

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 17 November 2016

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER, ABSENCE

The CLERK: I advise the house of the absence of the Speaker. I call the Deputy Speaker to the chair.

The Deputy Speaker took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUMPS RACING

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (10:30): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Bills

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 September 2016.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:31): I commend the member for Schubert for bringing this bill to the house. This bill is similar to one that I have suggested to our party room before, and I think the member for Schubert has taken up that call and argued forcefully for it. The party room has given its absolute support because this is an important measure that will improve—

Mr Knoll: Without dissent.

Mr GARDNER: —without dissent, in fact, and on that basis the member for Schubert has put it to the parliament because it will add to the committee's system under which the parliament operates. It will improve public accountability for measures involving public works. It will ensure that South Australian taxpayers get the best possible deal for the expenditure of their public funds on projects the government thinks are suitable going forward.

It will bring the Public Works Committee in many ways into the 21st century to reflect the manner in which public works are actually undertaken in the real world. I give this bill my wholehearted support. I commend the member for Schubert for bringing the forward, and I hope that the house will dally no further and support this bill.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (10:32): It seems not long ago that we saw you, and I congratulate you on last night. A lot of us got to duck out, Deputy Speaker, but your chairmanship was steadfast and untiring, and I think you deserve a lot of credit for that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you; I think we were all remarkable.

Mr KNOLL: This is a very common-sense amendment. Essentially, all we are asking is for public-private partnerships to be referred to the Public Works Committee. This is a very simple

measure that increases the transparency of the government and gives parliament its rightful oversight over important projects, such as the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

When the Parliamentary Committees Act was put into place, the concept of a public-private partnership was not as well understood as it is today, so this is really just bringing legislation into the 21st century and ensuring that the parliament, as was intended by the establishment of the Public Works Committee, has oversight over all public-private partnerships that are valued at over \$4 million.

I remind the member for Waite of his comments in this place on this exact topic. I look forward to his support today, and also that of the government. Against the backdrop of reducing transparency when it comes to cabinet documents to ICAC and to the Auditor-General, when it comes to not supporting the very sensible shield laws, when it comes to not supporting Freedom of Information Act changes that the member for Hartley brings forward, this is something I think we can all get around, and I sincerely hope that the government sees sense on this issue.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
Noes 22
Majority 2

AYES

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K. (teller)
Pengilly, M.R.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Williams, M.R.

Chapman, V.A.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
McFetridge, D.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Wingard, C.

Duluk, S.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.
Caica, P.
Gee, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Piccolo, A.
Snelling, J.J.
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Vlahos, L.A.

Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.
Weatherill, J.W.

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.

Digance, A.F.C.

Second reading thus negatived.

ROAD TRAFFIC (BICYCLES ON FOOTPATHS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2016.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (10:46): It is a great pleasure to speak on the Road Traffic (Bicycles on Footpaths) Amendment Bill 2016. I have been planning for a long time to speak on this bill. This private member's bill has been introduced to seek a default 10 km/h speed limit for cyclists on footpaths and shared paths, such as Linear Park. It would allow councils to alter the speed limit on

footpaths and shared paths by erecting speed limit signs and installing 'No bicycle' signage or road markings without the approval of the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, who may not alter or remove them. The government opposes this bill.

As part of the South Australian government's commitment to better cycling safety, on 26 August 2014, the Premier announced the establishment of a citizens' jury to examine the relationship between motorists and cyclists and to look at opportunities to ensure that users can share the road safely. This was made up of 37 randomly selected South Australians and was formed to consider the topic, 'Motorists and cyclists will always be using our roads. What things could we trial to ensure that we share the roads safely?' The citizens' jury was asked to deliberate on this topic and then provide recommendations to the state government to consider and act on.

Two of the recommendations were to make changes to legislation to introduce a minimum lateral distance for motor vehicles overtaking bicycle riders and to allow all-age cycling on footpaths. As a result of these recommendations from the citizens' jury, on 22 January 2015, the state government announced its intention to develop laws around a minimum passing distance and cycling on footpaths. People riding bicycles have less protection than motorists and are more likely to be injured if involved in an accident. The minister was advised by the Motor Accident Commission that, between 2010 and 2014, there were 366 reported crashes where cyclists were either killed or injured.

The new laws are intended to encourage motorists and cyclists to safely share our roads and to allow cyclists to ride on footpaths where there is no safer alternative. The state government gave careful consideration to the introduction of the new laws and, in March 2015, the department undertook a significant consultation process with members of the public and across government, the Local Government Association, Adelaide City Council, non-government agencies, Bicycle SA, the RAA and others.

We received almost 1,600 submissions on the two laws from both interested stakeholder groups and members of the public. Of the submissions received, I find it very hard to believe that not one was from any member of the state opposition. It was very interesting and quite consistent with a whole range of other different processes where they do not engage in the process at all. However, I was pleased to note that both the one-metre rule and riding on footpaths had over 70 per cent support from respondents to the consultation.

This consultation consisted of a briefing that was held with the member for Mitchell and DPTI staff on 18 March 2015. On 15 October 2015, there was a parliamentary briefing for all MPs on the new laws and, on 25 October, the new laws came into effect. On 12 October, the opposition leader suggested on FIVEaa, 'We've jumped into this without any scrutiny.' This is clearly just absurd given the amount of work that happened on this over a very long period of time.

In relation to cycling on footpaths, as I am sure most of you are aware, previously it was available only for people under the age of 12, and adults had to accompany those children. People who held a certificate issued by a doctor were also allowed to ride on a footpath. I recall that this was introduced well over a decade ago by the former transport minister, Diana Laidlaw, who was surprised that it was illegal at the time for children to ride on a footpath. At the time, she even mentioned she would have done this illegally not knowing that it was illegal to take your child and teach them to ride a bike on a footpath. Clearly, it is not something you want to do with an under-12 year old on a road. Bicycle riders who were not exempt and chose to ride on the footpath were committing an offence even under the regulation that was brought in over a decade ago.

As of 25 October 2015, everybody is now permitted to ride a bicycle on footpaths unless a sign is posted that specifically prohibits doing so. This allows those cyclists who are not confident enough to ride on the road to have somewhere to ride and clarifies and legalises an existing behaviour, which I think is a very important point: people have been doing this for a long time and police have not been out catching people if they have had to duck onto a footpath for a certain period of time.

The frequency of crashes between pedestrians and cyclists on footpaths and shared or separated paths is extremely low. Cyclists self-regulate their speed, given the road, traffic and weather conditions, regardless of the choice of route. Setting any fixed speed limit, especially on a shared path, such as Linear Park, would discourage commuting by bicycle. In terms of the existing

laws, protections and the impracticality of enforcement, permitting footpath cycling is the default position of the Australian road rules.

Other jurisdictions that allow all-ages footpath cycling, such as Queensland, Tasmania, the ACT and the Northern Territory, were contacted in the assessment of the regulatory options prior to the changes. Each of those jurisdictions advised that all-ages cycling on footpaths did not represent a regulatory compliance or enforcement problem, and there is very little evidence to suggest that cyclists pose a safety risk to other path users.

Existing laws require people riding on a footpath to give way to people walking and exercising, to give due care by travelling at a safe speed and being prepared to stop if necessary. For example, people ride more slowly around pedestrians and when driveways are obscured. A common-sense approach to enforcement is preferable in assessing and posting speed limits on all paths, which is consistent with other states and territories. In the event of a collision, a bicycle rider is required to stop, render assistance to anyone who is injured and exchange information. This applies to all road users, and failure to do so is an offence.

Compulsory third-party insurance is paid whenever one registers a motor vehicle in South Australia. It provides compensation to crash victims where the owner or driver of a registered South Australian vehicle is at fault. It may also cover crash victims where a passenger is at fault. The CTP covers passengers, pedestrians, bicycle riders and other road users if the motor vehicle is at fault. To be compensated, an injured person must prove that another injured person was at fault. It is considered that reparations from road crashes that occur, caused by people bicycle riding or walking, are best handled through applying common law principles of negligence rather than a compulsory insurance scheme for third-party persons.

Mr Pisoni: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Kurna, the member for Unley has a point of order.

Mr PISONI: The member seems to have drifted to speaking about a bill that was dealt with several weeks ago—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will listen to him very carefully. I am sure he will come straight back to the point.

Mr PISONI: —the CTP insurance component of this package, so I ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask him to do that too, which might help. Member for Kurna.

Mr PICTON: The member for Unley will be relieved to know that I have finished that section. Moving on, I will talk about enforcement. A bicycle rider can be stopped by South Australian police and be required to provide personal details. For cycling offences, anyone 16 years or older can be issued with a traffic infringement notice.

If a person is under 16, a formal or informal caution may be issued under the Young Offenders Act 1993 and escalated to the Youth Court, if necessary. People riding a bicycle can be charged with a traffic offence in the same way as a motor vehicle driver. Further to this, South Australia is currently the only Australian jurisdiction where cyclists can accrue demerit points for offences that a motorist may commit. If they do not hold a driver's licence, they will still incur demerit points which can prohibit them from obtaining a licence in the future.

SAPOL is continuing monitoring and enforcing new laws and has advised that they are working well. There was a lot of hoopla when these first came in, and these have not proved to be the correct result as to what has happened. They have also advised that from their observation, motorists are leaving more than the required distance from cyclists, and there has been no increase of cyclists on footpaths, which is a very interesting point.

Further to this, the City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters recently prepared a report on the new laws and found that, as expected, few cyclists are choosing to ride on the footpath and are doing so at pinch points—areas where there is no bike lane and the road narrows. Council staff have not observed a significant increase in the use of footpaths by cyclists. Motorists are being cautious

in their application of the passing distance. So, there is little support for this bill from the LGA, and they have also made it clear that their preference is for education and data collection.

This is yet another position the Liberal Party has had. In January 2015, the member for Mitchell gave bipartisan support for the new laws, then in October 2015 there were reports that the opposition was unsure about the new laws, then there were further reports saying they were siding with the government and would not support a crossbench disallowance motion. Later in October, they announced that they would move to disallow those laws, and then in December they said that they would not proceed with the disallowance laws and would support a majority of the laws that had been brought in.

Mr PISONI: A point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Unley, the time has expired.

Mr PISONI: I see you are engaged with the Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: On important business for the house.

Mr PISONI: I just thought I would assist.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is your turn to speak, if you wish, to close the debate.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (10:51): In rising, I obviously close the debate, but I want to make some points about the reason for this bill. I remind the house that this is the only bill that the Liberal Party has brought to the house. It is the only position that we have had as a response to the government's changes to cycling, particularly when it comes to cycling on footpaths. The government has said that this came from recommendations from a citizens' jury. The facts are that this was a selected version—or, if you like, an abbreviated version—of the recommendations that came from the citizens' jury.

The citizens' jury recommendation was that bike riders be allowed to ride slowly on the footpath. As a matter of fact, comments registered from participants in the citizens' jury said that it would be uncomfortable or confusing for people to have several different speeds—that is, different speeds for pedestrians and bikes on the road. This 10 km/h is not a set speed, or a fixed speed, as claimed by the member for Kaurna. It is a default maximum speed.

At the moment, the default maximum speed on our footpaths is the same speed as on the road—50 km/h. So, a footpath that is on Prospect Road or King William Road or Henley Beach Road or Military Road where the road speed is 50 km/h means that bike riders, unless otherwise signposted, do 50 km/h. That signposting is a very difficult and expensive process for local government because they must get permission from the Minister for Transport in order to do that.

That is a speed limit of 50 km/h whether there are diners using tables outside cafes on those footpaths, whether those footpaths have young people with children in prams or even just walking with their children, whether those footpaths are being used by people who may have disabilities, whether they be sight-impaired or have other physical disabilities that might make them less nimble to move out of the way of a cyclist who was moving at high speed.

Under the current law, a cyclist can legally ride on a footpath at the same speed at which they can ride on the road. This bill attempts to improve the changes that were made by the government earlier in the year. It also enables and encourages shared use of our footpaths by both pedestrians and cyclists. You see this all the time in Europe, where cycling is very popular. People use it as a mode of transport. They might pick up a hire bike from one location and ride it to another location. What you will notice is that there is no angst between pedestrians, bike riders and motorists in Europe. I certainly have not experienced it.

You will also notice that there are speed limits for cars, and there are speed limits for bikes, particularly when those bikes are on shared areas, and 10 km/h is often a speed limit you will see for bikes. You will see signs for bikes showing 10 km/h. We have had people claiming in this debate that you cannot ride a bike as slow as 10 km/h, yet it is a speed that has been elected by many European cities as the speed at which you can ride in a populated area. We are not saying that 10 km/h is the only speed for bikes on footpaths. Obviously shared paths are built for sharing by

pedestrians and cyclists. You are not going to have to dodge cafe tables, and so they would have their own speed limit. I urge members to support the bill.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
Noes 23
Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.	Digance, A.F.C.
----------------	-----------------

Second reading thus negatived.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DISRESPECTFUL CONDUCT IN COURT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 July 2016.)

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:04): It is my pleasure to speak again in private members' time on the Summary Offences (Disrespectful Conduct in Court) Amendment Bill 2016. I can tell the house that the government opposes this bill. In our view the new offence of disrespectful conduct in court, as created by the bill, is a completely unnecessary addition to the Summary Offences Act 1953. Disrespectful conduct is defined in the bill as the following:

- (a) refusing to stand up after being requested to do so by the court; and
- (b) using offensive or threatening language; and
- (c) yelling; and
- (d) interfering with or undermining the authority, dignity or performance of the court.

The government agrees that it is an unfortunate reality that our courts and judicial officers sometimes have to deal with disrespectful behaviour. However, the examples provided by the opposition in support of the bill offence do not justify the introduction of a new offence. The only examples furnished by the opposition of disrespectful behaviour, that would be covered by their new offence, are that of children in the Youth Court.

We do not think that imprisonment, or a large fine, is an appropriate way to deal with a defendant swearing and using inappropriate language. Disrespect for authority figures is a common hallmark of those young people who find themselves fronting up to the Youth Court, and we have complete confidence in our magistrates and judges to be able to deal with inappropriate language from children, without resorting to imprisonment. The Senior Judge of the Youth Court has advised the government that they do encounter disrespectful behaviour from parents of young offenders in the Youth Court, but she is of the view that the current laws of contempt, and other practical measures, are fully adequate to deal with such persons.

The Hon. Dennis Hood MLC, who has introduced a very similar bill in the other place, gave some further examples that he believed occurred interstate of individuals exhibiting disrespectful behaviour in court. These incidents have involved persons invoking their Islamic religious beliefs as a means of justifying refusing to stand for a judicial officer. This kind of incident has not occurred in this state, luckily, and, if it had, it does not justify the introduction of a new offence to deal with this kind of behaviour, according to our consideration in the government.

The opposition has not demonstrated that there has been an epidemic of these kinds of incidents, such that the new offence is needed, and there is certainly no gap in the law between contempt of court and less serious disrespectful behaviour, such that needs to be addressed with the new criminal offence. The current laws dealing with contempt of court consist of well-established longstanding legal principles and are adequate for members of the judiciary to deal with persons exhibiting serious disrespectful behaviour in their courtrooms.

Contempt of court is a serious offence and it is appropriate that the penalty may include imprisonment. Imprisonment is the most serious punishment available to our criminal justice system and it is important that it is imposed in the appropriate circumstances and is not used as a penalty for minor offences. Behaviour that is disrespectful in the courtroom is obviously something that needs to be strongly discouraged. It is inappropriate to have an offence with a potential penalty of imprisonment for disrespectful behaviour, that is comparatively minor, as compared with contempt of court, as defined in the bill.

Behaviour that does not meet the threshold for contempt of court can be dealt with by the judge or the magistrate using their own discretion and vast reserves of common sense. Persons may be removed from the courtroom for a period of time, their video link may be muted, the judicial officer may make a note of their behaviour on the court file, to ensure that any future judicial officers who deal with that person are aware of the behaviour. They may give the person very firm instructions to behave, or instruct their representative to speak to their client about their behaviour. If a person repeatedly and persistently exhibits disrespectful behaviour, and will not take instruction from the judicial officer, the behaviour is well on the way to satisfying that threshold for contempt proceedings to be commenced.

The government undertook consultation with the judiciary to seek their views on this bill and the responses we received have confirmed the government's view that this offence is unnecessary. The general view was that the current contempt of court laws are adequate for judicial officers to deal with disrespectful behaviour, along with the other practical methods that they use, such as excluding persons from the courtroom.

To conclude, the government has decided to oppose this bill, as the current contempt of court laws are adequate to deal with serious disrespectful behaviour in court, and judicial officers have other means of dealing with more minor disrespectful behaviour, making this new offence unnecessary.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:09): I thank the member for Kaurna for making a contribution and identifying the government's position on this, because clearly it seals the fate of this bill. However, I want to place three things on the record.

One is that, yes, we do have a contempt procedure in our courts that effectively enables judicial officers to have a power of inquiry, as an authority, to be able to manage the procedural fairness within their courts. It is effectively that power that is used. It is not currently an offence at all, and that is exactly what we are trying to do in this bill, to make it an offence. So that is what they have now.

Secondly, within that envelope the concern is that the general disorderly or disruptive behaviour of someone in the courtroom will not, in fact, actually qualify for management as a contempt matter because it does not reach the threshold of what is necessary to satisfy that the behaviour is contemptuous. Of course, in some jurisdictions the power of enforcement is to hold them in prison indefinitely, until they purge their contempt. It is a process that is a management tool that has a high threshold to apply, and that this type of disorderly and disrespectful conduct that we are talking about in this bill could escape.

Whilst the member for Kaurua invites the application of the magistrate or judge to be able to remove the person from the court, the fact is that it is often necessary for that person, especially if they are the defendant, to be in the courtroom to hear the case against them and, of course, to be able to present their own. So, that is an impractical alternate process offered as a way to manage the disrespectful and disorderly conduct, and that is disappointing.

Finally, in respect of the processes themselves, by offering to make this type of behaviour an offence we send a clear message that they can be the subject of a fine or a term of imprisonment, but there will be a fine option available to the judiciary. We think that is a sensible way of dealing with a lot of these cases of lower order disorderly, disruptive and disrespectful conduct. Interstate examples have been used because they have been identified, in litigation relating to them, as exposing this weakness in the current system. Other jurisdictions have acted to deal with that, and we are very disappointed that the state does not deal with that.

We are already facing a tsunami of backlog in our courts of cases awaiting trial. The District Court has been over the front page of the paper with over 600 cases waiting to be allocated a trial date. It is not just irritated defendants who are waiting for their day in court but witnesses, family, relatives of victims and the like who are also often in a state of distress and anger at the delay in the process of the hearing of their case, not to mention the lawyers and judges, who can get a bit touchy about these issues as well.

I make the point that we have a tsunami of a problem on its way, and the most important thing we can do at this stage is to provide our judiciary, in particular, and every other person who works in our courts, a safe workplace free of totally disrespectful and disruptive behaviour by anyone in the courtroom. It is going to be more and more important that we have this instrument.

Nevertheless, I note the government's position. The bill will clearly fail. I thank the Hon. Dennis Hood in the other place, who has contemporaneously introduced his bill and provided the same basis upon which it should be progressed. We will see what happens with that. It might give the opportunity for the government to reflect and consider how helpful this process may be in sending a clear message to those who come into our overcrowded, overworked courtrooms that, when they do come in, finally, to get their day in court, whether they are a victim or a defendant, that orderly behaviour is expected. I commend the bill to the house.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
 Noes 23
 Majority 3

AYES

Bell, T.S.
 Gardner, J.A.W.
 Knoll, S.K.
 Pengilly, M.R.
 Sanderson, R.
 Treloar, P.A.

Chapman, V.A. (teller)
 Goldsworthy, R.M.
 McFetridge, D.
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Speirs, D.
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Duluk, S.
 Griffiths, S.P.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Redmond, I.M.
 Tarzia, V.A.
 Whetstone, T.J.

AYES

Williams, M.R.

Wingard, C.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.

Caica, P.

Gee, J.P.

Hughes, E.J.

Koutsantonis, A.

Piccolo, A.

Rau, J.R.

Weatherill, J.W.

Bettison, Z.L.

Close, S.E.

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

Kenyon, T.R. (teller)

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Snelling, J.J.

Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Cook, N.F.

Hildyard, K.

Key, S.W.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Rankine, J.M.

Vlahos, L.A.

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.

Digance, A.F.C.

Second reading thus negatived.

FARM DEBT MEDIATION BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2016.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:19): I am continuing on from 3 November, page 7630 in the *Hansard*, where I was talking in support of this measure brought to the house by the member for Hammond. I will not repeat what I said then, but I refer members and readers of the *Hansard* back to that page. I will go on to say that one of the reasons why I think this would be a good move is that it would mandate that banks, before moving to foreclose on a farmer, would be obliged to sit down with the farmer and go through a mediation process.

In my experience, this would provide a win-win situation. If the bank thought that it was going to increase its risk profile, I think it would encourage the bank to start the process a bit earlier. I do not think there is a problem there. It would certainly provide a win for the farmer, because I suggest that farmers quite often find themselves under financial stress and live in both fear and denial. If a process is started, it has been my experience and that of the financial counsellors who work in this area, that those farmers who address these issues earlier usually get a better outcome. I believe the earlier the matters are brought to a head, the better the outcome would be for the bank. I believe it certainly would be better for the farmer and the farmer's family, irrespective of the final washout.

I certainly commend this matter to the house. As I said, I think the government is not supportive of it. I am very disappointed by that. Both New South Wales and Victoria have this process in place, and my understanding is that it works very well in those states. I think our farmers in South Australia should be supported. Only this week, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries claimed that he was supporting the farming community. From where I sit, I do not see it quite the same. I do not think this government gives our farming community, which is such an important contributor to the state, the sort of support that it deserves and indeed needs. I would urge the government to rethink its position on this.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:22): I rise today to support the bill that has been brought to the parliament by the shadow minister for agriculture (Hon. David Ridgway) in the other place. I commend him for his work in this sphere because it is a part of agricultural business that needs addressing. The bill essentially looks to create a legally enforceable bank mediation mechanism for primary producers. As other speakers have said, these days farmers and primary producers often

find themselves in multimillion dollar businesses and after just one or two or three poorer seasons or low wheat prices, for example, as we are seeing at the moment—I see the price of wheat has gone down every day this week and we are probably in what I would suspect is a 25-year low—all of these things put pressure on farm businesses.

Mediation is a structured negotiation process in which the mediator, as a neutral and independent person, assists the farmer and the creditor in attempting to reach agreement on the present arrangements and future conduct of financial relationships between them. It is so important in any business arrangements, but particularly when things get difficult, to come to the table. At the moment, sometimes they do and sometimes they do not. This would cause that negotiation to be enforced and, as the member for MacKillop has said, it ultimately would be win-win, both for the banks and for the primary producers involved.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:23): I thank the members for MacKillop and Flinders, and the Hon. David Ridgway in the other place for bringing this bill to the parliament. As I said in my previous contribution, the purpose of this bill is to create a legally enforceable bank mediation mechanism for primary producers. With regard to the mediation, it is a structured negotiation process where the mediator, as a neutral and independent person, assists the farmer and the creditor in attempting to reach agreement on the present arrangements and future conduct of financial relations between them.

I note that in this state there is no legally enforceable bank mediation mechanism for primary producers. As has been stated, primary producers can come up against many hurdles in the running of their business, not the least of which is on the front of the *Stock Journal* today where the strong storm moved through the Murraylands and threw field bins on top of each other out at the Herrmanns' property at Perponda.

I note that the member for Waite, when speaking to this bill, made the argument that this is a problem that does not require a solution. I believe it is a problem that requires a solution. I am off the land. My family have been on the land since 1840 when they came out to this state. If the government are serious about our clean and green image and the future prosperity of our farmers, as they keep stating they are, they need to support this legislation to show that their words are not just noise in the background. I commend the bill.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 21
Noes 23
Majority..... 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Second reading thus negatived.

Motions

DEFENCE RESERVES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:30): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the contribution of the Defence Reserves Support Council (SA), Air Force, Army and Navy reservists and employers of reservists;
- (b) acknowledges the contribution of Dr Pamela Schulz OAM as the recently retired chair of the council;
- (c) congratulates Dr Andrew Cannon AM as the new chair of the council;
- (d) recognises the contribution of reservists, in war and peace, locally, nationally and internationally, and including the Sampson Flat bushfires; and
- (e) appreciates the support of the employers of reservists to facilitate their contribution.

When I proposed this motion back at the beginning of 2015, members will recall that we were then facing the clean-up of one of the savage bushfires of our summer season, and for the 2014-15 summer season, we had the horrific circumstance of the Sampson Flat bushfire. Since then, we have had the ravages of bushfires across the state. During last year's occasion, the Mid North suffered a very, very significant loss.

The importance of recognising the contribution of our reservists or, as some like to be described, part-time serving personnel, should never be underestimated. Whilst our emergency services officers rightly receive accolades when we have these major incidents, it should never be overlooked that volunteer members of other areas, including the Australian Defence Force reserves component, should share in that recognition, respect and appreciation.

The purpose of this motion is to recognise the reservists generally, but also to highlight a number of other agencies, including the police, who contribute in those civilian emergencies. I am proudly a member of the Defence Reserves Support Council and have been for some years. I know the member for Ashford has been a member and now we have the Deputy Speaker as a member, which is very helpful. We are able to encourage our council to take up initiatives, such as the visit to the Woomera site recently.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And wear flak jackets.

Ms CHAPMAN: And wear flash clothes, yes, and shoot pistols and do all sorts of things. Aside from the benefit that we individually have, as members of the parliament representing this parliament on the council, I think that we certainly enjoy the enlightenment of information that we receive by being there.

Essentially, the council comprises a group of employers drawn from all sectors of the state who advise, direct and endorse strategies of engaging and supporting employers of reservists in South Australia. I think, personally, that we are one of the most successful councils in the country and that has been recognised by the present national chair and, indeed, the former chair also, Mr Jack Smorgon, who for many years served as the national chair. The council aims to ensure availability of the reserve component of the Australian Defence Force by promoting the benefits of employing members of the reserve. It also aims to establish flexible partnerships with the community and employers so that they are encouraged to support those in the reserve.

Let me now recognise Dr Pamela Schulz OAM, who was appointed in 2009 as the chair of the council. She was the first woman to be appointed chair of the South Australian committee. She is known to many of you as she is a longstanding public servant of our state. She has devoted herself to community education and encouraging people to participate and act in issues that are relevant to their daily lives. She has also covered very important issues, including parenting, vaccination of children, parliamentary engagement, justice and the rule of law, so a broad spectrum of contribution to public debate and to academic advancement.

I also recognise Dr Andrew Cannon AM, who has been undertaking the role as chair for some time. He has served a long judicial career in South Australia, including as acting chief magistrate. His judicial career combined with academic research into the court systems, and his work on the introduction of many reforms to civil and criminal processes is commended. I am very proud to serve with him in this current role. Just this last weekend, many members of the council attended to support the celebrations of the Maltese community. I think the Speaker of the house was in attendance, as was minister Bettison and the Hon. Jing Lee. Our council turned up in droves to support a member of our council in that community and I am very proud to be part of that.

I will also speak briefly to the contribution of the reservists during the now past Sampson Flat bushfire in South Australia, which included the important contribution of the reservists. RAAF Base Edinburgh responded to the emergency by providing logistic support to airborne fighting efforts from 4 to 7 January, two large air tankers, a Bird Dog aircraft and more than 10 air crew and support staff were employed to assist the South Australian Country Fire Service. The Defence aid provided refuelling, air movements and water replenishment support to contracted firefighting aircraft from Victoria.

Mr Norman Kent, who managed the base support tasks, said that, due to the efforts of a small but hardworking team of personnel, the aircraft were able to be sent straight back to work after arriving at the Edinburgh base. He also said that the rapid rate of aircraft operations was something out of the ordinary as, by the end of the day, which was effectively only half a day, there had been 10 aircraft movements, and the air tankers averaged a turnaround time of just 25 minutes. To put this in perspective, he explained that the turnaround time was when the aircraft took off from Edinburgh, dropped its water supplies into the fire, came back, reloaded and returned to the fireground again.

The aircraft had virtually just taken off when, 10 minutes later, they were landing again, already having completed their task. To achieve such a short turnaround time was truly remarkable. The Victorian Country Fire Authority aviation officer, Wayne Rigg, has revealed that the support provided by Defence at such short notice was instrumental in supporting the South Australian community during the fires. He also commended the Edinburgh base staff who coordinated the resources and equipment so that, once the air tankers had arrived, they were immediately able to scale up their operations and get to work.

Over the four days that the air tankers were deployed, 320,000 litres of water was able to be provided for the fire retardant mixing plant. In addition, 14 refuels were conducted, supplying more than 50,000 litres of fuel to the aircraft. These are exemplary efforts which deserve our acknowledgement and our thanks. Australia's Defence Force continually seeks the skills and expertise of reservists to help maintain its capability. Receiving the support of employers means reservists are available to undertake their duties when called for service. Late last year, five South Australian employers were recognised at the Employer Support Awards. Again, in the preceding year, there was recognition of this particular contribution.

I also thank all other employers of reservists who facilitate their contribution. We could not operate without the ongoing support of employers, such as the many that we have, and the thousands, literally, who have signed up in South Australia who are committed to this. Most of us understand that, under the law, there is an obligation to release employees for the purpose of their service. However, we should not underestimate the importance of the support that comes from employers to facilitate that, to support them when they come back and to make sure their duties are undertaken while they are away. Obviously, they have the reciprocal benefit, which I often remind them, that their employees are being trained, they learn new disciplines and new skills which they can apply in the workplace for the betterment of the operation, business or employment. Many of them are significant government departments.

I recently had a meeting with the Minister for Environment, the Hon. Ian Hunter in another place. We have an annual meeting on bushfire management. I like to know what is going on in the state and I like to know what is going on in my district. Just about every year I have a new minister for the environment, but that is no problem, and for the last couple of years he has been handling it. I had a briefing about the few fires that have been undertaken in my area, which includes the entire

Cleland National Park and very concentrated areas in the Adelaide Hills of bushland up against townships, and intense horticulture. So, we have a number of things that are intentioned.

I was stunned to have reported back that there had only been seven cold burns this spring across the entire state. Today, when we recognise the very significant work of our emergency services personnel and persons such as the reservists in South Australia, we need to understand the significance of not putting their life at risk, and putting costs and expense out into the arena to deal with these catastrophic fires. We also must ensure that our government employs funds to ensure that we have every possible advantage to diminish the fuel load before we get there. I do not want to be standing up in this parliament in the future having to commend contributions into events that should not have happened at all or been as severe. That, in my view, is up to the government to deal with. There is a lot of work to be done there.

Finally, it was recently announced that three members of our reservists are to retire. They are Commander Patrick O'Brien, who is the commander of the Navy, after some, I think, two years of service in South Australia; Air Commodore Steve Meredith, who is the senior officer for the ADF; and Major Russell Scutchings—we call him Russ—who is the Director of Defence Reserves Support SA. They have made a very significant contribution to our council. We thank them individually for the work that they do in their respective employment in the military and reservist roles, and wish them well in their next ventures. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (11:42): Many members may be aware that in the foyer of Parliament House there is a sign about being a supportive employer of defence reservists in South Australia. That important piece of information, which is shared with the general public as they come through the front doors of this building every day, was signed on 8 November 2012.

South Australia was the first state government to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Defence that draws the entire Public Service into the supportive employer network. The Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC) promotes the benefits of reserve service and encourages employers and the community to support reservists in our state and around the nation.

Those in this room recognise more than most the contribution that young men and women who serve in our reserve forces make in the defence of our security and our nation and often in peacekeeping operations and in disaster zones. Particularly, the members for Bragg, Ashford, Florey and Morphet, who I am aware have served on the Defence Reserves Support Council, and myself as a supporter of that council, acknowledge the work done on a regular basis by our attendance at and support of events.

When it comes to the reserve service, our nation has an impressive history. It is a history that stretches back over 100 years, almost to Federation. Given the hugely important regional nation-building tasks that have been undertaken by our reservists in recent years, our support for them has become more focused. This is fitting, given our mantle of being SA the Defence State.

I had the good fortune to attend an operation, Boss Lift, with reservist employers during Operation Anode, around the time of their last rotation as we were getting ready to leave the Solomon Islands, and to see the work that the reservists were doing every day and how their employers learnt the story of the skills that they were bringing back into their employment spaces and how that was strengthening our state's economy. It is clear to see that teamwork is one of those skills so essential in operations overseas, but it also has enormous relevance for our nation in peacetime. We see this teamwork in action whenever we experience a natural disaster such as the Sampson Flat bushfires or help in rescue and recovery efforts after these events.

These people, our reservists, persevere and protect our community in times of need. Many are ex-ADF personnel who choose to become reservists as they transition into civilian life or they are civilians who wish to contribute to our nation in a different way and learn additional skill sets. The teamwork shared by defence personnel is also valuable in their employment, as I have mentioned. In both the public and private sectors, employers repay these contributions by ensuring that reservists do not suffer as a result of their service and that their entitlements and defence leave are assured and protected.

I would like to acknowledge the importance of employers in the public and private sectors supporting our reservists to serve with confidence. I have long admired the good work of the past chair of the Defence Reserves Support Council of South Australia, Dr Pamela Schulz OAM, and I am pleased to say that I have become friends with her. In encouraging employers to become supportive employers, she has changed the face of this program and actively engaged deeply with the defence reserve community. Dr Schulz has recently completed her six-year tenure as chair of the council and she leaves it in very good shape.

I am told that the South Australian council has been a leader in this nation in the policy space when it comes to supporting our reservists and involving employers. Dr Schulz continues to serve the community in this space and give advice to the reserve council but is now actively involved in the Veterans Advisory Council. I would also like to comment on the wonderful work of the current chair, Dr Andrew James Cannon AM, in taking on this role after many years' service, most recently as deputy chair. He is also the Deputy Chief Magistrate and Senior Mining Warden, I am advised, whilst still undertaking academic research and publishing. He continues to serve this area and furthers the work Dr Schulz began.

Reservists should always enjoy the complete backing of our community and their employers and the Defence Reserves Support Council plays an important role in making sure this occurs. All of us in this chamber and across the house today would acknowledge their role in disasters and the relief that communities often experience when ADF personnel and reservists come to town. I recently saw that with the ADF in Two Wells when they helped to sandbag. Reservists change people's lives when they step up and I thank them for doing that.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:47): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and may I add my congratulations for your marathon effort yesterday. I think everyone appreciated the way you handled the day. Given that you were here for 15 hours or so with a couple of short dinner breaks, credit to you.

I have great pleasure in supporting this motion of the member for Bragg. I acknowledge points (a), (b) and (c) and congratulate the retiring chair, Dr Pamela Schulz OAM, and Dr Andrew Cannon AM, who is coming into the position on the council. This council does wonderful work and is a great support and liaison mechanism, I would suggest, between reservists and employers. Regarding points (d) and (e), the undertakings of reservists really need to be highlighted, as the member for Bragg mentioned. They are in critical roles and they back up our emergency services. At any time reservists are called upon, they are there.

For example, the member for Bragg talked about the Sampson Flat bushfire and there are other places as well. I reiterate that, as a former presiding member of the former Country Fire Service board when Mr Stuart Ellis was CEO while I was chairman, our greatest fear was another fire in the Adelaide Hills. I am going back now to when I finished in that position. I cannot remember how long ago it was—about 2000, I think.

I was put out to pasture by the then minister for emergency services, but that is another story. Our greatest fear was that the Adelaide Hills would go up. Here we are decades later and we still have not had that major fire. When it does happen, people like these reservists will be worth their weight in gold in assisting the CFS, the SES and other emergency services. They are a critical part of the human capital of the state, quite frankly, and it is wonderful that we have this council there to support them and pull things together.

In relation to point (e), employers who allow their staff to go into reserve situations need our full support. It is a big undertaking. It is the same with the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Services. For an employer to give an employee time out to attend either reserve activities or emergency situations always leaves them behind the eight ball. It quite often leaves them short on staff or having to employ additional staff. There are businesses in my electorate that do this regularly, without complaint and at enormous cost to themselves. They do a fantastic job. It is most appropriate that the member for Bragg has put this motion this morning and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:51): First of all, I congratulate the member for Bragg for bringing this motion to the house because the Defence Reserves Support Council is one of our

hidden achievers in the community. Certainly a lot of people I know were not really aware of the Defence Reserves Support Council until I had the honour of being appointed to it some six years ago, I think it was. The chair at the time was Dr Pamela Schulz OAM, who is a long-time friend of mine, mainly through some of the fantastic work she has done in community health as a communications expert. More recently, I have been benefiting from her expertise in the area of discourse analysis.

It is very helpful, certainly for politicians, to understand communication in the way she is able to put forward. She is very well known in academic circles. In fact, one of her publications was launched by the Hon. Michael Kirby AC, CMG. He wrote the foreword and introduction in her book *Courts and Judges on Trial: Analysing and Managing the Discourses of Disapproval*. As I understand it, that has gone on to be a textbook for people in such high office, and Pamela is called on quite often to actually go and support various seminars and presents papers to assist in the judicial system. This is one of her many skills.

She has been awarded not only for her work as a journalist, having been appointed an OAM, but for the work she has done all over the world with regard to the judiciary and her topics with regard to courts and public confidence. On the Defence Reserve Support Council—as the member for Bragg said, I had the pleasure of serving with her for some time—I have actually learnt a lot from the people around the table. I know that the member for Florey, who has followed me onto that council, has had the benefit of meeting people across the South Australian community, from the police commissioner right through to various people in the ADF services.

Because of the foresight of Dr Schulz, there is a number of different people from the community sector—I think Anglicare is represented, for example—people that you probably would not necessarily immediately assume to be part of the Defence Reserves Support area. Obviously, there are emergency services that are represented on that council because of the fabulous work—and I think the member for Taylor, the member for Bragg and the member for Finnis have adequately covered that area—done by Dr Schulz, followed by Dr Cannon, to make sure that we understand and have the best wide, big-picture approach to our volunteer services.

In a previous life, as a trade union official, I was always really impressed with the number of Transport Workers Union members, in particular, across a whole variety of areas—driving heavy vehicles would be an obvious one, but also in catering, logistics and a number of other associated areas—and people who came out of the wider transport industry who would have the opportunity, with support from their employers, to serve and train as a Defence Reserves Support Council person and also develop a whole lot of other skills and be of real use to the community in disasters and peacekeeping expeditions.

The other thing that I am really proud of from my time on the Defence Reserves Support Council was that, as the member for Taylor has mentioned, Parliament House became a Defence Reserves Support Council supporter. There was a negotiation—the minister at the time was the previous member for Napier, Michael O'Brien. He was the state public sector minister, and we were involved in negotiations for making South Australia the first state public sector that became a Defence Reserves Support Council employer. We also moved on into the local government area, and I was very pleased that the councils that were in Ashford at the time—Ashford does move its boundaries quite regularly, so sometimes the councils change—became Defence Reserves Support Council employers. In fact, Lachlan Clyne, who is the mayor of Unley council, is a Defence volunteer and the council is a DRSC employer.

That was a very satisfying experience for me, not to mention the amazing contacts that were made in the private sector. I have to congratulate the council as a whole, because it is a wide church, as I was explaining. I think the Defence Reserves have got into places where employers that you probably would not normally associate with Defence Reserves Support Council are now part of that council and under that umbrella. I do not know Dr Andrew Cannon as well as I know Dr Schulz, but one of the other aspects that Dr Schulz and Dr Cannon have brought to the council is looking at analysing and doing big-picture academic research. When I say 'big picture', I mean looking at similar organisations internationally and certainly South Australia holding its own on a national level.

I think it would be fair to say, and I think the member for Bragg actually mentioned this, that South Australia is actually held up as the template with regard to the Defence Reserves Support Council. I know that a number of people—including Thea Papadopoulos, who is now on the council and who has also been Defence Reserves Support Council ambassador, and the member for Taylor, who is an ambassador—have strategically been chosen to try to promote further the great work that is done by the council.

While I am very sad that I am not on the council anymore, I am very ably replaced by the Deputy Speaker. I know she gets as much out of being on the council as I do. The member for Bragg has been a very loyal and innovative member of the council, and I think the thing that is interesting about the three of us having different skills and different attributes while serving on that council is part of why we have been on there—because the council recognises that we can bring something different to what in days gone by would have been a fairly conservative agenda.

The President (Hon. Russell Wortley) was on the council for a while and preceded me, as did my good friend the member for Morphett. They were on the council before my time, so I am sure there have been other members that I do not know of who have served on that council. So, thank you to the member for Bragg for bringing this to our attention, and all speed ahead for the Defence Reserves Support Council.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (12:00): I did not think I would be getting to my feet this morning, but first I join the member for Finnis in congratulating you on your masterful performance in the house last night, managing to keep us all on track appropriately during a long debate.

It is my pleasure to rise to support this motion and, although I have never been a member of the actual council, I was for a long time a member of the Friends of the Defence Reserves Support Council. It is probably entirely appropriate that I follow the member for Ashford, who said she knows Dr Schulz much better than she knows Dr Cannon. Dr Cannon is the Deputy Chief Magistrate, and of course I know him much better than I know Dr Schulz, although I do know her and I have been emailing her brother this morning.

The thing I wanted to discuss very briefly in my comments this morning, whilst certainly joining with others in giving my congratulations to both the retiring and incoming chairs of that committee, is that very early in my parliamentary career I had the wonderful opportunity—and I do not know whether it is still offered—to undertake Exercise Executive Stretch. That was aimed at people who were currently or might in the future be employers of people who are in the defence reserves.

The point of it was to make the employers understand that their employees were not going out playing cowboys with guns on the weekend but were learning a lot of skills that would be useful in any workplace, whether that was leadership, team work, focusing on various issues—all sorts of things. The weekend I did Exercise Executive Stretch, my PA of 22 years, Gaynor, who still works in my electorate office, did it and said that it was the best weekend she had ever spent.

I will briefly explain what happens with Exercise Executive Stretch: you have to send in your measurements, and when you get up to Edinburgh Airforce Base, all your clothes, watches, phones—everything—are taken from you and you are in camouflage gear for the weekend. You are given actual Army rations. On the weekend I went, the first exercise we had to do was abseiling, an adventure sport I had never undertaken before. It was off a very high tower, and as I lowered myself backwards over this 60-metre tower I was thinking, 'Who invented this as something useful to do?'

There were two lines going down, and the chap on the other line was a very experienced abseiler who had a video camera. So, I was being videoed as he talked me through in my nervous state. On the weekend this was happening I had almost broken my ankle and ended up at the Stirling Hospital a couple of days earlier. So, I had been on crutches until the day before I went, I was still heavily bandaged, so I was a bit tentative on my right ankle.

I was climbing down an abseiling tower, and the chap with the video camera said, 'Smile!' So, when we got the CD that was made from this, it had a picture of a terrified Isobel going down backwards, and then when he says, 'Smile!', there is a quarter of a second of smile and then it went back to sheer terror for the rest of the time. Then we had to do the commando course and leopard crawling through the sand and climbing over things. I could climb fine—I am a tomboy, I admit it—

but I could not land on the other side, so I had to tumble down. We had to swing across the creek—I could swing right across the creek; I was the only one who made it—except I could not land because of my foot, so I had to drop back and fall into the river and then do the leopard crawling through the sand.

I then had a chance to try scuba diving, which was something I had always wanted to do. Scuba diving was fantastic except that they make the swimming pool very muddy, so that you understand that the sorts of exercises our Navy divers and our Navy reservists do are performed in muddy, dark, awful water, not nice clean swimming pools and you have to find your way with rope signals and so on. Of course, when I spoke about this in the parliament on a previous occasion, it was laughingly reported that with my gammy leg, no doubt, I had swum around in circles because I could only wear one fin.

By the end of the day, I was exhausted. We had been supplied with a pup tent and a stretcher, which were all set up. I was so looking forward to having my little bit of Army rations and going to bed, but they said, 'No, no, you've got to go to the officers' mess for drinks and we're going to have a lecture on the Six-Day War—the Egypt-Israeli war.' We got through that, but I was so tired that I fell into a very sound sleep, unlike what I had last night which was nothing at all. I fell into a very sound sleep only to find in the morning that everyone else in the camp was up and finished. They had actually packed up my tent around me. I was still sound asleep and everything had been packed up around me.

On the second day, we went to see the dog training and the way they manage and handle the dogs. We went on a PC3 Orion and had a look at all the work they do with that, and then went target shooting. We each fired a round with an AK-47, if memory serves me correctly—the standard Army assault rifle. I can tell you that my PA, Gaynor, has been extremely well behaved ever since we did this exercise together because, where I got 10 bullseyes, she hardly hit the target. Since that time, she has always considered that she had better stay in line.

The point of the exercise was not for us to have a great time—although we did—but for employers to understand that those who give of their time make a huge commitment and also learn skills through the process that will be of use to the employer. Not only that, employers at least at that time and I assume it is still the case, actually get quite good compensation for loss of time for the employee who has to go off on bivouac and so on. Having had a father who was in the defence services and a brother who was in what was then called the citizen military forces, I have had a long association with the armed services.

Exercise Executive Stretch is really worthwhile for any employer or potential employer. If there is another opportunity for members of parliament to take part, I would strongly recommend it to anyone who has not already done it because it really is an eye-opener and it does make you understand how many different things there are to do across our defence forces.

In closing, I add my congratulations to both Dr Schulz and Dr Cannon. They are no doubt both very worthy people to hold the role of chair of the committee. They are ably supported by an enthusiastic, knowledgeable and broad-based committee around them. The role the defence reserves play in all sorts of circumstances—not just when we are a wartime situation but, as has been mentioned, in numerous community emergencies—is invaluable. Without the training they get on a regular basis, it would not be possible. I endorse the motion and thank you for the opportunity to say a few words about it.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:08): I would like to join with others in the house and acknowledge the contribution of the Defence Reserves Support Council and all those involved and the reservists themselves, of course. I would especially like to thank Dr Pamela Schulz for her contribution over a very long period of time. When I was the state veterans' affairs minister, she was an excellent chair, a very good advocate for her organisation and very persistent.

In my view, she has done a lot to improve the lot of reservists, especially in regard to their interactions with their employers, which can be a little difficult. Employers sometimes do not understand their obligations or what might be available to them in terms of assistance. Congratulations to Dr Cannon, the new chair. I welcome him to the position. Finally, thank you to reservists for their contribution to our defence and also our civil defence in times of need.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is going to finish off. I have decided to say that I will happily do day 2, but I will never do day 1 of the stress thing, nor will I hang from the yardarm, member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:10): A marathon champion effort, Madam Deputy Speaker, only matched by your contribution to our Defence Reserve Support Council, which we all greatly appreciate. Thank you, members, for the contribution you have made. I look forward to this motion being carried and will of course ensure that your contributions are advised to the council at the next meeting.

Motion carried.

RIO OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:11): I move:

That this house wishes well all Australian athletes, particularly those from South Australia, competing in the Olympic and Paralympic Games in Rio.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. As others have also done this morning, can I thank you very much for your enduring and very fabulous efforts last night. I rise today to speak on what was an exciting moment for our global community and to wholeheartedly congratulate our Olympic and Paralympic athletes who travelled to and competed at Rio. It does seem some time ago now, but I think it is worth placing on the record our congratulations to them.

The Olympics and Paralympics represent, of course, the highest level of sporting competition, an opportunity to traverse the pinnacle of sporting achievement and an enduring way for nations around the world to come together to support their athletes in a spirit of cooperation and camaraderie. It is an incredible honour to represent your country at this level. Our Olympians and Paralympians are not just the most outstanding of athletes, they are exemplary ambassadors for our country.

This Olympics, our Australian Olympic team rallied itself around its One Team motto. Our athletes worked together, supported one another and represented a united front to the world, clearly representing the very best of what we have to offer. Similarly, our Paralympian team rallied itself around the motto We Believe. Working together, believing in one another and believing in their abilities produced an amazing result, with an impressive fifth place on the medal table.

As the Minister for Recreation and Sport expressed prior to the departure of our athletes, South Australia fielded an impressive number of athletes to these games. Our commitment to investment in sport and sports infrastructure has ensured excellent dividends through the make-up of our national teams. I certainly felt an immense pride when I learnt that our Olympic committee selected our flag bearer for the opening ceremony to be a woman we claim as a South Australian, the outstanding Anna Meares.

Anna is a perfect sporting role model and an inspiration to aspiring young cyclists everywhere. She is one of the greatest track riders in history, winning two Olympic and 11 world championship gold medals as well as five Commonwealth Games titles. In typical fashion, Anna was humble in speaking about her achievement. She stated:

For me, a country girl, a coal miner's daughter, to become the second cyclist in history to be flag bearer for this country leaves me very emotional and proud.

When you look at history, there have been very few Olympians, fewer Olympic champions and again, fewer flag bearers.

I dreamt of being an Olympian, of being an Olympic champion but never contemplated being a flag bearer.

Of all of things I have achieved and I have done, carrying the flag for Australia is the greatest honour.

Also with gratitude and, again, humility after the London Olympics, Anna took the time to personally respond to every single letter of the hundreds that she received—a great stateswoman in every sense.

Anna became just the seventh woman to carry the flag for Australia at an Olympic Games, and I for one cheered her on when she entered the stadium in Rio with the world looking on. Just a

few weeks ago, Anna announced her retirement from professional cycling. I thank her for her leadership, leadership that has made a difference to women in sport across the globe. I look forward to seeing how Anna will continue to lead the way long into the future.

This Olympics was also particularly special because the International Olympics committee nominated a refugee team who competed under the Olympic flag. About this team, IOC President Thomas Bach said:

These refugees have no home, no team, no flag, no national anthem. We will offer them a home in the Olympic Village, together with all the athletes of the world. The Olympic anthem will be played in their honour and the Olympic flag will lead them into the stadium. This will be a symbol of hope for all the refugees in our world, and will make the world better aware of the magnitude of this crisis. It is also a signal to the international community that refugees are our fellow human beings and are an enrichment to society...These refugee athletes will show the world that despite the unimaginable tragedies that they have faced, anyone can contribute to society through their talent, skills, and strength of the human spirit.

This incredible statement about the power of sport to bring people together, and together to promote compassion, hope, kindness and inclusivity will not be forgotten. Sport is many things to many people, and above all else it is a great equaliser. Sport has the potential to deeply explore, embrace and promote diversity, and I know that our government's work, and the work of governments and sporting peak bodies and other supporters around the country, has helped a number of women athletes to aspire to and achieve their wildest sporting dreams. These women will in turn inspire our young girls to also dream big and reach for whatever sporting goals they have.

There are many teams and individuals to mention in this regard, but I want to mention in particular our beloved Matildas, who competed again at this Olympics after a short hiatus. They and their success, amongst other teams, have helped to transform support for women's sport and sheer excitement about it. I felt their pain when they did not progress after that amazing game against Brazil—the heartache of that penalty shootout! We are all so proud of everything this team has done to raise the profile of women in sport. Amongst their players was a 16 year-old Ellie Carpenter. I know that she, along with many other players, will help many young girls to be inspired to pull on their soccer boots and start playing a sport that not that long ago was considered a sporting domain mostly for men.

Fifty South Australian athletes, including 34 current South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) scholarship holders, competed in Rio and made an impressive contribution to Australia's 29 medals. Before their departure to the Olympics, our excellent Minister for Sport and Recreation rightly listed a number of our outstanding South Australian athletes who were named amongst the competitors. In cycling, they were Alex and Annette Edmondson, Jack Bobridge, Glenn O'Shea, Callum Scotson, Matthew Glaetzer, Stephanie Morton (a proud member of our southern community), Patrick Constable, Rohan Dennis, Anthony Dean and Anna Meares.

In athletics, they were Jess Trengove, a member of our Women in Sport Taskforce; Jared Tallent; and Tanya Holliday. In badminton, it was Leanne Choo. In shooting, they were William Godward, Jack Rossiter and David Chapman. In swimming, we have Kyle Chalmers and Joshua Palmer. In tennis, it was Thanasi Kokkinakis. In trampolining, it was Blake Gaudry. In volleyball, they were Louise Bawden; Taliqua Clancy, an outstanding young Aboriginal athlete; Nicole Laird; and Maria Fe Artacho del Solar. In hockey, they were Georgie Parker, Karri McMahon, Jane-Anne Claxton and Gabrielle Nance, to name just a few.

Our South Australian athletes brought home an impressive 11 medals, meaning again that as a state we have punched well above our weight. Kyle Chalmers' efforts were spine-tingling and captured the heart of his school, Immanuel College, and indeed all of our community, with his gold medal swim in the men's 100 metre freestyle. This was followed up with bronze in the 4 x 100 metre freestyle and 4 x 100 metre medley relay.

I was very proud to see Jared Tallent win silver in the 50 kilometre walk, making him a medallist in that event at three consecutive Olympics. We could all see how much he was hurting over that last kilometre, and it is that grit and determination that defines our fine athletes. Rowing and cycling have always been an area of strength for our Olympic team. Our congratulations go to Jack Bobridge, Alex Edmondson and Callum Scotson for winning silver in the men's team pursuit. In

the rowing, we saw silver medals go to Alexander Belonogoff and James McRae in men's quadruple sculls, and there was more silver for Alexander Hill in the men's coxless four.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: A silver rush, indeed. It was Australian Olympic team flag bearer, Anna Meares, who I would like to congratulate again. Her bronze medal in the women's keirin means that she is now Australia's most decorated Olympic cyclist. She is a true inspiration.

A number of sensational SASI athletes also took part in the Rio Paralympics. This included 11-time Paralympian Libby Kosmala and several first-time Paralympic team members, including swimmers Liam Bekric and Jesse Aungles. Their stories of courage are moving and motivational, and they inspired all of us when we watched them compete in Rio. In the Australian Paralympic team there were nine South Australians who proudly brought home four medals. In the long jump, there was a gold medal performance from Brayden Davidson, and Sam von Einem clinched a silver in table tennis in his very first Paralympic appearance.

In closing, I want to mention a very special friend of mine, Katrina Webb-Denis. Katrina is a multiple gold medallist at the Paralympics, an incredible advocate for the Paralympics and women in sport—

Mr Pederick: Hear, hear!

Ms HILDYARD: Indeed—and a motivator and friend to many. Katrina performed outstandingly as a commentator at the Paralympics, and I could not have been more proud when I saw her on our screens and heard her on our airwaves. I again offer my hearty congratulations to all team members, medal winners or not, for their dedication and commitment to being their best in their chosen sport. I know that many of these athletes started their journey in our local clubs and schools in communities across South Australia, supported by their families, friends and training partners. I offer my thanks also to all of those people.

It is a testament to the effort of these individual athletes that they competed at the highest level, but it is also a testament to the support provided to them by grassroots sporting organisations in our community and the many volunteers within them, and it is a testament to all of the people who love and support these athletes. I will continue to recall, with great fondness, cheering on our incredible athletes in both the Rio Olympics and Paralympics. I thank them for their courage, determination and commitment, for what they brought and continue to bring to our community in terms of their athletic prowess, for the role modelling they provide to our youngest athletes, and for the deep pride that they instil in all of us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:20): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I would just like to compliment you on your Muriel Matters outfit, the colours that you are wearing today. It is very fitting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, that's really kind of you. I have my Muriel Matters badge on.

Mr WHETSTONE: I, too, rise to support the motion wishing the South Australian athletes well at both the Olympic and Paralympic Games in Rio this year. Obviously it has taken a bit of time for this motion to reach the debate stage and, as a result, the Olympics and Paralympics have well and truly gone. It is always a proud moment for any South Australian sports followers to watch our local heroes on the track, in the pool, in the velodrome, wherever it may be, performing at the elite level and trying to achieve the ultimate, and that is to bring home a personal best. The bonus is that some of our athletes came home with medals.

They have been widely reported and recognised, and I think we need to recognise any athlete that achieves at that elite level. Just to be selected in the team and to be able to compete at an Olympic level is truly an amazing achievement—not that I have achieved Olympic greatness, but I have represented Australia, and it is a great honour to have that opportunity. There were 50 South Australian athletes selected for the 2016 Rio Olympic Games, with almost all of them being current South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) scholarship holders, or having been supported by SASI during their career. This is the largest number since the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games.

Making up 12 per cent of the 2016 Australian Olympic team, our local athletes contested across 14 sports including athletics, badminton, basketball, beach volleyball, cycling, diving, equestrian, hockey, rowing, shooting, swimming, tennis, trampoline and water polo. SASI athlete and dual gold medal winning cyclist Anna Meares—there is not much more that I can say about Anna Meares—she is a true champion and a great ambassador for sport. She was recognised for that by being named the captain, but she was also given the great honour of being the flag bearer for the opening ceremony. I think that was very fitting. As she has since announced her retirement, I wish her all the best in her life after competitive sport. I am sure she will go on to be, again, a great Australian and a great ambassador for the country. I wish her well in whatever career path she chooses.

Twenty-four of our athletes had a combined 55 Olympic Games appearances between them, including 11 Olympic medallists, although for 26 of the athletes it was their first time in the Olympic Village. Debutant Kyle Chalmers, who competed in the 100-metre freestyle and the 4x100-metre freestyle relay, was South Australia's youngest Olympian at 18 years of age, and he turned out to be our most shining star at the games. Much has been said about Kyle's performance and much has been said about his last 10 metres in that 100 metres. His power and his ability to come home stronger than any other swimmer at the games was truly noted and admired by anyone who watched the footage that was played time after time. I was just as proud the first time I watched it as I was the last time I watched it. It was a truly outstanding achievement.

Prior to the games, I noted that expert SASI analysis suggested that as many as 29 South Australian athletes might bring home medals, including 11 who were in serious contention for the coveted gold medal. Seven athletes (four cyclists and three rowers) were first identified through the SASI community talent search program, with talent search locations set up to uncover our next Olympic hopefuls. South Australia had a contingent of 27 coaches and officials selected to support the 2016 Olympic campaign.

I would like to pay tribute to Wes Battams for setting up our SASI facility at Kidman Park. Wes has been around a long time, and he is no spring chicken, but he comes with a wealth of knowledge and he really is a great support to the SASI program and to those athletes. I would like to lobby for Wes that the Kidman Park facility is long overdue for receiving government monetary support.

Recently, I went to Western Australia and visited their new Western Australian sports institute facility, and it is world-class. Western Australia is now starting to poach some of the Australian Institute of Sport programs, and if South Australia does not watch out they are going to have some pressure put on them to lose programs here. Again, I urge the current minister, I urge the Premier, and I urge the Treasurer—I urge all South Australians—to support this SASI facility. The SASI program is up for a refurbishment; it is up for renewal, and I think that is worthy of mention in the debate on this motion.

In the end, South Australia had nine medal-winning athletes bringing home a total of 11 medals. As I have said, 18-year-old Kyle Chalmers won three medals: a gold medal in the men's 100-metre freestyle and a bronze in both the 4x100, and the 4x100 medley relays—only the fourth Australian to win that event. Jared Tallent won silver in the 50 kilometre walk making him a medallist in that event at three consecutive Olympics—an outstanding athlete. Jack Bobridge, Alex Edmondson and Callum Scotson won silver medals in the men's team pursuit. The Australian Olympic team flag bearer, Anna Meares, won the bronze medal in the women's keirin. Of course, in rowing silver medals went to Alexander Belonogoff and James McRae for the men's quadruple sculls, and Alexander Hill in the men's coxless four.

I would like to mention Alex Edmondson. I made a presentation to him as a young junior cyclist when he came up to the Riverland where he participated in the Tour of the Riverland and won the number 1 jersey. He was a shining star back then, and he is going from strength to strength, as is his sister. I would like to pay homage to the hundreds of fans who turned out in Adelaide's Victoria Square. There was also a reception at the Adelaide Oval to welcome home the Australian Rio Olympic athletes, and it really was a great event. It is always great to pay tribute to athletes who have given up their life, given up a huge amount of personal gain to be an athlete, who come home

and make us proud. It was the same for the homecoming of the Paralympians who competed and did us proud.

Speaking of the Paralympics, South Australia had nine athletes in a range of sports including athletics, canoeing, cycling, shooting, swimming, and table tennis. One of the notables, Kieran Modra, competed at his eighth Paralympic Games. I think it is an outstanding achievement for any athlete to have competed at eight games. It is simply outstanding. He also represented Australia in athletics, cycling and swimming, so he is an outstanding athlete when it comes to the games. Brayden Davidson won a bronze medal at the 2015 IPC World Championships in the long-jump event (T36), and was always a medal chance at Rio. He did not win a gold medal, but he certainly was in the mix.

Michael Roeger won the bronze medal at last year's World Championships in the 1,500 metres and competed in his third Paralympics—another outstanding achievement. The other South Australian athletes are Elizabeth Kosmala (shooting), who competed in her 12th Paralympic Games; Gabriel Cole competed in the 100 metres (T47) at his second Paralympic Games; debutantes, Jesse Aungles and Liam Bekric (swimming); Jocelyn Neumueller (canoeing); Sam von Einem (table tennis); Alex Hill, who has very proud parents, Michelle and Peter, up in the Riverland; and Kyle Chalmers, a great young South Australian.

I had lunch with Kyle before he went to Rio and I caught up with him afterwards, and nothing has changed. He did not wear his medals at the homecoming because he said that they were just a bit too heavy. That is the kind of guy he is. Jess Trengove ran the marathon and did an outstanding job. I met with Jane Claxton, a Hockeyroo, another great South Australian.

Well done to all of the South Australian athletes who represented our great country on an impressive Rio campaign and the state, I am sure, would be with me in saying how extremely proud we are, and I am certain the state will continue to produce many impressive athletes. Job well done.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:32): To add my voice to this motion brought by the member for Reynell, I would like to congratulate all of the athletes who represented Australia, especially those from South Australia; disproportionately represented by cyclists, of course, as you would expect with the cycling program here. A wonderful result for them; even just to be there. I have often wondered what sport I might possibly play to get me to an Olympics.

Mr Whetstone: Table tennis?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: No, I am not anywhere near good enough for table tennis. I am not good enough at skiing. I actually think maybe shotgun shooting might be my only chance—clay target shooting.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Trap, thank you—not skeet, definitely trap. Anyway, I am never going to do that. I always liked the idea of being at the Olympics, so to actually get there is an immense achievement by the athletes who did. I particularly take this moment, as others have before me, to acknowledge the sporting contribution of Anna Meares. She is a wonderful role model. I particularly thank her for the example she has given to my daughter.

I remember that in 2012 I had taken my family on a ski trip to Mount Hotham and Anna was racing in London. On one of the nights, my daughter, Rachel, got up at four in the morning and came upstairs in the ski lodge to watch her race because she was such a big fan. Happily, for all of us, she was able to get a gold on that occasion.

Anna has always shown tremendous courage, right throughout her career, with her silver medal in 2008, of course—I think her best medal, coming back from that back injury. That was absolutely amazing. She has been a wonderful ambassador, not only for her sport but also the Olympic sports in Australia. Thank you to her.

Thank you to all our Olympians and congratulations to all the staff who prepare them: the coaches and the managers. There is a tremendous amount of work that goes on at the various institutes of sport around Australia, most particularly at SASI. I congratulate all of them in their contribution in getting our athletes ready for Rio. I would like to congratulate the Paralympians as

well. The SASI effort that goes into paralympians is quite extensive and should be highly commended. Congratulations to the athletes, congratulations to the coaches and managers and we are all very, very proud of them.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:34): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I, too, will acknowledge your marathon effort in the last day or so. Well done. I would like to acknowledge the motion from the member for Reynell that this house wishes well all Australian athletes, particularly those from South Australia, competing in the Olympics and Paralympic Games in Rio. Certainly it has been outlined that many of the Olympic athletes came from South Australia, and we do have a very good quota of them, and I commend them for everything they do, whether it is at the Olympic level or the Paralympic level.

I am certainly pleased that in latter years the Paralympics has gained much more coverage and the coverage that they deserve. Sometimes it is people you would probably never expect to be competing in a Paralympics but, when they get the opportunity, they grab it with both hands and get right into it. Some of the sports you watch, especially with the wheelchairs, are pretty ferocious, and I commend them for the way they take to their sport and compete on the international stage.

I want to talk a bit about James McRae, an Olympic rower from Murray Bridge. It was a privilege to catch up with James and his mother, Chris, the other night in Murray Bridge at a combined Rotary Club dinner, where they both talked about James, his Olympic dreams and aspirations and what he has managed to do over the years. It was extremely inspiring. I had the privilege of sitting right next to him and I said, 'Are you going to keep going?' He replied, 'Yes', and I said to him, 'Well, you need one more for the boxed set.' He said, 'That's right,' and I said, 'No pressure, mate, no pressure,' because the one he is missing in the box is the gold.

He is 29 years of age. He grew up in my electorate in Murray Bridge and completed all his schooling in Murray Bridge before commencing a Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering degree at the University of Adelaide in 2007. He did say to me that it was nice to get away from rowing for a moment because, as with every Olympic athlete, it consumes your life—as it has to, so that you can be competitive on the world stage. He said, 'It's just nice to do something that I've trained for, that I've been educated for, to have the opportunity to do that.' He certainly has not lost his spirit or his keenness to row, he is certainly keen to do that, but he said that it was just nice to be able to do something else for a very short period of time.

His siblings Jessica and Anna are also Australian rowers with various South Australian Sports Institute scholarships and Australian titles, along with international competitions. James had a major involvement with the Murray Bridge Rowing Club and was coached by Adrien David, a former international oarsman. In 2009, he was awarded life membership of the Murray Bridge Rowing Club, and this was awarded to him for being the club's most successful rower and the club's first Olympian since the Murray Cods, who competed in Paris in 1924.

Anyone who is not aware of the Murray Cods' story needs to have a look at it. It is about blokes who had been off to war and who returned and formed the eight for the Murray Cods and competed in Paris. They had to borrow boats and a whole range of things, but they improvised and still competed on the world stage. It was such an achievement for back then in 1924.

Along with his sisters, James McRae is also a South Australian Sports Institute scholarship holder, and from 2008 to 2016 James was part of the South Australian men's eight. In both 2007 and 2011 James was chosen to contest the interstate men's single scull in the President's Cup, and in 2011 he won this event and rowed in the open men's quad scull, which won the national title. He is a very proud Murray Bridge and South Australian world rowing champion, three time Olympian and a medal-winning rower.

Before he won a medal they were a close fourth in Beijing in 2008, then he won a bronze medal in the Olympics in London in 2012 and in the Olympics just gone, the Rio Olympics, he got the silver. I think it was six international races that the Australian quad scull team competed in, and the only one they lost out of that six was the Olympic race in Rio. He said it was just one of those days and it is just what happens. Even though there is a fierce rivalry—and I think their main competitors were the Germans, who won the race—he also said that there is a great camaraderie

between the teams because obviously they see each other in many places around the world. As he said, 'Look, on the day the Germans were the better team.'

James is keen to keep training for Japan in 2020. As I said, he needs to get the boxed set; that will be a fantastic achievement, but that does not deny what he has already done. He has put in a great effort for Murray Bridge, for South Australia and for Australia. It is great to see this favourite son of the rowing club do so well, especially as the rowing club is looking at their major expansion works.

They have managed to receive some grant funding. They are attracting schools up to Murray Bridge, where they will have new facilities that they will lease out to various schools, and obviously they will have a bay for themselves. I congratulate the Murray Bridge Rowing Club on its foresight. Craig Christian and Stacy Seidel, as two of its lead people, are doing so much work to move this rowing club into the future.

In talking about Rio, I did say to James, 'What's with all the media you get about how rough Rio is?' He said, 'They do it every time. There's always a story from an Olympics; it doesn't matter where it is.' Obviously, we saw the media reports of how supposedly dangerous Rio was. He said, 'Look, it was fine.' He said that he actually did not stay in the village. They got some accommodation because they were a fair distance away. I think it was something like an hour or further from the Olympic village to where they had to row, so they managed to get some other accommodation with some other people who were doing water sports, close to the water where they had to compete. He said that was pretty good. He said negotiating with Kitty Chiller is not easy, but they managed to do that.

I certainly wish James the best in all his endeavours. I congratulate all the Rio Olympians, and not just the medallists; just to compete is a fantastic effort. I congratulate their families and support staff who support these people. I, too, would like to acknowledge Katrina Webb, another Murray Bridge person, for her involvement in the Paralympics for many years. She works at a governance level now. I run into Katrina around the place from time to time.

Mr Whetstone: She is climbing up Mount Everest.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, she is climbing Mount Everest. I think she is going to base camp, from memory. She is a real inspiration, and another inspirational person from Murray Bridge. She has been a great asset. She is a physiotherapist by trade and, when I had my hip operation several years ago, she was my physio. It was nice to have a little joke with her about, 'How would you be?' She has done great work. She is doing great work at the governance level, being involved with the Olympics. As I stated, she is going to go to base camp at Everest. I wish her all the best for the future and acknowledge everything that she has done for sport in the past.

I acknowledge James McRae for everything he has done in the past and wish him and the team all the best heading into Japan 2020. All our potential Olympians do give up a lot. They do not get paid at all really. They might get the odd little bit of funding to live, but that is about it, and it is a struggle. I do commend them for the great work they do for this state and the country at all levels, because it certainly is not easy on a range of fronts. I commend the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, member for Hammond, have you seen the movie *Paris or the Bush*, the story of the Murray Cods?

Mr PEDERICK: I have not had the opportunity, actually.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that might be worth us all having a look at.

Mr PEDERICK: That is the movie; yes, absolutely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the one. The member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:43): I rise to speak on this motion as well and note that, when it was first brought to the house, it was to wish all the Australian athletes well. Now, in the wake of the games, it is obviously to commend them for their efforts. I know everyone has spoken about a number of athletes, and I will be brief here. I want to speak about one athlete from my local area. As we looked forward towards the games, we were speaking about a very exciting young man who trains at the Marion Swimming Club in my local area, and his name is Kyle Chalmers. If I had

mentioned him before the games, a lot of people might not have known who he was. When we are talking about him after the games, everyone knows who is for his outstanding performance in the 100 metres freestyle.

Probably at the halfway mark of that swim a lot of people would not have known who Kyle Chalmers was. He was nowhere to be seen as they turned, but as they headed for home—I must say that in my past life I have watched a lot of sporting events on the land and in the water, across the gamut—I do not think he was in the swim until about the last 10 metres. Never before have I seen such a great performance. It is one of the all-time greatest performances in a sporting arena that I have ever seen, and I really do commend him for that wonderful gold medal—it was outstanding.

I mentioned that he swims for the Marion Swimming Club and lives in and around my community. The member for Flinders rightly points out that he is from the West Coast and is a Port Lincoln boy, but we are claiming him at the Marion Swimming Club, and our community was very supportive of him. In fact, the morning after, my office staff were so supportive and elated that they had posters of Kyle stuck all around our office; we thought he was absolutely sensational. It was a great achievement for a young man, and he is going on to do bigger and better things. It is just one of those highly successful stories to have come out of the Olympic Games, and I just wanted to note his being from our local area.

I also take this opportunity to mention the Marion Swimming Club, which was established in 1979 to serve the wider community. In 1982, just three years after it was formed, it became the youngest club to be awarded Club of the Year by the state governing body, Swimming SA, and has since won the award on a number of occasions, the latest being in 2005 and 2006.

They do a marvellous job, and have had some great names involved with the club over the time—state, national, commonwealth and Olympic-level athletes, including Hall of Fame member Glenn Beringen; Olympic and Commonwealth Games silver medallist Martin Roberts; Olympic and Commonwealth Games gold medallist Sally Hunter; and Olympic and Commonwealth Games gold and silver medallist Matt Cowdrey, Australia's greatest Paralympian. Pete Bishop was our long-time coach with the Marion Swimming Club and has done a great job as a swim coach right across the state. I know that he has had a lot of success in his time, and we commend him as well.

I point out the great work they do. Adam Luscombe is in charge of the YMCA and is manager of the South Australian Aquatic Centre, and he does a great job. To have this facility so close to my office is great. I go there for lunch often and catch up with people there, and what it does for the community is absolutely outstanding. I know the member for Bright has a gym membership there as well. It is a great way for people to meet, stay fit and healthy, and be involved with this from the elite level right down to the wonderful young kids and juniors we see going through that swim club. They do some great work in the disability sector as well; a lot of young and older people go through there who engage with that swimming centre and are really improving their quality of life.

I would like it to go on record that we know there were problems with the build of that centre—the Candetti build—and we know there are some ongoing issues with that. This is our state's premier aquatic centre and facility. We know the Minister for Recreation and Sport often goes to a lot of these events, including Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games, right around the world. He likes to get along to a sporting event at any opportunity, but he has not structured a plan as to how we will get a Commonwealth Games or something of that ilk in South Australia. I am really keen to keep pushing him on that, because he will go to the events, take guests along and have a good time—and good on him for that—but he has not actually directed a path for South Australia to get the Commonwealth Games.

We see that the Gold Coast is getting a Commonwealth Games. A regional part of Queensland is getting a Commonwealth Games before South Australia and Adelaide, which I think is somewhat disappointing. As far as the facilities are concerned, the minister must also work hard to make sure that this stays as an international venue because, again, the problems with the build and maintaining the facility at that standard is something that is very important to our community and our state. I fear that perhaps that investment has not been made by the minister and I would like to think that is not the case.

All the while, the Marion Swimming Club does a great job, and no doubt the pride of the swim club at the moment is Kyle Chalmers. We commend him for his great effort at the Rio Olympics, along with all the other athletes. I will not mention them all by name, as I know that others want to speak, but I just wanted to get that on the record.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:49): On behalf of the member for Reynell, I will close debate, if no-one else wants to speak, and thank all members for their contribution.

Motion carried.

CARNEVALE ITALIAN FESTIVAL

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:49): I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates the Carnevale Italian Festival for celebrating its 40th anniversary in 2016;
- (b) acknowledges the significant work and commitment of the Carnevale Italian Festival committee and volunteers, past and present, for continuously showcasing the vibrant and energetic Italian culture through the festival; and
- (c) acknowledges the importance of their establishment, and the work they have done over the past 40 years in the promotion and preservation of Italian heritage and in doing so, enriching the multicultural landscape of South Australia.

As we know, our multicultural communities certainly enrich every aspect of our lives here in South Australia and have done for some time. We are richer as a state because of our multicultural communities. Whether it is our sport, our civic society, our food or our language, we are certainly enriched as a whole because of our multicultural societies and what they have added to the beautiful mosaic that is the multicultural society here in South Australia.

For 40 years, the Italian community in South Australia has celebrated one of the most popular traditions in Italy, which is obviously Carnevale. When we think about Carnevale, some may immediately think about the masks, sweets and parties. However, it is interesting to note, and the government should take notice, that the word 'carnevale' actually comes from the Latin expression 'carnem lavare' (to eliminate meat) as it originally indicated the banquet that was held before the period of fasting for Lent.

I am informed by many that the festival began in 1976, a long time ago, in Rundle Mall. I believe a parade went from Victoria Square to Elder Park before celebrations in Rundle Mall. In 2016, we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the festival. The festival has also been hosted at various places throughout its history, including Rundle Mall, as I mentioned, but also Elder Park, Norwood Oval, Adelaide Oval, Rymill Park and of course its current home at the Adelaide Showgrounds.

The festival is a way of celebrating Italian culture and food and multiculturalism as well. Young people especially are certainly inspired to embrace their heritage, and I think it gives the wider community a great opportunity to experience Italian culture. Various Italo-Australian clubs and associations but also other organisations and businesses have always participated in the festival by either catering or displaying their region or their company at one of the stalls at Carnevale.

The festival is also of course used as a fundraising event for very good causes. It certainly raises much funding to cater for the welfare of our elderly in our community through the CIC, which is the Coordinating Italian Committee. The government has supported CIC for some years, as we have in the opposition, and other worthy charity community organisations are also supported.

At this point in time, I would like to say a few words about CIC and the good work that they do especially in assisting many of the elderly residents in our society. I think we have a duty as citizens to, when we are able, do what we can to help the frail and assist the elderly. CIC do a wonderful job in fundraising and making sure that they provide services for the elderly in our community by doing various things.

They have lunches, they have card games, and they have a service where people are able to seek counselling if they need it, and also take the pressure away from some families if there is a person who would like to get out and have some company. I know that, in my late grandfather's last days, CIC did a wonderful job in giving my grandmother some respite when my grandfather was not

well. He was able to meet some friends and have some camaraderie with people despite his ongoing health issues.

They do a wonderful job. They are situated on Magill Road, and I would like to thank them, especially their executive, for the good work that they do. They are ably led by Angelo Raffaele Fantasia, but I would also like to thank Alida Tarca, Norma Panella, Nadia D'Antuoni, the dynamic Eugene Ragghianti, Lucrezia Ranieri, Antonietta Cardinale, Maria Aglieco, Carla Giglio, Anna Sheridan and Sally Feo as well as all the other staff and volunteers who do a great job in making CIC what it is. It is always a pleasure to attend their carer support group sessions, social lunches and shopping programs. It is great to see that they are still doing their physical activity programs as well.

I want to especially thank the various organisations that have been involved in the most recent Carnevale who do a wonderful job in making sure that this festival continues to thrive. Obviously, a festival like Carnevale is only as good as its sponsors and volunteers, so I would like to pay tribute to some of these organisations which have continued to support Carnevale, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

I would like to pay tribute to Adelaide Blue Eagles Soccer Club, Adelaide City, Adelaide Olympic Soccer Club, Arena Community Club, ARIA (Association for Research between Italy and Australia), Bene Aged Care, Calabria Sport and Social Club, Campania Sport and Social Club, Campbelltown City Council, Campbelltown City Soccer Club and Campbelltown Rotary Club. I had the task of taking cash to the Campbelltown Rotary Club for some years, and making sure that it balances at the end of the day, and I am proud to say that it always did. They do a wonderful porchetta if you are ever looking for something to eat at Carnevale. They do a great job.

I would also like to pay tribute to Committee Giorno del Ricordo, City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, Cucina Veneziana, Ducati Owners Club of South Australia, Eastern United Soccer Club, Eastern Zone Primary School Association, Ferrari Club Australia, Fulham United, The Italian Choral and Arts Society, Lions Club of Adelaide Italian, Marche Club (led ably by Cathy Papandrea and Vincenzo Papandrea), Mater Christi Choir, Metro Stars Soccer Club, The Monteverdi Singers, Paradise Primary School, South Australian Rocco Adelaide, St Francis of Assisi Choir, South Australian Bocce Federation Inc., Society of St Hilarion, West Adelaide Soccer Club and Working Title Press, as well as many individuals.

There are too many individuals to name, but I want to point out a few who have done a wonderful job over the years in supporting Carnevale, including the most recent one, such as the Bergamin family, Cardinale family, Cherubini family, Chirico family, Coppola family, Costa family, Anna Fantasia, Anthony Fantasia, Cavaliere Lorenzo Ferini, Frank Maione, Frank Malvaso, Cassandra Mamone, Emidio Marozzi, Silvana Marveggio, Cavaliere Professor Desmond O'Connor, Vincent Plush, Ernie Sorgini, Fabio Tarca, Paul Triglau and Peter Zinghini.

I would also like to thank Joe Geracitano, President of the Italian Historical Society of South Australia, for sending me a few notes regarding the history of Carnevale. I notice that it looks like the date of Carnevale will actually be moved next year, and I am sure members on the other side of the chamber will have something to say about that. Thank you, Joe, for providing some figures. It is also interesting to note some of our multicultural stats in South Australia which put this festival into context, but what I might do is adjourn for today and return at a later point in time to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—

Annual Report 2015-16 (Paper No. 76A) [Ordered to be published]

An audit of the Department for Education and Child Development's complaint handling procedures—November 2016 (Paper No. 76B)
[Ordered to be published]

'Right of Review'—an audit of Local Government Internal Review of Council Decisions Procedures—November 2016 (Paper No. 76C)
[Ordered to be published]

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling) on behalf of the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Development—Revocation of Transitional Provisions Regulations

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling) on behalf of Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Public Sector—Miscellaneous

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling) on behalf of the Minister for Consumer and Business Services (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Sale and Conveyancing—
Miscellaneous

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

Health Advisory Council—

Barossa and Districts Annual Report 2015-16

Bordertown and District Annual Report 2015-16

Ceduna District Health Services Annual Report 2015-16

Country Health SA Local Health Network Annual Report 2015-16

Eastern Eyre Annual Report 2015-16

Far North Annual Report 2015-16

Gawler Annual Report 2015-16

Hills Area Annual Report 2015-16

Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2015-16

Kingston Robe Annual Report 2015-16

Leigh Creek Health Services Annual Report 2015-16

Lower Eyre Annual Report 2015-16

Lower North Annual Report 2015-16

Loxton and Districts Annual Report 2015-16

Mallee Health Service Annual Report 2015-16

Mannum District Annual Report 2015-16

Mid West Annual Report 2015-16

Millicent and Districts Annual Report 2015-16

Naracoorte Area Annual Report 2015-16

Penola and Districts Annual Report 2015-16

Port Augusta, Roxby Downs and Woomera Annual Report 2015-16

Port Broughton District Hospital and Health Services Annual Report 2015-16

Port Lincoln Annual Report 2015-16

Port Pirie Annual Report 2015-16

Quorn Health Services Annual Report 2015-16
South Coast Annual Report 2015-16
The Whyalla Hospital and Health Services Annual Report 2015-16
Waikerie and Districts Annual Report 2015-16
Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2015-16

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

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2015-16
SA Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2015-16

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fisheries Management—
Broodstock and Seedstock Fishery
Prawn Fisheries No. 2

By the Minister for Investment and Trade (Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith)—

Investment Attraction South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16

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

Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee—Annual Report 2015-16
TAFE SA—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—Miscellaneous No. 2
Road Traffic—Approved Child Restraints

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to the parliament today 20 volunteers from Modbury Hospital, who are guests of the member for Florey. I also welcome students from the SA College of English, who are guests of the member for Adelaide.

Ministerial Statement

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:04): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The fourth interim report of the Select Committee on Transforming Health was tabled in the other place on Tuesday. The report makes recommendations about new service arrangements across the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network's Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals that were implemented earlier this year, as well as the transfer of substantial additional services to these hospitals which started last month.

I applaud the committee, chaired by the opposition health spokesman, the Hon. Stephen Wade, for taking such a bipartisan approach in its recommendations, which are largely consistent with the government's plans and future directions for improving hospital services in the north and north-eastern suburbs.

Of note, the committee's first—and, if I may say, most important—of its recommendations asks the government to ensure as a matter of priority increased resourcing for the Lyell McEwin Hospital to enable it to function as one of the three major hospitals in the state. It was only last sitting

week that I updated the house in response to a question from the member for Napier on the substantial additional facilities, clinical staff and services we have started moving to the Lyell McEwin Hospital in line with the hospital's role as the major tertiary hospital of the northern suburbs.

As I noted then, the changes that started last month are expected to be completed early next year and see around 170 full-time equivalent employees and more than 70 overnight and day beds transferred to the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals. It is certainly very heartening to see that the committee, chaired by the Hon. Stephen Wade, has now joined the government, as well as our nursing and allied health staff and some doctors, despite the recalcitrance of their union in supporting this important part of the Transforming Health reforms.

We agree with the committee that a strategy is needed to help improve flow through the busy Lyell McEwin emergency department, and that is why we have already had an external emergency specialist undertake a review for us, with recommendations for improvement expected early in the new year. A scoping exercise is also well underway to look at options for the physical expansion of the emergency department to ensure it can continue to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population of northern Adelaide.

Likewise, I am very pleased to see that the committee has acknowledged in its recommendations that the Lyell McEwin Hospital, as one of our three major metropolitan hospitals, should have access to increased specialist diagnostic support. This, of course, is a key part of the Transforming Health reforms, which aims to realign health services staff and resources so that we can provide better treatment for major traumas and life-threatening emergencies every hour of the day.

In line with the committee's recommendation, we have recently installed a second CT scanner at the Lyell McEwin Hospital to support faster access to imaging, and this became operational last month. Further, we are building a second cath lab, which will be operational early next year, allowing more local residents with heart attacks and heart conditions to be diagnosed and treated closer to home.

With a change in service profiles, Modbury Hospital is now an elective surgery and rehabilitation centre of excellence and no longer performs emergency surgery. I note the evidence given by the chair of the South Australian branch of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons outlined in the committee's report which confirms the college's support for the principle of separating emergency and elective surgery, which, of course, is what we have done with the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals.

I acknowledge that these reforms represent change for our clinicians, and change is very rarely smooth sailing. Some clinicians do not feel that there was sufficient consultation, so we are continuing to engage with them. In fact, a workshop was held last month at Modbury Hospital and included emergency and surgical clinicians to continue to work through the change. This follows on from a significant clinical consultation program that occurred between October 2015 and May 2016 which included over 226 staff forums across Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals and which was open to all clinical staff. These forums included over 50 service planning workshops, with over 270 clinical staff participating in the development of the new models of care and service pathways. In line with the committee's recommendations, and as is standard practice, we will, of course, continue to engage.

The committee also makes recommendations on senior overnight medical cover at Modbury Hospital. I am told that we have already increased overnight cover on the advice of our Modbury Hospital ED clinicians. Lastly, I have appointed an emergency medicine specialist on the Transforming Health Ministerial Clinical Advisory Group in line with the committee's recommendation. Once again, it appears the committee is on the same page as the government, which is very pleasing to me.

I would like to thank the Hon. Stephen Wade and the committee for its well-considered recommendations which will very much support and align with this government's vision and plans for health services for the north and north-eastern suburbs under Transforming Health. It is great to see the opposition health spokesman taking such a bipartisan approach as we proceed with these

important reforms, and I am looking forward to seeing the Leader of the Opposition following his example.

PINERY BUSHFIRES

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On Wednesday 25 November 2015, the Pinery bushfire started and escalated rapidly across four local council areas in the Mid North. Two lives were tragically lost and 31 members of our community injured. To commemorate this significant occasion as the one-year anniversary approaches, several community events have been planned across the coming weeks for those who were impacted by this tragedy.

The weekend before the anniversary, on Sunday 20 November, there will be a commemorative service followed by a barbecue lunch held at 10am at the Mallala Uniting Church on Traeger Road. At 5.30pm that same day, the Owen Community Church and Owen Community Committee will co-host a community thanksgiving event at the Owen Institute, which will begin with music, reflection and a minute of silence, followed by a free community barbecue.

On the actual Pinery bushfire anniversary, Friday 25 November, the Wasley Community Group will host a thanksgiving event at the Wasley Institute, which will include a service conducted by Reverend Dr Phil Marshall, followed by a family barbecue. The Hamley Bridge Community Association events subcommittee will also host a 'coffee, cake and chat' event at the Hamley Bridge Institute from 3pm to 6pm, and the Mallala Uniting Church on Traeger Road will be open for people who may like to attend for quiet reflection between 10am and 1pm. The following weekend, on Sunday 27 November, there will be a community catch-up at Hamley Bridge Community Sports and Recreation Centre on Stockport Road.

These events will provide an excellent opportunity for the affected communities to come together and remember those who were lost, while also being reminded of the enormous outpouring of support they have received from across the state. One of the pillars of disaster recovery is the recovery of the local economy. The recent rains we experienced have resulted in crops in the area being equal to or better than many over recent years.

Whilst the economic recovery could be said to be on a positive trajectory, we must not lose sight of the psychological impact and burden carried by many who experienced trauma and loss in the fire. What is really important is that the communities are provided support through this next bushfire season. There are already heightened emotions in these communities as prevailing weather conditions remind them of this fateful day. This is why the recovery effort for those affected communities will continue into the new year.

Question Time

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. In the Premier's recent announcement of the development plans for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, did he omit proposals by the government's preferred proponent for new cultural facilities because some ministers oppose their inclusion?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:15): I was somewhat unsurprised to see that there was an article published in a news outlet today talking about what is planned for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, and the suggestions which have been running aflame on Twitter from the opposition that these plans were somehow hidden or concealed or not revealed is pretty surprising because, if I think back about what has been released to the public, I can remember, for example, that an accusation of concealing these plans might not quite cut it, given that they were released and

exposed on the front page of *The Advertiser* two weeks ago, or even earlier than that, on the front page of the *Sunday Mail* nearly a week before that.

If that is concealing it from hundreds of thousands of South Australians, if that is concealment, I stand guilty as charged. It is absolutely extraordinary that the South Australian Liberal Party says, 'No, we can't have residential on there,' from the member for Heysen, and then the Leader of the Opposition, while he was tripping over his tongue on talkback radio, says, 'No, that's not true. We had always said that we were open to mixed use. That includes residential. That's absolutely fine.'

Let's remember, Mr Speaker, who knocked off who over on that side. Of course, that is an absolute reflection of the sort of division that still remains over there. If you walk through the halls of this place outside of sitting times and you hear that soft click, click, clicking coming from some place up on level 2, if you push far enough into an office, if you expose that crack of light a little bit wider as the door opens, you will see the deputy leader there with her abacus furtively doing the numbers to see if she can build on that 13 which she got to only a few months ago. That's close—I will give her that. That is close but, as she would be used to, it's not close enough, is it, Vickie? It's not quite close enough.

The sorrowful performance from the Liberal Party on the position of the Royal Adelaide Hospital site redevelopment is dreadful. Can you imagine coming out and saying that in contemporary Adelaide perhaps what we need is some sort of health and biomedical precinct? I know the crowd on that side of the parliament don't get down west very much; I know they don't go down much past King William Street, let alone down to West Terrace, but it might come as some revelation to the Leader of the Opposition that there is a bit going on down there.

There is a large building that some refer to as the SAHMRI, containing hundreds and hundreds of medical researchers. There are a couple of other large buildings going up, one a new medical school and another a cancer centre from the University of South Australia.

Mr PENGILLY: I have a point of order. I suggest that the minister is debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think he is. I uphold the point of order. In that pause, I call to order the members for Hartley, Adelaide, Davenport, Chaffey, Morialta, Mitchell and Unley. I call to order the leader, the deputy leader and the Minister for Agriculture. I warn for the first time the deputy leader, the leader and the member for Morialta. I warn for the second and the final time the deputy leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer support the proposal to establish the history of South Australia museum proposed by the government's preferred proponent as part of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site redevelopment?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the minister be seated. The minister has not said anything yet, so he is not being provocative. The wall of interjections he is getting are all, of course, out of order. I just want to draw to the attention of the member for Morialta that he had a call to order and a warning from the morning session of the house, so he is now on two warnings. The member for Schubert already had a warning, and the member for Hartley already had a call to order, so he is warned. I am sorry—the member for Schubert had a call to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: This morning.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: the only time I spoke this morning was prior to the first division, and the *Hansard* records who was there and capable of giving warnings to me at that time. I certainly don't remember one.

The SPEAKER: I will consult the Deputy Speaker, who was here during the morning session. The minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:22): Thank you, Mr Speaker. In response to that question, it is important to remind ourselves what has been proposed for the use of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. We not only have the preferred developer, of course, who will be superintending the development but we have a partnership between the University of Adelaide and the developer to deliver a research and innovation hub.

We have the adaptive re-use of heritage buildings, and yes, absolutely, the proponent has been talking to organisations around Adelaide, indeed I think around Australia, trying to attract their interest to assist them in what will be a project requirement from the government, that is, the re-use of those five important heritage buildings which front that corner of Frome Road and North Terrace.

Whether it is to be the use that the leader refers to in his question, or indeed that the proponent had referred to in their prospectus document—which, shock horror, amongst the dozens of other organisations that they have been talking to in the last six months, has finally, weeks after the government made these plans public, somehow made its way into the hands of the opposition—it will be up to the proponent to demonstrate that it can be used for that purpose. It is in the best interests of that heritage building, and it is in the best interests of the development as a whole. Given that, as we have set out in some detail both in this place and in the media, we need to go through a process—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, we register your dissent to the leader. That is understood, member for Heysen. We know you are not happy. Those old and deep wounds take a long time to heal; I appreciate that, member for Heysen. Once that is resolved by the proponent in negotiations with the government, then if there are further developments about what is planned for that site, then once they are confirmed we will release those as well. But the fact is they are not confirmed and they are not yet ready to be released because it has not been agreed by the proponent, or by the government, that they will be going forward.

The SPEAKER: I have consulted the Deputy Speaker, and she said she made no calls to order or warnings in the morning session. Accordingly, the member for Unley was right; they must be from another day.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Does the minister support the proposal to establish the world-class concert hall proposed by the government's preferred proponent as part of the Royal Adelaide Hospital site redevelopment?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:25): Goodness me, Mr Speaker, isn't it a shame that after the dreadfully failed tactics of the opposition's question time strategy for the last two days, they would seek to repeat it in reverse?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, you are not leader yet.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: it has nothing to do with the question. He is now talking about the strategy in question time.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is being provocative. I hope his provocation is delivered and over and he can now answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I said in my first answer, these discussions hidden so wilfully by the government on the front page of the *Saturday Advertiser* some two weeks ago did canvass the government's strategy for investigating cultural institutions. And what did that article on

the front page of the Saturday *Advertiser* say? It talked about a process for a cultural institution and it talked about an art gallery in that article, and it also mentioned the fact that it had been proposed by the proponent for a concert hall.

Once those considerations by both the proponent and the government have been concluded—bearing in mind the government has its own processes for considering this, which has involved appointing a panel of eminent Australian arts administrators and identities to consider the appropriate location and form of a cultural institution—and once there is something to confirm, then the government will be making those plans clear.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the establishment of a new five-star hotel by the Marriott group as part of the redevelopment of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site is being jeopardised by the refusal of some of his ministers to support the art gallery, museum and concert facilities proposed by the government's preferred proponent?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:27): No, that can't be confirmed.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): A supplementary to the minister: is it not the case that negotiations with the Marriott hotel group were based on the hotel being co-located with these cultural facilities?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:27): Negotiations are being conducted between the proponent, the preferred developer (which is John Holland/Commercial & General group) and all of those institutions—whether it is the Marriott with regard to the five-star hotel or, indeed, whether it's between Telstra and BlueChilli and the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia, and the other consortium which is building the carbon-neutral cogeneration plant, which I note was alleged to have been another detail scurrilously hidden from public view in the report today which, indeed, was actually reported by InDaily yesterday. So I am not quite sure that the opposition and others are on the same page with what has actually been discussed publicly.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. What economic modelling was done around the benefit to the eastern CBD economy of a concert hall, history museum and other cultural facilities being located at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:28): There has been some economic analysis of the benefits of this project, and it's been—

Ms Redmond: Yes, you're going to sell off our Parklands.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, we all hear the member for Heysen's dissatisfaction with the Leader of the Opposition's fourth position on the Liberal's views on the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site redevelopment.

Ms Redmond: You're going to sell the Parklands into private ownership.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, that's right, keep hectoring your leader. It eventually proves effective, as history shows, I have to say. So, maybe the member for Heysen will make her case, albeit on that side of the chamber.

Mr Marshall: Somebody wants to expose it. Who is it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, the leader is correct: somebody did want to expose it. That was the Premier and I when we stood up and announced the plans on Sunday, and that was also the government, repeatedly, as I said on the front page of what I understand to be the most-read newspaper in South Australian circulation.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: having acknowledged that economic modelling was done, who did it and when was it provided?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:29): As I was saying, economic modelling has been conducted and the benefits of the redevelopment, as announced, are separate to—

Ms Redmond: Of selling Parklands.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the provision of any additional cultural facilities and shows virtually a replication of the daytime visitation on the site between—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Who provided it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It was provided—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, the member for Stuart makes a fair point. Who provided it? It was provided by the proponent.

Mr Marshall: For the cultural facility.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Now the leader seeks to change the deputy leader's question. It is getting to be a bit of a debacle over there. There was economic modelling done. It was done by the proponent on the basis of the announced redevelopment. Who will do the economic modelling of any cultural facility, whether or not it is to be located there? As we have said, both in this place and publicly many days ago, that will be done by the panel of eminent arts experts who are considering the fulsome business case for a cultural institution in Adelaide.

I know they don't like to hear it because they have been shamed about their lack of consistency on this project. I have to point out the gall of the leader to come into this place, who opposes this development, who opposes jobs and an economic future for this state, and who has been exposed time and time again for talking down the economic prospects of this state.

Indeed, only one hour ago was I at the Torrens to Torrens project announcing a project milestone—another project he campaigned against and promised to cancel, and 97 per cent of workers there are South Australians. It is six weeks ahead of schedule and providing hundreds of jobs for the state economy, as we are seeing in today's unemployment figures.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: standing order 98, the minister is entering debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

ADELAIDE BOTANIC GARDEN

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): To the Minister for—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr Whetstone: Give us a nuclear dump answer.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

Ms CHAPMAN: —Urban Development, have the botanical gardens—

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is called to order for provoking the member for Chaffey.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have the Botanic Gardens of SA been informed that 17,000 square metres has been earmarked for a new space for the Art Gallery?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:32): Certainly, there have been discussions with the Botanic Garden, and the Botanic Garden has been eagerly anticipating the return of 20,400 square metres or 2.04 hectares, nearly a third of the site, not just to Parklands but to the Botanic Garden. I think the deputy leader said 17,000 square metres, an invented figure which she erroneously draws as—

Mr Marshall: Is that right? Is that right?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, you are going to hear it and you won't like it. She talks about 17,000 square metres of land area which would be consumed by a cultural facility. How wrong she can be. Floor space is what has been proposed by the proponent, and what would the footprint be? Vastly less than that. In fact, I think off the top of my head it would be 1,408 square metres. If that is not precise enough for the deputy leader or for the leader, then I can appreciate that.

They don't like hearing facts and figures, particularly as they relate to economic development, job opportunities and the improvement of economic circumstances in the city. They are not interested in that, but those are the figures. They don't like it. They don't like development in the city. They have sought to hermetically seal it, whether that has been voting against small bar laws, voting against food truck laws—

Mr Wingard: Your car park tax.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right. As the member for Mitchell says, voting against public transport improvements in this state, making it impossible for the member for Hartley to make sure that he can deliver a promise, which he didn't actually promise—it was the other candidate for Hartley—about an upgrade to the Paradise Interchange.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is finished. The deputy leader.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My question again is to the Minister for Urban Development. Can the minister confirm whether he has read the economic modelling that he has received, of an unknown date and by an unknown person?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:34): Have I seen the economic analysis, or is the question did I read it or was it read to me? We have been provided with the information, and it is as we have released in press releases and in material which we have released to the media.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to repeat the question to the minister because, clearly, he is asking me now what I have asked him. I am happy to repeat it.

The SPEAKER: Did the minister get the question?

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: I got it and responded to it.

The SPEAKER: Okay.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): A supplementary: could the minister then confirm when he did read it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:35): I am sure it would be in the weeks leading up to cabinet considering the information and the recommendation about the preferred tenderer. If she wants a time frame or a particular date, I will do my best to provide that to her.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development. Can the minister advise how many of the modelled 2,900 ongoing direct jobs that will be created as part of the old Royal Adelaide Hospital redevelopment were linked to the concert hall, the Museum and the gallery?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:36): Consistent with the information I provided three answers ago, the economic modelling, which we provided in the scandalously concealed public release of all of this information, was exclusive of new cultural facilities related either to the Art Gallery or the concert hall.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): To the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, now that the minister is in a position to answer questions, could he indicate whether he now supports the Premier's nuclear waste dump?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That debacle by the opposition is entirely disorderly and will have consequences. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:37): Yes, and one of the consequences, sir, will be to rub their nose in what has been, I think, a catastrophic error of judgement by the Leader of the Opposition. As business lunch and business breakfast and business organisation one after another contact us on a daily basis to say they have lost complete confidence in those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —nervous laughter—as they contact us and say that any shred of faith they had in the Liberal Party has now completely gone, and as he has driven his team out into the open and has them fixed in the open with every major business group training their weapons on them, he will begin to realise, as will those sitting behind him, that he has embarked on a massive mistake on behalf of his group.

The people of South Australia will always be brought into our trust, and that is why we have engaged in a deep and intelligent public conversation with them about the future of our state in the nation, and it is beginning to have a dramatic effect. Today, we saw the 15th consecutive reduction in the unemployment rate in this state. As they were busily hitting the refresh button at 11am this morning, just praying for bad news, what popped up? South Australia having a lower unemployment rate than Western Australia.

South Australia created in the order of 10,000 jobs in the past year—and all this in the face of a federal government that chased Holden out of our state, that pocketed \$700 million in subsidy, that did not lift a finger for a labour market adjustment program out of that \$700 million and dithered over the Future Submarines contract in a way which has led to the loss of hundreds of jobs down in Techport. Despite all those headwinds, without any assistance from those opposite—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr BELL: On relevance: the question was whether the minister was allowed to speak to the nuclear waste dump and we got the answer.

The SPEAKER: These questions have been going on for some days now. These questions are of a rhetorical nature and the Premier is giving a rhetorical answer.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What were the brains trust opposite and the Treasury spokesperson opposite saying? In July 2015, the Hon. Rob Lucas said this:

South Australia is in the midst of a dangerous jobs crisis and is careering towards double digit unemployment. This was the chief economic adviser for those opposite, the shadow treasurer. He went on to say:

It is becoming clearer every day that South Australia needs jobs creation now, not in a few years like the Weatherill Labor government is talking about.

Since that time, the trend unemployment rate has fallen from 7.8 per cent to 6.6 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I ask you to bring the Premier back to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: There is no merit in the point of order. Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes.

INVESTMENT ATTRACTION AGENCY

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Has the Investment Attraction strategy, initiated last year, achieved its aims?

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) (14:41): I thank the member for Wright because, indeed, that strategy is delivering results.

Ms Chapman: Have you got any more 457s?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Something intelligent to say?

Ms Chapman: Any more 457 visas?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Something intelligent to say?

Ms Chapman: Any more?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: No, nothing really, pity. Ask a question, Vickie; see if it can be an intelligent one.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order: I would ask you to ask the minister to refer to members by their electorate name.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is highly disorderly to refer to members by other than their electorate name or position in the house. The minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I also thank the member for Finnis for his questions earlier this week about the Investment Attraction agency, which I will include in my response today, because the Investment Attraction agency opened its doors in October last year with the object of creating new jobs and attracting investment into the state to provide further economic stimulus. People were moved from the Department of State Development, from Primary Industries, resources from Renewal SA and DPC into the new agency so that it was raised from within existing resources, and it has been successful indeed.

It has helped 12 companies complete their investment plans, securing \$975 million worth of investment projects for the state, which will create 4,500 direct and construction jobs for South Australians, and there is more to come shortly. These jobs partly explain why the employment rate in South Australia is growing—and it is growing above that of other states. Some of those successes have come through financial assistance provided through the agency's Economic Investment Fund. Other successes have come through the very good case management services the agency provides.

Secondly, the agency has been a key player in the strategic annual calendar of trade missions that has been developed and run by the Department of State Development in conjunction with lead agencies, such as Primary Industries and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Just this week, we hosted a delegation from Singapore's state-owned investment powerhouse, Temasek. Thirdly, Investment Attraction SA—

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The SPEAKER: The member of the public sitting above the clock will not use flash photography. Would the security guard please remove that flash camera.

Ms Sanderson: Nobody saw it, though.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned and will be ejected if she continues to behave in that fashion. I definitely saw it and I am sure other members did, especially the member on his feet would have been distracted. Minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The agency is building the state's reputation across the world. It operates on two levels: it provides financial assistance via the Economic Investment Fund and it also provides direct assistance to companies, businesses and investors to help them establish new ventures. For example, the member for Finniss raised yesterday the matter of Red Capital Pty Ltd and what assistance had been given.

I am advised that Australian Global Wine Services, in conjunction with Red Capital Pty Ltd, announced plans in early 2016 to construct a bottling storage and container facility at Port Adelaide, which will cater predominantly for the wine industry. This \$55 million venture will create up to 70 new jobs plus 170 construction jobs. Investment Attraction SA worked closely across a range of government departments to support the project. That is what the agency does.

As the Premier announced in February 2015, we have corralled investment activities across government into one focused agency to improve performance, and it works very much as a part of the whole government team. We did it with no additional resource expense to the budget, using current resources. Under board chairman, Rob Chapman, and myself as minister and with the Premier's guidance and with a great CEO, close to \$1 billion of economic activity has been moved into our economy with the promise of 6,000 jobs by 2018 looking like being exceeded, no thanks to those opposite.

RESOURCES SECTOR

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you inform the house of the outcome of the latest JUMEX survey of explorers working in the resources sector?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46): As a matter of fact, I can, sir. I would like to thank the member for his question and his keen interest in the JUMEX survey and the work they have done. It is a timely question. The government has made efforts to unlock the full potential of the state's vast resources and energy potential so that we can create jobs and greater prosperity for all South Australians.

For seven years now, Grant Thornton, an independent insurance, tax and advisory firm, has carried out a survey of junior mining and exploration companies to provide a comprehensive market overview of the sector. I think it is fair to say that the most recent survey was conducted after a number of very challenging years for the resources industry. Falling global commodity prices and a decline in share prices for many smaller mining exploration companies have made it a very difficult environment to raise capital funding for drilling opportunities. We haven't been immune in this state to those global headwinds, but we have taken several steps to support the resources sector during this downturn.

The pleasing outcome of the most recent JUMEX survey is that junior miners and explorers in Australia are reporting a definite and sustained improvement in market conditions. That is not to say that the challenges do not remain—they do. The survey found that funding is a persistent concern amid intense competition for capital and that the search for investors is more global than ever. Amid those challenges, the survey identified South Australia as an attractive investment destination for minerals exploration in Australia, second only to Western Australia, which has obviously a very large endowment and a wide variety of mineral resources and a much more developed sector.

The survey found that South Australia was regarded by investors as generally a very positive environment for mining projects. On the other hand, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria were regarded as the most challenging locations from a regulatory perspective, with many investors reporting negative experiences with investments in those locations. The survey highlighted the need for companies to embrace innovation and, obviously, new technologies to drive efficiencies and lower their costs.

The government has repeatedly said that it is time for South Australia to put in both policies and programs to ensure the state is best placed to benefit from what will be an inevitable recovery of the resources sector. Mr Speaker, you would be keenly aware that South Australia has consistently been rated above most Australian states in the past decade due to the long-sighted approach we have taken to support this sector in South Australia. Our multi-award winning South Australia Drill Core Reference Library is an incredible resource to help foster exploration success.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: He was a very good treasurer who funded that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, he was. Our copper strategy has set an ambitious target for a tripling in production, and we have supported that objective through a \$20 million investment in funding for PACE copper to provide geological data to better identify targets and then provide co-funding through a Discovery Drilling program to partner explorers in the search for discoveries.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I would like an answer to that. How did you cough that up?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You were 15, were you? Don't blame me, I was in high school. Work continues to develop a magnetite strategy to harness South Australia's iron ore potential and to secure investment in major projects.

South Australia has a great track record for driving innovation through the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence, as well as our support for the research conducted by the Deep Exploration Technologies Cooperative Research Centre. I am confident that these programs will ensure that as the global commodity industry recovers so, too, will our resources sector for the benefit of all South Australians; and hopefully multiple land-use strategies can become a bipartisan policy rather than the opposition continuing to support 'lock-the-gate' campaigns and locking out miners from very wealthy deposits.

MODBURY HOSPITAL VOLUNTEERS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:51): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about his recent morning tea with volunteers at the Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:51): What a delightful group of men and women I did meet at the Modbury Hospital. They entertained me with too much cake and tea, nevertheless, it was a lovely experience.

On 21 October, I had this pleasurable experience at the Modbury Hospital together with the member for Florey. There are some 250 volunteers who actually do work at the Modbury Hospital and a number of them were at this lovely morning tea. I believe that some of these volunteers are with us today, and I would like to extend a warm welcome to them.

Since 2002, we have invested more than \$30 million in Modbury Hospital through our program to modernise our healthcare system. We are now investing a further \$32 million to turn it into a major elective surgery and rehabilitation hub in Adelaide's north and north-eastern suburbs. Despite the government's investment, our hospitals still very much rely on the work of our committed volunteers, and at Modbury Hospital they work in palliative care, for the Modbury Foundation, in chaplaincy and across the hospice in general.

They raise funds, provide food for patients and the public and give much-needed assistance and support to patients and the public. One story that did stick in my mind is the wonderful work that one beautiful lady did in going into the homes of people who were in the last stages of their life and gathering stories and putting those stories together in a way which enabled them to see their life, and it was a great comfort to them as they reflected on what had happened throughout the course of their life.

They were able to share these memories with the nurses and with family and friends as they came, and it was an extraordinary comfort in their last days. It was a wonderful thing to see. You just

could not imagine such a service being paid for, being delivered by a government agency or, frankly, even a non-government or private agency. It is just simply something done out of love and beautifully delivered, and thank you so much for your wonderful service.

During my visit I was able to observe first-hand the newly-opened rehabilitation inpatient ward that is already busy providing vital care to ensure that patients regain their independence and get home sooner. This is an essential part of the modernisation of the health system—making sure that the rehabilitation services are right next to the hospital services so that you can get cracking on rehabilitation as soon as possible without having to get on to another queue.

Following the service changes and completion of construction works, Modbury Hospital is expected to see about 3,000 more patients a year and perform roughly 1,800 more elective procedures, including the capacity to undertake other important procedures. This will give residents faster access to elective surgery with fewer delays and cancellations.

An expanded one-stop breast cancer service was started earlier this year at Modbury Hospital, giving women access to a breast surgeon, a radiologist and a breast care nurse in the same location. Patients can also access other local health services in Modbury Hospital, such as mental health services and treatment for ongoing conditions like diabetes, heart disease and lung disease. In fact, all specialty outpatient services provided there before the service changes will continue.

Construction of the new state-of-the-art rehabilitation centre at Modbury Hospital started late last year and is well underway. When complete, there will be more rehabilitation beds and services and a purpose-built gym and hydrotherapy pool. Allied health will be available seven days a week, ensuring patients get the treatment they need as soon as possible.

The improvements to the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals will ensure that the people of Adelaide's north and north-eastern suburbs receive the best care first time, every time. The member for Florey has always been a powerful and passionate advocate not only for her local community but also for her beloved Modbury Hospital. I know the volunteers who are here today share her love of that hospital and, together, you make it such a wonderful place that looks after our citizens. Thank you.

HOSPITALS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, can you inform the house how many hospital and healthcare sites you have visited in the past few months?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:56): It is important that I get out and about to visit our hospitals on a regular basis, to hear directly from our patients as well as doctors, nurses, midwives and allied health staff about their experiences in our health system, and I thank the member for Little Para for this very excellent question.

Just this week, I was with the member for Little Para visiting Lyell McEwin Hospital, where we got to see a sneak peek at the second cardiac catheter lab currently being built. Many more cardiac patients in the north will be able to be treated closer to home. We also visited medical subspecialties ward 2D which, last week, saw its first ever renal inpatients due to the significant transfer of services to the Lyell McEwin Hospital that started under Transforming Health last month.

Last month, I opened the newly refurbished renal dialysis unit at Maitland Hospital. This \$635,000 refurbishment has increased the unit's capacity from a two to a four-chair unit and now provides a larger space for patient care. The member for Goyder joined me on that occasion. I took advantage of the trip also to visit some of our other health sites on the Yorke Peninsula. In Port Broughton I was able to meet with local health staff and hear about their local healthcare concerns. I had the chance to go to Yorketown Hospital. If I remember correctly, you were born in Minlaton or Yorketown, member for Goyder?

Mr Griffiths: Yorketown. My children were born there.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: His children were born at Yorketown Hospital. We were able to do a walk around and meet the staff. I even met a long-lost cousin at the Yorketown Hospital, which

was wonderful. My cousins, of course, live in Minlaton, the Bennett family. They are not supporters of this side of politics, I am afraid, Mr Speaker, but I don't think there are many people in the member for Goyder's electorate who are supporters of this side of the house.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: There was a time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There was a time, when copper was being mined at Moonta, that we did have; and I think the first Labor majority Premier of South Australia was the member for Moonta. As part of our government's country cabinets, I recently visited Lameroo District Health Service and Pinnaroo Soldiers' Memorial Hospital, as well as staff and volunteers from Bordertown Hospital.

Of course, in the wake of the extreme devastating weather events which hit our state in late September, I visited Port Lincoln Hospital with the Premier. The Premier and I were impressed to see how they, along with staff at all our Country Health sites, played such a pivotal role in supporting their local communities during such a difficult time. More recently, in late October, I joined the members for Florey, Newland and Torrens to visit an upgraded ward in the new rehabilitation building at Modbury Hospital, both part of Transforming Health's \$32 million investment at that hospital. Of course, we know this investment created 1,000 jobs during construction, with around 130 workers on site at any given time.

Clinical directors showed us our hardworking clinicians are already using the new kitchen and therapy room to help people relearn the skills they need to regain independence and get home sooner. We had the chance to walk around the fantastic new rehabilitation centre being constructed at Modbury Hospital, which features a gym, hydrotherapy pool and a therapy garden.

The following day I visited the Flinders Medical Centre for a walk around with the member for Fisher (her old stomping ground) to chat to staff and patients in the emergency department, the ICU and on the wards about some of the changes that are on the horizon. I have to say that the member for Fisher was in her element as she introduced me to her former colleagues and showed me around, as I said, her old stomping ground.

We had a glimpse of the construction site, the \$185.5 million new rehab and palliative care building, multilevel car park and brand-new older persons mental health unit at the Flinders Medical Centre. This investment has seen the creation of about 1,000 jobs throughout construction and more than 200 workers on site every day. In the next fortnight, I will be visiting Whyalla, Booleroo and Roxby Downs hospitals as part of the government's next country cabinet and, of course, I look forward to visiting many more of our health and hospital sites in the future.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. Why has the cost of the nuclear dump consultation blown out from \$4.6 million to \$8.2 million for the 2016-17 year alone?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:00): Of course, this is the consultation that the Leader of the Opposition relied upon to take his party to the position it has, so that is the consultation that is being spoken about here. The lion's share of the consultation was actually a royal commission that was described by the Leader of the Opposition just the other day as excellent. Although, of course, his shadow treasurer did go out and say it had some gross distortions in the numbers.

Nevertheless, you can rely upon the Leader of the Opposition to say that this was value for money because he describes all of the processes as either excellent or sufficient to take his party into a position to rely upon it. Indeed, if you look at his public remarks he has been saying consistently that we should have the very consultation process that was undertaken by the royal commissioner.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister been briefed on the findings of the review into the Central Adelaide Local Health Network's clinical governance undertaken by a researcher team headed up by Professor Chris Brook and Associate Professor Grant Phelps?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:02): I would have to check my records to see if I have received a briefing on that review. It sounds to me like a review that was ordered internally and not one that would necessarily come to me.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): I have a supplementary question. On checking that, will the minister identify if a copy of the review report, when located, has been provided to the Coroner given the ongoing inquest into the death of a number of Central Adelaide Local Health Network patients, including Mr Stephen Herczeg and Mr Christopher McRae?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:02): I am happy to check my records and get back to the deputy leader.

TOURISM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. How is the state government supporting the tourism industry to create more jobs in South Australia?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:03): I thank the member for Colton for his question and also for his letter a few weeks ago urging us to have the Santos Tour Down Under begin at Henley Square in 2018. We will chase that up. I think it would be a terrific thing.

The South Australian government has put an extra \$70 million into the tourism sector because we know that when we spend money there, marketing South Australia around the nation and indeed around the world, we get more people coming here and spending money for our economy and creating more jobs. It is great to see that in the job figures out today there is a really good improvement in South Australia.

In the visitor economy in South Australia, we have taken our job numbers up by 4,000, so it is now up to 35,700 people employed in the tourism sector. That's an increase of 13.8 per cent. When we compare that with other states, we have the very best results in terms of improvement in the number of jobs in the visitor economy in our state. If we compare it to Queensland, for example, it has gone backwards up there by 4.8 per cent, so they have 4.8 per cent fewer people employed in the tourism sector than they did two years ago.

We have the best growth in tourism jobs anywhere in Australia, and we want to keep making sure that we double down on that. We have China Southern coming in here for the first time with direct flights from Guangzhou into Adelaide from 13 December. We have major events; some have been announced and more events will be announced in the near future. The Mundine versus Green fight on 3 February is going to be terrific. We will have 37,000 people down at Adelaide Oval for a fight night on a Friday night, hopefully a beautiful, balmy Friday night. I know that the health minister wants to get on the undercard, he wants to get in there, so if anybody wants to go in the ring with the Minister for Health and have a go, we can arrange that.

This weekend, we have the Formula One cars back in Adelaide, which is terrific. Stefan Johansson, Ivan Capelli and Pierluigi Martini are back here, and of course they all competed on the streets of Adelaide back in the 1980s. I want to thank Tim Possingham, who has put this Adelaide Motorsport Festival together. It is a terrific event. Last year, it pumped \$3½ million dollars into the South Australian economy. Another thing we are doing is that we have given money to the South Australian Tourism Industry Council to help them train tourism operators around the state.

We have thousands of tourism operators right around South Australia, many of them individuals or couples who have put a lot of their own money into making sure that they provide the sort of accommodation, touring vehicles and things like that to give visitors to our state an outstanding experience. We have put money in to make sure that they can get the training to go to that next level. I want to congratulate all the winners in the recent South Australian Tourism Awards two Friday

nights ago. It was terrific to have people like Trevor Wright from Wrightsair. He entered the competition for the first time and took out a gold.

People like Trevor, and they are all around the state, do a magnificent job giving people from around the world an incredible look at our wonderful state. The word 'unique' is often overused, but we are the only place in the world where you can go swimming in a cage with great white sharks year round. We are the only place in the world where you can go and see 560 million-year-old fossils. Trevor Wright is taking people out over the wonderful Lake Eyre and showing them the beautiful outback that is incomparable with anywhere else on earth. I thank all our tourism operators. As a government, we are there working side by side with you.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister update the house on how the South Australian government is delivering better homes for Housing Trust tenants and stimulating the housing construction industry?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:07): I thank the member for Napier for his question. I particularly know that he is a very passionate supporter of Housing Trust homes in his electorate. The South Australian government is delivering one of the biggest upgrades to our ageing public Housing Trust stock in the state's history. Many of our Housing Trust homes are more than 45 years old, and it costs a considerable amount of money to maintain them. Many don't suit the needs of tenants. Many are very large, and also expensive, for the tenants occupying them.

Through our various renewal programs, the state government will be replacing thousands of dwellings that will result in a public housing portfolio that better meets the needs of tenants now and into the future. Our Renewing Our Streets and Suburbs initiative will see us renew 4,500 pre-1968 Housing Trust homes located within 10 kilometres of the city by 2020. I can advise that as of the end of October, 769 development opportunities have been released, which will deliver approximately 1,100 new dwellings.

Further, the \$208 million 1000 Homes in 1000 Days program, announced in the now not so recent Mid-Year Budget Review, is also progressing well. This initiative will see us build energy-efficient, better designed new public housing that will support not only tenants but also approximately 400 jobs this year and about 500 jobs a year in 2017 and 2018. As at the end of October, 143 had been completed or are under construction, with tenders issued for another 183, and Renewal SA plans to issue more tenders prior to Christmas for the construction of approximately a further 150 homes. The majority of the materials being used to build these new homes are either sourced, value-added, or manufactured in South Australia, with builders subcontracting local tradespeople for the work required.

We are also committed to improving existing homes, and in the 2015-16 state budget the government committed an extra \$5 million towards upgrades and capital improvements to Housing Trust homes in the northern suburbs. The works include both internal and external works, such as kitchen and bathroom upgrades, new roofs, structural repairs, internal and external painting, and improvements to common areas. The upgrades and improvements were determined on a property-by-property basis, with 317 Housing Trust homes covered by the work.

Twenty groups of Housing Trust homes and two walk-up flat sites are also receiving external common area upgrades. The sites were located across the City of Salisbury and the City of Playford, and include homes in Elizabeth East, Elizabeth Park, Elizabeth South and Elizabeth Vale in the member for Little Para's electorate. The upgrades averaged about \$13,500 per site and were carried out by South Australian based companies, including Doherty Trade Services (a proud South Australian owned multitrade services company, established in 1988), and Glynde-based Bettio Building Contractors, who said that the work that they are doing with Renewal SA to upgrade Housing Trust homes in Adelaide's northern suburbs created employment on site and also in their head office.

I am pleased to advise that most of the work has been completed, with approximately \$340,000 remaining in the budget for refurbishment work, which will be completed by the end of this current financial year. By investing in programs like 1000 Homes in 1000 Days, and the wider Renewing Our Streets and Suburbs Initiative, we are reducing the age of our public housing stock

with properties that better suit tenants' needs, while also generating a pipeline of work for local builders, local subcontractors and tradespeople.

SOLAR EGGS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house about government assistance to solar egg farms?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:12): Solar Eggs is one of the state's two major egg producers and well positioned to replace eggs imported from interstate, pending an upgrade to its recently purchased Barossa farm. The member for Schubert is probably very well aware of this. This is why I am pleased to advise the house that I have applied and approved a major projects grant of \$400,000 from the Regional Development Fund towards the cost of the upgrade. This grant means that—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: You can't beat that.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: You can't beat that—\$400,000 towards this project. This grant means that Solar Eggs will be able to expand its production to a level that will allow the company to export, particularly to high-value Asian markets in the premium and luxury categories. Not only will this expansion create 12 new ongoing full-time jobs and six jobs during construction but the project will also include the development of a farm shop and cafe which will capitalise on the prime position of the site on a main entry road to the Barossa Valley. From our discussions with the member for Schubert, he has been very passionate about this.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: He's a 'yolker', that one.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: He's a bit of a 'yolker', is he? I don't think so. I think the member for Schubert is not too bad. Of course, this will only add to the tourism appeal of South Australia's world-famous Barossa Valley. Furthermore, another two to three ongoing jobs will be created at Solar Eggs' North Plympton facility as a direct result of this expansion in the Barossa Valley. I am proud and pleased to be able to support great South Australian companies like Solar Eggs.

Can I just reinforce the importance of the Regional Development Fund. The Regional Development Fund has been a great success across all regional South Australia and, as I have mentioned before, with the first two rounds for \$33 million we created about \$933 million worth of private investment from the private sector across all regional South Australia, and it is interesting that perhaps in the member for Stuart's electorate he has received around about 20 per cent of all the grants in rounds 1 and 2.

Just on that, I had the pleasure last week of attending the Innamincka area, at the top end of South Australia, and also the Strzelecki Track to have a look at the opportunities up there. The Regional Development Fund is on round 3. There are still two or three projects to be announced, and it is fantastic to see the great opportunities for regional people out there. Businesses across all of regional South Australia are joining together and working with the government, with industry and with local councils.

Grievance Debate

NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): I rise to place on the record the Liberal Party's position regarding South Australia's further participation in the nuclear industry. The Liberal Party has been directly and constructively engaging in consideration of this matter for the past two years. We have carefully considered the royal commission report. We have taken note of the outcomes of the community consultation. We have actively participated in the parliamentary committee process.

Like the Premier, I have visited Finland for an appraisal of what this could mean for South Australia. My shadow treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, has also visited Europe and the United States to consider, in particular, financial and economic issues. It has been the Premier's position for a long time that by now we should be able to determine what happens next. My party has done that and we are united in our position, unlike this Labor government. We have looked at the opportunities

and we have looked at the risks. We believe the risk of unacceptable cost to taxpayers is great when they will be incurred upfront without any guarantee of ever securing an international waste repository for South Australia.

Before going more into that, it is useful to reflect that South Australia's participation in the industry is not new. It began in an active way immediately after the Second World War 70 years ago, strongly encouraged by Liberal premier, Sir Thomas Playford. An extensive exploration program in South Australia led to the opening of the Radium Hill mine in 1954, which continued in operation for seven years until a significant fall in uranium prices forced its closure.

Following a revival in international commitments to nuclear power programs in the 1970s, a further round of exploration in South Australia led to the discovery of the Olympic Dam mine. It was again a Liberal government which secured its development, despite the strong opposition of the Labor Party. The Labor Party believed community opinion was on its side. The Liberal Party decided otherwise, and was proved correct by the strong public support the Olympic Dam mine continues to receive to this very day.

Throughout South Australia's involvement in the nuclear industry, the Liberal Party has been consistent in pursuing opportunities that are realistic and supported by the community. The record shows that Liberal governments have been successful in attracting investment in the nuclear industry which Labor has opposed. However, it is quite clear that the previous attempts of the Labor Party to demonise the nuclear industry continue to influence public opinion today about wider South Australian participation in this industry.

The community consultation which followed the recent royal commission of inquiry has exposed deep community divisions about further participation in the nuclear cycle beyond mining and particularly in relation to high-level radioactive waste that would be imported from other countries to be stored for very, very long periods of time in South Australia. This is hardly surprising given it was only relatively recently that a Labor government, one in which the current Premier was a minister, very actively opposed the location of a low-level radioactive waste repository in South Australia to store Australia's own waste. It is little wonder that the public remains confused and divided. It has been led to this position by the government.

Despite this, and unlike the previous obstructionist and opportunistic approach of the Labor government to these questions, the Liberal Party was prepared to give serious consideration to further participation in the nuclear industry. However, over the past few years, it has become abundantly clear that there is not sufficient public support for a high-level radioactive waste facility to be established in South Australia.

The process of community consultation initiated by the Premier has demonstrated strong opposition to continuing with such consultation with two-thirds of the citizens' jury returning the verdict that the opportunity should not be pursued under any circumstances, and a referendum is not the way to proceed. The Premier has previously said a referendum would close down debate rather than allow it to be developed. He has not even committed to implementing the outcome of any referendum by proposing an ultimate veto for Aboriginal people.

As well as lacking public support for the pursuit of South Australia's involvement in an international, high-level, radioactive waste storage facility, we believe that it will provide completely unacceptable financial risk. The evidence provided to the joint parliamentary committee is that South Australia would have to spend \$600 million in further consultation and costs associated with identifying a site for such a facility without any guarantee that such a development would ultimately proceed. Further information that became available to the parliament only yesterday shows that previous advice upon which the government has relied failed to fully explore issues that have significantly serious potential to adversely affect the project and its commercial outcomes such that project profitability could be seriously at risk.

In South Australia's current economic and financial circumstances, the Liberal Party maintains that there are far more important and immediate priorities to pursue than this one. It is the role of government to unite its community around achievable economic goals, not divide the people over something that is not supported, not achievable and not affordable.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:21): Much of the discussion on the policy positions to do with renewable energy and its various forms has centred on straightforward electricity production for group distribution or rooftop generation for households and businesses with the surplus exported to the grid. More direct, renewable-based industrial and manufacturing opportunities have not received the same degree of public attention.

Given the Paris agreement and despite its weaknesses, and the election of Donald Trump, the world will increasingly move in the direction of decarbonisation. That trend, which I hope is inexorable, opens up a raft of opportunities for South Australia providing we commit to being a first mover or at least an early adopter. Concentrating solar thermal, photovoltaics, wind and other forms of renewables all have the potential to expand manufacturing opportunities in South Australia despite a number of transitional issues that need to be addressed.

Concentrating solar thermal and the high temperatures generated can be used in a range of thermochemical processes in addition to being a potential substitute for gas in a number of resource processing applications. Wind and especially photovoltaics continue to slide down the cost curve. Evidence of that rapid slide down the cost curve is the recent winning bid of approximately \$20 a megawatt hour for a utility-scale PV plant in the Middle East.

The package of measures that enabled that bid are not standard elsewhere, but it is worth noting that the federally-funded SunShot program in the United States has an explicit goal of reaching \$20 per megawatt hour in just over a decade. Two years ago, the goal was \$50 a megawatt-hour, which is an indicator of just how quickly things are changing.

A number of papers produced by Ross Garnaut confidently put the proposition that South Australia will become a low-cost energy producer. It will become a low-cost energy producer as a direct result of its world-class solar and wind resource, and the overlapping of those resources allied with the ever reducing cost of the technologies to exploit those resources.

One of the questions will be how to turn that abundant renewable energy resource into a product that the decarbonising world will want. One approach is to use our renewable energy resources to produce renewable fuels for export and domestic use.

In 2014, Japan's Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry published a strategic road map for hydrogen and fuel cells. Japan is looking at building on the research, development and commercialisation it has done over the years on using hydrogen for a range of emission-free applications. Those applications include mobile fuel cells, stationary fuel cells and utility-scale electricity production by using hydrogen as the fuel for gas turbines.

It is interesting to note that 20 per cent of Japan's energy comes from Australia, which represents 40 per cent of our energy exports. Transporting hydrogen presents some challenges, given the nature of the gas. It is very light so, in order to transport it in bulk, it needs to be either liquefied at minus 250° or compressed at very high pressures, which would be a costly process.

Hydrogen can be produced through renewable electricity-driven electrolysis. In order to address the difficulties encountered in transporting hydrogen, hydrogen can be converted to ammonia using the widely used Haber-Bosch process. Ammonia is a combination of air-derived nitrogen and hydrogen, with one nitrogen atom to three hydrogen atoms. Ammonia becomes the carrier of hydrogen and it can be transported readily using available vessels, pipes and loading infrastructure. The process of ammonia production can be readily reversed to liberate the hydrogen, which can then be used as a very clean fuel.

Export infrastructure for ammonia already exists in South Australia at Port Bonython, some 42 kilometres by road from Whyalla. According to the Melbourne Energy Institute, in a paper prepared by Tim Forcey, supplying 5 per cent of Japan's energy needs through the process outlined would lead to the creation of a clean multibillion dollar industry that would rival Australia's liquefied natural gas industry. It is clearly theoretically possible, but the question is whether it is technically possible at scale and would it ultimately commercially stack up as a cost-effective energy resource?

NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:26): I rise today to speak about Premier Jay Weatherill's plans to make South Australia the nuclear waste dump state. That is where South Australia sits in the wake of Premier Weatherill's mismanagement of the engagement and consultation process around the potential nuclear industry. Let's be clear about this: this is the option the Premier has chosen for South Australia and this is the position he continues to take to make South Australia the nuclear waste dump state.

He takes this position despite profound opposition from many within the community. We see again today that the Premier covers for ministers in question time when they are asked about whether or not they support the plan to make South Australia a waste dump state. Not one of the ministers has objected to this proposal. It is clear that Premier Weatherill and those on the other side are determined to make—

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell will be seated. I do not know how many times I have to say it: the member will not refer to members of this house by their Christian name or their surname; it is highly disorderly. He is the Premier or he is the member for Cheltenham; it is not hard. The member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: It is clear that the Premier and those on the other side are determined to make South Australia a nuclear dump state. Let's have a look at the background. In May, the final report from the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission was provided to the South Australian government for its consideration.

The report determined that South Australia could safely increase its participation in nuclear activities. Twelve recommendations and 145 findings were made by royal commissioner Kevin Scarce in relation to the state's future participation in elements of the nuclear fuel cycle. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out a few moments ago, it is something that we were happy to explore and discuss, and support the process that was put forward. At the time of delivering his report, the Hon. Mr Scarce said:

The findings and recommendations in this report represent the beginning of a new series of conversations with the community that address their questions and concerns, and ultimately enable decisions to be made by the people of South Australia.

On this side, we were happy to discuss and have always been happy to discuss that and be a part of those conversations. In regard to electricity generation, the Hon. Mr Scarce determined:

Nuclear power generation would not be commercially viable in SA under current market rules, but should be considered as a future low-carbon energy source to contribute to national emissions reduction targets.

However, the commission made the following recommendations:

- Remove existing prohibitions on nuclear power generation
- Develop low-carbon, technology-neutral energy policy
- Monitor developments in new nuclear reactor designs for future consideration

Notably, in his most recent comments the Premier did not move to remove the prohibitions on nuclear power generation within the state. On the management, storage and disposal of waste Mr Scarce concluded:

South Australia has the attributes and capabilities to manage and dispose of international used nuclear fuel safely, and it would have significant intergenerational benefit to the community. Social and community consent is fundamental to this activity proceeding.

That is a very key point: social and community consent is fundamental to this activity proceeding. As a result, the Premier had a couple of citizens' juries, and we know the fallout from that. He thought that people would come on board and follow the way that he saw this going. Bear in mind, the Premier changed the game and made the focus of this South Australia becoming a nuclear waste dump state. It was interesting to read the comments by Professor Richard Blandy in the InDaily today. He talked about the process of the citizens' jury. He said:

The first jury operated as a free-flowing discussion rather than with set pieces presented by the witnesses followed by questions from the jurors. The issues are, of course, difficult and technical. But the jurors (like the jurors in

the second jury) were great. They were sensible, common-sense, people, who could see that the proposed dump was not a business proposition that any person in their right mind would invest in. They, too, quite properly insisted that the business case for the dump should be made watertight—or the dump abandoned.

He goes on to say:

Finding out if the business case for the dump was watertight, or not, would not come cheap. Jacobs Engineering Group project manager, Tim Johnson, who was added, by DemocracyCo, as an expert witness to the economics panel at the second jury, testified to the State Joint Parliamentary Committee investigating the project that it would take six years to firm up the business case before deciding to proceed, at a cost of \$300 million—\$600 million.

In other words, it would cost up to \$600 million to find out if the project was dud, or not! That is \$600 million not available to be spent on hospitals, schools, or roads—or solving our electricity crisis. And that would come on top of the \$10 million that this exercise in fantasy has already cost.

Those are Professor Dick Blandy's comments, and they just show that this project did not stack up. We know that the government is looking for a silver bullet solution and we know that they have failed on so many projects, such as Gillman, child protection in South Australia, EPAS, the hospitals, and the highest unemployment rate on the mainland, and they have also made us the blackout state.

NUCLEAR WASTE

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) (15:32): I rise not only as the Minister for Investment and Trade but as the former leader of the state Liberal Party to express my complete astonishment at what I have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite. If I heard correctly, the leader has just declared any prospects of a nuclear waste repository—either low-level, medium level or high-level—to be unachievable, not affordable and a complete waste of time and effort.

A number of leaders in the business community are astonished, as I am, at his position. They have rung me to tell me that. They see this as a bold opportunity for South Australia to at least continue a discussion based on the royal commission's work, with a view to determining whether or not the billions of dollars and tens of thousands of jobs identified by the royal commission could be brought to reality. I have faith in Admiral Scarce and the royal commission. It was an excellent piece of work, and that is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition told FIVEaa radio when interviewer Penberthy said:

So you repudiate in its entirety or overall on balance you repudiate the Scarce Report and think that this should be never, ever on the table for South Australia?

The Leader of the Opposition says:

Well no, we welcomed the Scarce Report, we thought it was an excellent report.

Well, that is not what he said today. He has now condemned the report. He thinks it is unaffordable, unachievable and a complete misadventure. Well, leaders of the business community think he is wrong, leading commentators, both in South Australia and nationally, think he is wrong, most leading academics think he is wrong, and, in fact, I think that a lot of South Australians think that he is wrong.

What I suspect is really driving the opposition leader and opposition on this is simple fear. I remember when I was in that party room in 2003, I think it was, when the excellent federal minister the Hon. Nick Minchin, on behalf of the Howard government, proposed a low-level waste dump for South Australia the Liberal party room bravely, under the leadership then of Rob Kerin and the guidance of shadow minister Iain Evans, supported that venture in this parliament to the letter and to the word.

Of course, a scare campaign was run against the idea of a low-level waste dump, and I think that the Liberal Party has come away from that afraid, scared and unable now to face up to the question. Excuse me, Mr Speaker, if I proclaim that in state politics the world seems to have gone mad because back then in 2003 it was those on this side of the house who were arguing against the dump and it was those on the opposite side of the house, the Liberals, who were arguing for it, and everything has been turned upside down. No wonder the people of Australia and South Australia are scratching their heads and looking for leadership.

I was in Taiwan recently and senior government officials told me that they have 600,000 barrels of low-level waste right now they need to remove from their country, which is half the size of Tasmania and which has 24 million people. They have 5,000 cubic tonnes of high-level waste they want something to do with right now. That just confirms the truth that is in Admiral Scarce's royal commission's report.

There are ideologues on the left who are opposed to this. They are entitled to their point of view. There are now ideologues, it seems, or political opportunists, on the right in the Liberal Party who do not want it because they think they can play political games with it. I am disappointed in them both as an Independent MP, and I wish that both the left and the right could rise above this political nonsense to see that there is an opportunity here and at least see that the conversation needs to continue. I am not convinced yet whether we have something we can construct here, but unless we continue the conversation we will never, ever know.

Where are the jobs going to come from? Where is the new high-tech future going to come from for our children and our grandchildren? If we are not prepared to embrace bold ideas, if we are not prepared to rise above the daily media cycle and challenge South Australians with a brighter future, then why are we here? I find the Leader of the Opposition's lack of leadership on this to be utterly disappointing. It is a lack of judgement, it is a lack of vision and it is a lack of trust he demonstrates having said that he would provide bipartisan support and then removing it. It is deplorable.

Time expired.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:37): I rise not only to explain to my electorate what happened last night in the parliament but also to explain more fully how I came to the decision I did and how I interacted with my electorate over the past few months in seeking to understand the way forward on this bill.

The first thing I want to say to my electorate is that I have received correspondence on this issue like no other. I have had hundreds and hundreds of emails and phone contact and contact in the street from local people, as well as a whole series of emails, ranging from the more thoughtful and considered individual through to the more generic and spam-like ones. Basically, we had to treat them as spam because there was no way to be able to identify who the people were and whether or not they were just sending multiple emails. Unfortunately, we had to disregard those because there was no way to really be able to count those in understanding where this topic sits.

In the end, the feedback I have had has been almost exactly fifty-fifty. I have had a lot of people in support of my stand against this as much as people pleading with me in various degrees of effusiveness or various degrees of severity to try to get me to vote for this proposal. The electorate of Schubert was genuinely undecided on this issue.

Whilst those in favour are upset that I voted against it, what I want to say to those people is that there is a principle to bring in a regime of voluntary euthanasia that people want us as a parliament to enact but, unfortunately, in this place we do not deal in the abstract principle: we deal in reality. I think the debate we had last night showed that there are many minute issues—minute but extremely important issues—that we have to deal with.

I would like to thank the parliament for the debate last night, and I would like to single out the member for Florey in her role as the committee Chair throughout the debate and, also the members for Morphet and Heysen. I know that, as the questioning became more and less intense and the questioners were able to come and go from the chamber, the member for Morphet and his adviser and the member for Heysen were steadfast in being there to answer every single question that was put to them. Some may question how well they answered those questions on various topics and whether they were answered to their satisfaction, but the truth is that they sat there from 7.30pm until 4 o'clock the next morning answering the questions we put to them.

I would like to say that today is not necessarily a day for joy at all. It is a day for relief. That is certainly what I felt and what I think the parliament felt after the vote. I know the passion I hold for this issue, and I know that that passion is equalled by those proponents of the bill. To those people,

I would say that I understand exactly where you are coming from and you should know that this parliament dealt with this issue in a fulsome and respectful way.

I want to say, though, that this is a definitive vote of this parliament. Certainly, some have tried to suggest that we got closer to a yes vote than we have previously and, on some measures, they would be right, but there were a number of members who voted for the second reading so that we could have the fulsome debate because it has never got to a committee stage before. Now it has got to the committee stage and, on the third reading, which is the definitive vote, the parliament voted against enacting a regime of voluntary euthanasia.

This is a definitive vote of the parliament, and I believe that this vote should stand for some time. We have had 10 months' worth of debate on this issue. We have explored, I think, every single issue that could be explored under this bill and the bill did not hold up to the test of a parliamentary vote. I think that the parliament should respect that definitive decision and that we should now move our attention to issues of importance to the day-to-day lives of South Australians, including helping them to find decent, meaningful and well-paying jobs.

Lastly, I want to say that those who did not get the result they wanted know what they have missed out on—the proponents of this bill and the people in the community who desperately want this—but those who voted this legislation down have sought to protect the most vulnerable in our community, who are very likely not to know what it is that we have done for them. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon us as a parliament to protect those who do not have a voice of their own and who may not even know that they need protection. On that score, I want to thank the parliament for the decision it made and, for those thousands of people who will never know what we have done for them, I say that I think your parliament has served you well.

PREVENT ALCOHOL AND RISK-RELATED TRAUMA IN YOUTH PROGRAM

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:43): Last week, I took the opportunity to join year 10 students from Kildare College in my electorate of Torrens to attend the Prevent Alcohol and Risk-related Trauma in Youth program (known as the P.A.R.T.Y. program) at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The full-day, in-hospital, interactive trauma prevention program for young Australians, delivered at both the Royal Adelaide and Lyell McEwin hospitals, seeks to effect behavioural change in young people in the prime of their physiological, cognitive, psychological and social development. It assists students to learn to identify risks, make responsible decisions and, ultimately, avoid risk-taking behaviour. The program is a dynamic, interactive injury prevention and health promotion initiative for young people.

Experts tell us that youth is a stage of life characterised by rapid psychological and physical development, when young people progress from a dependent child to independent adults. With the adolescent brain still developing, teens often act on their emotions and impulses, sometimes with highly detrimental impacts on their own health and wellbeing as well as that of others. Within this window of development (15 to 25 year olds), risky behaviour is especially prevalent, with 40 per cent of all deaths trauma related. Many more suffer the consequences of involvement in a trauma situation, often the result of a toxic combination of alcohol and/or drugs, coupled with risk-related behaviours. Tragically for those involved, most trauma situations were preventable.

SA Health and the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network offer the program, which is a worldwide trauma prevention initiative sponsored by AAMI, and the first of its kind to be held in South Australia. Kildare College year 10 students were exposed to some of the tragic consequences of poor decision-making, alcohol and drug abuse and the choices that ultimately lead to trauma. Accidents studied were road traffic related; inattentive pedestrians, including those playing Pokémon; distractions while driving; driving under the influence; speeding; and jetty jumping. They heard from clinicians from the emergency department, the intensive care unit, doctors, nurses, the SA Ambulance Service, paramedics, organ donor coordinators, allied health professionals and those involved in the rehabilitation of trauma patients.

The students progress through a number of interviews and real-life clinical scenarios and the rehabilitation process. The girls were able to go behind the scenes in the emergency department and the intensive care unit, where mock resuscitations were performed by the students. This was certainly an eye-opening and confronting experience for them. The comprehensive nature of the

program explained clearly that, although death is a possible real outcome, many others are left with permanent debilitating disabilities. They were faced with the fact that a single, impulsive decision could be life changing.

The day culminated in hearing Nick's story, a young man who is now a quadriplegic due to a motorbike accident. A survivor, Nick spoke about the choices and events that led to his injuries and how it changed his life forever. Teacher, Zefi Pezos, the year 10 wellbeing coordinator at Kildare said that, whilst parents play a vital role in keeping their children safe, Kildare College continues to encourage and educate the girls to engage in responsible decision-making and ultimately avoid risk-taking behaviour. This is why the college accepted an invitation to participate in the P.A.R.T.Y. Program with the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Year 10 student, Georgia Brunnings, said that the P.A.R.T.Y. Program was:

... an absolutely amazing experience that opened the eyes of every student that attended and left us all with much to think about. Even though these programs won't completely eradicate the problem, education plays a major role in preventing risk-related trauma. We are so grateful to the P.A.R.T.Y. Program for giving us an education that has the potential to someday save one of our lives. We experienced what it would be like to be involved in an event in which trauma took place from both a medical professional and patient point of view.

The realism and depth of the experience being held in a hospital has left a significant and lasting impression on the year 10 cohort in attendance of the consequences of trauma and risk-taker behaviour. Kildare College has committed to sending another cohort of year 10 students in 2017.

The P.A.R.T.Y. Program aims to keep young people safe, promote healthy lifestyles and prevent the devastating effect preventable injuries and death can have on our youth, their families and the community. Sharing time with Kildare students participating in the P.A.R.T.Y. Program—an important initiative for our young people, especially when the number of trauma-related incidents in this age group is on the rise—was a worthwhile experience.

During these years, our youth should be experiencing what is often referred to as 'having the time of their lives'. In doing so, we want them all to keep safe and make decisions that will not impact negatively on the rest of their lives and that of their families.

Time expired.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SURROGACY ELIGIBILITY) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 16 November 2016.)

Clause 24.

Mr ODENWALDER: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(a)(ii)]—

Delete inserted paragraph (ii) and substitute:

(ii) the commissioning parents;

Amendment No 4 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(c)]—

Delete inserted paragraph (c) and substitute:

(c) both of the commissioning parents must be domiciled in this State;

Amendment No 5 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(d)]—

Delete 'if there are 2' and substitute 'the'

Amendment No 6 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(d)(i)]—Delete 'they'

Amendment No 7 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(d)(ii)]—Delete 'they'

Amendment No 8 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(g)(ii)]—

Delete inserted subparagraph (ii) and substitute:

(ii) the commissioning parents;

Amendment No 9 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(h)(ii)(A) and (B)]—

Delete subparagraphs (A) and (B) and substitute:

by at least 1 of the commissioning parents;

Amendment No 10 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(j)]—

Delete 'commissioning parent or commissioning parents (as the case may be)' and substitute:

commissioning parents

Amendment No 11 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(1), inserted subsection (2a)(k)]—

Delete 'commissioning parent or commissioning parents (as the case may be)' and substitute:

commissioning parents

Amendment No 12 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 24 [Clause 24(5), (6) and (7)]—Delete subclauses (5), (6) and (7)

These amendments are merely consequential to the amendment we made yesterday.

An honourable member: We made a lot of amendments yesterday.

Mr ODENWALDER: We made one major amendment yesterday, to remove reference to single commissioning parents.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I have a question for either the member for Little Para or the assistant minister. If these amendments are successful, I understand this would have an impact on surrogacy for single people. Do they also have an impact on IVF or assisted technology?

Ms HILDYARD: No. It is just in relation to surrogacy.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: My next question is to the member for Little Para. Why would you have a change for one group and not the other? If your concern is about single parenting, why would you have it for one and not the other? Why would a single parent in one type of relationship be fine and not the other?

Mr ODENWALDER: It was because of the nature of the bill, the way it has been set up and the way it has been split up from the previous bill. We are amending different bills. Yesterday, we amended the ART bill. These are amendments to the Family Relationships Act, so it is dealing with a different set of circumstances.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am not sure I agree with your explanation. I understand what you are saying, but I would have thought that if the issue were to exclude single people from surrogacy that would be on the basis, I assume—I am a little confused because this week we have dealt with same-sex couples adopting, we have dealt with a whole range of things, and now it seems we are in a whole different pattern. If we are trying to exclude a particular group, we should just say so. If that

is the case, I would like to understand why we are trying to exclude a particular group. I cannot find a sound basis for this proposal, and I indicate that I will be voting against the whole bill if that is the case.

Ms HILDYARD: I think I understand the question about what we are doing here. When we talk about assisted reproductive treatment—and we dealt with that particular issue when we went through the clauses yesterday—we are talking about a woman accessing assisted reproductive treatment. So, we are talking about a single person accessing assisted reproductive treatment because that is all that you can talk about, if that makes sense.

Whereas in relation to surrogacy, so that we are really clear, all these amendments that the member for Little Para has proposed do take away the ability for a single person of either gender to be a commissioning parent in relation to applying for a recognised surrogacy agreement. All we are doing now is dealing with the single parent issue that the member for Little Para has raised in relation to surrogacy. I hope the ART explanation helps answer your question.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can I just add, and perhaps receive clarification from the Chair, that we passed the—what was the term we used yesterday?

Ms HILDYARD: The substantial amendment.

Mr ODENWALDER: We passed the substantial amendment yesterday, so the amendments we are discussing now are merely consequential. So, is it appropriate to discuss—

Ms Chapman: You can ask whatever you like.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can you? I am new at this, member for Bragg.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am happy for the member for Little Para to provide some context for why this is different, and why he has moved this particular amendment.

Mr ODENWALDER: As I advised the member for Ashford yesterday, there is a hierarchy of things we are trying to achieve in this bill, and I sincerely wish things which I and others place higher in the hierarchy of the needs of this bill to be passed, and I think it would have a better chance of passing if amendments were made.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If I understand you correctly—and I do not want to put words into your mouth—you are saying that to get this bill across the line you will be quite happy to discriminate against a group of people, even though this whole bill is about non-discrimination.

Mr ODENWALDER: You are putting words into my mouth. What we are doing is not changing the act in relation to certain groups of people. We are changing the act in relation to certain groups of people I am placing arbitrarily in this hierarchy of needs and we are not changing the act in relation to another group of people. I am not against changing the act in relation to that group of people, just not in this bill.

Ms CHAPMAN: What we passed yesterday was essentially to exclude a single person from being a commissioning parent to obtain a surrogate child, and that has followed the debate this week resulting in adoptions in South Australia now being available to heterosexual couples (married or cohabiting) and gay couples (registered or unregistered), but not a single person (someone who does not have a husband, wife or partner).

Furthermore, in this bill a person can apply now for assisted reproductive technology, irrespective of whether they are in a partnership. I think that the member for Light is right in identifying that we have—and if we pass the consequential amendments that go with this, we will have—a situation in South Australia where, other than for the purposes of applying for assisted reproductive technology, a single person cannot obtain the right to have a surrogate child or adopt a child under our adoption law. I have some issues about that, I must say, and it was concerning to me. I address this now to the mover of the amendments, that we could end up in a situation like that.

I accept that we have had the vote on the principal amendment, the result of which I think was three to the rest of the world. Surprisingly to me, I had the Speaker on my side. I am not reflecting on the vote. You should be grateful when you only have two votes to get three, I suppose, but unbeknownst to me there had been some discussion about how the controversial aspects of this bill

in relation to surrogacy might progress at least to give some opportunity for same-sex couples to be commissioning parents and that a compromise had been reached.

I point out to the parliament that, when we do this type of thing, we end up with an absurd outcome. I am not going to stand in the way of the consequential amendments, member for Little Para, because I had a crushing defeat yesterday. However, I make the point that that is what we are left with, and if there is any more absurdity it is the fact that we seem to have excluded, in this negotiated compromise position during this week, single parents.

Not only do we have mobile relationships these days for people who might cohabit in a shared arrangement and who, for significant periods in their lives, may be single parents, but we actually employ and enjoy the benefit of single people in South Australia who generously give their time to provide for the care, supervision and upbringing of many disabled children and a very significant number of foster children.

We have gone through a social agenda of change this week, most of which I have supported and which has enjoyed the support of the parliament, with the consequence now of saying to these people, 'You can look after someone else's child if they are disabled or damaged, but you can't commission your own. If you are in the right circumstances and you can afford it, you may access ART, if that is an option available to you.' But for someone who is being asked to do that on a regular basis, or for a group of people who generously do that in South Australia, I think it is shameful that we should now exclude them from this opportunity to either have a surrogate child or to adopt a child.

Hopefully, when we look at this in the clear reflection of what we have done this week, we will sit down and deal with a number of issues—not just this one but also the shameful circumstances in which the surrogacy contracts are still entered into currently with heterosexual couples in the buying of children from vulnerable and exploited parents overseas. I am not going to say anymore about it, but I can tell you that it is unfinished business. I will support the amendments.

Ms HILDYARD: I want to place on the record that I certainly agree with the member for Bragg's sentiments and look forward to continuing the conversations about the issues that she has raised over time so that we can resolve those issues.

Amendments carried.

Mr PEDERICK: This I think becomes the nub of this legislation. As I indicated in earlier contributions in regard to this bill—again, probably when it was part of the Relationships Register Bill—it goes away from the intent of where the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place wanted to go with surrogacy. Again, I recognise the fine work he did in this parliament in regard to access for surrogacy for South Australian couples, being men and women legally married or in a de facto relationship.

To be frank, I will be voting against the bill. This clause goes against the original intent, and I must say that, to me, this has been rushed into this parliament along with a whole raft of similar legislation in recent weeks. I repeat that the original discussion around surrogacy was part of a standing committee reference to the Social Development Committee years ago now. Quite frankly, I think if we were going to debate this in the proper way that should happen again, but I understand we are here debating it today.

I voice my disapproval of where we are going with this clause by opening up surrogacy. I just wonder whether the parliamentary secretary can explain to me some of the practical experiences in accessing surrogacy that will have to be dealt with by gay couples, whether they be women or men, in a relationship.

Ms HILDYARD: I will make a couple of comments about your lead-up to your broad question. As I said yesterday, in 2015, we commissioned the SA Law Reform Institute to undertake a review of all South Australian laws that discriminate against our LGBTIQ community members. We received the report into these particular issues in June. As you know, member for Hammond, you were invited to and attended a number of briefings that I held. You asked questions at those briefings. You were given written information at those briefings. Those were a number of months ago now.

As you also know, on several occasions I invited you to continue to ask questions, etc. so I reject the assertion that these issues have been in any way rushed. If anything, I wish we could have addressed this discrimination against our fellow South Australians somewhat earlier. I just want to place that on the record. In terms of your very broad question about what this means for couples accessing registered surrogacy agreements, they are now able to equally access surrogacy agreements in the same way as any other couple is able to do so, and rightly so.

Mr PEDERICK: That is fine. We also get the opportunity in this house to ask questions, which is obviously the appropriate place to do so. You said that they have the same access as other couples. For gay couples, whether they be women or men, can you tell me the procedure? Do you have to have a relative? Do you have to have a consenting friend? I am trying to flesh out how it will work in a practical sense with gay couples. If it is such a strong part of the legislation, it should be known.

Ms HILDYARD: We are just dealing in this particular clause, and indeed in this bill, with eligibility to access a surrogacy agreement. We are certainly not talking about the process in terms of how that actually happens. This clause sets out—and it is one of the key features of the act—that we are now enabling surrogacy for same-sex couples who are in a registered relationship, which we spent some time discussing on Tuesday and at briefings that you have attended, or same-sex couples who are in a marriage-like relationship. If, in their circumstances, they are unlikely to become pregnant, they are now able to access surrogacy agreements. It is the eligibility issue that this particular clause, and indeed this bill, addresses.

Mr PEDERICK: I assume you are talking about clause 24.

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, section 10HA.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, section 10HA. I am still not satisfied. We did flesh out in the Social Development Committee who an appropriate surrogate mother would be. I am intrigued to know, and I would like the parliament to be reminded, who an appropriate surrogate would be. Obviously, I understand it is not for profit. You are supposed to be accountable for reasonable costs, but it is not to be a profit-making venture. I am trying to flesh this out because this is a big change, and it is a big change from where the Hon. John Dawkins wanted this to go. He explicitly left these amendments out of the original process of surrogacy in this state.

Ms HILDYARD: To be clear again for the member for Hammond, this bill deals with the criteria around commissioning parents for a surrogacy agreement; it does not deal with who can be a surrogate. That responsibility lies with the Attorney-General in other legislation.

Mr PEDERICK: I beg to differ, because in section 10HA—and it is involved in the bill as well—there are eligibility criteria around the surrogate mother and the agreement that has to be gone into. As I said, it talks about valuable consideration, expenses incurred with or consisting of a pregnancy, the birth or care of a child, counselling or medical services and legal services, so I do beg to differ. Obviously, as part of surrogacy, you do need a surrogate.

As part of both the bill and the Family Relationships Act, the surrogate mother does have to be assessed and approved as a surrogate by a counselling service. It goes through a whole range of accreditation procedures and guidelines that have to be met with the National Health and Medical Research Council, and that is in both the act and the bill. This is quite a big part of this legislation, and I think it is significant because, if you do not have a surrogate, you cannot have commissioning parents.

Ms HILDYARD: I hope this makes it clearer because I think perhaps my last answer was not as clear as it could have been. The Family Relationships Act absolutely sets out those matters that you have just spoken about. We are not changing anything in the Family Relationships Act except in relation to matters relating to who can be commissioning parents for a surrogacy agreement. We are not changing anything that is already in the Family Relationships Act about anything other than who can now apply for a recognised registered surrogacy agreement. If you look at the bill, you will see verbatim the existing clauses that you have just spoken about exported directly from the existing Family Relationships Act into this bill, and the only changes are in relation to commissioning parents.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 25.

Mr ODENWALDER: I move:

Amendment No 13 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 25 [Clause 25(1) to (5)]—Delete subclauses (1) to (5) (inclusive)

Amendment No 14 [Odenwalder-1]—

Schedule 1, Part 6, clause 25 [Clause 25(7) to (10)]—Delete subclauses (7) to (10) (inclusive)

These amendments are consequential.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 26 negatived.

Clause 27 negatived.

Ms HILDYARD: I move:

That the following words of enactment be inserted:

that the Parliament of South Australia enacts as follows—

Amendment carried.

Ms HILDYARD: I move:

That the short title clause be inserted—

This act may be cited as the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy Eligibility Act) 2016

Amendment carried.

Ms HILDYARD: I move:

Clause No.2—Commencement clause be inserted—

This act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause No.3—Amendment provisions clause be inserted—

In this act, a provision under a heading referring to the amendment of a specified act amends the act so specified.

Amendment carried.

Ms HILDYARD: I move:

That the title of the bill be—

A bill for an act to amend the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988; the Equal Opportunity Act 1984; and the Family Relationships Act 1975.

Amendment carried.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:20): We come to this bill because it came about quite clumsily, to say the least, under the Relationships Register Bill. That bill, I believe, was split into two and the more controversial part of the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy Eligibility) Bill 2016 was hived off.

In my almost 11 years in this place I have not seen this happen. It can be a drama on any given day in this place to be absolutely certain about what is going on from one minute to the next because the line-up of bills gets changed as well as the line-up of debate and bills come back from

the other place. I well and truly know that is how it works, but I think that this could have been dealt with in a lot better way.

As I said, I certainly will not be supporting this bill. It does go against the massive amount of work that was done in the early 2000s and instigated by people who had contacted the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place about access to surrogacy. If these people want to access surrogacy they had to go interstate where it was available, in Victoria, and some of these commissioning parents were spending around \$50,000 to access surrogacy.

I went through the bipartisan committee process of the parliament, and we did a full and exhaustive review. We certainly had some emotional couples telling us about their desire to have children and the obstructions that were in the way to their having that ability. It is nice to know that we assisted those couples—those couples who are either de facto couples or who are in a legal marriage arrangement.

That was certainly the full intent of the honourable member John Dawkins from the other place. That is where he wanted surrogacy to be and which people were going to be eligible to be part of the process. Certainly I fully supported that process those years ago now, and I acknowledge what it did for couples who could not have children any other way and saved them spending the tens of thousands of dollars going interstate to access surrogacy arrangements.

The minister has reminded me about briefings that have happened over the last few months, and that is fine, but they are not anywhere near as exhaustive as either a select committee investigation or a standing committee investigation. It certainly has been awkward, to say the least, for people in this place to negotiate their way through what was originally the Relationships Register Bill and with this one being split off to debate clauses during the committee stage.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:24): I just indicate that I am not satisfied that the inconsistency between the ART provisions, which were adopted yesterday, and this bill can be justified.

This is no reflection on the member for Little Para because I understand the circumstances in which this came about. That just reflects what I believe to be an unsatisfactory process for all of us and it has put all of us in a difficult situation where we are not quite certain. Certainly, if I was aware of the provisions yesterday, I would have spoken a bit differently on it. I think that, as a matter of principle, if you are trying to deal with discrimination and you are going to use discrimination as a part of the answer, that is just untenable, and I will be voting against the bill.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:25): I want to place on record a few points as we draw to the conclusion of this debate on the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy Eligibility) Bill 2016, what I think is an incredibly important piece of legislation that will, indeed, help bring South Australia closer to true equality for LGBTIQ South Australians.

In closing this debate, I want to thank everybody who has contributed to the debate and also say again to the deputy leader and place on record my thanks to her for her very constructive debate in this house and also in the various briefings and conversations we have had about these matters. I also was asked by the member for Elder, who is unable to be here this afternoon, to mention in closing the debate that she was very much looking forward to voting for this legislation. I just wanted to put that on record for the house.

What we are changing in this bill will not affect most South Australians. The changes will not in any way affect the day-to-day operations of many of our lives. Many amongst us will not even realise that these laws have changed. But, for those who can now access assisted reproductive treatment and a surrogacy agreement, including those who talked with me and others with tears in their eyes about what it will mean for themselves and their loved ones, these changes will have a profound impact.

There are so many different types of families. Each of us has a different experience of family life, of ups and downs within our families, and of happiness and sorrow. What we all know is that the essential ingredient for a positive and nurturing family life where family members are safe, with their mental, physical and emotional wellbeing cared for, is love. This bill helps people who love each

other to create those families. It means they do not have to travel interstate away from their loved ones to do so. To be very clear, the bill does these things:

- It amends the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act of 1988 so that a person can access assisted reproductive treatment if in their circumstance they are unlikely to become pregnant other than through the use of assisted reproductive technology.
- It creates an exemption in the Equal Opportunity Act to ensure that a person going through assisted reproductive treatment will not be discriminated against in terms of receiving care.
- It also makes changes to surrogacy via amendment to the Family Relationships Act of 1975 so that non-heterosexual couples can become commissioning parents in terms of applying for a recognised surrogacy agreement.

There are some, including here in this house, who may feel that we should deny same-sex couples the opportunity to enter into surrogacy agreements. I feel very strongly that these are views from another time. Today, we have an opportunity to continue our work, undoing archaic laws to offer hope to future generations and to support loving couples to grow their families.

To illustrate the real impact this legislation will have on South Australian couples, I put on record the words of Ali and Jo, a same-sex couple living in Adelaide who had to travel to New South Wales to conceive their children because of the barriers to accessing IVF in South Australia. Their story is not unusual and, hopefully, it will become a thing of the past after the passage of this legislation today. They say:

The discrimination in the law makes what is already a complicated and stressful process even more complicated and stressful. Rather than undergo invasive exploratory procedures to assess my fertility levels, we decided to go to [New South Wales] to conceive our two beautiful children.

We had to save up each time we needed to travel for a consultation or procedure, sometimes delaying treatment because we ran out of money, simply because of these hurdles in the current law. We're allowed to foster children but not allowed to have our own children in our own state—I hope the parliament finally realises that this just doesn't make sense.

A participant in the SA Law Reform Institute process added the following:

I believe this law creates a situation whereby I am required to use risky, unchecked sperm from a male (known to me by friendship or via a website set up to provide sperm to people) rather than being able to access IVF.

The lack of sperm in my relationship (as we are both women) is not considered to be enough reason to justify why we need to use IVF to have a baby. I believe this is unfair—as we should not have to use sperm from a donor, whom we may not know about his HIV status or STI risk...I think [the current law] discriminates [sic] against people...

It is clear to me, and I hope that it is clear to all my fellow parliamentarians, that this is a long-overdue reform for South Australian couples.

I hope that today we have yet more good news for our LGBTIQ community and yet more progress for our community at large. Again, it is the work of active community members, the South Australian Law Reform Institute, the leadership of our Premier and, of course, the votes of my parliamentary colleagues here today that will bring about this progressive change for South Australians. I thank all who are part of doing so.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes 25
 Noes 16
 Majority 9

AYES

- | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Bedford, F.E. | Bell, T.S. | Bettison, Z.L. |
| Bignell, L.W.K. | Brock, G.G. | Caica, P. |
| Chapman, V.A. | Close, S.E. | Cook, N.F. |
| Gardner, J.A.W. | Gee, J.P. | Hildyard, K. (teller) |
| Hughes, E.J. | Key, S.W. | Marshall, S.S. |

AYES

Mullighan, S.C.
Pisoni, D.G.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Wortley, D.

Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.
Weatherill, J.W.

Picton, C.J.
Redmond, I.M.
Wingard, C.

NOES

Duluk, S.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Snelling, J.J.
Treloar, P.A.
Williams, M.R.

Goldsworthy, R.M.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Pederick, A.S.
Speirs, D.
Vlahos, L.A.

Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.
Piccolo, A.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Digance, A.F.C.
McFetridge, D.

Pengilly, M.R.

Rau, J.R.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today in the gallery the former member for Baudin and deputy premier, Dr Don Hopgood.

*Bills***ELECTORAL (FUNDING, EXPENDITURE AND DISCLOSURE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:37): I rise to speak to the Electoral (Funding, Expenditure and Disclosure) Amendment Bill and expect to be the only speaker in the opposition. The matter of substance, namely the Electoral Act, the actual law we are amending, relates to the Electoral (Funding, Expenditure and Disclosure) Amendment Act 2013, the effect of which was to provide for the rules and regulations surrounding the entitlement of political parties to access public funding for election campaigns, and the obligations of disclosure and expenditure capping that were prerequisites to being eligible for the said public funding.

The effect of that act, and its obligations, commenced on 1 July 2015, so for the last 14 or 15 months we have been operating under that regime. With the best will in the world, when a new, novel scheme is introduced, it sometimes requires some amendment. This is no exception. It is fair to say on the principal act that the model which has been implemented for South Australia, as proposed by the government, certainly is not easily compared in other jurisdictions, particularly the commonwealth, because we did not follow their disclosure scheme and funding model. In any event, we are not here to revisit that.

We have a novel arrangement, and we have all signed up to it, to the extent of the principal act. In the course of its operation, unsurprisingly, some deficiencies have been identified and the government has worked with members of our party, and I expect other members of existing parties, to attempt to resolve these inconsistencies and anomalies so that we can have the fluid and effective implementation of this law in the lead-up to and during the 2018 election.

I am advised that, essentially, these amendments incorporate a pre-existing agreement to provide an up-front one-off payment to parties with six or more members to compensate for the establishment costs incurred by parties to ensure compliance with the new recording requirements under this new regime; to provide for greater consult by regulation of funding to be paid to parties every six months for ongoing compliance; furthermore, to clarify reporting requirements in the last weeks before the election; to introduce a new definition of a person who can prove they exercised all reasonable diligence to prevent the commission of an offence; and to repeal a section the government believes will undermine the stricter reporting and time frames under our South Australian law.

I thank the government for bringing some of these matters to our attention and agreeing to work through them so that we implement an orderly and workable model. The election is less than 500 days away, and we do need to make sure that these are remedied. With those few words, I indicate that we will support the passage of the bill. I understand that representations do continue, and I think this is entirely appropriate to look at as the new waves of introduction are coming into place. If any further clarification is required, as a parliament we may need to attend to it, but hopefully not. If we do, there is an opportunity of course in the Legislative Council to manage that. With that, I support the bill.

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) (16:42): I would like to thank the member for Bragg for her contribution, and on behalf of the Attorney-General I thank the staff within the Attorney-General's Department for the work they have put into this. I also thank the opposition for the way the discussions have gone, and I now commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

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) (16:43): I move:

That the bill be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 September 2016.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:43): I rise today to speak to the Biological Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016. The bill amends the Biological Control Act 1986 to specifically include viruses and subviral agents within the definition of an organism. In regard to the Biological Control Act 1996, South Australia is part of a national scheme of mirror legislation based on the commonwealth legislation, the Biological Control Act of 1984.

Uniform legislation was passed by the state and Northern Territory parliaments to establish a uniform equitable system applying throughout Australia to ensure that biological control programs which had been identified as being in the public interest could proceed without interruption by litigation. These amendments address an issue which has arisen about the classification of viruses and subviral agents as living organisms, and the possible legal implications this might have for agent and target organism declarations made under the biological control acts.

Two new viruses are being assessed for national release: the next rabbit haemorrhagic disease virus (RHDV1 or sometimes it is called RHD5) and the koi herpes virus to control European carp. The amendments are required before an application is made to ministers for these releases to proceed. To enable the proposed biological control agents for rabbits and European carp to be considered, this bill, on our information, must be passed by December 2016.

The bill introduces minor amendments to specifically include viruses and subviral agents within the definition of an organism. The bill addresses an issue which has arisen about the classification of viruses and subviral agents as living organisms and the possible legal implications this might have for agent and target organism declarations made under the biological controls acts. These amendments clarify biological control programs which use viruses and subviral agents and they are covered by the Biological Control Act 1986 (South Australia). The amendments maintain consistency with mirror legislation in the commonwealth and other jurisdictions to address a sovereign risk. They certainly, from our understanding, do not affect the original scope or intent of the act.

Certainly, there have been issues that have had to be dealt with and one of them has been Salvation Jane in the past. Salvation Jane is a dominant pasture weed and toxic to most grazing animals. One single plant produces over 10,000 seeds. It was estimated that in 1985 Salvation Jane was present on over 30 million hectares in Australia. By 2002, this weed had cost the wool and meat industries \$125 million each year. Salvation Jane is a declared plant in South Australia and landowners have the responsibility to control the weed, hopefully with the assistance of natural resources management.

As cited in the biocontrol fact sheet, Salvation Jane biocontrol in South Australia involves a suite of agents that attack various parts of the plant: leaf mining moths attack the leaves, crown weevils attack the rosettes, flea beetles and root weevils attack the roots, and pollen beetles attack the flowers and seeds. The pollen beetle feeds on the flowers and seeds and the larvae of these beetles also have an effect on the weed. Crown weevil larvae also have effects on Salvation Jane and it is said to be more of a success than other methods, especially in areas that are susceptible to higher rainfall.

It has certainly been noticed that in more recent times, over the last decade or so, Salvation Jane is not as prevalent as it once was, so obviously these practices have come into play. I think part of the reason this legislation is being changed is that there were some legal challenges around some of these viruses with Salvation Jane all those years ago.

Anyone involved in farming certainly would be aware of myxomatosis and its effect on rabbits. The myxoma virus was the first virus released into the rabbit species in the 1950s. This virus spread through fleas and mosquitoes, and myxoma was first field tested in 1938 before being released in the 1950s. After the official release, the virus reduced the estimated rabbit population from 600 million to 100 million in two years.

Partial genetic immunity to the virus was observed and since the seventies, this resistance has grown. Now only 50 per cent of infected rabbits die. There is presently an outbreak of the myxomatosis virus in South Australia, and owners of rabbits are being urged to keep their rabbits indoors or away from mosquitoes and other biting insects as, for obvious reasons, the virus is fatal. I am talking pet rabbits here, obviously. I am not looking after my rabbits home on the farm.

Unfortunately, with many viruses such as those being discussed, animals tend to develop somewhat of an immunity, therefore resulting in the need for alternative strains which led to the introduction of the calicivirus. The rabbit calicivirus (RCD), also known as rabbit haemorrhagic disease (RHD), was first reported in China in 1984. RHD is a viral disease which only affects European rabbits. As RHD had the potential to be a biological control method for wild rabbits, the virus was brought to Australia and was quarantined at the CSIRO Australian Animal Health Laboratory where extensive studies were conducted.

In 1995, the virus escaped field trials. It was being trialled on Wardang Island, and there have been some quite legendary stories of how it happened. I remember talking to a group of learned gentlemen one night at the Cleve field days about how it might have escaped. There were a few knowing smiles but, at the end of the day, it was the best thing that happened in regard to controlling rabbits. Farmers and station owners had seen the potential of what this virus could do, and they were keen to get it out there. We saw, especially on larger properties, station owners delivering dead rabbits with the virus from helicopters to spread the disease more quickly on their properties.

Since 1995, this virus has spread across the majority of Australia. There were some concerns raised about the virus affecting humans. However, studies have shown humans who were exposed

to the virus were not affected and the virus has been present in 40 countries since the eighties. Along with humans, no other animal species have been affected but, for those with pet rabbits, vaccinations are available and can be accessed at vet clinics. RHD can only be released during specific times of the year as it generally does not have an effect on kittens and young rabbits. Initial results in wetter areas were also lower.

A new strain has been identified which is a Korean strain of the calicivirus called the RHDV-K5. RHDV-K5 is already in many locations within Australia; however, it has not yet been formally introduced as a biological control method. Contrary to the calicivirus, RHDV-K5 is effective in cool, wet and other parts of Australia where the original calicivirus was not present. Rabbits are Australia's most costly pest, costing Australia's agriculture industry an estimated \$206 million per year in damage. They contribute to soil erosion and are also allegedly associated with impacting 304 threatened species in Australia. RHDV-K5 is one of the most humane methods of pest control and is anticipated to be released in 2017.

I note a press release that went out recently from the federal member for Barker, my colleague Tony Pasin. Barker will participate in the release of a new variant of the rabbit haemorrhagic disease virus, RHDV1 K5, at 15 sites, and a RabbitScan mobile app is now available to enable people to contribute to the national dataset. This comes some 21 years after the initial release. This new virus will be trialled next year at 20 sites across the electorate of Barker in an effort to significantly reduce rabbit populations and the devastating impact on agricultural production and native ecosystems. There were many local residents who got on board to help identify potential trial sites for the release of the virus in 2017.

Scientists and landowners certainly hope it will significantly reduce rabbit populations. Some of the sites across Barker and several other electorates include Alawoona, Brookfield Conservation Park, Cambrai, Kingston on Murray, Kingston South-East, Lameroo, Loxton, Lucindale, Meningie, Naracoorte, Parrakie, Renmark, Sandleton, Annadale, Blanchetown, Sedan and Taldra. Australia has had a good track record when it comes to the biological control of rabbits. When the first calicivirus was released, there was up to 98 per cent reduction in arid areas.

In regard to the reductions that were achieved from the release of myxoma virus in the fifties, more than 85 per cent of Australia's rabbit population was killed. This will certainly do great work in decreasing the rising rabbit population, and it has industry, government, researchers and local communities working together to address this problem. This is part of the Australian government's \$1.2 million commitment to assist in the research and development of new rabbit controls. This trial will certainly be welcomed. People can search about RabbitScan and they can go to the Invasive Animals CRC website for more information.

Carp is another pest that has invaded our Murray River system, so I will talk about the carp herpes virus. Carp were first introduced into our systems over 100 years ago. They are in every state except the Northern Territory and now make up 80 to 90 per cent of the Murray-Darling Basin's fish biomass. Females produce up to one million eggs per year. Carp are known to be very tolerant, can adapt to water with low oxygen levels and can live in salty water.

The federal government has allocated \$15 million over 2½ years for the National Carp Control Plan. The carp virus only affects carp, is a natural occurring strain and has been investigated by the CSIRO for some eight years. It is suggested that the herpes virus has been around since the late nineties and is now present in 33 countries. The virus is expected to be released by the end of 2018 and it is expected that the virus will initially remove 70 to 80 per cent of carp in the river system. However, it will not eradicate the carp species.

The economic impact of carp is estimated to be up to \$500 million per year. A trial in New South Wales showed that, after the removal of carp in a small designated area, the water became clear. I can tell you it has been a long time (many decades) since I have been able to see any distance in the River Murray. Concerns have been raised in relation to the removal of great amounts of carp and whether fish that consume carp will have enough food. However, studies in Queensland investigated how the ecosystem responded to the removal of carp. The studies found a significant increase in zooplankton. Subsequently, small-bodied fish increased by up to 1,000 per

cent and native fish also exploded in numbers, and the biomass was more than the carp that was removed.

I note the recent announcement that Dr Matt Barwick was appointed as the head of the rollout of the virus and the community consultation process. It is on the internet—or the 'interweb', as the Attorney-General likes to call it—that Barnaby Joyce, our Deputy Prime Minister, was asked a question about the carp virus in federal parliament earlier this year, and I quote from part of his answer to the federal parliament:

It was great to be able to announce the \$15 million that we will put towards the eradication of carp. We know that it is incredibly important. We are afflicted with these disgusting, mud-sucking creatures—bottom-dwelling, mud-sucking creatures. The only form of control is a version of herpes; it is the only thing that will get rid of these disgusting, mud-sucking creatures.

They probably do not give it enough inflection to match our Deputy Prime Minister, but I think you get the idea.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: What's that, Madam?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mud-sucking!

Mr PEDERICK: Mud-sucking creatures. There are things that will need to be ironed out before this carp virus is released. I believe that Senator Anne Ruston is involved in the investigations. I will be having discussions with her, and I certainly want to catch up with Dr Barwick. When you have an electorate at the bottom of the system—although, this will not affect my electorate, but it will affect four or five state electorates, including the member for Chaffey's electorate—if the carp virus is introduced, the management of the carp and getting them out of the system is the biggest issue facing downstream communities in the river system. It is a huge issue.

No-one is exactly sure how many hundred thousand tonnes or million tonnes of carp might be killed, how many will be killed in a set time and whether they will start from the bottom of the river system and work up. I commend the federal government funding and Matt Barwick. Let's hope that the appropriate work is done because the last thing we want is to have hundreds of thousands of tonnes of rotting carp that we are not able to manage out of the system.

It would affect not just the environment and irrigators. Obviously, pipelines come out of the system at Murray Bridge, Mannum and other outlets along the river, watering most of our population, so we have to get this right, when critical human needs water is coming out of the Murray River. Most of these pipelines are not just-in-time pipelines; they are connected to dams and storages. I declare an interest to the degree because my property is on the Keith pipeline, which is a just-in-time pipeline, bar a few storage tanks along the way. Essentially, it is just-in-time delivery from a service at Taillem Bend, where it goes through the filtration process and then heads all the way to Keith in the South-East.

The big thing we need to know, especially in this state, is that the research has been done and that we have the appropriate actions in place to get rid of the carp. There is some talk about vacuum machines and so on, but I will not be happy unless we have at least one more built-in failsafe apart from the original way of however the government believe they can get rid of the dead carp in an effective manner. Certainly, I am keen to have further involvement and dialogue with my community at my end of the river, at the bottom end of the system, to get people along so that they are informed about potentially what will happen. By the looks of it, they are aiming at the latter part of 2018.

This is not to say that everyone is happy about the carp removal. Some of the fishermen in the Lakes and Coorong are heavily reliant on selling carp, especially with the damage inflicted on their nets by the New Zealand fur seals when they are fishing for Coorong mullet and other species. Some of them will lose that vital market to a fair degree. Obviously, with some of the carp left behind, they will still potentially have a market. The carp may be a little harder to catch, but there is certainly a big market in fishing for carp for the cray pots in the South-East, so that is something else that needs to be managed.

On the other side of the ledger, people have come to me and said that they want to be involved, to get a job or supply equipment and help out with this project, and that they are more than happy to get on board. In terms of the calicivirus, I think that will be an exercise that continues and will not be a huge drama. Hopefully, the release of the herpes virus into the carp will not be a huge drama either. In fact, I do not want it to be any drama. We need to make sure that all the discussions are had and that all the investigations and all the details are in place with respect to how we are going to get rid all the bodies of these filthy mud-sucking creatures. With those few words, I commend the Biological Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 and indicate that our side of the house will be supporting it.

Sitting extended beyond 17.00 on motion of Hon. L.W.K. Bignell.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:04): I rise to speak on the Biological Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016, which essentially makes amendments to our Biological Control Act 1986. Why is this so important? Because the area that has not been canvassed to date by either the proponents of this bill or indeed the opposition's position, as ably presented by the member for Hammond, and taking into account that the principal act of 1986 was established with a clear understanding and knowledge of the interests of the Australian economy and the general protection of the Australian environment, it is the necessity to implement and have an ongoing scheme for the biological control of pests across the states and territories.

Whilst the implementation of the scheme requires some uniform approach, and indeed legislation to a large degree, to try to administer the effective biological control, the act also is highly restrictive on the capacity for anyone, whether they are a farmer, an environmentalist or a resident, but someone who may be adversely affected when something goes terribly wrong, is extremely limited.

It is an act which already bars the capacity for people to take legal proceedings in respect of those who are responsible for the release of an agent organism in a state; and, secondly, if they have been instituted they have almost no capacity to recover any loss or damage in those circumstances. We therefore expect, and quite reasonably, that whatever the authority does—and we have a South Australian authority that is responsible under the act to administer it—it has to do properly because the consequences are very stark and there is not an easy remedy. In short, if they bugger it up, then there are very dire consequences.

So, when we come to considering a bill where we are going to amend it to expand the definition essentially of an organism, allegedly to avert any particular court challenge that might emanate from a virus not being defined as an organism (which I think would be hard to prove, and nobody seems have done it since we have had a number of grubs and bugs issued to deal with Salvation Jane) that is the fear being presented to us as the need to pass this legislation.

It was apparently the basis upon which the ministers got together in one of their meetings across Australia to consider to avert any possibility of there being a challenge before we deal with the carp virus (because, frankly, that seems to be the one that is really precipitating this), then we better get it right and we better make sure that we tidy it up. For that reason I am prepared to support that, but members ought to be aware that there is scant opportunity for an individual adversely affected by a process in which biological control is used and where there is damage caused.

Of course, if there is reckless indifference and some mischievous criminal activity by somebody, there are other means by which one can usually make some claim. At present, we are alienated if we are a victim, so we expect these authorities to properly test things before they administer them. I will come back in a moment to the two pests that have been identified that are in need of treatment.

One matter I do want to raise is the process whereby this has been brought to the parliament. A short second reading contribution was presented by the minister for primary industries—quite rightly: he is, of course, responsible for the act and its administration. He provided a short explanation to the parliament that outlined the need for the act as having its genesis in the June 1983 proposed release of insects to control Salvation Jane. Everyone knows about that: it is an important pasture weed in South Australia. In fact, it is a general pain in the neck in a lot of areas. I saw it growing

recently along the median strip outside the Burnside Village, so it is pretty effective in getting anywhere and causing a problem.

I did not have a problem in reading, with some comfort, that there had been a claim to the minister 'which has been very effective and is now preventing its dominance in pastures'. That was good to hear, I thought, and it was certainly consistent with anecdotal information. When I have a briefing on this matter, I will inquire as to the progress of that and any assessments that have been done which actually support this statement which, as I say, I was pleased to read.

In the course of what is the next stage consistent with the progressing of most bills and changing of laws, a briefing was provided to me by Mr Will Zacharin (who, at the time was acting deputy chief executive of the primary industries department) and Ms Alice Vista, who I think is from the minister's office from recollection, but maybe somewhere else. In any event, both ably set out that they had no information about the Salvation Jane programs or any assessments or reviews that had taken place.

It seemed that they had not been alerted to the fact that these statements had been made in the second reading contribution, but they went on to outline the significant areas of proposed biological control they wished to implement and be part of a national push for, and that was the issuing of a virus to deal with carp and the calicivirus type 2 to deal with rabbits. As I say, they have been largely dealt with by the member for Hammond and he, of course, is very familiar with their problem and their management.

During the course of the briefing, I did inquire why there had been absolutely no mention by the minister, at the time of his second reading, of the two principal activities which we were about to be protected by, namely, the virus for the carp and the rabbits. We already knew that a national program had been announced during the last federal election campaign, about the middle of this year, by Senator Anne Ruston and the Hon. Barnaby Joyce, the federal minister, about a program they were going to promote. Funding had been announced for it and it was going to take, I think, two or three years to implement, even though it was active in other places in the world.

Obviously, introducing a virus needed to have special assessments and preparation done, etc. We knew about that. There was nothing to hide about that. It seemed pretty consistent that he would tell us about that. It seemed that there would be no reason he could not tell us how the first calicivirus program had gone. I remember all the hoo-ha when it happened because, of course, it went out a bit earlier than it should have at the time. Nevertheless, it was effective, and apparently immunity builds up and there is a need to develop and test another virus, and they have provided that. That is excellent.

However, that was a briefing that at least I had, given that the minister had given no information about what this was all really about. I made some inquiry about the assertions about Salvation Jane. I was forwarded—it must have been immediately after the meeting because they did not have anything—some flyers from the website which, frankly, did not tell me about the review, just about what 'salvation' meant and what it did, where it grew and so forth. What concerned me was that, firstly, there had been a non-disclosure by the minister as to what this was really about, which seemed bizarre to me, given that there were quite genuine and, it seemed to me, sensible reasons for doing it.

Secondly, when I asked to have information about the pest that was identified in the second reading to justify the existence of the review and the expansion of the definition, I was told that it was really nothing to do with this bill and that I did not need to have it. In that regard, I felt that the information given by Miss Ruth Sibley, who I think is also in the employ of the minister, suggesting that it was effectively going to be a waste of their time to have to follow up that information, was frankly unhelpful, unnecessary and totally inappropriate.

In whatever role she plays in the future in the promulgation and promotion of law reform, she needs to understand that whilst ministers gallivant off to have meetings at a national level and discuss things of mutual benefit and interest they need to come back to the parliament on a number of these things and they need to get our approval, and it is about time that she understood that. If her minister does not fully disclose that in the process of his presentation to the parliament and we ask for it, we

are entitled to it and we expect to get it, and they will not have the swift passage of legislation unless they provide it. I hope I make myself clear for future purposes.

However, on that aspect, subsequently I met with minister Hunter, as I do once a year to deal with a number of issues in my electorate, and I asked him about pest management, which is always on my list. We have a problem with rabbits and foxes (apart from the ones I see in here). Coming from Kangaroo Island, I did not grow up with rabbits and foxes, but I have learnt a lot about them since. I get an update about what is happening or not happening with the foxes program, etc. I still do not know a lot about rabbits, and I do not care to, so I will leave the member for Hammond to sort them out.

However, I make the point that at least during the course of that meeting Ms Tara Bates, who I think is in the employ of minister Hunter at a senior level, did follow up and has followed up for me (it took her a while to get the information through her department and through SA Water) what was actually happening at the moment in respect of carp. Whilst there might be a tsunami of carp carcasses when we implement the benefits of the new virus proposed to be issued in a few years' time, I wanted some understanding of what was happening with this mischievous and unpleasant, at best, fish that nobody seemed to want or like.

I have been in the River Murray area with the member for Chaffey, who has taken me to a number of areas, and one of them was the Chowilla dam site—we call dams 'regulators' now—and this was a new and beautiful freshly built regulator. Of course, it is designed to do a number of things, one of which is to ensure that there is a water flow to manage areas further downstream that continue to need to be watered to protect our natural wildlife. It is a very interesting project and a very expensive one. However, not very much done seems to have been done to manage this offensive level of carp that is really taking all the oxygen out of the river system to the detriment of the other natural fishes, etc.

When I asked for that information, it was drip fed in, but it appears, in summary, that there are still some traps along the way, particularly at one of the locks. They are emptied from time to time (not very much as it turns out in the end), with only a very small amount of 80 to 100 kilograms a year from Lock 1. A small amount of that goes to Sydney. The Charlie Carp program seems not to be terribly effective, but a small amount may go to them or for lobster bait or other purposes. It seems that for quite some time now that the very expensive and perhaps not as effective trap system has not been at least been implemented; if it has, it is only for small amounts.

This is very concerning because it appears, from what we are told, that it will be three years before this new program is implemented. Our River Murray system, which of course is a lifeblood for South Australia, is going to continue to be infested with these creatures. I will be disappointed if the government is not doing something about making sure that we at least keep some cap on the population of these fish, so that we might at least have some chance for the other life in the river to be protected. SA Water has the management of these locks, and I think it is incumbent upon them to give some information to the parliament—perhaps they could do it in their annual report, if we ever get it—as to what they are doing, and what application is being implemented, to biologically control that pest.

In respect of the amendments themselves, we are not making an amendment specifically for particular viruses to be allowed. We are changing the definition so if other viruses are developed or identified that will have an effect for pest management then there is no need for them to come back to the parliament to deal with it. I do not have a problem with that, but I make the point that I expect the management of the pest control to be carefully administered, properly researched, and with all of the appropriate safeguards.

I feel some comfort, at least, with the federal department covering these matters. They seem to at least have a grip on the situation, and are progressing along a path. I am informed that, for the purposes of the rabbits to initiate the release of the new virus at the beginning of autumn next year across Australia, or probably in trial periods to start with, we will need to pass this legislation this year. It is necessary to avoid the risk of liability in court proceedings if someone were to challenge that.

For that purpose, I am happy to advance this. If we were just dealing with carp and we had three years, frankly I would be asking the government to be a bit more effective in the provision of information when it is asked for in a timely manner, if they expect our support in respect of these matters, to ensure that we give swift passage to legislation that is meritorious. I would also ask that, where necessary, we be properly informed so that when we are consulting with any stakeholders, who may raise issues themselves, that can be appropriately dealt with. It is a lesson, I suggest, in making sure that some respect is maintained for the fact that it is this parliament that makes the decisions about law, not individual ministers or people who work for them.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:23): I will make a brief contribution because I know that everyone is a little weary after last night. I rise to speak about the Biological Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, which amends the Biological Control Act to specifically include viruses and subviral agents within the definition of an organism. Essentially, the act is part of a national scheme of mirror legislation which is based on the Biological Control Act 1984. Uniform legislation was passed by the state and Northern Territory parliaments to establish a uniform, equitable system, applying throughout Australia, to ensure biological control programs which have been identified as being in the public interest.

I take note of what the member for Bragg has said, that nine times out of 10, biological control works, is efficient, is not invasive, and does not impact on those surrounding areas and people who use the land or the waterways. But every now and then there are issues: there are impacts on those people who utilise the waterways and land. As the member for Bragg said, we do need those trials to be definitive. They need to be absolutely flawless in the way that these biological controls are rolled out.

There are two new viruses being assessed for national release: the next rabbit haemorrhagic disease virus (RHDV1) and the koi herpesvirus, to control European carp. Essentially, the moving of the amendments to this bill through the South Australian parliament will give the necessary support for the projects related to these viruses to progress.

Pest animals, such as European carp and rabbits, have been a serious threat to South Australia's primary industries for more than a century, and their cost to the economy is something that I do not think has ever been defined. People do put numbers on it—they say that it was \$743 million in 2007, but I would challenge that. I think we could probably put a zero on the end of that because of the damage that they do, and their impact is untold.

The carp virus was announced by the then minister for science, the Hon. Christopher Pyne, before the federal election. It is now under the care of Senator Anne Ruston. The federal government is hoping to release the cyprinid herpesvirus number 3 at the end of 2018 to reduce the huge numbers of the introduced European carp.

I think it is timely that we see this virus being released because, as we speak, we are implementing the Murray-Darling Basin plan, and that is to take water back from productive use, create efficiency gains right throughout the basin, put water into the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder's bank, and then on-use it so that we can water flood plains, environmental assets, and make sure that our river system—our basin system, the delta—is healthy. With a healthy environment we have good water and more secure sustainable communities.

It has been reported that if this virus is released, there will be a huge clean-up bill. It is good to see that the federal government has committed \$15 million to the National Carp Control Plan, which was dubbed by the then minister and the minister now, and the senior minister, Barnaby Joyce, as the 'scourge of the waterways'. They are a filthy animal, they are a mud-sucking, mud-plucking water deterrent. Anywhere you go where there is carp, the water is cloudy and full of carp.

Living on the river, I have quite a lot to do with carp. I am seeing a lot of carp getting into the flood plains at the moment. I am lucky enough to live on the great River Murray, and I am already seeing carp of significant size: carp of a metre-long and perhaps 250mm high. They make their way through our waterways, in only a couple of inches of water. It just shows you how these fish survive, how they breed, how they get into these wetlands, and how they are so destructive.

The herpesvirus is envisaged to kill 95 per cent of carp in the river system over the next 30 years. It is not going to be a virus that is going to kill carp overnight, and it is not going to be a

virus that, once it is introduced into the river system, kills everything stone dead. We have a gazillion tonne of carp floating in the waterways, but there is going to be the science and the clean-up in relation to how we deal with it. Many people have said that it should be introduced from the bottom up, and as the river flow takes those carp out to sea it will reduce the majority of the clean-up. That is all very well in theory, but I think the science is yet to be brought up on that.

I know that, if the herpesvirus were released now and it were successful, money for the clean-up would be much more easily used. Because we have high flow, dead fish float to the top and flow out to sea, but the waterways and the backwaters—the environmental assets—are what we really need to protect, as that is where the carp are breeding. Obviously, carp have been in this country for more than 100 years, and they have been established in every state except for the Northern Territory. I think that they have enough of their own issues up there, particularly with cane toads and other biological control methods that have been brought into this country and gone pear-shaped.

Carp are able to consume good water and turn it into cloudy, muddy water. I do another way, which is quite an expensive way, of biological control of carp, and that is a piece of PVC pipe, and it is something I taught my kids. When the water came up on the flood plains, they would go carp thrashing, which is all about bashing the carp with the PVC pipe. There was no interference. You would throw them up onto the bank or up onto a high spot into the trees. Birds and other predators would get them, so they would not last there too long and therefore they would not smell. If we are going to have inaccessible waterways, where thousands of tonnes of carp float to the top and prove to be an issue, that is when that federal government money to clean up will be critical.

Obviously, we need to look closely at the research on how the ecosystem will change without carp and the decomposition of their bodies. In my electorate, particularly in the Riverland, we have a number of wetlands, environmental assets where, as we speak, with the high river, there is a carp-breeding frenzy at the moment. The carp are thick wherever you go. I would like to advocate that yabbies are starting to run. So, all those people who enjoy a yabby, particularly the tourists who want to come up to the Riverland and visit, please come up and make sure you spend some money while you are up there catching yabbies and that, if you do get carp in your nets, you put them somewhere where they cannot wriggle back into the river and make a mess.

According to the CSIRO, the herpes virus, or KHV as it is known, first appeared in Israel in 1998 and spread rapidly throughout much of the world, although not Australia or New Zealand. It causes high death rates in common carp and the ornamental koi carp. No other species of fish, including goldfish, are known to be affected by this virus. The CSIRO has undertaken significant and ongoing research to test the susceptibility of the virus to other fish and amphibian species, consulting with conservation groups, recreational fishers and resource managers.

Scientists at the CSIRO have spent many years experimenting in the world's most sophisticated high contaminant facility to address the issue. I am sure there are many people who are cynical out there. I know that the member for Hammond is very concerned. He will be engaging with his community to make sure that all the research and all the trials are done so that they do not adversely impact on the people in his electorate.

They say that up to 58 million individual carp are eaten for breakfast in Israel every day. Imagine if we could change the Australian palate to accept eating carp, but we are spoilt by the other beautiful freshwater species, such as Murray cod, the different perch (silver and gold) and the different callop. We have all those different species, and we also have introduced species like redfin, which is a no-go zone, and we have catfish, which is a no-take zone.

To rid the river system and our waterways of carp would be an absolute coup. It would potentially bring our river ways and waterways back to a much cleaner and clearer state, but we do have to live with the other side effects of having clear water, such as weeds. I know that during the drought we had low flow and low numbers of carp in our river system; hence, the river system became clearer, but a lot of the weed that grew on the bottom of the river started choking the river. So, there are side effects of having good clear water that will also need to be addressed, I am sure.

As the carp rot, they take the oxygen from the water, and that is one of the issues. The smell, the impact on aquatic life and the impact on the quality of water have also been mentioned today.

The federal government has estimated that the damage that carp cause will far outweigh the benefits of what this herpes virus will do.

Again, we need to embrace the challenge if there is one. We need to cut back the carp population and the destruction it is causing to our Murray-Darling Basin system and other associated waterways. We need to make sure that it is eradicated, but eradicated safely, and that it does not have that impact on the people who live in those waterways and those local communities.

Regarding the rabbit virus, the amendment bill also progresses plans for the rabbit haemorrhagic disease (RHDV1). Myxoma and the calicivirus have been successful, drastically reducing pest rabbit numbers in Australia after they reached about 600 million in 1950. I can say with some credibility that the electorate of Chaffey has been a breeding ground for carp. It has been a breeding ground particularly in the Mallee as well for rabbits, so I think that the electorate of Chaffey would be one of the biggest beneficiaries of these two biological control agents, as long as it is all kept in check and all the protocols and all the trials are proving successful.

As we know, wild rabbits were introduced into Australia in the mid-1800s by a wealthy Victorian grazier for the sport of hunting. It does provide an economic benefit. There are some people who love a good rabbit stew, but most people would rather see a dead rabbit than a live rabbit because, while the rabbit is alive, it is eating pasture, it is eating crop, it is digging holes, it is undermining trees and fences, and it is just destructive.

As many of us might know, myxomatosis was a biological control in the 1950s, and that saw a dramatic reduction in the rabbit population. As a child, I would always know if a rabbit had myxomatosis. It had the milky eyes, it was always very thin, it was diseased and it was something you would always stay away from. In 1984, a new emerging disease of rabbits was described, the calicivirus. It was brought into Australia in 1991. It was extensively assessed for its suitability here in Australia, and it was released. This was somewhat questionable, but it was released and it did have an impact on rabbit numbers.

I want to touch briefly on something else that I as a horticulturalist over a number of years have used, and that is integrated pest management. Integrated pest management is a great tool for reducing the use of pesticides and insecticides, but it is also a biological control for insects that are a great cost to our green reputation.

I would like to put on the record that Biological Services up at Loxton, next to the Loxton Research Centre, owned by James Altmann, is probably one of the country's leading biological control pest breeders. He really does a great job. He is undertaking some great research and some great pilot programs on the Adelaide plains at the moment with the intensive crop management that they need to reduce the pesticides and insecticides. There is also a biological control for pest pressure. What it does is reduce residue through MRI tests, particularly with our clean, green environment and our clean, green reputation into our export markets. It reduces the off label use and it gives us a better opportunity for our clean and green exports.

Those education programs around integrated pest management are the future of food production and particularly of our horticulture. As a horticulturalist, I used one for 20 years, and it reduced my amount of insecticide, the oil sprays and all of that insecticide control of pests. It does take it a little while to get it balanced, but it does work and I think it will be the way of the future. It reduced my sprays by up to 75 per cent, so the cost-benefit analysis stacked up, but it is a long-term strategy.

The parasitic wasp, again, is something that Biological Services is breeding. Funnily enough, they breed them in pumpkins. Once they have bred them, they get them out and collect them. They then release them into the orchards, and they control the scales—red scale, brown scale, the soft and hard scales. There is a method with biological control. Again, integrated pest management is the way of the future. If the herpesvirus and the new calicivirus are trialled properly—rolled out, managed, cleaned up—it will be a coup for our environment. It will also be a coup for our food production in this state. I support the amendment and I am hoping that it is all rolled out nicely and safely.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:40): I rise to support the Biological Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. This bill amends the Biological Control Act 1986 (South Australia) to specifically include viruses and subviral agents within the definition of an organism.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: I almost fell into the same trap.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: They are leading me astray, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does this have anything to do with country living?

Mr TRELOAR: Biological control is a method of controlling pests such as insects, mites, weeds and plant diseases using other organisms. It relies on predation, parasitism, herbivory or other natural mechanisms, but typically also involves an active human management role. It can be an important component of integrated pest management programs. In fact, the member for Chaffey was just talking about his experience with integrated pest management programs and the importance of those programs within horticultural and agricultural cropping systems going into the future.

There are three basic types of biological pest control strategies. The first is importation, in which a natural enemy of a pest is introduced in the hope of achieving control. The second is augmentation, in which locally occurring natural enemies are bred and released to improve control. Finally, conservation is where measures are taken to increase natural enemies, such as by planting crop plants in the borders of cropped fields.

The Biological Control Act of 1986 is part of a national scheme of mirror legislation that is based on the Biological Control Act of 1984. Uniform legislation was passed by the state and Northern Territory parliaments to establish a uniform equitable system applying throughout Australia, to ensure biological control programs which have been identified as being in the public interest could proceed without interruption by litigation—most important. These amendments address an issue that has arisen about the classification of viruses and subviral agents as living organisms and the possible legal implications this might have for agent and target organism declarations made under the biological control acts.

Two new viruses are being assessed for national release: the next rabbit haemorrhagic disease virus (RHDV1) and the Koi herpes virus to control European carp. The amendments are required before an application is made to ministers for these releases to proceed. To enable the proposed biological control agents for rabbits and European carp to be considered, this bill must be passed by December 2016. Hence, here we are in the third week of November with some pressure on this parliament to get this bill through.

Both the member for Hammond and the member for Chaffey, with their River Murray frontage in their electorates, know far more about the damage that European carp has done to that riverine environment than I do. I remember hearing always that European carp, having been introduced into our rivers and waterways, had devastated the native fish stocks and overtaken every other single fish species within those systems. So, control of carp would be a wonderful thing. I do not think they are particularly edible either, are they, member for Hammond?

Mr Pederick: They're not my favourite, but you can eat them.

Mr TRELOAR: You can eat them, but they are not much sought after game fish, unlike some of the other river fish such as the Murray cod, and no doubt carp have had an impact on cod numbers. That will be welcome, and not before time. The other one that was mentioned is the new rabbit virus. All Australian schoolchildren are familiar with the story about the introduction of myxomatosis in the 1950s and how successful that was. In the 1860s, the rabbit was introduced into Victoria originally so that some landowner could go hunting or trapping.

By the time my grandfather went farming on the West Coast of Eyre Peninsula in the 1920s, they were literally everywhere in plague proportions, over the entire southern Australian landscape, and they were devastating. They denuded the landscape of grass and any tree seedlings and native eucalypts that might have been emerging and created in many situations a dust bowl.

I remember my grandfather in the old days clearing mallee. Much criticism has come in later years of the extensive clearing of our mallee landscape. One of the reasons was that any Mallee scrub that was lost, even if it was around stony knobs or on sandy rises or scrubby bits, was a haven for rabbits, where they were able to live and breed and then move out and essentially eat an entire wheat crop, which made it very difficult for farming to continue.

When I was a young boy, my grandfather taught me how to set rabbit traps. They are of course illegal these days, but he spent many thousands of hours setting rabbit traps and trying to control rabbits using such things as 1080 poisoned oats. As young farm boys, one of the skills we learned was how to set a rabbit trap. It was quite an art. I remember my grandfather always used to cut a newspaper into small squares and lay them carefully over the plate before sprinkling soil on the top. We always asked him what the pieces of paper were for, and he always said, 'It's so the rabbits have got something to read while they are waiting for you to come and get them.' As far as I know, that was true.

The calicivirus was remarkably successful in decimating rabbit numbers. Rabbits are still in existence. Slowly, over time, rabbits became somewhat immune to the myxomatosis virus and then, of course, the calicivirus famously escaped from Wardang Island off Yorke Peninsula.

Mr Pederick: Mysteriously.

Mr TRELOAR: They mysteriously escaped from Wardang Island off the coast of Yorke Peninsula in the early 1990s. I think the plan was to release the virus within the next 12 or 18 months, but somehow it managed to get off the island and the impact was, once again, almost immediate and ultimately successful. There is some resistance bred into a rabbit population. This I am sure will be the next stage in the management of rabbit numbers. It will not eradicate rabbits; I do not think it ever will. They are so suited as an introduced species to the Australian environment that they will remain forever, but it is about managing the numbers. We are not setting rabbit traps any more, but it means less poisoning and shooting certainly. I am looking forward to that.

Famously, Australia, through northern New South Wales and Queensland, was inundated by the prickly pear in the early decades of the 20th century.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: What I am getting to, minister, is how successful the biological control program for the prickly pear was. Prickly pear cacti were introduced into Queensland—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: Wait for this—you said your mother or your grandmother used to grow them.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: No, my grandmother grew oleanders, actually. The Prickly pear cacti was introduced into Queensland, Australia as ornamental plants. They quickly spread to cover over 25 million hectares of Australia. They are admirably suited to northern New South Wales and south Queensland.

Two control agents were used to help control the spread of the plant, the cactus moth (cactoblastis) and the dactylopius scale insects. This was an incredibly successful biological control because it virtually eradicated the prickly pear cactus from the Australian farming and pastoral landscape within a few years. So, success can be had at a local level. There are any number of introduced plant species in our South Australian agricultural landscape, and I notice the member for Hammond nodding knowingly. I suggest that we have all spent a fortune trying to control one of them.

One weed that was becoming prevalent on the southern part of Eyre Peninsula was Salvation Jane, otherwise known as Paterson's curse, although we knew it more as Salvation Jane. In recent years, I know that our local NRM board has been very active in releasing a rust throughout the more highly infested areas, and once again this has proved a very successful biological control. Where once upon a time we saw purple hills in the springtime, apart from seeing the odd purple flower of the Salvation Jane, we rarely see thick infestations.

It is absolutely worth pursuing. If it is done correctly, researched properly, accredited and managed by human intervention, it can be a very successful program. I look forward to the passage of this bill and the opportunity to further control the European rabbit in the Australian landscape and also cleaning up our beautiful riverine waterways in southern Australia of the European carp.

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) (17:51): I would like to thank everyone who has made a contribution to this bill, in particular the members for Hammond and Chaffey. I found their contributions very interesting. Obviously the knowledge and the passion they have for their local area is to be commended. I enjoyed both their contributions and I thank them for the efforts they put in and the questions they asked about what this could mean into the future. Of course, this is mirror legislation that we have to bring in right across all the states as part of the federal plan.

I would also like to thank all the hardworking people in Primary Industries and Regions South Australia, particularly in Biosecurity South Australia—people like Will Zacharin, Dr John Virtue, Mark Ramsey and everyone else who has done so much in this space. I would like to thank my federal counterparts Barnaby Joyce and Senator Anne Ruston. This is something we are taking a national approach to.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention the member for Bragg, who came into this place and put down public servants and put down political staffers. I do not think there is any place for that. I am quite happy to take criticism as a member of parliament. I have seen the member for Bragg in briefings over the years, and she is an expert on everything and she knows more, she thinks, than all these hardworking public servants who do such a good job for South Australia. They really put their heart and soul into what they are doing, so I think it is very unfair of the member for Bragg to come in here and talk down these hardworking public servants who do such a tremendous job.

She reminds me of one of the aristocratic Bellamy family from *Upstairs, Downstairs*, where she lives upstairs and is better than everyone else in the world and the servants live downstairs. There is no place in our society for that sort of behaviour. We all have to get on. Everyone has a role to play, and I think our public servants do a tremendous job. With that little discussion I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

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) (17:54): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2016) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment and suggested amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment and suggested amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly, and which suggested amendments the Legislative Council requests the House of Assembly to make to the said bill:

Schedule of the amendment made by the Legislative Council

No. 1. Clause 8, page 7, lines 21 to 25 [clause 8(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

Schedule of the suggested amendments made by the Legislative Council

No. 1. Clause 2, page 6, line 8 [clause 2(2)]—After 'Part 5,' insert 'Part 8,'

No. 2. Clause 2, page 6, line 11 [clause 2(4)]—Delete subclause (4)

No. 3. Clause 35, page 13, after line 39—

After inserted section 40D insert:

40DA—Payments to Fund

- (1) Subject to this section, the Commissioner of State Taxation must pay, out of the taxation revenue collected under this Division during each financial year, an amount of \$500 000 into the *Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund* established under the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* (the *Fund*).
- (2) The amount required to be paid into the Fund in respect of taxation revenue collected during a particular financial year is, on or after 1 January 2018, to be adjusted on 1 January of each year by multiplying the amount that would be required to be paid in accordance with subsection (1) by a proportion obtained by dividing the CPI for the September quarter of the immediately preceding year by the CPI for the September quarter, 2016, on the basis that the quotient used for the purposes of the adjustment will be calculated to 2 decimal places and that the amount obtained from the adjustment will be rounded to the nearest dollar.
- (3) Regulations made under section 40G(1)(i) may require the Commissioner of State Taxation to pay amounts into the Fund in addition to the amounts required under this section.
- (4) If in any financial year the revenue collected under this Division is insufficient to make the payment required by this section, the Commissioner of State Taxation is relieved of the obligation to make the payment under this section to the extent of the insufficiency.
- (5) Amounts paid into the Fund under this section may be applied and dealt with as if they had been paid into the Fund under the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*.
- (6) In this section—
CPI means the Consumer Price Index (All groups index for Adelaide) published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

No. 4. New clause, page 22, after line 17—Insert:

64A—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

Section 2(1)—before the definition of *business of primary production* insert:

association includes—

- (a) a group consisting of 2 or more persons (whether or not incorporated); and
- (b) any person, or group of persons, holding land on trust (whether or not incorporated);

No. 5. Clause 65, page 22, lines 19 and 20 [clause 65(1)]—Delete subclause (1)

No. 6. Clause 65, page 22, line 22 [clause 65(2), inserted subparagraph (i)]—

Delete ', or that is owned on behalf of a trust,'

No. 7. Clause 65, page 22, line 27 [clause 65(2), inserted subparagraph (ii)]—

Delete ', or that is owned on behalf of a trust,'

No. 8. Clause 80, page 31, lines 4 and 5 [clause 80, inserted Schedule 2, clause 2(1)]—

Delete 'during an assessment period is liable to pay' and substitute:

of a point to point transport service during an assessment period must collect from persons using the service, and pay to the Minister,

No. 9. Clause 80, page 31, after line 6 [clause 80, inserted Schedule 2, clause 2]—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) A levy amount required to be collected from a person using a point to point transport service is separate from, and does not form part of, the fare or consideration payable by the person for the use of that service.

No. 10. Clause 80, page 33, line 35 [clause 80, inserted Schedule 2, clause 10(1)(a)]—After 'levy' insert 'to the Minister'

No. 11. Clause 80, page 33, after line 37 [clause 80, inserted Schedule 2, clause 10(1)]—After paragraph (a) insert:

- (ab) make provision in relation to the collection of the levy by a relevant provider of a point to point transport service from persons using the service; and

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (17:55): On the indulgence of the house, I would like to thank table staff and the attendants and other staff in the building—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hansard.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Hansard, of course—thank you, ma'am—who were here for such a long time last night and serving us very ably as we sat and discussed the euthanasia bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:55): On indulgence, from this side of the chamber, I too would like to thank all the staff who were involved, whether it was the catering staff, Hansard, table staff—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Library.

Mr PEDERICK: —floor staff and library staff—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Drivers.

Mr PEDERICK: It was a long night, and for everyone involved it is much appreciated to keep the wheels of democracy grinding on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's do it again.

At 17:56 the house adjourned until Tuesday 29 November 2016 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***RIVERLAND HOMELESS**

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (29 September 2016).

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (DCSI) funds two services to provide homelessness responses in the Riverland area: the Riverland Homelessness Assertive Outreach Program (Outreach Program), delivered by Life Without Barriers; and the Riverland Generic Homelessness Service (Generic Service), delivered by Anglican Community Care.

Over the course of the severe weather event that impacted South Australia in late September 2016, the two services provided an enhanced level of support to people who were sleeping rough.

Increased outreach support was activated with the services actively visiting the areas where people were known to be sleeping rough. Workers also assisted clients who did not wish to go into alternate accommodation, to relocate to safer areas in preparation for the weather.

Additional support was also provided for motel accommodation, bus tickets, food and fuel to ensure safety.