, Birdwood, Lobethal—those northern areas of the Adelaide Hills. No doubt, it is also important for those residents in the southern towns of the electorate of Schubert—Mount Pleasant, Kersbrook and Williamstown—because they all look to the Modbury Hospital for a very high level of health care.

What we have seen this government do over its 14 years, so far, of being a government, is to look to really set in place a certain style of spin. When I am talking about spin, they actually present what they are doing in a certain style to try to convince the constituency that they are actually improving services and delivery of whatever the government is responsible for to all South Australians.

What they are doing in relation to this initiative of Transforming Health, particularly in relation to Modbury Hospital, whichever way you look at it, is a pretty good exercise or a pretty poor exercise in spin. Let's get down to the tin tacks of it: Transforming Health is about reducing services and cutting costs, and that is exactly what is going to take place at the Modbury Hospital. They are reducing services and cutting costs at the Modbury Hospital, and that will obviously impact on the delivery of health care to all those residents in the north-east and also in the northern part of the Adelaide Hills.

It is a very serious issue, because the last thing we want to see is patient care compromised. I am yet to be convinced, and everybody on this side of the house is yet to be convinced, of the government's spin that moving and transferring services from the Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital is not going to compromise patient safety or care. As the member for Morphet said in his motion, 'patients do not have to travel 14 kilometres away to the Lyell McEwin Hospital'. If a patient presents at the Modbury Hospital with a critical health issue, to then have to put them in an ambulance, or the 'ambus'—the latest thing is the ambulance bus, and nobody really knows how the 'ambus' is going to work.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The minister was on the radio the other week—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): The member for Florey.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —and they were asking questions about the 'ambus'.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Nobody really quite knows how the 'ambus' is going to work. Whether you wait for half a dozen patients to sort of be stockpiled at the Modbury, then to be transferred to the Lyell McEwin—they might be there for a couple of hours—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —in a seriously—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Davenport is right: they might be equivalent to sort of ramping. A staff member might come along and say, 'What are you lying on this bed for?' to a patient—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: 'Oh, we're waiting for the bus. It comes at 12.05'—we do not have the timetable of the 'ambus' yet. For goodness' sake, get a grip on reality, government members, about what is going on in relation to this. Nobody on this side of the house, and I would not doubt an enormous percentage of the community that the Modbury Hospital delivers services to, is convinced that the transfer of important, lifesaving health services to the Lyell McEwin Hospital is not going to put—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —patient care at a potential risk.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): You've had your chance. Let the member speak.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Now we get to the issue—and I have raised this before in the house—concerning the information that some of the sitting Labor members are distributing in their electorates. I have raised this issue before about the material that has been distributed, particularly by the members for Florey and Newland in their electorates, listing the services that will be available at Modbury Hospital. We know that some of those services are going to be cut.

As I have said before in this place, I think it is the responsibility and the duty of those members to be honest with their electorates and now communicate in a factual manner to those electorates in the north-east about what the Modbury Hospital will deliver in terms of services now that Transforming Health is moving along and services will be cut. They have a responsibility and a duty to be honest with their constituents. We will be monitoring that very closely and, if it does not happen, I am telling them that it will be highlighted in those constituencies. On this side of the house, we do not base our views on wild reasoning or unsubstantiated facts. We base our reasoning and our argument—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —on information that 30 medical specialists—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order! Member for Wright, you have had your chance to speak. I call you to order. Please let the member give his speech in silence.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your protection. We know the member for Wright is a continual interjector and disruptor of the proceedings of the house. The government has this letter, because it is an open letter to the Minister for Health and SA Health. It is from 30 medical specialists from Modbury, and it lists a whole lot of issues. I do not think I have time to list them all but, under the first heading 'Overall', the letter states:

...the reconfiguration of services will deliver poorer patient and health system outcomes.

That is the opening line of their assessment of the effect that the Transforming Health reforms will have. The letter continues:

We feel strongly that Transforming Health...will deliver a downgraded Modbury Hospital with decreased capabilities and increased costs and risk.

That is the thing that concerns us the most—the potential for the increase in patients' risk, putting them on the 'ambus', getting on the timetable. 'Hang on, it's 12:05. Sorry, the bus has gone. We'll have to wait till 12:35 until the next bus arrives.' That whole thing is just ridiculous.

The letter talks about losses: the hospital will lose the high dependency unit, 30 acute medical beds and surgical inpatient beds and after-hours on-site anaesthetic airway management services, so there is an overall decrease in the number of beds available for medical patients in the NALHN.

Under the heading 'Unnecessary transfers', the letter states that, on the health department's own figures, there are 20 patient transfers per day from the Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin hospital, which is nearly 7,500 patient transfers per year, costing \$7.5 to \$15 million per year and that that money would be better spent at Modbury.

This is an open letter to the Minister for Health and SA Health signed by 30 medical specialists. That is where we derive our information from—the health specialists who deliver services at that hospital.

Time expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:03): Just as I did with the debate around voluntary euthanasia, I am going to try to take the emotion out of this and just deal with the logical facts of the debate around the Modbury Hospital. I want to start with a bit of a history lesson for those of you who may not know as intimately as I do exactly what has happened at the Modbury Hospital over the past 30 years that I know of, which perhaps explains why I became interested in public health as an issue. I am very sorry that not all the members are able to stay to hear this, but I know they will read my *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Modbury Hospital, as we said, was started some 40 years ago and we know that Molly Byrne and Don Dunstan were integral to it, but so too is Dr Donald Beard, someone you on the other side will all know through his veteran's work in Korea and in Kapyong and Long Tan, Vietnam. I am happy to say I have a good working relationship with Dr Don, irrespective of the fact that we obviously come from different sides of the political persuasion. I know the Modbury Hospital is very dear to him, as it is to many people in the area for all sorts of other reasons.

The Modbury Hospital has had an amazing amount of fabulous work put into it by huge numbers of doctors and nurses, allied healthcare workers and their marvellous volunteers. It has a long and proud local history, and it has been shamelessly used as a political football for many, many years. I can only tell you that at every election I have to stand outside the Modbury Hospital and say, 'It's not closing,' and it never has, has it, while I have been here? And while I am here it will not close because of the large amount of money that has been invested in it—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: No, they don't.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

Ms BEDFORD: You see, this is where I am asking you to try to be reasonable, member for Hammond. I have listened to everybody else this morning and I am just asking you to listen to what I have to say. If I thought the Modbury Hospital was in any danger of closing I would be the first one to say so, believe me. Nobody has ever called me a shrinking violet.

I want to take you back to some of the changes that have happened in our hospital. The member for Wright mentioned earlier the failed privatisation experiment. I understand that you on the other side of the house knew you had to deal with health in some way, and this was the beginning of what you thought might be the answer to changing the delivery of health services. I have no problem with it, except it was the wrong model. What you had planned to do was to put a private hospital in one of the wards of the Modbury Hospital, without them paying levies or taxes, or even working out how they might even pay their electricity, in exchange for letting them run the main hospital, which you all thought was going to drain you of dough, so you had to do something to prop it up. I understand all that, but it was clearly the wrong model.

What that did is: it saw a mass exodus of really good and experienced staff leave our hospital, and your costs soared because you had to take in agency staff. Healthscope shares plummeted and the whole thing was a disaster, from which you were really pleased to extricate yourself, but only, luckily, because we had stopped you doing that at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital site. Goodness only knows what would have happened if you had unravelled the egg that far, because it might have been too hard to go back.

That aside, we then come to the question of the removal of delivery services for expectant mothers. Happily, I called a big public meeting and minister John Hill was there. We had an auditorium full of people. The AMA's representative on that night said there was no way you could keep maternity services there. It was not possible for him to offer the full suite of services because the anaesthetists would have to come from other areas because, like a lot of medical services at the Modbury Hospital and other sites within our system, these things are not available 24/7, people are on call.

It was a matter of looking at how we could provide the safest health care to people. If I cannot make sure all those services are there and provide women with the best possible outcomes with health, I am then faced with a model that is produced by the health professionals and presented to me as the outcome of their deliberations and the way they can ensure safety, and that is how we

saw the birth of the Lyell McEwin birthing services. We all know about the great changes that have taken place in childbirth. We now have home deliveries happening, which we all thought would never happen in a safe way in this state. This has all happened very quietly and I have not heard one of you come in and say anything about that in the time I have been here.

So we lost maternity services and, again, as the member for Wright pointed out, people have been more than happy with the service that has been provided. So the proof has been in the—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: It's the best in the state.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): Order!

Ms BEDFORD: I want that 40 seconds added onto my time, and I mean it. The proof will be in the pudding. I have worked really hard with anyone who has had an adverse outcome of any variety in the birthing services. None of us on this side shirk from wanting to hear about the problems. We need to hear about any problems anyone faces because it is the only way we are going to sort out the health service. We really want best care, first time, every time, not only for my family but for your family, because unless it is there for you it will not be there for me.

The next thing we have to look at is paediatrics. Again, as a resident of the area, I have had two paediatric emergencies, one with each of my children. One of them, my son, unfortunately had a stroke when he was eight. I rang the Modbury Hospital and said, 'We're coming in.' She said, 'Take a Disprin, we are busy.' As a responsible parent, I knew, 'Okay, next step Women's and Children's.' It is about knowing where to go to access the services that you want.

Fortunately for me, after pulling ourselves together—you do not want a child's stroke if you can avoid it—we went into the Women's and Children's. Luckily for us, the registrar on duty knew exactly what was happening. They get 10 a year, and it was fabulous service because everyone wanted to look—no problem. My dribbling child in a wheelchair, incontinent and unable to move, has recovered and is a terrifically well-functioning adult. Boy, am I lucky! My daughter, on the other hand, had an overnight stay and was out of the hospital.

We now know that the paediatric ward had very few numbers going through it. For staff to have access to the large number of cases that give them the experience to handle these cases, they need a throughput which we did not have. We struggled. All our north-eastern members struggled. We got the overnight stay ward, which is now a paediatric area in the emergency and accident area, which has worked fine. I have had more than enough people say to me that it has worked fine. I have not had a complaint about it, and I encourage people to complain because I do not want to be the person standing back and having things happen when nothing should be going wrong.

Transforming Health is the newest look at how we might sustain health services for everybody. The Tea Tree Gully area—the council area rather than the suburb—has a large number of older people. Our shift, our focus has to be on handling the largest numbers of people we have. Our rehab ward which, I will be the first to admit, was part of a promise before an election which did not happen and is now back on the drawing boards and has started, gives me great confidence in saying to you that I will be in the best-placed position to make sure the residents of my area, and indeed as part of the whole plan of the north, will have access to the best possible rehab care close to home.

We know that the hospital at home service is working fabulously well. I have not had one person come and say anything about that to me, and I urge them, if they have issues, to come and say something, as it is the only way I can make sure they get what they need. The undermining of confidence in the hospital is deplorable. I have a surgeon one day wearing a T-shirt saying, 'I have survived Modbury Hospital' and, the next day, I have people saying it is a fabulous thing.

What is it with you people? Do you not understand the damage the scaremongering causes to the older people of our area? In hand-to-hand combat, each of my members have to speak to people for 10 to 15 minutes to calm them down because they have picked up some throwaway line, some bit of waffle, that has them scared to death that they cannot go to the hospital closest to them.

Let's all get behind this health system and try to make it work. It has to work because, otherwise, there is no way we can make sure people get the best care that they need.

The other thing that really appals me is that no-one seems to understand how the health system is now going to work. The government has invested \$314 million redeveloping the Lyell McEwin health service. Most people still think it is a Nissen hut in a paddock, because they have never been. You are only going to go and access acute health care when you are sick, and you need to know exactly where you are going to go and how you are going to get there. If you are that sick you are in an ambulance, it is not your decision. If you are not that sick, go to the closest hospital. If you are going to drive, go to the closest hospital.

The health system is not third-world. I cannot believe someone said to me the other day that the South Australian health system is third-world, but that is because people are eroding their confidence in the system. Third-world health services means there is nothing there when you get there, and that is very far from the truth now.

Our investments in the Lyell McEwin have seen it transform into a major, state-of-the-art, tertiary hospital, and we must have great confidence in delivering good services. The staff are going to be able to rotate through the general hospital to the tertiary hospital. It is actually, as Malcolm Turnbull would say, an 'exciting time' to be a health professional because you are going to be able to go and access this. I beg all of you to get behind Transforming Health and, instead of scaring people, encourage them to go and look for themselves.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:14): I am pleased to make a contribution to this, and I do so on the premise that I consider myself to be a hospital brat. My mum was a nurse for 50 years. It was her life, and it has trained me in how to react to people in many ways because of the requirements of being a nurse and how you have to interact with people. So, when I stand up and speak on this, I do so not from a detailed knowledge of the individual circumstance but from the perception of what the community needs—that is the way I put it.

I did appreciate the member for Wright's contribution and the member for Florey's. It has put some information before the house that I believe is helpful for the public debate that will need to occur, and I want discussions to be accurate ones also.

It is interesting though that members from the government side will accuse the Liberal Party of scaremongering. I cannot remember those sort of words being said in 2007 when Country Health was being talked about when there were various versions of what the impact was going to be on regional hospitals with proposals by then minister Hill that would have resulted in significant downgrades for the level of services provided. That disappointed me immensely.

There were a variety of public meetings held. I know in the Goyder electorate there were three—one with 700 people, one with 500 people and one with 400 people. Other members from the government's side are shaking their heads saying, 'What is he talking about?' I can assure you that in trying to ensure that I had information available, I had health professionals there from the department to provide advice.

At the very first meeting in Yorketown, with 700 people there, the question was asked by the crowd, 'Where do you have to go for a certain level of care?' and the response was, 'Whyalla.' That is what the person who works within the department said. When that sort of advice comes from someone who is meant to know, who looks at it simply as closest on the lines of a map instead of what the reality of the world is—no Yorke Peninsula people are going to drive all the way up the gulf and down to Whyalla again, they are going to go to Adelaide for their services—it takes away all confidence in it.

I appreciated the member for Florey's comments and the member for Wright's about obstetrics and delivery of babies. The reason I rise, and how this relates to me in a personal way, is that when I am in Adelaide I live in the member for Torrens' electorate, so I am relatively close to Modbury. I have attended there twice myself when I have had little incidences when I am at that house and have needed some help, and they have been great. I offer no criticism at all to the staff. They have done exceptionally well.

My family is blessed by the fact that in five weeks and two days' time, if it goes to schedule, we are going to get a grandchild and they live three minutes away from Modbury Hospital. So the member for Wright, when you talk about the fact that the Lyell McEwin is closer, it is all relevant to where the location is and I understand that. It is not a criticism of your comments in particular. They have said to me that it is a 20-minute drive for them to get to Modbury. They have been for what they are required to do before the baby comes along. They have the route down pat. They know exactly where they have to go.

I came into this place with a belief that there were really key issues that government have a responsibility for and they are education, law and order, and health. No matter where you are, those are key issues for all people. Many people decide to live in particular areas because of the range of services provided for them in those areas, and when there are changes it creates concerns, it creates the need for information, and it creates an opportunity for political arguments to occur. I have no doubt about that.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I do want my grandchild born in the safest environment.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In fairness, there should be no interjections and you do not need to respond to them. I will speak to you later about having babies on the bathroom floor as that happened to my daughter eight weeks ago. Come and see me and I can tell you all about it.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I understand that some babies arrive in very interesting circumstances with a lack of notice, but it is an example of where the concerns come from. When the member for Kavel reads out portions of a letter that is signed by 30 professionals who come from Modbury Hospital who express concern, to me that is the credibility I need to see because it identifies those people who live it. They commit their life to it. They put their focus upon providing the best possible service they can.

When the professionals who work for the government and take some level of risk in putting their name to a letter that criticises the government about a decision that it is making, you have to listen to that sort of advice. It is not the political argument, but it is the reality of the world argument actually coming through that these people who work there worry about what the impact of it is going to be.

There is a necessity for change to occur. I am not crazy on that. I know the previous member for Kaurana, as minister for health at the time, spoke to me a couple of times and certainly mentioned in this place the fact that, unless changes occur to the provision of health services, it will consume the total budget of South Australia in the mid 2030s or thereabouts. I understand that, but I get concerned though when I hear impressive titles, such as Transforming Health, and I worry about what the impact is going to be upon people.

People are not as well informed as you, Deputy Speaker, when it comes to a crisis occurring and knowing where they need to go. There are many people in our community who still choose to remain completely blank about these sorts of things and, when something occurs, they have nowhere to go for assistance. You got a shocking response, initially, from the first professional service that you rang when they told you to go somewhere else.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: 'Have a Disprin.'

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, 'Have a Disprin,' and then you went to the place that you needed to go: I understand that. However, for those in our community who are not engaged, not informed and do not know what their options are, they are going to take what they see as their closest possible option and go there. I am pleased for the member for Wright when she talks about the level of care that will take place—and there will only be, I believe, 20 people per day who have to be transferred between hospitals for a high level of care that will be available at other places—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will change. We don't know how many people.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Okay, and I understand that, but my concern becomes: do people have to self triage? It is a term that I use. Do they have to determine where they have to go for the level of care? The member for Wright has talked about the fact that you present there.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Looking at me might be the safest thing to do. Just talk to me.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My apologies. Then I won't get distracted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, don't. Look to me.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Okay. I do believe in my heart that the motion is presented to the house with the best of intentions, that is, to try to ensure the best outcomes from Transforming Health—because it will be a program that will be pursued. No matter what we say in this political world, you will push for it in the two years to ensure that it is there, but I believe in my heart, also, that, in two years' time, someone else will have responsibility to make it work. There has to be an opportunity to ensure that the debate occurs about it and for information flow to occur, too.

The member for Morphett has brought this motion because he follows this completely. I know: I sit next to him in this chamber and the number of times he is talking about health issues proves to me that it is not a one-time opportune moment he is seizing on. It is something that is very dear to his heart. He has family in that area and he wants to make sure the best outcomes occur. When he and other members stand up and talk about it, it is because they care about people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As do we.

Mr GRIFFITHS: As do you, Deputy Speaker. I understand that. That was quite evident when, even though you took the emotion out of your speech, there was still a lot of reflection upon that.

I hope that the debate about this motion is fulsome. There is a need for people to put their position on it, but the importance rests with government, as the holder of the cheque book—for the next two years, at least, and, hopefully, that is all—to ensure that the outcomes for people, no matter where they are from and no matter what their circumstances, provide them with what they need, and that is what government's responsibility is.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:22): I rise today to support this excellent motion that has been brought to the house by the member for Morphett, who has had, for many years, a great passion for health and the state's health system. In fact, for a time, he was our shadow minister for health. The motion reads:

That this House condemns the Government's decision to cut services at the Modbury Hospital and in particular, to downgrade emergency departments and cut vital cardiac services which provide lifesaving treatment to hundreds of residents in Adelaide's North East to—

- (a) ensure patients don't have to travel 14 kilometres away to the Lyell McEwin Hospital for important medical care;
- (b) ensure residents are not faced with long wait times; and
- (c) ensure emergency surgery remains available to residents in their local area.

It has created some excellent contributions from both sides of the house and, ultimately, what this motion reflects is the government's Transforming Health policy, which we hear a lot about and we are just starting to see evidence of how it is unfolding.

There is no doubt that services will be reduced at Modbury Hospital and, as the member for Kavel so succinctly put it—and with great passion, I might add—Transforming Health is all about reducing services and cutting costs. It seems to be a lot about centralisation and reducing hospital care in one area, and transferring those available facilities to another is exactly that. It is about centralisation.

Why are we seeing these services being reduced and cutting of costs? I think it is pretty obvious. We have a brand-new Royal Adelaide Hospital just down the road from here, which I am sure will be a marvellous building, but it is currently estimated to cost something like \$2.3 billion. It has become like a vortex. It is sucking up so much of the state's energy, so much of the state's

resources and so much of the health system that we are starting to feel the effects of that throughout the suburbs and throughout the country areas.

I think at one point it was described as the third most expensive building in the world ever built. It is extraordinary. We are doing that in Adelaide. Add to that the desal plant and you have got almost \$5 billion worth of money, and the desal plant I might add is hardly being used at all. We have got \$5 billion of expenses to a state with a budget and an economy that is struggling. It is extraordinary.

The up-shot of all of that is that we are seeing a reduction in services, as I said, in other hospitals, in the suburbs and most likely in country areas, and I fear that we have not even started to see how Transforming Health might be rolled out in the country areas. The member for Goyder spoke about 2008 when there was a very real threat to country hospitals, and there were certainly some large meetings in my electorate of Flinders on the Eyre Peninsula. I was a candidate at that point and I went along to big meetings in my home town of Cummins and also Streaky Bay.

Town halls were packed because they feared a reduction in their health services. That did not come to pass, but it was purely and simply because of the public involvement and public backlash. I sincerely hope that we do not have to get to that situation again. I think it is about centralisation, and I am starting to wonder when this government will ever realise that centralisation does not deliver savings or efficiencies, it simply delivers the reverse.

There is no doubt that the Modbury Hospital has provided invaluable health services to the north-east suburbs since it was first built in 1973, and, of course, in those days the north-east suburbs, suburbs like Golden Grove, Tea Tree Gully and Modbury, were brand-new suburbs. They were growing areas. There were young families having children. It was a vibrant place and it still is; it is still a growing area. Many of those families have elected to stay. Some of the original residents have become elderly, aged, and they are looking at another stage of life and require another part of healthcare—rather than mothers and babies and middle-aged people we are now looking at the elderly.

I think that one of the other real challenges for this government and this state will be how we deal with aged care, and that is something I might talk about a little bit more another day, but certainly the challenge is how we best deliver aged care in an ageing population, in a population where fewer working people are supporting a larger proportion of older people.

I know that just next week I have two meetings with constituents. One meeting will be in Cummins and one meeting will be in Cowell, and both those communities are really concerned about how they are going to provide ongoing, affordable and suitable aged-care facilities, because the people who live in these towns actually want to stay there, and it is very difficult for them to be able to do that. I think that, very seriously, we need to start looking at some new models about how we might best make that work. Anyway, we will decide how that best happens in a local environment in the next little while.

There is no doubt that a reduction in services at Modbury will increase pressure on the Lyell McEwen Hospital. Good healthcare is all about proximity. People do not want to be travelling miles and miles. Obstetrics has been mentioned, and on the Eyre Peninsula now can you only have a baby in three places. A mother can only have a child—or is it a person? No, it is a mother, it is a woman. I digress. A woman can only have a baby at Port Lincoln, Ceduna or Whyalla and nowhere in between unless, of course, as the Deputy Speaker's daughter did, fortunately, they have a safe delivery on a bathroom floor, because that happens occasionally.

My wife is actually a nurse so I will declare an interest here, and she has often said that if a baby is going to come—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: Yes, the nurses are everywhere, I know. She is working in community nursing at the moment, but she often says that if a baby is that ready to come then it is most likely to come safely, anyway. Good healthcare is all about proximity and we are finding, particularly in country areas, that people are having to travel further and further for good healthcare and, of course, that puts their welfare and safety at risk at times. Now, as a result of decisions like this, we are seeing

people in the suburbs having to travel further and further, which is not acceptable in an emergency when one really needs to access health care quickly.

I know the house needs to get onto the next motion, but I would like to congratulate the member for Morphett on his motion. It is well thought through. As I said, his passion and diligence in the health portfolio has been well recounted today. I have to say that I hope the people in the north-eastern suburbs get behind their hospitals and vote with their feet.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:30): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the adjournment:

While the division bells were ringing:

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: While the count proceeds, I shall welcome to parliament students from Westminster School who are guests of the teller for the noes.

Motions

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ayes 13

Noes 18

Majority..... 5

AYES

Bell, T.S.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
Pengilly, M.R.
Treloar, P.A.
Williams, M.R.

Duluk, S. (teller)
Griffiths, S.P.
Sanderson, R.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Gardner, J.A.W.
Pederick, A.S.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Digance, A.F.C. (teller)
Hughes, E.J.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Gee, J.P.
Key, S.W.
Piccolo, A.
Snelling, J.J.

Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.
Hildyard, K.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

PAIRS

Chapman, V.A.
Koutsantonis, A.
McFetridge, D.
Kenyon, T.R.
Wingard, C.

Vlahos, L.A.
Marshall, S.S.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Speirs, D.
Bettison, Z.L.

Knoll, S.K.
Weatherill, J.W.
Pisoni, D.G.
Rau, J.R.

Adjournment thus negatived.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:38): I am very pleased to support this motion. It is unfortunate that some other members who would like to speak at another time will not necessarily have the opportunity to do that due to pairing arrangements. Nevertheless, on their behalf, I will just put a few

final comments on the record before we bring this to a vote this afternoon. I am very pleased that as the Liberal Party and the Liberal opposition we will have the opportunity to support the motion:

That this house condemns the government's decision to cut services at the Modbury Hospital and, in particular, to downgrade the emergency departments and cut vital cardiac services which provide lifesaving treatment to hundreds of residents in Adelaide's north-east to—

- (a) ensure patients do not have to travel 14 kilometres away to the Lyell McEwin Hospital for important medical care;
- (b) ensure residents are not faced with long wait times; and
- (c) ensure emergency surgery remains available to residents in their local area.

As the member for Morialta, I stand as one who has had polling booths in my electorate where residents were told that they had to vote Labor, in fact, to ensure that the services at Modbury Hospital would not be downgraded.

The fact is that the Labor government is the one that is doing this work, that is doing this downgrade, that is reducing services to the people of the north-eastern suburbs—people in my electorate and the surrounding electorates. It is an extraordinary betrayal of those residents and an extraordinary betrayal of our community. The public will not stand for it. They can see through the government's lies, and I urge all members to support this motion.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 13
 Noes 18
 Majority 5

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Brock, G.G.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.
Digance, A.F.C. (teller)	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.
Hughes, E.J.	Key, S.W.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Snelling, J.J.	Wortley, D.

PAIRS

Chapman, V.A.	Bettison, Z.L.	Duluk, S.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Marshall, S.S.	Kenyon, T.R.
McFetridge, D.	Koutsantonis, A.	Pisoni, D.G.
Weatherill, J.W.	Treloar, P.A.	Vlahos, L.A.
Wingard, C.	Rau, J.R.	

Motion thus negatived.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Fisher will not reflect on the result of the division.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:45): I rise today to move:

That this house—

- (a) commemorates the 30-year anniversary of Neighbourhood Watch;
- (b) congratulates Neighbourhood Watch, which has grown to be the largest not-for-profit crime prevention organisation in the nation;
- (c) recognises the hard work and dedication of Australia's police forces and local communities in helping prevent crime; and
- (d) encourages all people to continue promoting and fostering cooperation between the community and local policing by developing new technology and strategies to combat crime.

It gives me great pleasure to speak to this motion today. For three decades from 1985 to 2015—and, now, for over three decades—Neighbourhood Watch and their various volunteer groups have served as ears to the ground and eyes for the communities around us. They work side-by-side, of course, with the police in the prevention of crime and also in the reduction of crime.

I have had the pleasure of visiting six Neighbourhood Watch groups in my electorate of Hartley. I would like to pay tribute to not only current coordinators and volunteers but also the volunteers and coordinators who have gone before them for the tremendous amount of work and the countless hours they have given to our community to make it a safer place.

I would like to begin with Felixstow Neighbourhood Watch, ably and aptly led by Mr Dennis Obst and Ray, who are part of an outstanding group in Felixstow. They have fantastic guest speakers who are very engaging. Quite often, the local hall they meet in is packed because the speakers are so good. There is a fantastic community feel and they have a raffle at the end of the night. I note the energy of people like Dennis Obst and Ray, who do a lot for that local group.

One night in particular, they had a retired magistrate come out to detail how sentences are applied and to help the community understand how they work. They have many fantastic guest speakers and many volunteers who work extremely hard to make that particular group work. They also distribute a thorough newsletter. Thank you, Felixstow Neighbourhood Watch.

Kensington Gardens Neighbourhood Watch has recently been revived after being dormant for some years and I would like to thank Miss Elina Dalziel for her hard work in getting that group going again. They meet at St Joseph's Hall, Tranmere. I would like to thank the volunteers who do a wonderful job at Kensington Gardens Neighbourhood Watch.

Neighbourhood Watch Tranmere is, again, one of the groups that has been around for many years. I would like to acknowledge the volunteers who have done a great job over the years in that area. The current coordinator is Ms Judy Black, who has been in our community for a long time and works very hard in that community.

Moving on to Neighbourhood Watch Campbelltown 391, I would like to thank Vern Wensley for the good work that is being done in Campbelltown. Thank you, Vern. In Hectorville Neighbourhood Watch, John Nemic is a great community member and an asset to our local community who is involved in a number of community groups. Thank you to John and his volunteers in Hectorville for the work they do.

I would also like to recognise Peter Damiani at Magill Neighbourhood Watch. Peter is very thorough. In fact, he only called my office this week. Magill is obviously a growing area where lots of subdivision is happening. One of the issues which is of interest to the Magill Neighbourhood Watch at the moment is the new McNally Training Centre. We want to make sure that residents have their say about what goes there, so Magill Neighbourhood Watch have been in contact with me recently. We want to make sure that the community has a say about what development goes on up there and that they are informed. Obviously, there will be things like traffic issues which a new development of some 300 houses will create.

I thank Peter, his volunteers and his team. They always get a good turnout at Magill Neighbourhood Watch when they meet at the Magill Senior Citizens Centre. Thank you to Peter and

the team that also distribute an extremely professional and thorough newsletter. I always learn something when I read their newsletter.

I would also like to acknowledge Sergeant Peter Winter, who for many years has been involved in assisting these Neighbourhood Watch groups. Peter is a crime prevention sergeant in eastern Adelaide and he oversees many of these groups. I sincerely thank Peter for all that he does. He certainly makes the job of these volunteers and these associations much easier: for example, if anyone is ever struggling for numbers, struggling to get speakers or struggling for resources. I commend Sergeant Peter Winter for the wonderful job that he has done over the years and that he continues to do.

We are very fortunate in our area that we have such fantastic volunteers. As in any community, volunteers are certainly the fundamental backbone of our community. Volunteers hold the fabric of society together. The state could not function as a whole without the countless hours, toil and sweat that these volunteers contribute to our community. All these Neighbourhood Watch volunteers and groups do their bit to make sure that our community is a safer place to be in. They serve as the eyes and the ears of South Australian communities, and they work hand in hand and side by side with South Australia Police to prevent and reduce crime.

There are a number of statistics out there that suggest that, when you make people more aware about crimes that exist, obviously people are going to know about it, people are going to know how to report it and people are going to look out for each other. Due to volunteers, amongst other things, going out doorknocking, distributing letters and making this information more readily available for the community, people in our community feel like they are in a safer spot. Also, when the need arises, they come forward and they report incidents to police.

All these groups are fantastic forums to meet new people—wonderful community people who have dedicated many hours and years purely to improve the community, because it is the right thing to do. Helping your neighbour is the right thing to do. I thank all those who are involved in Neighbourhood Watch and I commend this motion to the house. I look forward to the support of all members in the chamber.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:53): I am really pleased to support the member for Hartley's motion on behalf of the government commemorating and celebrating 30 years of Neighbourhood Watch. My dear dad was an active participant in his local Neighbourhood Watch. In fact, my mum was very grateful for the many hours that he spent delivering newsletters and cooking barbecues at the local hardware store, so Neighbourhood Watch certainly serves its purpose.

I now also support Neighbourhood Watch myself, with attendance at the Woodcroft, Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park meetings. I also know very well the hard work that all of the volunteers put in to their Neighbourhood Watch. In particular, a gentleman called Jim Phillips is tireless in his operating and support of Neighbourhood Watch at a local, regional and state level. Thank you very much for the work you do, Jim.

From really humble beginnings at Flinders Park Area 1, which commenced operation on 1 May 1985, Neighbourhood Watch has grown in South Australia to 630 Neighbourhood Watch areas with a combined volunteer workforce of 20,000. We cannot underestimate the true value of our volunteers. In fact, in 2012, the University of Adelaide study found that volunteering in Australia is now worth more than \$200 billion a year, which is quite significant.

Everyone deserves the right to go about their daily life safely and without fear of crime, and that is why keeping South Australian communities safe has been and will remain a fundamental priority for this government. We have the lowest crime rate of all capital cities in Australia, and we are now consistently rated as one of the safest cities in the world. Compared to 2002, there are 800 additional police officers on the beat. There are now more criminals in prison than ever before, but this is not because crime is rising: it is because higher numbers of violent and serious offenders are actually getting caught and going to prison for longer.

Rather than sit still, we are continually evaluating our own systems and looking at jurisdictions around the world to find new ways to prevent crime, foster safe communities and improve our criminal justice system. South Australia Police is conducting a comprehensive review into

Neighbourhood Watch, with this ongoing evolution of the program supported by a commitment from the government for funding to reinvigorate Neighbourhood Watch. This has ensured that Neighbourhood Watch in South Australia is strong and still recognised as Australian best practice.

It is recognised that South Australia's Neighbourhood Watch program, like all community awareness campaigns, must change to meet current demands and to remain relevant, given the availability of technology and ever-changing modes of communication, especially the here and now with social media. The evolution of the program is now ready for its next phase. The movement of this program into the online area is a natural progression and fits much better with the generation X and Y lifestyles and interpersonal communication systems. These are our next generation of crime preventers, and we welcome them to the program.

Election funding commitments for 2014 included \$500,000 per year for four years. In August 2010, SAPOL commenced a 12-month trial of a neighbourhood policing concept of a dedicated small team of police officers working within a suburb with significant community safety and wellbeing challenges. Neighbourhood policing teams were established in selected suburbs in the South Coast and Elizabeth LSAs.

Under SAPOL's Strategic Direction 2012-2015, neighbourhood policing teams were expanded with increased victim support and proactive community safety committees involving a range of community leaders increasing police visibility in the community. These teams represent an innovative and creative approach to increasing community engagement, confidence and satisfaction in the delivery of policing services. They also demonstrate SAPOL's commitment to the government's seven priorities; in particular, safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods. The local service areas now covered are Elizabeth, South Coast, Holden Hill and Western Adelaide. These locations are all chosen due to the demographic factors indicating vulnerability, through disadvantage, of community status, size and crime rates.

The combination of these factors provides opportunities for local police to take the lead in forming problem-solving partnerships between themselves and local community members as well as other government agencies to address local crime and related safety issues and, more broadly, to build better community resilience and wellbeing. Improving police and government service delivery in this way improves community confidence and trust in themselves and the agencies involved. In 2010, SAPOL commenced a 12-month trial of this policing concept with a dedicated small team of police officers working within a suburb with significant community safety and wellbeing challenges.

In the interests of moving on, I will just summarise that this government will not sit still and is constantly searching for and implementing smarter ways of preventing and fighting crime. The Neighbourhood Watch team is part of this future and will also be smarter. If anyone needs a demonstration of what a grassroots volunteer organisation is, they need look no further than Neighbourhood Watch as a gold standard example. Congratulations, Neighbourhood Watch. Thank you for bringing the motion to the house, member for Hartley, and thank you, Neighbourhood Watch.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:58): It is great to be able to speak today on the member for Hartley's motion on Neighbourhood Watch in South Australia. I have six Neighbourhood Watch groups operating in my electorate. They are all of varying sizes, but what they have in common is they are comprised of a group of enthusiastic members of the community who want to give back to the community they are a part of, look out for their neighbours, enjoy some fellowship and create a bit of community spirit at the same time.

The Neighbourhood Watch movement in South Australia is an enduring one. It is one that should be celebrated and one that should be invested in. I note that the government has, in past budgets, since I was elected, increased funding to Neighbourhood Watch, and I hope that continues because it is an excellent organisation which goes a great distance in keeping our community safe and building community spirit within our neighbourhoods. As I said, I have six Neighbourhood Watch groups within the electorate of Bright. The furthest north is the Brighton Hove Neighbourhood Watch group, and we extend to the south where there is a Neighbourhood Watch group at Hallett Cove. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today pupils from the Golden Grove Lutheran Primary School who are guests of the member for Wright. I acknowledged Westminster School earlier.

*Ministerial Statement***PFIZER**

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This morning I was pleased to be at Pfizer's Thebarton facility where the company announced the final phase of its \$21 million upgrade which will help secure 100 South Australian jobs at the manufacturing plant. The government is working to diversify the economy and a big part of this is increasing health industries investment in the state.

Pfizer's site upgrade is expected to generate \$380 million for the South Australian economy over the next seven years, and it not only secures 100 high-tech manufacturing jobs, but local manufacturing contractors have managed the development and local tradespeople have been contributing to the highly-complex and advanced fit-out.

The South Australian government granted Pfizer a lease on crown land adjoining its current facility after negotiating for the commonwealth tenants to move, and that allowed the upgrade to proceed.

Health Industries South Australia provided negotiation support to Pfizer in dealing with the regulatory obligations during the planning of the development. The upgrade will ensure Pfizer's Adelaide commercial manufacturing of a biosimilar medicine that is used to help cancer patients.

The facility will be completed in the middle of the year allowing for the commercialisation of the medicine to a global market valued at \$4.6 billion.

Pfizer's Adelaide team is embarking of a new era in pharmaceutical manufacturing, and this investment will establish the Thebarton plant as an innovative site and the largest biologic medicine manufacturer of its type in Australia. It will also further develop the skills and capabilities of 100 South Australian workers.

The government is targeting more health industry investment with the building of the \$3.6 billion Adelaide BioMed City, the largest health and life sciences cluster in the Southern Hemisphere, bringing together institutions from research, development and clinical care through to business development.

*Question Time***MEDICAL RECORDS**

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:01): My question is to the Minister for Health. Now that the minister has had 24 hours to check with his department, can the minister inform the house whether he has been informed of a patient records breach, since he has been minister, where a significant number of records held by SA Health may have been, or were, accessed without authority by an external party?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:02): I haven't.

HEALTH INDUSTRIES ADVISORY BOARD

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:02): My question is to the Minister for Health Industries. Can the minister provide further details about last week's visit of the Health Industries Advisory Board and how it will help grow the life sciences sector in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:02): The state government's Health Industries Advisory Board convened in Adelaide last week for two days of strategy sessions and networking to discuss future prospects and strengthen links in the local health and biomedical sciences community. We are fortunate to have so many talented people, locally and from interstate and overseas, helping steer our direction in health industries and identify opportunities.

The advisory board heard from the companies that have already invested in South Australia with Health Industries' support—Hydrix, Micro-X and Trajan—and how the role of Health Industries is evolving to support a mature investment and regulatory environment.

The board saw interesting presentations on topics as varied as medical devices, digital health, ICT, the Business of Ageing, and Investment Attraction South Australia. The week was capped off by a networking event in the Mortlock wing of the State Library last Thursday with the Premier and more than 50 people in industry and academia. The local health and life sciences community has been encouraged by the government's focus on health industries.

On a recent trip, I met with companies in Italy, France and the United Arab Emirates. I signed a memorandum of understanding between South Australia and the Piedmont region of Italy, focusing on increasing collaboration in health industries. The memorandum was signed at Bioindustry Park Silvano Fumero, a life science and technology park just outside Turin, with the Piedmont Minister for Economic Development, Giuseppina De Santis.

The agreement will see our two jurisdictions work together to support the growth of life science companies in our regions, especially in the healthcare sector. It will also increase collaboration on research and education, and help the parties share best practices and knowledge for delivering better public health services. The agreement also establishes formal ties between Health Industries South Australia and bioPmed, a community of 460 companies, three universities, and different research centres and associations active in life sciences in Piedmont.

Piedmont is the most economically advanced region of Italy, well known for its history of manufacturing with Fiat and now its expertise in life sciences. As well as strengthening historical ties, this agreement will allow increased business research and education collaboration between Turin and Adelaide, including great potential for Turin-based companies using Adelaide to enter markets in the Asia-Pacific region.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): My question is to the Minister for Health. How many Queen Elizabeth Hospital patients have had their elective surgery postponed or cancelled in the last month as a consequence of the breakdown of the hospital's air conditioning, and does the government have any plans to provide compensation to these patients?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:05): No, we don't normally compensate patients and it is not unusual, unfortunately, for patients to have their elective surgery cancelled. It is quite a frequent occurrence, and it is something which, through the changes with Transforming Health, we are proposing to fix.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have a plan to improve the—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have a plan to improve elective surgery so that patients do not wait as long for elective surgery and there are far fewer cancellations of elective surgery.

With regard to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, my advice is that there has been a problem with the air conditioning in the operating suites because of the high humidity that we have been experiencing in Adelaide. These are very specialised air conditioning systems for operating theatres

and they are not operating well at the moment because of the high humidity. It is something technicians are attempting to fix.

I do not have the exact number in front of me but I know most recently the number was roughly 100 cancellations of elective surgery. The operating theatre that deals with emergency surgery is still operating, so emergency surgery is happening at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and urgent elective surgery is being transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament Jessica Trengove, Commonwealth Games medallist, and wish her well for the Olympic Games. The member for Wright.

Question Time

DISABILITY JUSTICE PLAN

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:07): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the house about the implementation of the Disability Justice Plan and the Communication Partner Service?

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) (14:07): I thank the member for Wright for her question. This is a very important initiative by the state government and it is one that I am sure most people will welcome. It is very important that there is communication support in police interviews and in court, and this was a strong theme that arose from the community consultation in the development of the Disability Justice Plan.

A key initiative in the Disability Justice Plan is the introduction of trained, independent volunteer communications partners. These are people who will play a similar role to interpreters for people with complex communication needs. The Statutes Amendment (Vulnerable Witnesses) Act 2015 provides a statutory basis for the introduction of communication partner services.

The objective of the service is to provide trained independent volunteer personnel to facilitate communication between vulnerable victims, witnesses, suspects and defendants with complex communication needs in their contact with the criminal justice system. Funding of \$1.362 million under the Disability Justice Plan was allocated for the establishment of the Communication Partner Service in the non-government sector over a period of some four years.

As part of the competitive process, the Communication Partner Service Grant was launched by the Attorney-General's Department on 16 September. I am now pleased to announce that Uniting Communities has been selected as the successful provider of the Communication Partner Service. Uniting Communities is tasked with establishing and managing the service, including the selection, training and supervision of volunteers to provide communication assistance to vulnerable witnesses for the giving of evidence in and out of court.

Uniting Communities has extensive experience in delivering programs to people with disability and children all across the states, including in regional areas, and has a large trained volunteer workforce delivering vital programs, such as, for example, Lifeline. The Attorney-General's Department will work collaboratively with Uniting Communities and criminal justice agencies to get the service in place prior to the commencement of the Vulnerable Witnesses Act on 27 June this year.

The Communication Partner Service will complement other services in the Disability Justice Plan, including the previously announced specialist training for investigative interviews being delivered by the Deakin University Centre for Investigative Interviewing to investigating staff in South Australia Police, in Child Protection Services, in Families SA, the Department of Education and Child Development and Disability SA—all of them.

The Communication Partner Service, combined with the specialist training legislative reform and other measures in the Disability Justice Plan, will make South Australia a leading jurisdiction in improving access to justice for people with a disability.

CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT ERROR

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Minister for Health. When did the Department for Health and Ageing request that the Royal Adelaide Hospital undertake a root cause analysis into the chemotherapy dosing case?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): My recollection is, and I will double check it, that when the chief executive learnt of what had happened he provided instructions for one to happen.

CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT ERROR

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): When was that?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11): I don't know, I need to check the date.

SMALL BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister advise the house about the recent Small Business Roundtable?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:11): Thank you, sir, and I thank the member for Little Para for his question; there are a lot of small businesses in his electorate. This morning more than 25 heads of small business organisations gathered in the Old Chamber for the Fifth Small Business Roundtable, that is, the fifth such round table conducted by the Weatherill government since 2014.

The round table is a great opportunity for people who represent thousands of small businesses—the beating heart of our economy. It allows direct access to ministers on a range of topics, and can I thank the Minister for Automotive Transformation and the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development for attending this morning.

Today's forum considered the opportunities for small business among the raft of programs designed to assist automotive-centred businesses to move into other opportunities. Concerns were also raised at the forum about delays in planning reforms. That is an issue for consideration in another place, but it is clear from this morning's meeting that those delays are hurting small businesses.

The round table was also an opportunity to hear from businesses about how we can maximise job creating through the recently announced Small Business Development Fund. The \$10 million fund is part of the Northern Economic Plan and will be rolled out after July 1. We have consulted with major business organisations, and again today I took the opportunity at the Small Business Roundtable to consult with representatives from small business about how we should construct that program.

It is clear that the fund needs to include employer grants to small businesses to take on new employees in specified job-seeker categories, particularly those potential employees, the very young, the very old, those who most need our help. Also, that it needs to include start-up grants for people starting a new business based on matching funds, contributions from business and business expansion grants to job-creating SMEs.

So, Mr Speaker, we sought this opportunity to listen carefully to the advice of small business so as to guide our policies going forward on how to create more jobs for them. There is considerable growth in some sectors of the SME sector, particularly in regard to exports of primary produce, meat, wine and advanced manufacturers.

We are committed to keeping the administrative burden with the grants programs to a minimum. We will be targeted and swift and we will aim to get people in jobs as soon as we can. We

will build a better economy as we transform from the old one to the new economy, and I thank the representatives from the various SME associations who attended this morning.

Can I also indicate that I have met now with quite a large number of small business organisations and listened carefully to their wish list, if you like, their list of concerns. There is often about 15 to 20 key points of concern. We are working through those 15 to 20 points with each industry association point by point and will get them an answer one way or the other on each of the issues they have raised. My aim is to get through nearly all of them over the coming year or so.

Can I also congratulate the industry advocate, Ian Nightingale; the Small Business Commissioner, John Chapman; the Department of State Development, and the red tape reduction unit in the DPC. We meet weekly to go through the issues confronting small business to coordinate what we are doing, and all of those officers are doing a splendid job in making sure that the lines of communication between the government and job-creating SMEs are open for business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Chaffey, Mount Gambier and the Treasurer.

CORONIAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the concerns raised by the Coroner, will the minister commission an audit of root cause analyses undertaken in South Australia to ensure that all deaths which are required to be reported to the Coroner under section 28 of the Coroners Act have been reported?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15): I understand the Coroner has been on radio this morning. I have not seen exactly what he has said, but my understanding is that he has expressed concerns about root cause analysis not being disclosed to him as part of his proceedings. This was a matter, I think, in the Supreme Court where the Supreme Court (Justice Vanstone if I recall) ruled in favour of the government or the Department for Health that the statutory privilege that is provided to root cause analysis should be upheld. The Department for Health—not only could it not, but legally it was unable to provide information to the Coroner that he wanted.

There are very, very important reasons why root cause analyses have this particular privilege associated with them and why it is provided in the Health Care Act. This is something, I have to say, that has existed in legislation in living memory and been supported by both sides of politics when they have been in government. The reason why these are privileged is so that when something happens—when something goes wrong in our health system—clinicians can speak frankly and honestly about their actions without fear of repercussions from what they say as part of that root cause analysis proceeding.

So it is a long-held provision in South Australia, and my understanding is that similar provisions occur in health acts right around the country, that root cause analyses have this special provision in order to protect clinicians and to protect what they say. As soon as there is threat of repercussions from what a clinician might say as part of a root cause analysis—as soon as there are repercussions—then of course clinicians will be very careful about what they say and, to put it bluntly, will lawyer up and take legal advice about what they say, because they won't want to compromise themselves in the event of a medical indemnity proceeding, a medical negligence proceeding or any other proceedings.

Having said that, root cause analysis does not preclude other investigations happening; they run in parallel. So it does not preclude the Coroner having access to all other information: medical records; the whole gamut of information the Coroner needs as part of his investigations. It also doesn't preclude AHPRA and investigations that the AHPRA conducts. While root cause analyses have particular privilege attached to them, that doesn't preclude the other investigations, including coronial investigations, from happening. But it is a longstanding principle, and something that in the past at least has had support from both sides of politics, that—

Mr Marshall: Are you going to get to the question; you've got 15 seconds to go.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is a provision that has had support from—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —both sides of politics—

Mr Knoll: Come on Jack; are you going to do an audit?

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —and I would expect that to continue.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:19): Will the Treasurer update the house on the latest developments on the campaign by this government to have the federal government reverse its \$80 billion cut to health and education from their 2014 federal budget?

The SPEAKER: The question is to the Treasurer.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:20): May I say, sir, it is refreshing to see the spirit of Graham Gunn alive and well in the parliament today. All members are aware that the centrepiece of the 2014-15 commonwealth budget was cuts. They were deep, they were unprecedented and they were delivered without warning or notice. They totalled \$80 billion in health and education across the nation over a 10-year period. Scorched earth. In South Australia they totalled \$5.5 billion over a decade, \$655 million of which impacts the health sector between 2014-15 through to 2017-18.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: These are real cuts with real impacts on real people.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Despite the views of members opposite, one of whom chose to go to print this week with the absurd claim that these cuts were make-believe, I can assure the house that they are real and they are having a massive impact on the state budget. Whilst those opposite don't think these cuts are real, they appear in the commonwealth budget papers themselves. Maybe those opposite should ask their hero, Liberal Premier Mike Baird, a successful Liberal—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I take objection to the improper interjection by the member for Chaffey, and I am not prepared to say what it was he said to the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Wright approach the chair and confidentially disclose what is alleged to have been said. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am sure they would be enlightened by Premier Baird's response. Our government has campaigned strongly against these cuts, and with the commonwealth

government now preparing its May budget, whenever it is, it is now an important time for all South Australians to add their voice to the campaign. Last month, a meeting of health and education stakeholders, businesses and universities met with the Premier and other government ministers to hear an update on these commonwealth government cuts.

Today, the Australian Medical Association, who was represented at our federal cuts taskforce meeting, restated their position on these cruel cuts. They say that Australian public hospitals are facing a catastrophic funding crisis from 2017, when the full impact of these cuts take effect. They say, and I quote the AMA President, Professor Brian Owler:

The AMA has highlighted the crisis facing public hospitals and patients for almost two years, but the Federal Government has done nothing.

This government knows how they feel. Since the cuts were handed down we have consistently applied pressure to have the commonwealth government reverse these cuts. Unfortunately, our calls have been ignored and our state budget has suffered as a result.

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Professor Owler notes that these cuts will have a real impact on the treatment of patients. Waiting times will increase, causing patient health to suffer.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We need to find a solution to this problem; a long-term solution, not a bandaid fix. The calls from the AMA—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Hammond to order.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Professor Owler has called on the Prime Minister to use the May budget to offer a long-term public hospital funding—

Mr Bell interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —commitment. Today we join him in those calls. I encourage every South Australian to join our campaign to fight these cruel cuts—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Davenport to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to South Australia's schools and hospitals by joining the campaign—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —at www.federalcutshurt.com.au. We need a united front to apply pressure on the commonwealth government to fix this problem that they created and commit to properly fund health care in this country.

The SPEAKER: Would the Treasurer please approach the chair. The deputy leader.

RENEWAL SA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Given that the evidence of Bronwyn Pike to the

independent, broad-based anticorruption inquiry has been now published, will he now immediately ask Ms Pike to stand aside as chair of Renewal SA?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:25): I thank the deputy leader for her question. I am advised that Ms Pike was called to appear before the independent, broad-based anticorruption commission to assist with their investigation, not on the basis that she was a person being investigated. I am also advised that there has been no suggestion or allegation of criminal or corrupt conduct by Ms Pike—

Ms Chapman: It's in the transcript.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The deputy leader refers to reading the transcript; perhaps I could suggest to her that she goes through that process.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am also assured, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier and the member for Hartley are both on two warnings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier spent some time in the chair this morning and, in fine cricketing tradition, he was willing to walk—I haven't declared him out yet. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying, there has been no suggestion or allegation of criminal or corrupt conduct—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And so, in the absence—

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And so in the absence of such an assertion or an allegation of criminal—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley will leave for the remainder of question time under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In the absence of an allegation of corrupt or criminal conduct by Ms Pike, I'm interested to understand the basis on which the deputy leader suggests—

Ms Chapman: It's only a multimillion dollar tender business.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —she immediately be sacked.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Has someone taken offence at something the minister said? No? The deputy leader.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO TRADE UNION GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question again is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Given that the government is not prepared to stand aside Michael Deegan after his investigation and referral to the New South Wales DPP in relation to the Crimes Act, and given—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The deputy leader's question is out of order.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader's question contains argumentation. The member for Colton.

RIVER MURRAY SAFETY CAMPAIGN

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:28): My question is to the Minister—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphet is warned.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house of the new safety campaign for Murray River users that will be launched tomorrow?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:28): I thank the member for Colton for his question but, to be honest, the real thanks for this should go to the member for Hammond because, without his sustained and well-made campaign to see this through, this initiative would not be happening.

As the member for Colton said, tomorrow a safety campaign will be launched for recreation on the River Murray. The campaign is as a result of a grassroots effort from the River Murray Boating and Recreation Advisory Group (or RMBRAG, as they are known) to reflect community sentiment about the kind of behaviour they want to see out on the river.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: RMBRAG is made up of representatives from government and regional agencies, waterskiing and wakeboard groups, industry association members, but most of all, members of the many river communities. RMBRAG took the initiative, through the member for Hammond, to develop a survey which had over 400 respondents, most of whom used the river for over 35 days per year, with the survey identifying a number of common concerns around boating behaviour on the river. RMBRAG told me—and the member for Hammond reiterated this—that there is an overwhelming sentiment from the survey respondents that a campaign of 'educate, not regulate' was required with regard to this behaviour.

RMBRAG has been developing a strategy and presenting the plan and campaign approach that is to be launched tomorrow. I reiterate again and commend the member for Hammond for recognising this idea in his local community and pursuing it with the government. A key pillar of the strategy by RMBRAG is an innovative social media approach to target the key demographic groups of river users. The argument, quite frankly, was immediately compelling from the member for Hammond and from RMBRAG. Subsequently, we were able to provide grant funding of \$20,000 to RMBRAG to make the campaign possible.

The campaign uses various media platforms to feature videos, as well as more traditional methods such as better signage at boat ramps to drive home key safety messages for river users. Presented by wakeboarding champion and Riverland local Bec Gange, the first three videos to be released as part of the campaign will feature safety messages on:

- location—encouraging river users, particularly of larger vessels making wash, to keep away from populated areas and other vessels, minimising wash impact;
- jet skis—the campaign video provides advice about not operating near other vessels, riders and skiers, not to jump the wash and general handling advice; and
- life jackets—encouraging river users, especially children, to wear life jackets in or near the river.

Having fun on the water should never come at the expense of safety. I encourage anyone thinking about taking the boat or jet ski out on the river this weekend to look at the hashtag #murrayriverlife and the campaign there first. People are encouraged to view and share the videos via the Murray River Life Facebook page and share their own experiences of the river under that hashtag #murrayriverlife. Chair of RMBRAG Adam Bruce told me he is thrilled to see the campaign launch just in time for the long weekend.

A code of conduct has also been advised by RMBRAG, in conjunction with the Boating Industry Association and Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, which guides river users on the safe way to operate vessels when undertaking activities like water-skiing, riding and tubing. RMBRAG is hoping to have a significant number of high-profile groups, such as boat rental businesses, rental shacks and houseboats, skiing and wakeboarding groups, promote the code of conduct that has been developed. This campaign is a great example of how a local community and a local member working together with the government can bring about a great outcome on the River Murray. Once again, I thank the member for Hammond for his efforts.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Chaffey please approach the chair. The member for Unley.

ROAD SAFETY REMUNERATION ORDER

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister support the Australian Industry Group's submission to delay the implementation of the Road Safety Remuneration Order until 1 January 2017?

The Australian Industry Group claim the Road Safety Remuneration Order, which was due to start 4 April this year, is causing widespread concern and confusion in the road transport industry and the community. The application is supported by the National Road Transport Association. The Australian Industry Group's application to delay the start date aims to protect the community from widespread job losses, damage to businesses and harm to rural and regional areas.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:33): I have not seen the AIG's submission on it, but perhaps if I can provide the house with some background information on why the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal was established and what it aims to do, particularly through their recent remuneration determination. We have spoken on several occasions in this chamber, and certainly there has been a lot of interest ventilated in the—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: previously it has been your ruling that, while photography may take place from the galleries, the position that photography is out of order from within the chamber is still the case. The Minister for Tourism has just taken a second photograph of yourself. I request that you rule on the matter.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Tourism?

Mr GARDNER: I invite you to invite him to the bench to check his phone if you are uncertain, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will consider it in due course, after I have dealt with the member for Chaffey. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, we have spoken at some length in this chamber about the need to improve safety standards within the heavy vehicle industry, not just here in South Australia but nationally. We are part of a nation which has a freight industry which operates, of course, as you would expect, across borders, and we have recently been

pointedly interested in it. Something that the member for Mitchell, when he had his former responsibilities, and I were very interested in were improving—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Chaffey's insults are getting out of hand. They need to stop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is there—

Members interjecting:

Members

MEMBERS, NAMING

The SPEAKER: I name the member for Unley, the leader and the Treasurer for that outburst.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise for the outburst.

Mr PISONI: I apologise, sir, for the outburst.

Mr MARSHALL: I apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: You are all shriven.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:36): I move:

That the apologies be accepted.

Motion carried.

Question Time

ROAD SAFETY REMUNERATION ORDER

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer, I trust, was making a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir. I have withdrawn it.

The SPEAKER: The point of order stands withdrawn. The member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Education—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr PISONI: I don't believe the Minister for Transport had finished his answer. It's an important issue, sir, and—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I get that. Has the minister finished his answer?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, I will keep going.

The SPEAKER: You will keep going, splendid.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thanks very much, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I thank the member for Unley for his assistance.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:37): As I was saying, in recent times, particularly in the middle of 2014, we saw some horrendous accidents involving heavy vehicles on the South Eastern Freeway. There has been an enormous amount of effort locally to address heavy vehicle safety not just on that route but more generally in South Australia. There have also been similar efforts at a national level to try to enshrine greater levels of safety throughout the industry, and that was the key reason, I am advised, for the establishment of the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal.

The purpose of the tribunal is to, amongst other things, make determinations about minimum rates which drivers need to be paid when they are operating within the industry, and that's important for a few reasons. One is because, in some areas of the industry around the country, there has been a practice where very large companies with very large economies of scale can afford to win contracts based on very sharp pricing because they have inherent efficiencies within their business.

At the other end, there are enormous numbers of owner-operators within the heavy vehicle industry who find it incredibly difficult to compete with those larger operators and who find that they need to cut their cloth accordingly so that, when they tender for work on behalf of people who are looking to move goods from one place to another, they can compete with these larger companies. In cutting their cloth, quite often, there have been practices, particularly amongst some of these smaller operators or owner-operators—not all of them, but just some of them—where they have been cutting back on the maintenance of their vehicles. An unroadworthy vehicle on the road poses a danger not just to that operator or their operation but to all of the other road users around them.

The purpose of issuing a determination by the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal is to provide a floor at or above which people must be remunerated when they are carrying goods around the country. I can understand that there are large business interests and employer groups—perhaps like the AIG, and, as I said, I haven't seen their particular comments, but I suspect they are similar to some other comments that have been made by those sorts of people around the country—that don't support this lifting of minimum remuneration levels for operators within the heavy vehicle industry.

On this side of politics, it wouldn't be the first time that we have had employers complaining about having to pay people a reasonable and fair rate of pay to make sure that they can achieve a standard of living or to make sure that, when they're operating within the industry, they are doing so safely. Do I support the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal? In principle, absolutely, yes, I do and if their determination is going to lead to safer outcomes out on the roads, then I think that is something the whole community can support as well.

Mr PISONI: Supplementary, sir.

Parliament House Matters

CHAMBER PHOTOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER (14:40): Before we come to the supplementary, if indeed we do come to the supplementary—would the member for Unley be seated—the member for Morialta raised a point of order about the Minister for Tourism taking photos of the member for Chaffey and me in conference at the chair. I did, as Speaker, liberalise the rules on taking photographs in the chamber. However, I think members taking photographs of other members without their consent is a bad development.

Mr Marshall: A grievous crime.

The SPEAKER: Well, I wouldn't say that, but it's a deplorable development, and I rely on a ruling of Speaker Snelling.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Good Speaker!

The SPEAKER: Self-praise is no praise. The Speaker acknowledged that the practice was disorderly and two members apologised for disorderly behaviour and indicated that they would dispose of the offending photograph, and I suggest that the Minister for Tourism does the same. The member for Reynell.

Question Time

BETTER SCHOOLS FUNDING

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house how the Better Schools funding is helping Wirreanda Secondary School support vulnerable students?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:42): I thank the member for her question about a school that, of all the schools she likes in her electorate, I'm sure is very near the top. Wirreanda is

an extraordinarily good school. I'm yet to visit the campus and I'm looking forward to doing that, but last year I was very impressed to attend an ANZAC Day celebration that they held here in Adelaide where they showed how the students had learned about the individual histories of people who had been associated with the school who had gone to Gallipoli 100 years earlier and, of course, many did not return. It was a very moving but also very impressive experience to be part of.

Of course, the member's question relates specifically to how Gonski or Better Schools funding is being used for the betterment of students at Wirreanda, as it is across the state, but of course, particularly targeted at schools that are managing and teaching children who come from an educationally disadvantaged background. Wirreanda is a category 3 school, unlike the Mark Oliphant school we spoke about yesterday, which is a category 1.

Category 3 is a little higher, but it is, nonetheless, a school that has a reasonable amount of disadvantage to counteract. There is a high proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students in the school which is excellent and, of course, it has a significant proportion of socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. The school also has a disability unit, as the member would be aware, which caters for about 20 students and offers flexible learning options (FLO) for 144 of their 850 students.

When the Better Schools funding was made available, the principal went through a process of determining how that school could best spend that money and, similar to the Mark Oliphant school, determined that attendance and completion is crucial. So the funding that they have had, which is something like \$300,000 over the past two years, was specifically targeted for attendance and SACE completion, and particularly to allow leadership of the school to work with—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer, the leader and the deputy leader will be silent. The minister's answer will be heard in silence. The minister is supplying the house with information.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —students on completing their SACE, and also to provide enhanced education plans for Aboriginal students in order to specifically target the support that they need and deserve. The school has seen results already even though it is early days. Over the past year the school has seen a 5 per cent increase in their SACE completion rate which is not insignificant and, importantly, since the program has begun, there has been a 9 per cent increase in the attendance rate of ATSI students, which is absolutely testament to the effort that that school and those students have put in.

Principal Fishpool has said that the school is very pleased with these early results but, of course, it is just the start of ongoing investment. We have committed to years 5 and 6 in South Australia so they are at least confident of that funding but desperately need to know if the federal government is going to step up and continue to fund to need, as we all know is necessary.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): My question is to the Treasurer as Minister for State Development. Have Adelaide Capital Partners responded to the state government's breach of contract notice issued in respect of the Gillman land deal?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:46): I thank the deputy leader for her question. This issue has been raised, I understand, as part of a briefing that was provided to the deputy leader last week when the chief executive of Renewal SA canvassed a range of issues that the deputy leader was interested in, but she, I understand, was interested in this matter and received some advice about that. It is my recollection that the Attorney-General, in his former capacity, has also received questions about this from the deputy leader.

I think, from both last week's briefing and from the comments that the Deputy Premier has made in this chamber, it has been made clear that, while there are dispute resolution processes that are available to both parties within the deed that has been reached between the government and Adelaide Capital Partners and there is a process to resolve that dispute, the government has repeatedly couched its comments in terms of needing to be particularly careful about the requirement

to maintain confidentiality or to be very circumspect about what information was ventilated about this matter, of course, for potentially a range of reasons, but none greater than the risk of compromising the state's position. So you can imagine my surprise—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So you can imagine my surprise—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is warned, and it is especially deplorable given that the former dignified member for Kavel is in the gallery.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Schubert. I'm sorry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So, understanding all of that background and realising that the deputy leader was across the fact that those dispute resolution provisions were contained within the deed, that they were available to both parties and her gaining an understanding through that briefing that some administrative action by the government was underway with that, imagine my surprise when the alternative first law officer of the state, the shadow attorney-general, ran straight out to the media and placed a story in the media about the fact that this commercial arrangement was underway. I am staggered to think that the deputy leader would have acted in a way to potentially compromise the state's position in this matter.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. Can the minister inform the house how the National Disability Insurance Scheme will provide new employment opportunities for South Australians?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:49): I thank the member for her question and note her long interest in the National Disability Insurance Scheme. I had the pleasure last week of joining Mark Kulinski, Chief Executive of Community Living Australia, and Freddie Brincat OAM, Executive Director of Community Bridging Services, to announce new data released by National Disability Services and the Every Australian Counts campaign.

This data reconfirmed existing government estimates that the NDIS will create around 6,000 jobs here in South Australia. The researchers also looked at the direct employment gains in different industries, sectors and regions in our state. The modelling undertaken, in partnership with the Centre for Applied Disability Research, shows increases in employment opportunities across the economy and include 891 new direct jobs in health care and social assistance; 600 direct jobs in manufacturing; 532 direct jobs in retail trade; 473 direct jobs in construction; 456 in education and training; 339 in professional, scientific and technical services; and 280 jobs in administrative and support services.

Importantly, these figures also take into account the anticipated number of carers who will wish to re-enter the labour market following the implementation of the NDIS. Further to this, the government's own analysis is now showing that considerable employment benefits will be spread across the state, and I am sure the members opposite will be interested. In the Yorke and Mid North region, covering the electorates of the members for Frome and Goyder, it is estimated there will be around 400 new jobs. In the Murray Mallee region, the electorates of the members for Hammond and Chaffey could potentially expect to have 300 new jobs.

In the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island region in the member for Finniss' patch, there will be roughly 200 new jobs. In western Adelaide, covering the electorates of the members for Croydon, West Torrens, Colton and Lee, it is estimated there will be roughly 800 new jobs; and in southern

Adelaide, covering the electorates of the members for Bright, Mitchell, Mawson, Reynell and Kaurna, there is expected to be an additional 1,300 new jobs. In the northern Adelaide region, where my electorate resides alongside the electorates of Little Para, Ramsay, Napier and Playford, there are expected to be 750 new jobs.

This builds on the government's \$4 million investment in the disability employment hub in the northern suburbs as part of the Look North announcement. This hub will foster employment growth through training and further education in employment for automotive workers, upskilling existing workers and encouraging university students to enter the disability sector.

I would like to congratulate National Disability Services and the Every Australian Counts campaign for the research that they have undertaken, which is yet to be released. It is important that all sides of politics work together to ensure this important transformational scheme delivers all it needs to for the people who are looking so much towards it.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question again is to the Minister for State Development. When does the state government expect to receive payment for the first section of land being sold to ACP under the Gillman land deal?

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) (14:53): This is something that we have discussed in this place before, many times. The situation is that the state government has completed those prerequisites required of the state under the agreement in order to facilitate the first part of the agreement being crystallised. The matter is now in the hands of the other side—ACP—and we are seeking, as—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We hoped it would have been late last year, but the fact is that all of the ducks haven't lined up yet, so we are continuing to work with them.

The SPEAKER: The ducks?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The ducks, indeed. We are continuing to work with them, as was indicated by the deputy leader as per the briefing that she had. We understand that we are in contact with ACP, obviously, as a contract partner. I think the simple answer is that, as yet, there has not been that payment but, obviously, we hope for that to be done sooner rather than later.

FESTIVALS

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Based on current indications, has the 2016 summer festival season been a success?

The SPEAKER: The cultural attaché.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): I thank the member for the question. The short answer is yes. As the Adelaide Festival of Arts—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The philistines opposite, sir, do not appreciate the cultural life of this state, but nonetheless they are going to hear it; they are going to listen to it. As the Adelaide Festival of Arts and the Adelaide Fringe draw to a close this weekend, I am pleased to inform the house that both events are set to record huge audiences.

The Adelaide Fringe under new director Heather Croall has gone gangbusters, with record numbers flocking to the opening parade and other events, including the stunning illuminations that lit up North Terrace for the first two weeks. With over 400 venues and 1,000 events, this year's festival has been the biggest yet.

While there has been some discussion about the size of the Fringe, I am pleased to inform the house they are on track to hit their target of selling 550,000 tickets, indicating that Adelaide crowds are anything but complacent or lazy. That being said, I know the team has taken on board some of the criticism levelled at the Fringe and will strive to find ways to provide more support to venues and artists as it plans for 2017.

Heather, together with her board and Fringe staff, has worked incredibly hard to bring together such a successful event, and I would like to record my thanks and appreciation to them all for their efforts. The Adelaide Festival has gone extremely well with box office targets achieved two weeks before opening night. David Sefton's final year as Festival Director kicked off with a bang with Groupe F at the iconic Adelaide Oval. I am pleased to note that, despite the incredible fireworks display, the grandstand did not catch fire and the scoreboard is still standing. This year, Mr Speaker, I have to say I am very impressed by the number of—

Mr Marshall: Who's your speechwriter?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You're very angry today, Steven—very, very angry young man. I think it might have something to do with the deputy leader doing her job interview at *The Advertiser* earlier today. The poor old Leader of the Opposition seems to be a little bit rattled. I have to say that I am very impressed by the number of local artists and arts organisations, like up-and-coming playwright Phillip Kavanagh, Vitalstatistix and Slingsby, who have been programmed in this internationally renowned festival, alongside the likes of Pina Bausch.

The Adelaide Writers' Week, which took over the Pioneer Women's Garden last week, was incredibly successful, and I would like to congratulate the director, Laura Kroetch, on what was an excellent program. As we approach this final weekend and throw WOMAdelaide into the mix, there is nowhere in the world you would rather be than here in our festival state. Not only are these events great experiences for South Australians, they are also economically important with around one-third of our audiences coming from interstate and overseas, injecting millions into our state's economy. I encourage all members to get involved with this incredibly unique Adelaide festival season.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for State Development. Has the minister met with any of ACP's investors who will be paying for the first section of the development at Gillman?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:58): I meet with people all the time, and I meet with representatives—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —of the business community, I meet with people who want to Invest in South Australia, I meet with representatives of the media, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has today, and I always encourage investment in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light.

TOURISM MARKETING

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:59): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Minister, can you update the house on tourism marketing activities in China?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Do it in Chinese; do it in Mandarin.

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) (14:59): Ni hao, xie xie. I thank the member for Light for the question. Last week it was terrific to see our international visitor survey figures come out to show a 10 per cent increase in the number of international visitors to South Australia and, importantly, a 26 per cent increase in the revenue of the money spent by international visitors when they have come here.

In this year's state budget we added an extra \$35 million for the tourism sector to make sure that we can market our state and its regions all around Australia, and indeed around the world. Three million dollars of that \$35 million was earmarked for promotions in China, and I am happy to say that we are seeing a great increase in—well, I guess in the revenue. Year on year we have increased the amount of money coming into the South Australian economy from Chinese tourists by 33 per cent, so that is a terrific result.

The number of Chinese visitors to Australia increased 5 per cent, and it is part of our 2020 China strategy to keep increasing the number of visitors. We had 32,000 Chinese visitors to South Australia last year; we want to grow that to 57,000 by 2020. One of the ways we are doing it is by working with television production companies, and I just wanted to single out one that is called *Running Man*. It is a show not known to Australians, but it is a massive show in China. They were here last year and, as soon as people saw characters from these shows in Rundle Mall or in Chinatown, down at the Adelaide Central Market, and they put that on Twitter or Facebook, huge mobs just descended on the mall and Chinatown.

That episode has gone to air now and it reached an audience of 200 million people. I mean, they are figures that even Matt and Dave would dream about. Two hundred million people is a great audience; it is a terrific audience. We are going out on social media; we are spending money in that way. When I was up in Qingdao last November I walked into a local shopping centre and they had fantastic displays and interactive activities for families to get involved in.

Of course, we have seen an increase, too, in the number of students that we have got coming to South Australia. Through Study Adelaide we are working on getting even more Chinese students down here to—

Mr Knoll: Leon, isn't *Running Man* a Korean show, not Chinese?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Mr Speaker, the member for Schubert just keeps yelling out. I can't even hear myself. If you could just—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: He just keeps yelling out, sir.

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

Ms Sanderson: Is it Korean or Chinese?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Ends another bad week for the member for Schubert.

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We will continue to look at the visitor economy as a way we can create more jobs in South Australia and that we can add money into our state. It is an important sector; one that employs 32,000 South Australians. We want to get another 9,000 South Australians working in the tourism sector by 2020, and we will do that by spending more money, by getting more events, more conferences and more conventions to South Australia, and making sure that we show off South Australia to interstate and overseas audiences in the best possible light.

We are also working with Chinese airlines. We know it is very important to get a direct link with China. The team from the South Australian Tourism Commission recently had discussions up there with China Southern and China Eastern, and those talks are continuing.

Grievance Debate

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:03): Rarely is the subject of water far from people's minds on Eyre Peninsula, or indeed South Australia. The limited nature of our most precious resource has always dictated the way we live. Our early households were often entirely self-sufficient and, more often than not, their domestic supply was captured from the roofs of houses and sheds, which was eked out over a dry summer and encouraged to last by the implementation of the 'one bath a week' policy which, although not legislated, was often enforced in homes around the state.

The decades following World War II saw the gradual exploitation of our underground water resource. This was following the building of the Tod River Reservoir in the 1920s and the extension of the reticulated scheme throughout Eyre Peninsula. I am going to come back to the Tod a little bit later should time permit. We also saw the exploitation of our underground basins. Unfortunately the limitations of these basins were not realised for some years and only now are we beginning to understand the finite nature of a shallow limestone lens.

It would seem that the Tod Reservoir is about to be taken offline and the likelihood is that it would be mothballed in the very near future. The Tod is, after all, a product of its catchment, a catchment that delivers salts, nitrates and chemical residues into the water. There are also quality issues with our current supply, mostly associated with high levels of calcium.

SA Water is the corporation currently responsible for the delivery of water to the major households and businesses across South Australia. That entity and the Department of Environment are responsible for the sustainable management of our public water resource. Up until recently, SA Water has held a monopoly position in this state, but late last year legislation was passed through the state parliament—this parliament—enabling third-party access to SA Water pipes and infrastructure.

It is yet to be seen what this might look like in a practical sense but I believe it could well mean an opportunity for providers other than SA Water to enter the water market. Extra water could come from a number of sources and a desalination plant is the most obvious. The likelihood of a large-scale, expensive plant built by a government on Eyre Peninsula is unlikely. What is more likely is a number of small scale privately owned and operated plants manufacturing water for businesses and towns.

Imagine the opportunities that could come to Eyre Peninsula if we had ample good water available, opportunities to grow businesses and population that have been restricted up until now by a lack of that most basic of requirements—water. I think the opportunities are endless. As well as desal, there could be an increase in the use of plastic sheeting, an increase in the use of captured stormwater and recycling, and even the desalination of groundwater and, of course, that old favourite and ever-reliable, rainwater.

SA Water has officially moved towards decommissioning the Tod Reservoir. It has written to both the District Council of Tumby Bay and the District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula outlining its plans. SA Water is planning to spend approximately \$15 million to decommission infrastructure that has been in place for almost 90 years. I would have to say that I and most of the community would view this as valuable infrastructure and it should not be walked away from completely.

I understand there are quality issues, and I have talked about that already, but it was only just a few months ago that the state government was talking about recreational fishing in this reservoir for goodness sake. I understand that there have been conversations with Lincoln Minerals about supplying up to 600 megalitres of water per year for a potential graphite mine in operation just over the hill. So I wonder at the wisdom of mothballing a reservoir such as the Tod. It has iconic status on Eyre Peninsula and surely, as technology advances, this one gigalitre capacity reservoir should have some useful purpose and at least provide extra water security for Eyre Peninsula going into the future.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge in the gallery today visitors from the Amadiyya Muslim Community and welcome them to parliament. We thank them for visiting us and hope that they enjoy their time with us today. Member for Fisher.

Grievance Debate

AMADIYYA MUSLIM COMMUNITY

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:08): I rise today to celebrate some fantastic work happening in my community over the past week. The Amadiyya Muslim Community is a dynamic, fast-growing, international revival movement within Islam. It was founded by His Holiness Mirza Ghulam Ahmad

of Qadian India in 1889, and it now spans over 207 countries with membership exceeding tens of millions.

The motto of their community is 'Love for all and hatred for none'. Most members are from the subcontinent with others from Africa and the Pacific Islands. The community invests heavily in teaching its youth the true teachings of Islam and to enjoin each other in matters of goodness and piety, refraining from matters of sin and injustice as well as to vie each other in matters of excellence. The association actively participates in various initiatives such as the national tree planting day, Red Cross door knock appeal, blood donations and feeding the hungry.

Every year, thousands of Amadiyya Muslim men and women, young and old, enthusiastically take part in clean-up activities in their neighbourhoods, and also generously donate to their organisation. They have some of the highest volunteer numbers in the country. Clean Up Australia inspires and empowers communities to clean up, fix up and conserve our environment. Since its first day in 1989, Australians have devoted more than 27.2 million hours towards the environment through Clean Up Australia Day, and collected over 288,650 tonnes of rubbish.

The Amadiyya Muslim Association has been taking part in Clean Up Australia Day since soon after its inception in Australia in 1989. This year, they successfully participated in clean-up activities in all eight states having the most volunteers and financial donations with over 1,500 volunteers, and around \$4,000 in donations.

Amadiyya state headquarters is Mahmood Mosque, Beverley, and they started their clean-up activities around on Tapleys Hill Road, near the airport. Their community have now adopted additional sites including Panalatinga Road at Woodcroft, and last Sunday they had their large group of volunteers, which I supported. This last week there were 268 registered volunteers in all of their projects, including youth, children and the elderly. Their Adelaide chapter also donated \$687, and during clean up collected 70 bags of rubbish. They were very large and, indeed, very full bags of rubbish.

Working with this community, I was struck by their commitment to being positive role models to not only their own children, but two other children in their community. They are committed to an inclusive, respectful and peaceful community. I had some great conversations with a few of the local participants, and really got a good understanding of what drives them. I was very impressed.

By coincidence, on Monday night I then attended our local citizenship ceremony where 101 new citizens were being welcomed in the City of Onkaparinga. I noticed an old friend of mine, Dr Munawar Rana, sitting in the front row. I have worked many long shifts in the Flinders Medical Centre Intensive Care Unit with Dr Rana, as well as flying retrieval missions with some extremely sick patients. I remember being so confident in his skills as a trainee anaesthetist at that particular point, and I know together we saved lives; and that ensures a life bond—one that is long-lasting.

Dr Rana is the SA President of the Amadiyya Muslim Association. I had not seen him for perhaps eight years and, just by chance, bumping into him the day after joining his association for Clean Up Australia Day was uncanny. Dr Rana's son, Khizar—and I apologise for the pronunciation, if that is incorrect—was the recipient of a perfect ATAR score in year 12 last year. He had been invited to speak as a youth leader to the new citizens in the City of Onkaparinga.

Khizar's speech explained much to me about Dr Rana's journey to Australia which, I am sure, is no different from many members of the Amadiyya Association, and explains their compassion as well as their determination. With four children, he and his wife came to Australia as refugees from Pakistan. As Amadiyya Muslims, they had faced state-sponsored religious persecution in Pakistan, the constitution of which restricts them from identifying themselves as Muslims and from practising their religion in any manner.

Dr Rana spent time in gaol for praying, and his father also spent time in gaol for saying *As-salamu alaykum*—and again I apologise for the pronunciation—which is a simple expression which means: 'Peace be upon you'. Basic rights of living were withheld from them. Open hate speeches and life threats were in abundance, so they left and came for a better life, and, along with many inspiring immigrants to this country, delivered pizzas and drove taxis while they studied and

achieved excellence in the studies of medicine, and I thank you all for what you are doing for our community today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I must say I actually spend a lot of time at Panalatinga Road, Woodcroft, and I noticed it is cleaner. So, well done. Member for Hammond.

RIVER MURRAY BOATING AND RECREATIONAL ADVISORY GROUP

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:14): I rise today to speak about the River Murray Boating and Recreational Advisory Group, and I acknowledge the kind words today in question time from the Minister for Transport. This has been a long road for our group. We formed just over three years ago in response to a piece in *The Advertiser* on the front page about no-wash zones, and we knew we needed to act to protect everyone's rights in relation to the use of the river. So, that is why the River Murray Boating and Recreational Advisory Group was set up.

It is a group I am heavily involved with, but there are also a lot of volunteers on board, and we have the Boating Industry Association and Houseboat Hirers Association on board. I must acknowledge that staff from the environment department and the transport department have been very helpful along the way. I will once again acknowledge the support from the Minister for Transport, because without that support and the funding from that department, we would not be where we are today.

This group was incorporated in 2015. RMBRAG conducted a community survey in 2014, and the response from some 400 responders identified concern for boating behaviour and education on the river. From this response, the committee identified strategies to target these concerns which were:

- to develop a code of conduct for the diverse and varied activities that are undertaken on the river and its immediate environment,
- to develop a communications and education plan that effectively connects with a range of demographics and generations who use the river, and
- to provide solutions and recommendations to government for implementation and seek support financially and in kind.

In 2015, shortly after becoming incorporated, RMBRAG applied for funding through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and were successful in receiving \$20,000 in September. The group have established a one-page code of conduct which covers river users making use of boats and jet skis with topics such as wake, noise, no power turns, keeping your distance, signals, education, location, speed and awareness, wake jumping, life jackets, and drugs and alcohol. With the \$20,000, RMBRAG have also created nine short educational videos, of which three will be launched tomorrow at Sturt Reserve in Murray Bridge. They will also be launched on the Facebook page Murray River Life and everyone is encouraged to share the videos if possible. The code of conduct will also be available on the website, www.rmbtag.com.

I would just like to acknowledge everyone who has been involved, not least my staff and former staff who have been heavily involved in this project. I would like to acknowledge everyone from up and down the river who have come to meetings in Murray Bridge or here in Adelaide to make sure we can keep this project going, and acknowledge that they kept that work up and that desire to make this thing work.

I think we have achieved a great outcome with minimal funding. I am not trying to be too critical of government, because we are very appreciative of what has happened here with the \$20,000, but I think we have made probably hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of investment out of \$20,000 through this way, through the volunteer support and through the ability to hire people like Bec Gange to star in the videos and her group who did the filming one day on the river. It is not too hard to get people to have a bit of fun on the river and work with us to get these videos up. Drones were used and they were fantastic videos that were put together.

I would also like to acknowledge Adam Bruce for his work in coordinating these people and being the chair of our committee. He has done a great job working through meetings and working

with departments to get the job done. Certainly George Bolton from the Boating Industry Association has been a great person and a great conduit to have between the committee and the department. Once again, I would thank everyone who has been involved.

It is going to be a great launch tomorrow. I have seen the videos; they are fantastic. They will really hit the mark that we want to hit so that people will behave appropriately on the river. We want a river that is appropriate for all river use, whether you are a canoeist, a rower, a wakeboarder or a jet-skier. We understand that we need to educate and not regulate, because every time that big yellow boat comes round the corner, the boats slow down. We think this is a great opportunity to get the message out to people along the river, and I appreciate the support of the transport department and the transport minister. It has been fantastic and we will launch this tomorrow.

Time expired.

MEN'S SHEDS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:19): Today, I would like to bring to the house's attention a special week. This week is the Australian Men's Shed Association's inaugural Men's Shed Week. The Men's Shed Week runs from 6 to 12 March and, during this week, various men's sheds right across the country will have open days, shed tours, barbecues and information shared at various local shopping centres, etc. The aim of the week is obviously to increase the profile and awareness of the existence of men's sheds and also the important work they perform in our various communities.

I am aware that, right throughout the whole state, there are a number of men's sheds in both urban and rural areas. I am also aware that, in a lot of rural communities, men's sheds play an important role and, in a moment, I will speak about the shed in my town of Gawler. The sheds play an important role in providing a safe place for men to socialise.

A lot of the men who attend are people who have retired, or who, for example, may not be employed, or who, for whatever reason, attend to engage in friendship with other men. Apart from it being a safe place in which to socialise, there is an opportunity to have a coffee with other men and share their stories and life experiences. There is also an opportunity to learn new skills. A lot of men who go to men's sheds are retired tradespeople, and they are obviously prepared to share the skills they have learnt through their working life.

In some cases, men's sheds play an important role in dealing with the isolation that some men experience through that part of their life, whether the isolation is caused by a partner's death and they are by themselves, whether it is isolation caused by the breakup of the marriage, where they are again by themselves, or because the family has moved away, etc. There are also men who have lost employment.

What the men's sheds achieve and seek to do varies from community to community, depending on how the shed is actually established. Some sheds are started by church groups and some sheds are started by farm groups. The shed in my town, for example, was established by a men's health group. Every shed plays a different role, and they come in different shapes and forms. Some are literally in the centre of town and some are sheds on somebody's farm, etc. I understand that, in one of the communities in my electorate, we may have one of the first pop-up sheds.

The one shed I would like to talk about in a bit more detail today is Willo's Men's Shed which is in Gawler. Willo's Men's Shed opened in 2007. Just to put it on the record, Willo's is located in a big shed which was actually then operated by Employment Directions, which was a not-for-profit organisation in Little Paxton Street, Willaston.

The shed, back in 2007, was the result of a collaboration of many people working together, and I think it is important to acknowledge that. There was the then fatherhood worker in the community, Aaron Phillips; mental health worker, Nigel Davies; Debbie Martin, who was then the manager of community services; Erik Moen, the CEO of the Gawler Health Services; and also Mr Mark Abrook, a member of the Gawler Men's Health Group at the time. They also received support from the then CEO of Employment Directions, Carmel Rosier.

With a grant of \$50,000 from the then Wakefield Health, the shed was established, and it has gone from strength to strength. The shed provides a whole range of opportunities for men to do

things which men like to do. It is not a case of men having to do these things: they actually agree amongst themselves on what is important to them.

For example, in the Willo's Men's Shed, they have got a workshop there and they tinker with, obviously, a lot of equipment. They actually make toys, which they sell to raise funds, and repair furniture for people in nursing homes and other community organisations. They also provide cooking classes for men.

The Willo's Men's Shed, under the current leadership of chairperson Neville Voigt, secretary Kevin Douglas, treasurer Wayne Marks, and committee members Andrew Scholtz, Dougie Lloyd, Henry Loveridge, Rodney Mold and David Dawson, provides a very important support mechanism for men in our community. I would like to congratulate the Australian Men's Shed Association for this inaugural Men's Shed Week.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:24): For three decades now, Neighbourhood Watch volunteer groups have served as the eyes and ears of South Australia and communities, working side-by-side with the South Australian police force to prevent and reduce crime. Since May 1985, when the community policing concept was originally launched with a meeting of Flinders Park Area 001 at the Flinders Park Church of Christ, Neighbourhood Watch has grown to incorporate 630 areas across the state.

Some 20,000 volunteers participate in WatchSA programs including Business Watch, School Watch, Health Watch and Transit Watch. In our security-conscious climate, the Neighbourhood Watch program encouraging community vigilance is more relevant than ever before. In addition to preventing crime, WatchSA programs help to build community resilience, reduce and rationalise the fear of crime and reassure vulnerable members of our community.

I commend all WatchSA volunteers and, in particular, the dedicated long-serving members who have contributed to the continued success of the program. South Australians owe a great deal of gratitude to those volunteers for the vital part they play in their continuing community programs. There are five active groups in the Riverland—Renmark, Barmera, Berri, Loxton and Waikerie—who meet every two to three months.

Paringa was also active for 24 years and went into recess two years ago due to a lack of volunteers, as have the Mallee branches, which have been great community assets, but as is the case with a lot of our community programs, they are driven by some enthusiastic volunteers who, in many cases, become aged and move on. It is sad but it is often unfortunately inevitable that some of those groups have disbanded.

Most groups have guest speakers for the meetings on various topics of interest such as police matters like domestic violence, major crime, drugs and alcohol and road safety. Recently the member for Morialta visited my electorate in his previous role as shadow minister for police and we met at the Waikerie Neighbourhood Watch led by Lynette Nitschke, who has a really great knowledge of Neighbourhood Watch. She is also the area coordinator for that local zone of Neighbourhood Watch.

The Neighbourhood Watch groups involve community members like aged-care services, pharmacists, CFS, ambulance services and keep our communities informed about the latest information regarding the safety and care of their communities. Most of the Riverland groups have been meeting for between 25 to 27 years and all volunteer groups work in conjunction with the local police to keep communities safe.

Renmark has 40 zone leaders, Waikerie has 25, Loxton has 70, Berri has 12 and Barmera has two. Over 8,000 newsletters are delivered in the region every three months. The Neighbourhood Watch groups in the region have had joint stalls at the Riverland field days and they have a purpose-built trailer to promote the ideals of Neighbourhood Watch. That trailer can travel to various locations where there are opportunities to make other communities aware of the need to mark all property, lock up valuables and so forth.

All areas promote and sell safety items such as personal alarms, door alarms, numberplate screws, engravers and other items to help communities live in a safer environment. Once again, I

congratulate all Neighbourhood Watch volunteers on recently reaching a 30-year milestone. Well done to the wonderfully dedicated volunteers in my electorate of Chaffey who assist police on these groups. Neighbourhood Watch plays an invaluable role in our communities and I hope it does so for many more decades to come.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:29): I rise to speak on International Women's Day celebrated earlier this week on Tuesday 8 March and, in doing so, I am pleased to acknowledge that we have a woman in the Chair—the member for Florey. Our state of South Australia can be particularly proud of its part as a world leader in women's rights. While suffragette protests for the right to vote raged in cities like London and Boston in the later years of the 19th century, South Australia went a step further when, in 1894, it became the first democracy in the world to grant women the dual rights to vote and to stand for election to parliament.

However, history reveals that it took another long campaign before the first women were elected to the South Australian parliament in 1959, and I say women because it was two with the election of Joyce Steel to the House of Assembly and Jessie Cooper to the Legislative Council. I am reminded of this every day as I sit in this chamber directly opposite the tapestry that celebrates the Centenary of Women's Suffrage in South Australia and events leading to what was to be a major parliamentary reform.

I also sit directly in front of the tapestry that depicts images which symbolise reforms that have helped make women equal before the law. We have, indeed, come a long way since the passing of the Commonwealth Franchise Act in 1902 when Australia became the first country in the world to give women the right to vote and to stand for federal parliament.

There have been great advances towards achieving equality in this country and there are many women who have been ground breakers in paving the way for others. This week in South Australia we gathered on the steps of state Parliament House to acknowledge some of these women with the launch of the public art 'let us be up and doing' exhibition, celebrating South Australia's history of women in government.

The phrase 'let us be up and doing' was used by Mary Lee, the secretary of the Women's Suffrage League, from its foundations in 1888 when campaigning for women's enfranchisement in South Australia. I encourage those who have not yet viewed this exhibition to go and look at the South Australian women who have served in our state and federal parliaments and learn more about their achievements, such as women like the Hon. Anne Levy AO, the first woman to be elected as president of the Legislative Council, Molly Byrne OAM and Rosemary Crowley AO.

Women who attended the launch of 'let us be up and doing', former members of parliament and many others have played a significant role in bringing the needs and rights of women to the fore in South Australia. The efforts of women to achieve equality, of course, go well beyond the walls of our parliament, so today I would like to recognise too the many women who do not make the headlines and who have not had the chance to move us with inspirational speeches or actions.

These are the women who have had to fight hard for everything they have achieved, often in unfair workplaces. Women who continue to have to juggle a career with raising a family, who drop the kids at school before heading to work and who often have to take work home so they can collect the children from after-school care or child care. The many single mothers, women who juggle their daily lives without the support of a partner. The women who, in addition to caring for their children, are today's carers for their parents. The women who are grandmothers and having raised their own children are now caring for their grandchildren. Women who spend their lives dedicated to the care of their child who, as an adult, is not able to care for themselves because of disability or illness. They are champions and deserve to be acknowledged for their efforts and achievements.

International Women's Day recognises and honours these women too. Not only those whose names we know and who we admire. Women like my mother Janice and my mother-in-law Pamela, each who raised six children. Women like Diane at North East Community House in Hillcrest, Rille at Wandana Community Centre in Gilles Plains, Robyn who leads the Klemzig Neighbourhood Watch and Sheila who volunteers her time to many worthwhile causes including White Ribbon Day.

These are all women who walk the path and face the struggles that women of their generation face when equality issues were not enshrined in law. It acknowledges these women and others who have played a part towards achieving equality and fairness, whether through standing up for their rights in the workplace, at home, in learning institutions or in society generally. It acknowledges those who have taught or are teaching their children respect and the importance of respectful relationships and the fact that some things are worth standing up for. It acknowledges the efforts of these women who fought the fight and those who continue to do so, helping to make Australia a better fairer place for us all.

Bills

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (PARENTAGE PRESUMPTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to Amendment No. 2 made by the House of Assembly without any amendment; the Legislative Council agreed to Amendment No. 1 made by the House of Assembly with the amendment and consequential amendment indicated by the annexed schedule, to which amendment and consequential amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

House of Assembly's Amendment No. 1.

New Schedule, page 3, before line 13—Insert:

Schedule A1—Related amendment to *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996*

1—Amendment of section 14—How to have the birth of a child registered

Section 14—after its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:

- (2) The birth registration statement must include particulars of the identity (if known) of the biological parents of the child.
- (3) The fact that a person is described as a biological parent of a child in a birth registration statement in accordance with subsection (2), or in an entry about the birth in the Register—
 - (a) does not constitute an acknowledgement of parentage for the purposes of the *Family Relationships Act 1975* or any other law; and
 - (b) does not otherwise operate to make that person the mother or father of the child for the purposes of any other law.
- (4) In this section—

Biological parents, in relation to the birth of a child, means—

 - (a) the person who provided semen resulting in the birth; and
 - (b) the person who provided the ovum resulting in the birth.
- (5) Subsections (2), (3) and (4) expire on the day on which the donor conception register is established under section 15 of the *Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988*.

Legislative Council's Additional Amendment to the House of Assembly's Amendment No. 1.

Schedule A1—After clause 1 insert:

2—Amendment of section 46—Issue of certificate

Section 46—after subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) A certificate under subsection (1)(a) may only include particulars identifying the biological parents of a child at the express request of the applicant for the search in relation to which the certificate is issued (however, a failure to comply with this subsection does not affect the admissibility or validity of a certificate).

Legislative Council's Consequential Amendment to the Bill

Clause 2, page 2, lines 6 to 8—Delete clause 2 and substitute:

2—Commencement

- (1) Subject to subsection (2), this Act will come into operation 3 months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor.
- (2) Schedule A1 will come into operation 12 months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988* provides for protection of all Aboriginal sites, objects and ancestral remains in South Australia. The Act recognises that Aboriginal sites are not only the physical evidence of past Aboriginal occupation but are also integral to the enduring living Aboriginal culture and practiced beliefs.

The current Act commenced operation almost 30 years ago and it was thought at that time that Ministerial powers should frame decisions about how Aboriginal heritage would be protected and the circumstances in which it might be damaged.

In recognition of the fact that knowledge about the location and importance of certain areas protected by the Act is only held by Traditional Owners, a practice has developed where government, developers and mining operators have sought to reach direct agreements with Traditional Owners regarding land use on and around Aboriginal sites, objects and ancestral remains protected by the Act. These agreements are not currently recognised under the Act.

In addition, the recognition of native title over much of the State, with the balance largely subject to native title claim, has resulted in land access agreements being required with native title holders and claimants. It is common for these agreements to provide for site avoidance but as with other non-native title agreements of this nature, they are not able to deal with matters requiring my authorisation under the current Act.

In 2008, this government commenced a review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and two key objectives of the proposed reform were to enable traditional owners to deal directly with land use proponents about the impact of their activities on Aboriginal heritage and the accommodation of native title holders and claimants within this structure.

The *Aboriginal Heritage (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016* has been informed by consultation since 2008 across government, industry and most importantly with Aboriginal South Australians about these matters.

The amendments proposed in the Bill enable the traditional owners to reach agreements, in their own right, with land use proponents who in turn gain certainty about who speaks for heritage in the area and all benefit from overall certainty of process. The agreement making process is not mandatory and does not require consultation as outlined under section 13 of the Act.

To enable agreement making the Bill inserts a new Part 2B which provides a process for Aboriginal bodies to apply to the South Australian Aboriginal Heritage Committee (the Committee) a body that is already established under the current Act, to become Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies (RARB).

Under new section 19B(4) where there has been a determination of native title, the registered native title body corporate will automatically become the RARB unless it opts out or the Committee does not approve it.

The Committee may give written reasons for its decisions relating to the appointment of RARBs and, where there are competing applications for appointment as a RARB in relation to a particular area, or particular Aboriginal heritage, the Committee may attempt to resolve any dispute through mediation.

Pursuant to new section 19E the Committee has powers to revoke and in some cases suspend the appointment of a RARB. These powers exist to deal with a RARB that has failed to properly ascertain and represent traditional owners or where the RARB has failed or refused to perform its functions under the Act. Pursuant to new section 19F, the Minister also has a general power to for example revoke the appointment of a RARB and reappoint it, save for a specific site where I may appoint another body as the RARB. This provides checks and balances for traditional owners who may have interests in areas where the native title holder is the RARB.

Once a RARB is appointed it may enter into agreements with land use proponents under new Part 3 Division A1.

Both the RARB and the land use proponent may then elect to negotiate at which point good faith negotiations commence. Once agreement is reached the Minister may approve it if satisfied that it satisfactorily deals with the Aboriginal heritage and in doing so must then make an authorisation that contains a condition that the person authorised must comply with the approved agreement.

Local heritage agreements can be enforced through the District Court, and costs may only be ordered where it is in the interests of justice to do so.

If agreement is not reached then the Minister must consider the application for authorisation in accordance with requirements of the current Act.

In making Division 1A agreements, the parties may provide for avoidance of known sites, object, or remains. The agreement may also provide a protocol for what might occur in the event that an Aboriginal site, object or remains not known about is discovered and partly damaged or disturbed. As all Aboriginal heritage is protected, an agreement about site avoidance can now deal also with the possibility of damage to what is unknown by the parties with certainty that the Act has been complied with.

Lastly, Division A2 provides for the approval of agreements affecting Aboriginal heritage under other Acts. This Division provides for the approval of native title agreements required under other legislation. New section 19N provides that the Minister must be satisfied that the agreement satisfactorily deals with the Aboriginal sites, objects and remains in the area of the agreement.

Agreements of this kind do not have to be made with a RARB but because they are made according to the requirements of other legislation and the Minister is required to approve them if of the view that an additional regulatory burden is not required. Since consultation commenced in 2008, there has also been litigation about the meaning and effect of section 6(2) of the current Act. Section 6(2) requires the Minister to delegate his or her decision making powers most often requested in relation to section 23, to authorise damage to sites to the traditional owners on their request.

The impact of judicial decisions about the interplay between section 23 and section 6(2) has led to difficulties with the administration of the Act. The current wording of section 6(2) where the Minister must at the request of Traditional Owners delegate his powers has proved to be impossible to determine since the Act was introduced in 1988. There have only been a handful of section 6(2) requests and no section 6(2) requested has ever been successfully granted.

The Bill therefore repeals section 6(2) and section 6(4) and provides that any current requests before the Minister will be void and of no effect.

These amendments to the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* inserts a framework that adopts existing and familiar agreement making practices that are commonly used outside of the Act and invests them with certainty and regulatory force.

This Bill represents an important and practical step for Traditional Owners to have a meaningful say about how their heritage is protected. By providing for native title matters to be addressed under the heritage legislation it also provides for much sought after efficiency and certainty for land use proponents.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions of key terms used by this measure into section 3 of the principal Act.

5—Amendment of section 6—Delegation

This clause deletes subsections (2) and (4) of section 6 of the principal Act.

6—Amendment of section 7—Aboriginal Heritage Committee

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 7 of the principal Act.

7—Amendment of section 13—Consultation on determinations, authorisations and regulations

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 13 of the principal Act to exclude from the scope of that section an authorisation in relation to which a local heritage agreement has been approved.

8—Amendment of section 14—Authorisations subject to conditions

This clause inserts new subsection 9(2) into section 14 of the principal Act, creating an offence where a person contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of an authorisation under the principal Act.

9—Insertion of Part 2A

This clause inserts new Part 2A into the principal Act as follows:

Part 2A—Aboriginal Heritage Guidelines

19A—Minister may publish guidelines

This section enables the Minister to publish guidelines for the purposes of the measure, and makes procedural provisions relating to making the guidelines.

Part 2B—Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies

19B—Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies

This section appoints, or provides for the appointment, of persons or bodies as Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies in respect of an area, or Aboriginal sites, objects or remains.

The section makes procedural provision in relation to such appointments.

19C—Priority where multiple applications

This section provides guidance to the Aboriginal Heritage Committee in the event there is more than 1 application to be the Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies in respect of a particular area, or Aboriginal site, object or remains.

19D—Additional functions of Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body

This section confers an additional advisory function on each Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body, as well as allowing the Minister or other Acts to confer functions on the bodies.

19E—Revocation and suspension of appointment of Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body by Committee

This section sets out the circumstances in which the appointment of each Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body must, or may, be suspended or revoked by the Committee.

19F—Revocation of appointment of Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body by Minister

This section sets out the circumstances in which the appointment of each Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body may be revoked by the Minister, and confers powers on the Minister to fill resultant vacancies, or give directions to the Committee.

19G—Register

This section requires the Committee to establish a register of Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies, and makes related procedural provision.

10—Insertion of Part 3 Divisions A1, A2 and A3

This clause inserts new Divisions A1, A2 and A3 into Part 3 of the principal Act as follows:

Division A1—Agreement making with Recognised Aboriginal Representative Bodies

19H—Negotiation of agreement with Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body

This section enables an applicant for an authorisation under section 21 or 23 of the principal Act to negotiate with a Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body, and enter a local heritage agreement accordingly. The section makes procedural provision in relation to local heritage agreements, including a requirement that they be approved by the Minister.

19I—Approval of local heritage agreement by Minister

This section sets out how a local heritage agreement is to be approved by the Minister.

19J—Minister to grant certain authorisations where local heritage agreement approved

This section requires the Minister, on approving a local heritage agreement, to grant an authorisation under Part 3 of the principal Act to which the agreement relates.

19K—Enforcement of local heritage agreement

This section provides that local heritage agreements can be enforced by a party on application to the District Court.

19L—Interaction of Division with other provisions

This section clarifies the relationship between the proposed Division A1 and other provisions of the principal Act.

Division A2—Agreements affecting Aboriginal heritage under other Acts

19M—Application of Division

This section sets out the agreements to which the proposed Division applies.

19N—Approval of agreements to which Division applies

This section sets out how an agreement referred to in proposed section 19M is to be approved by the Minister

19O—Variation, revocation or suspension of approval

This section empowers the Minister to vary, revoke or suspend the approval of an agreement under the proposed Division for any reason he or she thinks fit, and imposes a requirement of consultation with the Committee.

19P—Certain provisions of Part not to apply in relation to acts done under approved agreements

This section disapplies sections 21 and 23 in relation to things done, or not done, in accordance with an agreement to which the proposed Division applies.

Division A3—Register

19Q—Register

This section requires the Minister to establish a register of local heritage agreements and agreements to which Division A2 applies and makes related procedural provision.

11—Amendment of section 24—Directions by Minister restricting access to sites, objects or remains

This clause inserts new subsection (2) into section 24 of the principal Act to require the Minister to have regard to specified agreements before giving directions under that section. It also amends subsection (4) of that section to require notice of proposed directions under the section to be given to the relevant Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body.

12—Amendment of section 25—Directions by inspector restricting access to sites, objects or remains

This clause inserts new subsection (1a) into section 25 of the principal Act to require inspectors to have regard to specified agreements before giving directions under that section.

13—Amendment of section 37A—Aboriginal heritage agreements

This clause amends section 37A(5) of the principal Act to require the Minister to consult with the relevant Recognised Aboriginal Representative Body before entering into an Aboriginal heritage agreement under that section.

14—Insertion of section 37E

This clause inserts new section 37E, setting out how applications under the principal Act may be made.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Delegations under section 6(2) of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*

This clause makes transitional provisions quashing certain applications and rights to apply that existed under section 6(2) of the principle Act (that subsection being repealed by this measure).

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February 2016.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:35): I can tell the house that I am the lead speaker on this bill and that the opposition will be supporting it unamended. When people talk about the driest state on the driest continent and think about emergencies in South Australia, they immediately go to

bushfires, but emergencies here vary across the whole spectrum of meteorological, geological and human health events. We have animal and plant disease, earthquake, escape of hazardous materials, extreme weather, flood, human disease, rural fire, urban fire and, of course, terrorism. The emergency management plan in South Australia is designed to have arrangements in place to manage that range of emergencies.

The Emergency Management (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 was introduced in the House of Assembly on 11 February 2016 by the Premier. The bill provides the legislative framework for the management of emergencies in South Australia. It seeks to ensure that South Australia has the capability to properly manage any state emergency by articulating the key elements of the state emergency management arrangements, including roles and responsibilities under these arrangements.

As outlined in the minister's second reading speech, the bill seeks to clarify the authority of the State Emergency Management Plan, enable the efficient operations of the State Emergency Management Committee, ensure the emergency management arrangements are clearly defined, provide for protection from liability, provide objects and principles to address clarity on role and function, clarify powers that may be exercised in relation to disconnection of water and drainage, and clarify various emergency management definitions. The bill follows a legislative review undertaken of the State Emergency Management Plan by the emergency management committee, and I will give some information to the house about the emergency management plan and some of the background on the committee.

The State Emergency Management Plan outlines responsibilities, authorities and the mechanisms to prevent or, if they occur, manage and recover from incidents and disasters within South Australia. The SEMP will be updated as required and reviewed by the State Emergency Management Committee. The SEMP relies on strong, cooperative, coordinated and consultative relationships amongst state government agencies and local government. State government agencies and local government will also be required to maintain effective relationships with other services and equipment owners and operators to ensure that an efficient and coordinated response can be made to an incident or disaster.

The state government agencies and local government acting to prevent, respond to, investigate and recover from incidents in Australia will base their plans on the SEMP. This plan does not assume a particular incident or event and is based on all-hazards principles as endorsed by the Emergency Management Council and Emergency Management Australia. The plan is intended for use by senior members of state and local government, including commanders, controllers and other senior coordinating officials.

The plan is issued as both public and government versions. The public version, which is the government version minus restricted contact details, is freely available on the government's websites. The review of the Emergency Management Plan, as I have said, is a responsibility of the State Emergency Management Committee. Sitting above that committee, though, is the Emergency Management Council, and this is a council which particularly has a role if there is a declared disaster. It sits there and is the supreme management authority for emergencies in South Australia.

The Emergency Management Council is a committee of cabinet chaired by the Premier and comprising the Attorney-General, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, the Treasurer, the Minister for Health, the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services, the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy and the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion.

Its objectives are to ensure the adequacy of the State Emergency Management Plan. Then responsibility for the actual plan comes down to the State Emergency Management Committee, and the State Emergency Management Committee is a strategic planning committee that reports to the Emergency Management Council on matters that relate to the preparedness of the state against identified hazards or protective security matters.

The SEMC is chaired by the Chief Executive, Department of Premier and Cabinet, and the committee members include the chief officers of the emergency services, the Commissioner of

Police, the chief executives of state government agencies with emergency management responsibilities and a local government representative. The various levels of control and command that come under that, then, are divided into 11 management zones across the state and they are: the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island; Barossa; Eastern Adelaide, Eyre and Western; Far North; Limestone Coast; Murray and Mallee; Northern Adelaide; Southern Adelaide; Western Adelaide; and Yorke and Mid North.

The state is divided into these zones to allow particular arrangements to be put in place depending on the particular risks and threats that exist in those areas. Within the emergency management zones, and also across the state in some cases, there are arrangements put in place for control and command when a particular hazard arises or is encountered, and we have hazard leaders there. A hazard leader is the agency which has the knowledge, expertise and resources to undertake a leadership role for the planning of emergency management activities pertaining to the prevention of, preparedness for and responding to and recovery from the appointed hazard.

The need to make sure that South Australia is well and truly prepared for emergencies that may arise—and will unfortunately will arise at some stage—is something that we have to be very well aware of. It is all well and good to have an emergency arise, such as the Sampson Flat bushfire, and if we are not prepared not only to combat the emergency when it arises and then also to have plans in place to provide for the recovery and to maintain the resilience of communities, then that would be a sad state.

That is why this plan is such an important document. It is freely available, as I have said, and the people involved at all levels, I know, are very dedicated and diligent. The recent bushfires we have had in South Australia have been horrific for everybody concerned and all those who have been touched by them in any way. Certainly I would like to thank the former minister for emergency services for his level of cooperation and keeping me informed on what was going on there in his role, and I know that he undertook his role with great diligence and conscientious application of effort.

There were issues around the management of the Sampson Flat fire that were investigated by AFAC, the Australasian Fire and Emergency Services Authorities Council. There were 18 recommendations, and one of them was that the South Australian Bushfire Plan should be put in under the State Emergency Management Plan and then also clearly define the role of the Country Fire Service.

That was one of the concerns that I had when I received a briefing on this bill and can I thank the minister's staff for the briefing on the bill. They gave me responses to my concerns, and there are a couple, and I will talk about the AFAC recommendation for a start and then a couple of others. The response that the minister's advisers gave me when I asked about this inclusion of the bushfire management plan was:

The AFAC review recommended a review of relevant Legislation associated Acts and Plans to establish a consistent approach to fire and emergency management to minimise duplication and risk of contradiction, and that the Hazard and Functional area plans be amalgamated and establish a SA Bushfire Plan, under the SEMP, which clearly define role of SACFS.

The CFS CE, Greg Nettleton advises that he has noted the recommendation of the AFAC review. The recommendation relates to the fact that there are requirements for a Bushfire Management Plan in the Fire and Emergency Services (FES) Act and a Hazard Plan (fire) in the Emergency Management (EM) Act, and questions why there are two separate plans.

Chief Officer Nettleton has said that:

...the CFS is currently working towards amalgamating these into one single plan covering the requirements of both Acts. Future amendments to both Acts may be required to reflect this change, however this matter cannot be considered by the current bill as the planning phase alone (i.e. amalgamation) could take in excess of 12 months to work through.

I understand that that is going to be a thorough process and we will watch this space.

The Functional Plan is a separate document and subject to a different process under the [Emergency Management] Act—i.e. all Functional Services have a functional services plan as a stand-alone document. The Rural Fire Functional Service Plan outlines comprehensively [and] describes the SACFS role and function when responding as per the State's emergency management arrangements. It builds upon the role that the SACFS carries out pursuant

to the Emergency Management Act 2004, State Emergency Management Plan and Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. The CFS will not be amalgamating this plan with the other two.

I also had questions about how an incident is declared, whether it is a major incident or a disaster, and the response from the minister's adviser is:

There are three declarations available under the State Emergency Management Arrangements: a) Identified Major Incident, b) Major Emergency and c) Disaster. The Police Commissioner as the State Coordinator can declare an Identified Major Incident and a Major Emergency. The Governor can extend a Major Emergency and can declare a Disaster.

I assume that the Governor is doing that on the advice of the minister, who I would imagine would be then acting as part of the cabinet emergency management committee. There were some concerns from the Local Government Association initially when this bill was first put out for consultation about the arrangements between local government and the state government, particularly over the workers compensation arrangements for local government workers acting under direction as part of the State Emergency Management Plan. Again, I will put on the *Hansard* the response from the minister's advisers:

From late 2013, the Local Government Association (LGA) have utilised Natural Disaster Resilience Program funding to develop (with the support of emergency services) a framework for engaging councils in emergency operations which emphasizes safety. This is known as the iResponda program.

In April 2014, the President of the LGA wrote to the Minister for Emergency Services expressing concerns about workers compensation liability where local council workers are injured while acting under the direction of Control Agencies. These concerns were also expressed in a subsequent meeting between LGA representatives and the Minister.

In response to these concerns the State Emergency Management Committee (SEMC) has overseen the 'Local government workers compensation risk management project'. This project has clarified that local council workers participating under the iResponda framework are covered for workers compensation under the Return to Work Act (2015) where their activities carried out with local council equipment are considered ordinary council business conducted at the direction and control of the Council.

Those were the few points of clarification. We do not have any amendments on this legislation; it is a sensible piece of legislation. The act will need to be reviewed, depending on everything from the technology that becomes available in managing hazards, to any other jurisdictional arrangements that may come up through COAG or through the federal government wishing to have further input in the management of emergencies, such as terrorism, or having to be handled and approached on a national basis. There are the speakers from this side of the house, and I will now pass over to them. If there are any concerns that need to be clarified, I look forward to the minister's winding up in the second reading speech.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:51): I rise to support this bill, and I thank the member for Morphett for his comments, and also his indication of his support for the bill in an unamended form. I also thank him for the generous comments he made about my role as previous minister for emergency services, and I acknowledge that. I would like to make a few comments in support of the bill, and also draw on some of the experiences from the Pinery fires which are relevant, given that a third of my electorate was actually affected by the fires.

The Emergency Management (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 is a positive step by this government to ensure continuity of community safety, and also to develop resilience or, I should say, to further develop resilience. It has been 12 years since the Emergency Management Act 2004 was enacted. Since this time, the state's emergency management arrangements have held us in good stead. They have seen us through the disaster and loss that was Black Tuesday in 2005, the one in 20-year flood of Virginia in 2005, the heatwave of 2009, and through to the fires that ravaged Sampson Flat and ultimately took life at Pinery late last year.

Particularly in the last major disaster, the Pinery fires, which affected my electorate very much, I would like to make a few comments. This is where this act is important in terms of planning and research in terms of future disasters. If you like, one of the ironies, when I was speaking to farmers about the nature of the fire, was that the improved farming practices which have been very good for farmers and very good for our economy—good for everybody—have actually meant there is more—

Mr Pederick: Fuel.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Fuel—thank you; that is the word I was looking for. So, the challenge now is: how do we maintain those very good practices, because we need to produce food in the most effective way for the world, and also deal with these issues. Whether you believe in climate change or not is not relevant. As the farmers say to me: it is changing—the patterns are changing. What you call it is irrelevant; the fact is that things are changing, and we need to respond to those changes.

Ms Chapman: Tell the Fraser Institute.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The point I was making, member for Bragg, was that it does not matter what you call it; the reality on the ground—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You are agreeing with me, okay, thank you. The farmers tell me that things are changing: our summers are getting longer, and there is variation in heat, which does impose a lot of pressure. And particularly with our summers getting longer, the issue where we actually lease planes from overseas in the off season to provide protection for our communities in Australia—putting aside for a moment the fact that the commonwealth has withdrawn some of its funding for that support—does pose a challenge to our communities to provide that air support for our firefighters on the ground. In the northern hemisphere, when their seasons become more unpredictable and longer, they need the planes there longer as well.

One thing the farmers in my community have made very clear to me is that they believe that air support—and increased air support—is very important to fighting fires in the very early stages. I would endorse those comments, and I would actually say at this point that both the commonwealth and the state governments need to get together to make sure we find a solution to make sure we have that air protection and air support for our communities.

The other thing I need to also mention related to that is that one of my communities which was affected very severely by the fires was the Wasleys community. The challenge there was the lack of mobile telephone coverage. That is something I have taken up with Telstra and have also taken up with the relevant ministers. Again, that is one of the things I think is very important. Again, it is a commonwealth responsibility, but I would say that both the commonwealth and the state—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If you let me finish, what I am about to say is that both the state and the commonwealth need to sort that out. It matters not to the communities on the ground who has responsibility. This is not to give a free pass to the commonwealth, but we need to make sure that, as a state government, we do what we can to make sure we get rid of these blackspots in our communities.

I certainly have made it very clear to the ministers in the government that I will be supporting any moves to make sure there is budget provision—a co-payment, if you like—to make sure we get that improved mobile coverage. It is not only about safety, which is very important, but it is also very important for those rural communities to have access to appropriate internet services, etc., to support those communities. I would like to put on record my support for both improving our air support for our firefighters on the ground and also improving the funding available for blackspots to ensure we have good coverage in those communities.

This act has ensured that our state's emergency management arrangements are cooperative and integrated, meaning that we are fully prepared for preventing, responding to and recovering from emergency situations and disasters as best we can. It brings together government agencies, emergency services, local government, non-government organisations and the community in a collaborative approach, ensuring community safety and resilience. I would agree with that. If you look at any major incident in our community, it is when all those groups get together and the community get together that we actually stand up and fight those disasters together.

This bill is important because it takes our already effective emergency management framework and strengthens and enhances it. Constant learning and experience have provided us

with improvements and clarifications which will ensure the act can continue to provide for community safety and resilience into the future. Specifically, the bill will clarify emergency management arrangements around roles and responsibilities. This is of particular interest to the government, given the importance accorded to these matters during inquiries into some of the largest and most recent disasters in Australia, namely, the Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission and the Queensland floods inquiry.

The bill also addresses the efficient operation of the State Emergency Management Committee, which has a leadership role in emergency management planning in South Australia, which the member for Morphett alluded to in his contribution to this place. The bill will widen the strategic management functions of the SMEC to allow it to examine and review any emergency, not just one which has been a declared event, including interstate and international events. This will allow the government to expand on lessons learnt, improve its knowledge base and identify improvements to state arrangements. Ultimately, this will be reflected in the development of community resilience to emergencies and disasters.

The updated act will contribute to South Australia's Strategic Plan vision, 'We are safe in our homes, community and at work,' which makes specific reference to the potential impact of natural disasters and notes that, 'Everyone has a role to play in being prepared for such events.' That is certainly something I would echo. I believe these changes will ensure the purpose of the Emergency Management Act 2004 is fully realised, and that is to have clear, integrated emergency management arrangements to reassure the community that this government is proactive in its approach, and to encourage community resilience and reduce vulnerability to emergency events. With those comments, I would commend the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:58): I rise to support the Emergency Management (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill was introduced into this place on 11 February by the Premier. Its focus is to provide the legislative framework for the management of emergencies here in South Australia. It seeks to ensure that our state has the capability to properly manage any state emergency by articulating the key elements of the state emergency management arrangements, including roles and responsibilities under those arrangements. What the bill seeks to do is:

1. clarify the authority of the State Emergency Management Plan;
2. enable the efficient operations of the State Emergency Management Committee;
3. ensure the emergency management arrangements are clearly defined;
4. provide for protection from liability, and I think that is vitally important;
5. provide objects and principles to address clarity on role and function;
6. clarify powers that may be exercised in relation to disconnection of water and drainage; and
7. clarify various emergency management definitions.

This bill has come about because of a legislative review which was undertaken by the State Emergency Management Plan and formulates the role of hazard leaders and zone emergency management committees within the structure of South Australian emergency management arrangements. The Local Government Association have been consulted. The concerns they initially had with the bill regarding the acknowledgement of their role have been addressed, and they have no concerns with the current bill.

I am also pleased that, as part of this bill, it is for the government to absolutely ensure protection from liability for those people who act in good faith in accordance with the act. The bill will extend appropriate coverage of individuals executing directions in accordance with the State Emergency Management Plan, and this option will allow any group of persons carrying out directions or requirements issued under either the act or the State Emergency Management Plan to be provided with appropriate protection.

I think, certainly in relation to this liability protection, and I have spoken of it several times in this place, it is absolutely necessary that people are aware of the protections they have, especially

when they are out fighting fires and need to address local issues on the ground, at the fire front, and make the right decisions when the fire is in progress. I have indicated before that there was a poor decision made somewhere up the chain when a back-burn was not done in Ngarkat not that many years ago and a fire came out towards Parrakie and Parilla. If the burn-back had been lit that Sunday morning, it would have pulled that fire up before it reached the farming land.

That is the type of decision that we need made on the ground by local commanders. They could be in touch by radio and mobile phone at times, depending on the coverage, to advise what they are doing, but we need people to take appropriate, direct action. I think we live too much in a world where people are so concerned about what the consequences are. The consequences of not doing that burn-back that day were that many hundreds of acres were burnt out, and we had farmers on ploughs trying to pull it up, and then people out on the land trying to stop the fire from getting further.

We have to make sure that the individuals on the ground are covered, whether or not they are in a farm firefighting unit. We cannot operate in our emergency situations without those farm firefighting units. I think of the recent fire out in Billiatt towards Lameroo, where there were many ploughs run into the ground and many utes driven to extinction in trying to keep ahead of the blaze that essentially burnt out very close to 100 per cent of Billiatt Conservation Park.

This is not to detract from our formal emergency services like the Country Fire Service, of which I am a member as are many members in this place as well, but it is all a combination. As the member for Light said, our air assets are vital to firefighting. We have seen so many times that, when the air assets have been used appropriately, we get great results.

The air assets have better direction. I think the direction generally used to be to protect only assets, but now I believe they will be sent to many more fire fronts to try to contain the blaze before it gets anywhere near assets, which is a much better role. I have spoken many times in here of the role that Aerotech and the McCabe family and others who join them play in these programs of fire suppression.

You only have to look at fires like Sampson Flat, Pinery or smaller fires. I have certainly been involved in a lot of firefighting; I have done plenty of burn-backs. We have had to put out accidental fires, and you soon get to learn the nature of the beast. One thing you do learn very quickly is that it can be very unpredictable sometimes, and you need to get those air assets in, hit it hard and knock it out, then get in the ground crews, whether they are CFS trucks or farmers with their own private vehicles, who can do the clean-up and do a great job.

We do need to be absolutely certain and not make excuses when, I believe, sometimes poor decisions are made. I think poor decisions were made in relation to Cherryville. For the next few days after that event, the government was making excuses about why the planes did not go up: 'Oh, it wouldn't work.' Obviously the edict was drilled down through the MFS and CFS, who said, 'Oh, no, it was just not going to happen,' for whatever reasons.

I cannot remember the myriad of reasons now; there was a range of reasons why the planes would not have worked. I diverge well away from that. I think the planes should have gone up and, if they had, I do not think we would have lost anywhere near the amount of scrub and farmland and dwellings that were lost in that fire. I believe it was firmly the government's problem in regard to the fact that they would have had to spend money to get those planes back out of contract and into firefighting mode at the end of the season. I believe it would have taken less than an hour to convert back those planes that had been converted for crop-spraying or for other jobs.

I know in relation to the Wangary fire, which was right near the member for Flinders' properties over on the West Coast, some decisions were made where some private operators did not take off because of the contractual arrangements. I would like to think that there are better plans in place so that, if for whatever reason the contracted planes cannot be there at that minute, and if there is the option for private contractors to go up, there can be arrangements in place so that if the plane is available and is loaded with water and gel, they can do the job.

And they do a great job. I heard only the other day about the special fire equipment that is based at Keith for fighting in the parks. One of the blokes operating it down at, I think, Messent Park needed a fair few loads of gel dropped on him and, in the end, he could not see out of the machine

because he had so much gel over the tractor. And it protected him, which is the role of the planes, and that is fantastic.

In a smaller fire we had at Coomandook several years ago, which was nowhere near the size of Pinery or Sampson Flat, a friend of mine and his family for whatever reason did not get out quickly enough. They went into the bathroom and filled the bath with water and, luckily for them, when it got pretty hot outside, a plane came over the top and dropped a load of gel on the house and that fixed that. They do great work. I think, especially in relation to Cherryville, we just cannot be nitpicking about what these planes cost. They save many lives. It is great to think of the number of lives they have saved.

They have also saved so many assets. One issue in relation to firefighting is that people cannot get into their homes if they have left or have been away for the day because they cannot get past the police roadblocks. I can understand that the police do not want to have loss of life, but I think there needs to be some flexibility around that where people are caught by accident. I was up around Hamley Bridge around sections of the Pinery fire—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I'm on a roll, Dunks; don't tell me—with the Natural Resources Committee. We heard some interesting stories. I think it was the Bubner property where the wife actually made what would have been a heartbreaking phone call to her husband, who was playing bowls, and said, 'I think my time has come,' because the car would not start and she could not leave. It was probably a blessing that the car did not start because she was in the house when the fire went over the top. She managed to get out and use buckets of rainwater to put the fire out because the other pipes had melted. I am sure John Bubner could not have had a better sight than to see his wife putting the fire out when he got there.

There is also another story that came out of there about Peter Angus and his family. You hear these almost bizarre stories. His father was doing such a great job in rounding up stock. This is one of the harder hit areas up past Mallala. It is a lot sandier country. The country is just drifting. There is nothing you can do; there is no management. You cannot hit it with a cultivator or rough it up, as they have in some of the heavier country, because it is just blowing away anyway.

Peter was not at the farm. His father was doing something with fighting the fire and Peter got in touch with him on the phone and said, 'Well, don't you think we ought to save the stud stock?' 'Oh, that would be an idea.' So, he rounds them up, gets them out of the path of the fire and gets them into the yards. Then he was trying to save some of the commercial sheep. The fire was essentially following him down the roadway and eventually he had to cut and run himself and get out of there.

The fascinating thing is that Peter Angus ran into his uncle by chance in Mallala (I think); it was outside away from the farm. Peter was just in a vehicle, but his uncle had a tank of water on the back of a ute. Somehow he managed to get back into the fire zone and put out his neighbour's house and then got to his house. We saw the damage where the fire had actually taken out the hessian-type pergola area on the side of the house and had started burning the woodwork up against the stonework; it was that close. He said that if he had not run into his uncle and had not managed to get back there, they would have lost their house.

There are other stories of very historic homes that have been lost because people were not there. I know it is a matter of risk and a matter of what you think you can manage, but I have had reports from people in the hills who have said that if you are going to stand and fight, sometimes that is the best method. You just stay inside, wait until it goes over the top and then put it out, but that takes a bit of courage and I certainly would not have my family on board; I would tell them to go and I would stay there and wear the consequences. Something that needs to be weighed up is letting people back in and how we manage that. There needs to be a bigger discussion about that because I do acknowledge the risks and what could happen in the confusion, but we do lose a lot of assets.

I would like to acknowledge all of our emergency services people, whether they be paid or volunteers. They do such a great job. This bill is about putting in a management committee to be in charge of a state management plan for these major events so that there can be a coordinated

response, and not just the response after an event has happened, but the mitigation and planning for what could happen into the future.

As the member for Light indicated, with the upgraded farming methods we have had for over 20 years and things like no-till, where you can grow a pretty handy crop on not much rain, you probably have what is essentially a five tonne to a hectare stubble. You do not get much rain, so then you grow a two tonne to the hectare crop, but you have all this fuel there, and that is exactly what happened at Pinery. It was like the perfect storm. Whether the crops had been reaped or not, there was still such a huge fuel load and away it went.

Since then there has been some discussion about whether we have one of those big planes that can suck up straight out of the sea and that kind of thing for fighting fire. That is something that needs to be addressed, but, as I said, we cannot take it away from the air elements we have now. Elvis and all of the operators like Aerotech that are in the air do a fantastic job. Perhaps it might mean that more of those type of planes need to be contracted for that quick hit at the fire front, that quick hit to save people who are in dire straits, especially in their own homes, and other associated incidents.

I would certainly support this bill. I hope we get the right outcome and let us hope we do not have to invoke it too many times into the future.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (16:14): This government is committed to ensuring that South Australia's emergency management and protective service measures continue to be appropriate and in the interests of community safety. This act, the Emergency Management Act 2004, provides the legislative framework for the management of emergencies in South Australia. When we look around the world at recent events and local events, whether in the context of a natural disaster or terrorism, they all remind us of the need to maintain effective emergency management arrangements.

I think it is fair to say that, in South Australia, we have been leaders in emergency management and, importantly, I think, in recovery following those emergencies. It is a fact of life in this country that we will always face the forces of nature, whether it is fire or flood, and the consequences can be catastrophic and we very much need to be prepared. We are always facing different circumstances. With every major event there comes some surprise. You can never calculate exactly what a fire might do.

I have lived through the horrific fires of Ash Wednesday. I was in government when the North Shields fires occurred around Port Lincoln and then, more recently, Sampson Flat, where parts of my electorate were evacuated and then, more recently, the Pinery fires. When I was Minister for Emergency Services, Stockport flooded as well as areas of the Clare Valley and many Riverland towns, and to see the devastation caused was quite heart wrenching.

I note the comments of the member for Hammond expressing his view about how he thinks fires should be managed and, can I just say, thankfully, it is not us in this house who make decisions around direct operational matters, nor should it be. There are always lessons to learn. It is the job of the expert emergency services to be making decisions as we live through these disasters.

I understand his concern about people not being able to get back to their homes but there are protocols in place in relation to that and, quite frankly, people going back to their homes when they think they can save them, when they do not have the necessary expertise and equipment and a clear understanding of what the emergency services are facing, is a recipe for people to die. The most important thing is that people are kept safe, and that is why the police do that.

The State Emergency Management Committee initiated a review of this act to enable considerations of those important lessons that we have learned from previous events in the interests of ensuring our emergency management arrangements continue to be relevant and effective. The review was aimed at ensuring South Australia has the capability to properly manage any emergency; that is, as we have heard, including roles and responsibilities—making sure that they are clearly articulated.

The act and the arrangements were found to be substantially sound, I understand, but a number of improvements were identified to improve the clarity, certainty and operation of the act in

order to support best practice—that is what is important, best practice—emergency management arrangements. I understand it is a very emotional situation when your home or business is under threat, but we have to ensure that we have best practice in place, not what someone wants when they are simply upset when an event is occurring.

The suggested amendments include more comprehensive definitions of emergency management arrangements and a clearer outline of the roles and responsibilities. The recommendations to update and strengthen the emergency management arrangements align with the South Australian government strategic priority, 'Safe Communities, healthy neighbourhoods', and also the South Australian Strategic Plan vision, 'We are safe in our homes, community and at work', which makes specific reference to the potential impact of natural disasters and notes that everyone has a role to play to be prepared for such events, and that is really important. When we say that everyone needs to be prepared we mean each individual.

Every person has a responsibility if they live in an area that is subjected to fire, and I deliberately do not use the term 'bushfire', but potentially subject to fire. Each individual has a responsibility for that. The process will reassure the community that South Australia's emergency management arrangements are being updated to ensure, as I said, best practice and encourage community resilience through coordinated planning and disaster preparedness activities.

There was extensive consultation undertaken on the review and the preparation of the draft bill with state and local government stakeholders, members of the SEMC and chairs of the SEMC advisory groups. The SEMC is chaired by the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and comprises 19 members, including the Commissioner of Police, chief executives of South Australian government departments, SA Water, the Local Government Association of South Australia and chief officers of the emergency response agencies.

Changes specific to local government were arrived at following extensive consultation with the Local Government Association and with the agreement of SEMC. The government believes that the proposed changes will strengthen South Australia's emergency management arrangements, providing reassurance to our community and encouraging community resilience through coordinated planning and disaster preparedness activities.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:21): I rise to speak on the Emergency Management (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill and note the government's bringing of this bill after a period of extensive consultation; and, obviously, having conducted the review. I also commend our representative and lead speaker for his contribution to the development of ensuring that our emergency management is the best it can be.

I want to commend both the government and those who are involved in the review for the extensive consultation on this bill. It is particularly important because unless we have a bill where everyone has been able to have a say about it before it gets to the parliament, then we waste a lot of time. Also, we have people who feel aggrieved that they have not had a chance to make a contribution, and, frankly, when people do make a contribution they may make a statement which identifies the expected response.

They may have a strong objection to it, but at least it is clear and at least they have had a chance to be able to put their view; and if they are able to make a constructive comment about the bill and improve it then we can deal with it more rapidly through this process in the parliament and start with a bill which is as best it can be given the policy development, area and structure in which it wants to go.

It is also important to ensure that we do not have an approach which effectively uses this parliament as a means to push a new initiative through without anyone knowing about it and then find out about it later. Just this morning I spent time at *The Advertiser* building in Waymouth Street meeting with senior members of the *The Advertiser* and *Sunday Mail* to confer with them about the contents of a bill which we are about to consider debating in this parliament and which we were forced to debate and consider.

They had no knowledge of when the government introduced the bill. They had no knowledge or information given to them once it had been introduced that it was going to be progressed and,

indeed, progressed this week, the very week after it had been introduced. They had no information other than the fact that, fortunately, it was able to be identified on reading of the bill by me, and I am sure others would have eventually had a read of it and identified that.

What has happened as a result is that everyone has had to rush around and be consulted in a hurry. That both denies the opportunity for stakeholders to have discussed it with the government before and also to be able to make some improvement. I commend the government and minister, as I say, in properly presenting this bill after proper consultation. I think that is a precedent which ought to be followed, and the Attorney-General might want to take note.

The second thing I want to say about this bill is that for once I actually agree with the member for Wright on one thing that she said today—not everything she said, you will be pleased to know—and that was that people who do not know what they are doing should get out of the way when they are in an emergency situation, and she used the example of fire. I could not agree with her more.

If you live in the Adelaide Hills, in the beautiful part of my electorate, and a fire comes down the side of the gully in the Uraidla Valley and you are living in a dwelling at the bottom and you have young children, aged parents or pets and you do not have a clue what to do in relation to it, then my view is to get the hell out of there. Let the people who know what they are doing manage it.

However, I do not agree with the member's comment today, which I found to be rather churlish and insulting, and that was to suggest that members of the parliament did not have the expertise to be able to make some assessment when dealing with emergencies and again, in particular, fires. The member for Hammond gave a contribution today outlining his concerns in respect of the resources available in a fire situation. Our lead speaker is someone who has had experience in this area, and so have a lot of people in this parliament and plenty of them who sit on this side of the house and, I do not doubt for one moment, others who sit on the other side of the chamber who have had experience in this area.

Sadly, in my lifetime, I have been in situations of dealing with fires, probably 10 or 12 serious fires in country South Australia. In January, a fire started adjacent to our property on the northern side and I had to spend a couple of hours with a wet wheat bag and deal with it with one of my other neighbours until the CFS arrived. Fortunately, we were able to at least manage a grass fire along the top of the property until they arrived.

A few hours later—unfortunately my fishing trip was delayed again—we had a fire start up on the southern side of the property and, sure enough, other local people had to come and manage it and deal with it on that person's property. It is something that we live with; it is something that we need to be experienced in and/or trained for. It is not something that you should get involved in, or try to get involved in, or stay in a situation where you put yourself, your family, your pets or other stock at risk, if you do not know what you are doing. I totally accept that. However, please do not make statements in this parliament that there are members here who do not know what to do in those circumstances and who are not experienced. Frankly, they are very capable and very much appreciated to make a contribution to the debate in relation to the matter.

However, the important aspect of this bill, which I do commend, is that it appears to at least be looking at a more streamlined and efficient structure. I hope that it helps us to deal with, through the plan, a proactive program of cold burning and all sorts of other things to ensure that we minimise having to read coronial reports and reports after fires, and reviews of shockingly costly—in life and dollars—fires that the government then has to mop up, the taxpayers have to pay for, and the parliament has to then make further provision for. I hope that this new structure is helpful in doing that.

However, if it simply just changes the chairs on the *Titanic* and it says, 'We are going to draw another plan,' and it does not follow through—that is, the government is not prepared to implement the necessary action to ensure that there is an improved and protected area; resources and funding of course are all parts of this—then it is not going to make a scrap of difference. I remember that Sir Eric Neal said to me once, 'You know, it doesn't really matter what the structure is, Vickie'—when we were talking about the reform of universities—'it's the people who are on the boards. It's the people who are going to activate the policy or initiatives that are to be done.' I think that is a fair comment.

I commend the government for doing the review of a restructure. It was always important to review what we are doing, and make it better if we can. However, it is going to be utterly useless unless it undertakes the initiatives that are recommended by the boards and committees and that are highlighted in the plans.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:30): I rise to support the Emergency Management (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 and congratulate the minister who brought the bill to the house and the shadow minister, who has done a tremendous amount of work, for his contribution today. The bill provides the legislative framework for the management of emergencies in South Australia. It seeks to ensure that South Australia has the capability to properly manage any state emergency by articulating the key elements of the state emergency management arrangements, including roles and responsibilities under these arrangements. It is particularly looking at defining those roles and responsibilities. As outlined in the second reading speech, the bill seeks to:

- clarify the authority of the State Emergency Management Plan;
- enable the efficient operations of the State Emergency Management Committee;
- ensure the emergency management arrangements are clearly defined;
- provide for protection from liability which, of course, is a key issue, and the member for Hammond talked about that at some length;
- provide objects and principles to address clarity on role and function;
- clarify powers that maybe exercised in relation to disconnection of water and drainage; and
- clarify various emergency management definitions.

I understand that extensive consultation went into this, and I know our shadow minister raised several issues at the briefing which the minister's staff took on board and which I would expect will provide answers to the shadow minister in due course.

It follows the legislative review undertaken by the State Emergency Management Plan and formalises the role of 'hazard leaders' and 'zone emergency management committees' within the structure of South Australian Emergency Management Arrangements. This is all very well and, of course, it remains to be seen how it will work in practice. Until we are confronted with an emergency, that cannot be tested, of course, because you can only make decisions and react in an emergency based on the experiences you have already had. Every emergency is different: we talk about bushfires; we talk about possible earthquakes; and possible terrorism—and any other sort of disaster that might arise.

Normally, in South Australia our emergencies are bushfire related, or fire related; it is the nature of the landscape we live in. Although I will tell you that my mother was resident in Adelaide in 1954 and experienced a not insignificant earthquake at that time—I think it is probably the biggest one that Adelaide has ever experienced. But Adelaide and other parts of the state reside on a fault line, although it is not a particularly active geological site—but you can never know what emergencies might confront us.

The bill will also include the high-level role of local government in relation to emergency management, and we will reflect the emergency management functions of a council as described in the Local Government Act. Of course, local government is right at the frontline; here in state parliament we are more removed from our natural disasters with the day-to-day tasks. When there is an emergency, the council needs to swing into action and, of course, all inquiries generally go to the council. They are charged with not only handling an emergency, but often the clean-up afterwards.

A lot of our ability, our capacity and our success in managing disasters relates back to our preparedness, and I would hope that this new bill adds to that preparedness. It cannot ever be foolproof; we do not always know when emergencies are going to confront us, but we do know there are high-risk days and high-risk situations that could occur.

I might just touch on one particular issue that has concerned me for a little while, and that is the lack of firebreaks in our rural landscape. I have farmed for 30 years, before coming into this place, and when I first began farming there was a significant effort by landowners and farmers, land managers, to have firebreaks in place. It was not necessarily around every single paddock, but a lot of property was protected, usually by cultivated firebreaks of some width (I think it has to be a minimum of four metres).

As cropping has become more intensive these firebreaks have all but disappeared from our rural farming landscape, and I think that with wall-to-wall crops, much more stubble and much more fuel, a higher fuel load and fewer firebreaks, it creates almost a perfect storm when we get a searingly hot day and a north wind—as we do see and as was experienced recently at the Pinery bushfire. That burned about 80,000 hectares in around six hours, I think; it burned with extraordinary ferocity and speed.

I am not saying that firebreaks would have helped at all that day, because they probably would not have, but there are situations that arise in other parts of the state on other days where firebreaks could very much be used to burn back against it as a tool to combat the fire. It is a bit of a hobby horse of mine, although I am as guilty as anyone because we have fewer firebreaks than we have ever had on our property as well. I do not think anyone or anything is particularly to blame, but we just need to be aware of that.

I was involved with the Wangary bushfire in 2005 and while I know it is not proper to reflect on the gallery, the granddaughter of one of my neighbours at the time is here today visiting. My neighbour's property and one of our properties were completely burnt out on that day, and I am sure Jemima would well and truly remember that day. I think what is different now is that we have aircraft available to us that can be used as water bombers or fire bombers; for whatever reason, those planes, in that capacity, were not available to us in 2005. I know there was a local spraying contractor who volunteered his aircraft and his time but that offer was not taken up, for better or worse.

Ultimately, as a result of the review of that Wangary bushfire and other reviews, the state government has quite rightly seen fit to have a long-term contract with an aviation company, a crop dusting company, to provide aerial support should bushfires occur. I know for a fact that they are on standby over all of the summer, and on the very hot days, the high risk days, the pilots are based at the airport. In fact, one of my sons is learning to fly at the moment and his ambition is to be a bomber pilot, as in a water bomber or a fire bomber, and a crop duster. So good luck to him with that; it is a young man's game I suspect, you would need to be pretty sharp. I am particularly impressed with the work they do and I want to make a particular mention of it.

The other things that occur regularly in my electorate, of course, with a high number of national parks and large areas of still intact native vegetation, are the controlled burns that occur within national parks. I am a great supporter of this. I suspect it is the toughest job in the world because you never please everybody, and occasionally fires do get away. I know that; as I said, I have been a farmer and I have been involved in burn-offs and, despite best efforts, sometimes they do get away. However, I think that is a really important part of not just fire management but of vegetation management as well.

All of those things are going into the mix, I am sure, and I think this is a step in the right direction. Depending on whose predictions you listen to, I guess the risk from natural disasters, particularly bushfires, will become greater and greater and our capacity to manage that is very important. I commend the bill to the house and congratulate everyone who has been involved with it for the contributions that have been made and the work that has been done. I look forward to it coming into place and it being administered in a practical way.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:39): I thank the member for Morphett for his support and his party's support for this important legislative reform. I also thank members for the contributions they have made in the passage in this bill, particularly the ones we have heard today from the members for Light, Wright, Flinders, Hammond and others. They have all expressed not just an interest in this area but very genuine, heartfelt and experienced care and concern about the matters that the framework of this bill seeks to address. I appreciate the contributions of the parliament and the approach that people have taken.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We welcome St Peter's Girls' School to the gallery and hope they enjoy their time here, as limited as it may be.

Bills

VICTIMS OF CRIME (COMPENSATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

YOUTH JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 26, page 40, line 43 [Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 26, inserted section 63(9)]—

Before 'a magistrate' insert 'a Judge of the Court or'

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (ARTISTIC PERFORMANCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Adjournment Debate

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:43): I rise to speak in support of the adjournment debate and in doing so I would just like to raise a few matters of interest to my community. There are two items I would like to speak about today. The first is that, over the Easter weekend, up to 10,000 music enthusiasts are set to descend on the Town of Gawler, and in particular Trinity College, Gawler, to attend the 2016 Yamaha National Band Championships. Trinity College are hosting this event on behalf of the South Australian Band Association over the four days, with brass and concert bands performing to an audience of family friends, fellow band musicians and the general public.

According to the event organisers, the championships are the biggest band competition in Australia and, as I said, are likely to attract up to 10,000 spectators, with about 50 bands expected to participate from across Australia and also overseas. The site coordinator and music director of bands and ensembles at Trinity College, Mr Bruce Raymond, has said that band members will come from overseas to compete and are expected to stay on and visit the Barossa and surrounding regions.

The event will open on the Friday evening (Good Friday) with the open section of the brass bands' hymn and test piece, while on Saturday the open and junior concert bands play their hymn, test, own choice and march. Mr Raymond said there would be a parade of bands on Saturday morning, with up to 40 bands expected to participate, showcasing their marching skills and their music. The highlight of the Monday program will be the Champion of Champions solo competition.

On behalf of the band competition, I am happy to say that I worked with them to lobby for some funding for these championships and I have been advised that they have been successful in getting a grant under the arts regional development fund and, hopefully, those few funds will help them to actually host the event. Importantly, with 10,000 visitors to Gawler and the Barossa region, the economic impact on the greater Gawler area will be immense in terms of accommodation, hospitality and the like.

Also, I am advised that the event will be streamed across the world, which will promote the town and the state to a bigger world audience which will, in itself, attract future tourists to the region. It is anticipated that the championships will provide an economic benefit to the region of approximately \$4.5 million through the spending of domestic overnight and day visitors along with international overnight visitors. We congratulate the South Australia Band Association and Trinity College for hosting the event.

The other matter I would like to raise in support of the adjournment is to commend a particular program that is run by both Flinders and Adelaide universities' medical schools. In this case, it is the Barossa Valley Parallel Rural Community Curriculum and I understand there are similar programs run in other regions such as the Riverland and other parts of the state. This joint program run by the medical schools gives students hands-on training and experience in rural general practice. I attended the welcoming event held in the Barossa just recently.

The program is an innovative and internationally recognised program for future doctors, designed around a full year of clinical placement within a rural practice, combined with an integrated curriculum focusing on rural health. Students are encouraged to embrace and become involved in the communities assigned to them during the program, so that they become active members of their host communities. The program is designed to give students the opportunity to experience living and working in a rural community with the hope that they may choose to work and also reside in rural communities when they become qualified doctors.

At the launch of the program, I noted that one of the doctors in training, Damian Drew, was an ex-Trinity College and Gawler boy. He has come in as an adult learner, having acquired a PhD and a whole range of other qualifications in universities here and overseas. He has come back to study medicine. He completed a Bachelor of Medical and Pharmaceutical Biotechnology, graduating top of his class, and then did a PhD in molecular biology at the University of Adelaide.

He spent some years as a post-doctoral scientist at the University of Copenhagen in Denmark and is now doing his medical training in the Barossa. The PRCC is renowned for providing hands-on training and providing students with a great deal of clinical experience. It is a great way of training our medical students to ensure that we have qualified GPs in our rural communities.

MEMBER FOR UNLEY

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (16:48): On Tuesday of the previous sitting week, the Leader of the Opposition was again embarrassed by the member for Unley. He has embarrassed and torched successive Liberal leaders and you might think they might be used to it by now but, by the look on the leader's face, clearly not. He was obviously unimpressed by his shadow minister's exploits—again.

The member for Unley—who was, until very recently, the Liberal shadow minister for multicultural affairs—gave the tick of approval to the Twitter site 'Mohammed WazzaPaedo'. So keen was the member for Unley to 'Like' a tweet he thought attacked the government, it mattered not what else it contained. If you can believe the excuse he proffered on the Channel 7 news, he did not read the handle.

Is the Liberal Party so devoid not just of talent but, importantly, of decent people that they have senior people in their ranks who have no moral compass, no regard whatsoever for content but

who will 'Like', retweet and 'Favourite' unseemly and derogatory sites as long as they think they are having a go at the government?

Is the Liberal Party content with the explanation from this senior frontbencher that he sometimes does not take the time to read Twitter handles before liking a comment or retweeting it? Really? Are we really expected to believe that an alternative minister of the opposition does not read a Twitter handle they like? How long would he last as a minister, for goodness sake?

'MohammedWazzaPaedo' denigrates people of Muslim faith. We have wonderful communities here in South Australia that deserve an apology from the member for Unley, not the pathetic excuse for an apology that we saw on Channel 7 news on that Tuesday evening. The site also denigrates refugees, referring to them as 'rapefugees'. Refugees are people who have fled their native homelands because they are in genuine fear for their lives.

Our own Governor and his wife were refugees. They, like so many others, are incredibly grateful to their new homeland and work every day to give back to our community. I expect the member for Unley would be happy to stand in front of this good and decent man to be sworn in as a minister. I suppose the member for Unley will claim he did not see this either, but he liked it.

It takes deliberate action to like a tweet or to favourite a site. How does the member for Unley explain to his leader and other members of the Liberal Party why he favoured a post, 'Found her on sexyf...book.com, retweet if you like her'. The handle was 'I like girls daily'. Was this another mistake? Did he not read the handle? Did he not read the post either, or was it like the member for Schubert's membership of Ashley Madison—just a bit of fun?

This man was the Liberal spokesperson for education and child development. He tried to promote himself as some sort of crusader for the protection of children, yet has favoured 'I like girls daily'. I checked the site: it is offensive and it is sleazy. I have no idea why anyone would make it a favourite, let alone a person in public office. I gave the member for Unley the opportunity to provide an explanation. Was it a slip of the finger or a momentary lapse? He received a letter from me on 25 February, but to date no explanation.

The Leader of the Opposition was clearly unimpressed with the member for Unley's antics, but, really, how much is the leader going to put up with? How much embarrassment to his party can he tolerate by the member for Unley? 'I like girls daily' is just one example, and it seems there were more. After being caught out on Tuesday with 'MohammedWazzaPaedo', the member for Unley got busy and deleted 224 posts—224! Why? Why did he delete them? What was in them that was so bad he had to delete them the day he was caught out?

I know that members of the Liberal Party are constantly embarrassed by the member for Unley. They apologise for his behaviour, but none of you do anything about it. His shame is shame on you all. His shame is shame on the Leader of the Opposition, and his shame is shame on the Liberal Party.

KANGAROO ISLAND COUNCIL

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:53): I rise, not with any great deal of pleasure, in fact with no pleasure whatsoever. I never thought I would have to stand in here and raise the matter of Kangaroo Island Council again—I was hoping I would not have to. However, for seven or eight years now it has been in a fair bit of a mess, and this week it has fallen to a new level of mess, as portrayed in InDaily earlier this week, where the headline was, 'Kangaroo Island council land deal unlawful: Ombudsman'.

It went on to talk at length about the council's actions in relation to a project at American River in relation to the Rebuild Independence Group, and I have no problem with them whatsoever—they are a great group and I am supportive of what they want to do. It was in relation to a piece of land. The council since has been trying to duck and weave and offer distractions, to the extent that the CEO, Mr Andrew Boardman, as part of his contribution to InDaily, actually admits that it was his fault, so to his credit he says that. However, he refers to RIG as a distraction from their own absolute mess.

The Minister for Local Government has to act on this. There have been four years of tyrannical rule at that council by the current chief executive officer. Unfortunately, what has happened

now is that on Tuesday at their council meeting, in item 15.2, there was a report from the Ombudsman. That Ombudsman's report brought on a motion from councillor Ken Liu, which was seconded:

1. That the report be received for information
2. That the CEO be directed to obtain legal advice whether:
 - (a) The infrastructure grant given to RIG is legal; and
 - (b) The lease of community land for the group is in fact valid.

That is fine. That motion actually went down 1 for and 6 against. The CEO and the mayor, who were complicit in this whole debacle, did not declare a conflict of interest. They did not leave the room. They stayed in the chamber while this was discussed. That alone is a great breach of the way things should happen. They should never have stayed there. Furthermore, in my view, it has got a lot worse. The Ombudsman found that:

The council has also acknowledged that its failure to have the land excluded as community land has had the effect of the council failing to comply with the provisions of sections 196(1) and 202 of the Local Government Act.

The Ombudsman says:

In my opinion the council did not undertake any public consultation as envisaged by the Local Government Act before granting the lease to RIG. This failure resulted in there being no consultation with rate payers in relation to the intended use of the land as required by section 202.

One of the great reasons this has all fallen over and there is such a catastrophic mess with the Kangaroo Island Council is an inexperienced CEO who will not listen to anyone and who has bullied and cajoled councillors, both past and present, to the extent that one councillor has already left. The mayor seems unable to control the CEO. The CEO has the councillors in his pocket, so to speak, that is, in a bullying manner. The CEO is inexperienced and, unfortunately, just last financial year alone—I think my figures are correct—spent \$235,000 on legal advice. Compare that with Victor Harbour council which spent just over \$40,000 on legal advice.

I am here to speak on behalf of my ratepayers, many of whom would like to be able to say what I am saying in here, but are too scared to for fear of legal action. I am here on behalf of my constituents. Within the elected members of that council there are some very good people who are not game to speak up for fear of being bullied. In the CEO's time there, my understanding is that 33 staff have disappeared for various reasons. There are outstanding defamation cases against the mayor and the CEO currently which may or may not go to court, I am told. It is simply not good enough. The bullying and the intimidation are ongoing at senior management level.

As far as I am concerned, the Minister for Local Government has no choice but to put an administrator into that council and have it sorted out once and for all. That administrator, in my view, should come from interstate and should not be a South Australian. We are just far too close to each other in this state on seemingly everything to do with local government and a number of other things as well. It needs sorting out. There are, as I said, some very good elected members. Unfortunately, in the event of an administrator, they would have to be removed.

I challenge the local government minister to put somebody in there and have a complete review into the operation of this council and the amount of money that is being spent on this, that and everything else, particularly legal costs. They should be able to speak to staff members, both present and past staff members, in a confidential manner and find out just what has been going on. It is not good enough. That has been a wonderful council over many years, but unfortunately with this current CEO and the last CEO there has been too much bullying and intimidation, and it is not in the best interests of the people of Kangaroo Island.

I stand here with no pleasure whatsoever but I want it fixed up because I am going to have to come back in here again, quite frankly. I can see it happening. I do not doubt for one moment that what I am saying today is not going to earn a lot of friends in some places; I really do not care about that. What has happened is not good enough. They are trying to put to one side the findings of the Ombudsman. Members in this place know what happens in regard to the Ombudsman: the Ombudsman can give opinions but cannot enforce anything. The Ombudsman can express a view

about what should happen and what should not happen. I believe the current Ombudsman is a very good ombudsman and that he sums things up pretty well.

Unfortunately in this case, this council is ethically bankrupt, it is almost financially bankrupt, and the poor old ratepayers will have to pick it up and sort it out. I know that there are councillors there now who feel browbeaten and cajoled by what goes on; they are not game to ask questions in council. Just as we on this side of the house ask questions of the government as part of our process, which is right and proper, councillors should be able to ask deep and meaningful questions of the CEO and the administration of Kangaroo Island Council and get answers. That is not happening; they are not game to.

They are being bullied. It is outrageous, it is a disgrace and, as I said, the local government minister has to do something about it and has to act immediately and move to put things right. There are a couple of major projects—the airport project is going to happen in the near future—and they could present another opportunity to speak in the house, particularly after having been to the Public Works Committee. I am not comfortable and I have no confidence in the current CEO and a couple of the senior managers, a topic which I may have to pick up on at another time.

I thought after the election in 2014 that we might have a new council that might be able to fix up a few things. The Kangaroo Island Council does some very good things, let me say that, but what is happening at the moment is not good. I shudder to think what the CEO will treat people like after he has been made aware of what I have had to say in this place.

I say again that I did not want to do this, I do not want to put it on the public record, but this is the place to do it. I want to protect the ratepayers and my constituents of Kangaroo Island, I want to protect the staff of the council—both administrative and outside staff—and I want to see the ship of state over there running properly. It is not running properly at the moment. It is urgent and desperate that the minister acts. I spoke to him briefly today in the house and told him I was talking, so he is aware of what I have been doing, and I am sure that out of all this will come some good. There have to be changes, they have to be made quickly. You cannot pay someone over \$200,000 a year and have a disaster such that is occurring.

At 17:03 the house adjourned until Tuesday 22 March 2016 at 11:00.