

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29 November 2016

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

### *Ministerial Statement*

#### **CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Children deserve to be nurtured in a loving home, and families should be supported in creating a child-friendly environment. Where they are unable to provide the level of support our society expects, government must step in to care and protect them.

The final report of the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission was publicly released on 8 August 2016. Titled 'The life they deserve', the report described a system under significant stress that requires decisive action to ensure it better meets the needs of children. The report contained 260 recommendations that provide the foundation for a fresh start for child protection in South Australia.

The report clearly emphasised that child protection is everyone's responsibility. It highlighted that we must intervene earlier when families are in need, that we must work together as a community to assist vulnerable families and children, that we must commit to prevention as the primary focus, that we must use evidence to inform our decisions, that we need to do more to provide every child in care with the best chance of succeeding and, above all, it reminded us that we must listen to the children who we strive to protect.

Recommendation 260(a) of the report states that the government responds on or before 31 December 2016. Today, I table the government's response, which is entitled 'A fresh start'. With the handing down of our response, we outline a renewed vision for a robust and functional system. The vision goes beyond child protection and looks to develop a broader child development system that supports families and children from before birth into early adulthood.

The response outlines how we are responding to each recommendation, and it sets out the plan for reform over several years. It describes our commitment to work closely and collaboratively, hand in hand, with the non-government sector, key service providers and all members of the community to deliver a responsive and effective system.

The South Australian government is making a funding commitment of \$432 million to fundamentally change the way in which we manage child protection and wellbeing in South Australia. The government has accepted 196 recommendations and a further 60 are accepted in principle, meaning they are partly accepted or further work may be required to determine how best to deliver the intent of the recommendation. There are four recommendations the government has chosen not to accept after consultation with stakeholders. Further detail about why these recommendations have not been accepted can be found in the response we are tabling today.

The government response was informed and guided by significant input and expertise. Both targeted and general forums and workshops have been held with key non-government partners, members of the community and the Department for Child Protection and other government staff. To ensure a unified approach to implementation, we will establish the child safety and wellbeing advisory panel to oversee reform and implementation. Its membership will include key government agencies and representatives from key non-government partners, such as peak bodies and advocacy groups

that represent children in care, out-of-home care providers, social and community services, foster and kinship carers and other partners in child protection.

To ensure we address the disproportionate representation of Aboriginal children and young people in child protection, we have established the Aboriginal Community Leadership Reference Group. This group will also be a member of the advisory panel and includes some of the most respected and knowledgeable leaders from the Aboriginal community.

Protecting vulnerable children can be difficult and emotionally demanding work. The people working with these children and families often do not get the recognition they deserve. I thank these people for their commitment to such an important cause and look forward to working together to create a fresh start for child protection.

Each government agency involved in the child protection system will engage staff to act as child wellbeing assistants. These staff will be local experts on child protection in hospitals, schools and other government workplaces and centres for the community. They will advise people on how to assist families, and when and what to report, and they will have knowledge of the support services available in their communities.

We will trial a new intake model for notifications of child safety concerns: the child safety pathway. The pathway will include a multi-agency assessment team to support the Child Abuse Report Line with assessing notifications by drawing on the agency's information about families and the supports that are being offered. This will help paint a full picture of the family's circumstances.

Child wellbeing practitioners with expertise in child protection are now working in schools across the state. On a daily basis, these staff are providing invaluable assistance to families and child protection advice to teachers and school staff. They are connecting families with services and providing a valuable link between schools and the Department for Child Protection.

The government's response also acknowledges the very important work that has already occurred. Already, 42 recommendations have been accepted and implementation has begun. Key initiatives already included involve the establishment of the new Department for Child Protection and appointing Ms Cathy Taylor as its first chief executive. We have passed the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016 and the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016. These acts establish the office for the Commissioner for Children and Young People and improve the screening system for people working with children. In addition, the Public Sector (Data Sharing) Bill 2016 has been introduced to parliament.

We have also committed to a number of significant initiatives for which implementation will commence shortly. We will trial three child and family assessment and referral network pilots in the metropolitan area to support and strengthen the capacity of families to care for their children and to prevent abuse and neglect. Together, these and other initiatives signify a renewed focus on supporting families to address problems before a child needs to be brought into care, with an additional \$44 million for early intervention programs and services.

Where early intervention efforts fail, we must be equipped to work with families who need help to build safer homes so children can return from care and those who need more intensive help to make sure their children are cared for safely. Therefore, we have committed \$11 million to employ a protective intervention backlog team in the Department for Child Protection. These social workers and case managers will work with families to either return children to safer homes or help families quickly address problems that might put their children at risk.

We know that proper reform of the system must be underpinned by a strong and supportive workforce, so the government has committed an additional \$10 million to professional development and training of Department for Child Protection staff. A dedicated family scoping unit will be established to map family connections, so that safe and supportive kinship placements for children coming into care can be found as soon as possible.

Today, we also table the Children and Young People (Safety) Bill 2016, which will implement a number of royal commission recommendations and provide the legal framework for a reformed child protection system. The task of reform ahead is significant. 'The life they deserve' report provided South Australia with a suite of improvements and changes that will help us meet our obligations to

vulnerable children and families, but our vision for South Australia is for all our children to reach their full potential to be happy and feel secure and safe in their families and communities. I now table 'A fresh start. Government of South Australia's response to the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission report: "The life they deserve"'.

### CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:10):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** As has been said here before, on 8 August 2016 the final report of the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission was publicly released. 'The life they deserve' report delivered a raft of recommendations that proposed wideranging and far-reaching changes to the child protection system in South Australia. Many of the recommendations in the report required significant changes to the current legislative framework, across numerous acts. Since the release of the report, we have passed the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016 and the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016. Still in the other place is the Public Sector (Data Sharing) Bill 2016, which I hope will pass this week.

Each of these legislative instruments includes clauses and laws that strengthen our child protection system and further contribute to ensuring the safety of children and young people in our state. The most significant legislative changes recommended by commissioner Nyland relate to the current Children's Protection Act 1993. Many recommendations either directly recommend changes to clauses in this act or require legislative changes to be implemented.

Recommended changes relate to issues such as decision-making responsibility, the role of foster and family carers, guardianship and custody arrangements, information sharing, other person guardianship and the involvement of children and young people. These amendments have been made in the Children and Young People (Safety) Bill 2016, which will repeal the Children's Protection Act 1993.

The bill implements a number of royal commission recommendations and provides a robust legal framework for a reformed and reoriented child protection system. Its primary objective is to protect children and young people from harm and make provisions for the support, safety and care of children and young people. The bill puts children at the centre of the child protection system. It makes a parliamentary declaration recognising the importance of children and young people to our state and the desire for children and young people to grow up in an environment where they are safe and supported and are given every opportunity to thrive. It also acknowledges that outcomes for Aboriginal children and young people in care have traditionally been poor.

There is a strong focus in the bill on early responses that do not require the intervention of the courts, including family group conferences and child and family assessment and referral networks. The bill places a new emphasis on timely and efficient decision-making that gives proper consideration to the views of children and young people. It is proposed that the guardianship and custody arrangements for children in care under an order, which now sit with the Minister for Education and Child Development, will move to the chief executive of the Department for Child Protection.

The bill provides for the legal representation of children and young people and enshrines in law the obligations of individuals representing them. Key legislation regarding out-of-home care and the rights, standing and responsibilities of carers has been reviewed and moved from the Families and Community Services Act 1972 into the draft bill. With these changes, increased rights for carers to participate in decision-making for the children in their care is now enshrined in the bill. There are also increased rights to obtain information and receive delegations from the chief executive earlier.

Unnecessary barriers for carers seeking to obtain long-term guardianship for children have been removed and processes have been streamlined. This includes, when there is an objection to an application, moving the onus of proof from carers, who must prove that they can care for children

long term, to birth parents, who must prove that a carer cannot. New provisions have been made to continue support up to the age of 25 to children and young people who leave care. This includes helping young adults to find accommodation, employment and support services and transition to a successful life as an adult.

This is a significant step forward in ensuring that a young person's transition from care to the adult world is well supported and gives them the best start for adult life. Most importantly, the draft bill makes it clear that the paramount consideration in the operation and enforcement of the act is to protect children and young people from harm. The purpose of this draft bill being tabled, as opposed to introduced, is to make it available for public comment prior to it being finalised and introduced in the parliament. The bill will also be sent to all key stakeholders in the child protection area, including peak bodies dealing with children and young people, who will be invited to engage children for feedback.

The draft bill will be made available today on the YourSAy website, and I encourage all organisations, agencies, carers and citizens who are either directly affected by, or have an interest in, this important issue to have their say and provide feedback on the draft bill. Consultation closes on 27 January 2017, with feedback to be taken into account before the final bill is introduced in parliament. We need to take our time to get this right. I now table the draft Children and Young People (Safety) Bill 2016.

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2016) BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment and suggested amendments.

(Continued from 17 November 2016.)

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment and suggested amendments be agreed to.

**Mr KNOLL:** The opposition concurs. I point out that, in the bill we received from the Legislative Council, all the suggested amendments are struck out, but I understand that that is because this is a money bill. We assume that the government is going to take on board all the amendments made in the other place and we are happy to support them.

Motion carried.

### **GENE TECHNOLOGY (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2016.)

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:20):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition and that the opposition will be supporting the bill. Like many pieces of legislation going through parliaments nowadays, this bill is part of a national agreement, and this state legislation reinforces that national agreement. The moment you mention gene technology and genetic engineering, if people do not recoil in horror thinking about the man-fly, the fish with tomato genes or something like that, they get seriously worried about genetic engineering and the associated technology.

I have three science degrees—and I am not boasting; I am just qualifying my opinion—including veterinary science and agricultural science in crops and soils, so I have done a fair bit of genetics and been exposed to a lot of opportunities for genetically-modified organisms to improve the production of both medical and agricultural outputs to improve the lot of the whole human race. To look at gene technology as something that is bad is something that we all need to reassess and try to understand what we are dealing with and where we can go with the appropriate use of gene technology. This is a very, very exciting area and we should not be afraid of it.

Obviously, there are areas where we have had serious issues both in agriculture and, more poignantly, in chemical warfare and bacterial or biological warfare. These are serious issues we need to make sure we are controlling, but the technology we are talking about in this legislation does not go anywhere near that area, although there are other jurisdictions that are very closely monitoring it.

Genetic engineering in animals and plants has been going on for many years, if not hundreds of years. Anybody who has done any genetics at all or who knows anything about Mendelian inheritance and genetics knows that for years and years farmers have been breeding their best bulls with their best cows, and it goes on from there. You are breeding the best with the best. You are slowly improving by genetically modifying because you are picking the best packet of genes and mixing them with the best packet of genes to produce the best offspring. As I said, that has been going on for hundreds and hundreds of years.

What we have managed to do now with modern technology is go down to that microscopic level and look at individual genes, map genes and identify genes, both the good genes and the bad genes. Let us remember that there are lots of bad genes that have been identified and, because of gene technology, we are able to improve people's lives, even if for no other reason than identifying a gene which they carry and should be aware of which may predispose them to some form of cancer or other genetically induced disease. The BRCA1 and BRCA2 gene for breast cancer is a classic example. Many women, and I would think most men, would be aware of the genetic influence of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes on breast cancer and other forms of cancer in the human system.

We need to make sure that we embrace with open arms the sort of technology that improves the identification of the genomes of both animals and plants, and humans as part of the animal world. I look forward to seeing that improved and embraced by this parliament and by other parliaments around the world. That said, we need to make sure we are controlling the advances, the changes, the investigations and the experimentation that is going on so that unintended consequences do not happen. Those unintended consequences can be as simple as genetically modified crops being inadvertently released into the broader agricultural world and then causing some issues with not only the control of weeds but also those particular crops, possibly affecting markets.

There is medical research that is using genetic engineering and genetic identification, or genotyping. Genotyping is a massive area and it is going on down the road, at SAHMRI, and all over the universities. It is going on at Waite, that wonderful institution, where I studied for a number of years, and they are doing some absolutely marvellous work, in both animal and plant genetics. Improvements in drought tolerance, salt tolerance and vitamin inclusions in plants are happening not only at Waite but all over the world, and we should be looking forward to this and embracing it.

As I said, there are cures available through genetic modification of organisms such as plants—for example, for vitamin A deficiencies. There are too many to mention this morning, but there are so many examples of where we are benefiting from advances in genetic engineering and producing genetically modified organisms that are going to be of great use to us.

If people want to read more about this, and I would encourage them very strongly to do so, they should go to the Agricultural Biotechnology Council of Australia's website and look at the sections on gene technology regulation. There are four or five pages about how gene technology in Australia is being regulated, how the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator has been set up and how a ministerial council has been put in place to oversee state, territory and commonwealth legislation. That is all based on the original Gene Technology Act 2000, which covers:

...[both] live and viable GMOs, the research, manufacture, production, breeding and import of GMOs. But it does not cover—

this is interesting—

- cost/benefit considerations
- comparisons with alternative technologies
- marketing and marketability
- intellectual property
- human beings and cloning.

I remember that in this place a number of years ago we talked about some of the stem cell therapies that were around, and some very lively and intense debate went on about stem cell therapy. This is quite different from that. The bill before us today is aimed at improving the control by various jurisdictions of genetically modifiable organisms in order to improve the long-term outcomes from what is happening with our GMOs.

Strict licensing conditions are in place, and there is certainly strong monitoring and enforcement of genetically modified organism release and development. The assessment processes that the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator oversees are very intense. There is public consultation and government consultation, risk assessments and risk management plans are put in place, and certainly there is a lot of public input. The so-called social licence we hear a lot about today is a very important part of assessing the whole process of developing and then, hopefully, using genetically modified organisms to improve our agriculture, medical products and animal sciences.

There are some notes in the briefing paper put out by the Agricultural Biotechnology Council of Australia that talk about assessing and managing risks. They talk about some of the perceptions out there about genes moving from plants to weeds and GM crops transferring to non-GM crops. I would suggest that people read this brochure; it will settle a lot of minds and clarify a lot of concerns.

The bill before us today, though, is really fairly straightforward. It relates to the gene technology scheme which regulates dealings with genetically modified materials. It does not look at the regulation of genetically modified foods, which is covered by the Food Standards Australia New Zealand, or genetically modified drugs, which is covered by the Therapeutic Goods Act. The scheme covers the use of genes as tools where the end goal is not a food product or drug product. Possible uses include medical research or plant research, as I have said.

In 2011, the commonwealth act was reviewed and 16 recommendations were presented to ministers at the gene technology forum. Of these recommendations, 14 were supported or supported in principle. These recommendations fall within three main categories: the first one is modifications to the operations of the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, the second one is minor technical administrative and consequential amendments, and the third is other technical amendments. On 15 August, the commonwealth Gene Technology Amendment Bill 2015 was passed without amendment by the House of Representatives and the Senate and came into force on 10 March 2016.

The commonwealth bill dealt with five minor technical, administrative and consequential amendments that will have minimal impact on the technical operations of the act. South Australia is a signatory to the national Gene Technology Agreement, an intergovernmental agreement which sets out the understanding between commonwealth, state and territory governments to establish a nationally consistent regulatory scheme. Within the agreement, the Gene Technology (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 before the house will bring the South Australian Gene Technology Act 2001 into alignment with the commonwealth legislation.

These changes will have minimal impact on the operation of gene technology activities within South Australia, and I am advised that three states have applied agreed provisions by reference to the national law and that three state parliaments currently have bills before them. While the bill deals with five recommendations from the 2011 review which provide minor administrative changes to the scheme, a further six recommendations have been implemented by the Office of the Gene Regulator without the need for legislative change. Three more significant recommendations are still to be considered further by the ministerial council. With that contribution, I support the bill.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:31):** I rise in support of the Gene Technology (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016, which amends the South Australian Gene Technology Act 2001. It is not often that a piece of legislation or, indeed, this subject matter gets debated in this house so I will take the opportunity to go through the regulatory regime and the importance of having a risk-based regulatory system in place in this area of public policy. The Gene Technology Act 2001 is the South Australian component of the nationally consistent regulatory scheme for gene technology in Australia.

The act aims to protect the health and safety of people and the environment by identifying risks posed by or as a result of gene technology and by managing those risks through regulating certain dealings in genetically modified organisms (GMOs). The act establishes a consistent national

regulatory framework to provide an efficient and effective system for the application of gene technologies that operate in conjunction with other commonwealth and state regulatory schemes relevant to GMOs and products.

In 2000, a regulatory framework was established with the Gene Technology Regulator, who is responsible for making the majority of decisions relating to gene technology. The regulator is an independent statutory office holder and is not subject to direction by anyone in relation to the performance of functions, in particular whether or not to grant a GMO licence with or without conditions. The regulator is responsible for the decisions on particular applications, is subject to guidance at a general level from the Legislative and Governance Forum on Gene Technology and is ultimately responsible to the parliament.

In 2011, the commonwealth Department of Health commissioned a review of the commonwealth act on behalf the forum, of which the health minister is a member. This review is the second statutory review of the gene technology scheme, the first being undertaken in 2007. The 2011 review investigated three areas: firstly, emerging trends and international developments in biotechnology and its regulation; secondly, the efficiency and effectiveness of the operation of the act consistently across the national scheme for gene technology regulation in Australia; and, thirdly, the interface between this act and other acts and schemes for regulation of related entities throughout the commonwealth.

The review found that overall the act and the regulator were operating very well. The Gene Technology Regulator was found to be performing its functions in a very efficient manner. The review also noted that current consultation processes in relation to applications under the act were also working well; however, it did make 16 recommendations. Of those, 14 were accepted by the ministerial forum. The bill seeks to amend the act to implement five of those 14 recommendations. These five were all agreed to by the ministerial forum.

They are minor and technical amendments that enhance the overall operation of the regulatory scheme without changing the underlying policy intent. The five recommendations have been incorporated into the commonwealth act; therefore, to ensure that South Australia remains aligned with the national scheme and in accordance with the national Gene Technology Agreement, they should be adopted into the South Australian Gene Technology Act.

'Gene technology' refers to a number of methods whereby genetic material (DNA) in the cells of target organisms is altered in a very specific way. Gene technology works because there is a remarkable similarity between the central biochemical systems of plants, animals, bacteria and fungi. The potential benefits from the application of gene technology include more efficient use of agricultural and veterinary chemicals; savings in energy inputs to farm production; and the recovery of degraded land, or being able to grow specific crops on land that would previously not have been viable. It also enables research into the causes of diseases and improved biopharmaceuticals and bioremediation.

However, the characteristics of gene technology which produce many of the benefits also cause concerns in the community, including unknown long-term health consequences, allergic reactions and generation of weeds or pests. Of course, there are also broader concerns in this area about using gene technology, including some of the ethical, social and moral concerns about the impacts of humans playing God. This is why it is essential that we have rigorous risk-based regulatory systems in place. Legal responsibility for gene technology regulation is vested in many regulatory bodies depending on the intended use of the relevant genetic technology. For example, genetically modified foods are regulated under state and territory food acts and the Food Standards Code.

Therapeutic goods and human gene therapy are regulated by the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA). Agricultural and veterinary chemicals are regulated by the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) and states and territories. Industrial chemicals are regulated by the National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS) and imports and exports of GMOs or GM products are regulated under the Quarantine Act and the Imported Food Control Act, amongst other pieces of legislation. As you can see, it is very well regulated.

In a very simplistic manner, gene technology processes are regulated by the national gene technology scheme, whereas the products that result from these activities are further regulated by the specific agencies, as previously mentioned. The vast majority of research is conducted with food and textile plant crops. The breeding of grains and new cultivars for our farmers is nowadays intrinsically linked with our ability to alter the gene sequences. It might be achieved by artificial means or it might be achieved, as has always been done, by traditional breeding techniques. It is simply another tool that our producers can use to achieve an outcome that has been sought through more traditional methods for thousands of years.

Obviously, anything coming out of the gene technology pool should be monitored and approved on a case-by-case basis. That is why we have regulation. It is the same situation with a new chemical, for instance. We should only approve the use of a new chemical if it is not going to cause environmental damage or create safety issues. New substances or processes that are registered for use should be properly checked, and of course gene technology is no different. There are many GMOs that are enormously successful and are now embedded in our society and accepted worldwide and in Australia.

The use of GM cotton has reduced pesticide and herbicide use by more than 50 per cent. This makes a significant contribution to looking after our environment. A Chinese study completed in 2012 found that the use of GM cotton halved the amount of chemical application and doubled the number of ladybirds, so it is a good news story. Within South Australia, the risks to markets are managed by the conditions applied by the crops management act 2005. This enables the growing of food crops in South Australia, providing an exemption permit is granted by the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. This act makes no reference to potential health or environmental impacts, so it falls outside the scope of the national scheme and has no relevance to the bill being discussed today. I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:39):** I rise to speak to the Gene Technology (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016. I note that the commonwealth Gene Technology Act came into being in 2000 and that the national gene technology regulatory system came into force in Australia in June 2001. Its aim is to identify and manage risks to human health and the environment posed by, or as a result of, gene technology.

The Gene Technology Act created the regulatory office, the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, within the federal government. This office is overseen by an independent Gene Technology Regulator whose role is to administer the laws and make decisions relating to gene technology research and development in Australia. The act also created a ministerial council comprising the commonwealth health minister and ministers from each state and territory to provide broad direction and regulatory guidance to the regulator.

The bill also relates to the gene technology scheme, which regulates dealings with genetically modified material. It does not look directly at the regulation of genetically modified food, which is dealt with by Food Standards Australia New Zealand, or genetically modified drugs, which is dealt with by the Therapeutic Goods Administration. The scheme covers the use of genes as tools, and possible uses include medical research and plant research.

In 2011, the commonwealth act was reviewed and 16 recommendations were presented to ministers at the gene technology forum. Of these recommendations, 14 were supported, or supported in principle. These recommendations fall within three main categories:

1. Modifications to the operations of the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator;
2. Minor technical, administrative and consequential amendments; and
3. Other technical amendments.

In August 2015, the commonwealth Gene Technology Amendment Bill 2015 was passed without amendment by the House of Representatives and the Senate and came into force on 10 March 2016. The commonwealth bill dealt with five minor technical, administrative and consequential amendments that have minimal impact on the technical operation of the act.

It is to be noted that South Australia is a signatory to the national Gene Technology Agreement, an intergovernmental agreement, which sets out the understanding between the



commonwealth, state and territory governments to establish a nationally consistent regulatory scheme. Within this agreement, the Gene Technology (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 before the house will bring the South Australian Gene Technology Act 2001 into alignment with the commonwealth legislation.

We have been informed that these changes will have minimal impact on the operation of gene technology activities within South Australia. We have been advised that three states have applied agreed provisions by reference to the national law and that three state parliaments currently have bills before them. This bill deals with the five recommendations from the 2011 review, which provide minor administrative changes to the scheme. A further six recommendations have been implemented by the office of the regulator, without the need for legislative change. Three more significant recommendations are still to be considered further by the ministerial council.

I note from some of the comments during the second reading debate that the agreement is, ultimately, to ensure a national fulfilment of the principles of the gene technology legislation to protect the health and safety of people and protect the environment. This is achieved by identifying risks posed by, or as a result of, gene technology, and by managing those risks through regulation or certain dealings, which include the manipulation, storage, transfer or disposal of genetically modified organisms.

It has been a long debate, certainly in South Australia, on whether or not to have genetically modified canola, for instance, grown in this state. I note that there is a moratorium until 2019, yet over previous years we have seen the Eastern States and Western Australia have the ability to grow genetically modified canola. We have this absurd situation where, if the seed is grown on our side of the country, whether it is in Victoria or New South Wales—although I understand there are some licences to grow seed in Mount Gambier, South Australia—that seed has to be transported around through the Northern Territory to get to Western Australia because you need fresh seed every year to grow genetically modified canola.

There has been some debate about how useful genetically modified canola is. The feedback I have received from farmers in states that have been utilising this technology is that certainly in the bad drought year in Western Australia, which was in the last five years, I believe, for some farms it was the only crop that yielded because they could dry sow it early. It took every drop of rain, and they sprayed weeds with Roundup where the rest of their crops failed. A lot of comparisons are made about whether there is a yield potential and a price differential. I do not think the price differential, especially, has ever been proven. We learnt on the select committee into the grain industry, when we went to Canada, that their canola is co-mingled with either GM canola or other canola that is grown—

**An honourable member:** Conventional.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Conventional canola—thank you. That is certainly co-mingled, and it does not harm their markets into Japan, for instance, because that is the way they have done it for years and continue to do it.

There has been a lot of discussion about a benefit cost or a price benefit through not having genetically modified canola as a tool, but I do not think it has ever been proven. I have never had any evidence put before me. Interestingly, there is an ongoing court case in Western Australia at Kojonup (I am not sure whether it is up to the appeal stage), and it was certainly something that I raised five years ago with the minister and his staff in Western Australia at the time about what was happening with that. They had some interesting insights into how that supposed contamination came about. Sometimes there are other forces at play. It has caused a lot of grief. It has torn apart a community, and I think it has helped to destroy the marriage of one couple at least. This case of an organic farm allegedly being contaminated with genetically modified canola has caused a lot of headaches in the small regional community.

It is interesting how the debate has progressed over time. Certainly, a lot of people accept soy as a product. From what I am told, 99 per cent of soy products in the world are genetically modified. Certainly, in the health scheme of things, insulin would not be around if it was not for genetic modification. In the member for Fisher's contribution, she talked about cotton, which is Bt cotton,

genetically modified cotton. Farmers can restrict insecticide sprays by eight to 10 times. That is a massive saving for a farmer.

The member for Flinders will be able to help me if I am off the mark, but I think it is now around \$18 a hectare just to hire planes without chemicals. That is a huge cost if you have to fly the plane over a crop, let alone pay for the appropriate chemical, and in this case it will be an insecticide, and insecticides are expensive and they do not take prisoners. As we have heard, there is a recovery rate with regard to ladybirds another species; they can get on with their life and play their part in nature.

Some of the issues for me include the world-leading research done at the Waite Research Institute, part of the University of Adelaide, where they have a plant accelerator. From what I understand, one side is dedicated to genetically modified breeding and the other side to the regular breeding of crops. It is interesting that this work still goes on. I do not know if it has slowed down at all with the current moratorium in South Australia, but that work goes on in this state and I am sure that they need a licence for that. The minister may be able to come back with a response in his contribution about what arrangements are happening there.

Also, from what I understand—and I am happy for the minister to correct me if I am wrong—there are licences for some of the major companies growing genetically modified canola seed in the Mount Gambier area still. I would be interested in comments regarding that and, depending on what comes back, we may go into committee.

You certainly hear a lot of things regarding growing genetically modified canola. We have hundreds of kilometres of the state border up alongside Victoria, and I am sure there are farmers who have land on either side of the border who can grow genetically modified canola on one side and not on the other. There are a few rumours circulating at the moment that there may have been some seed brought into South Australia. I must say that it is only a rumour at this stage. However, I would be interested in knowing how the government would manage that under the regulatory scheme and what testing can be done and what plant testing provisions there are in the case of a plant like canola to detect if it is actually genetically modified or not.

Certainly, with regard to the legislation in the bill, I notice that part 5 deals with all the arrangements around the licensing system, around the application program, how the regulator interacts with applicants and, further down, how genetically modified material might interact with the local environment. Clauses 5 and 6 amend section 46A and section 49. Section 49 deals with issues around the dealings proposed to be authorised by the licence, which are limited to one or more of the following for purposes relating to disposing of a GMO, so this is about the disposal process. This links with the following:

- (i) conducting experiments with the GMO;
- (ii) propagating the GMO;
- (iii) growing, raising or culturing the GMO;
- (iv) transporting the GMO;
- (v) any other dealings to be undertaken for the purposes of, or for purposes relating to, disposing of the GMO...

I would certainly be interested in some of the responses on how much genetically modified material is grown in this state, especially with regard to propagating seed whether it is by Monsanto or Bayer, which are both still live companies I am assuming. There have been a few amalgamations proposed recently with some—

**Mr Treloar:** It's hard to keep up.

**Mr PEDERICK:** —yes—chemical companies in the field. My understanding is that it does happen in this state and certainly there is work done at the Waite Institute. Across the world, there is some debate about whether genetically modified wheat would be useful. I think there is a small amount of it grown around the place, but I think it is on another level where it is grown with a grass. Obviously, canola has a broad leaf and there is a different regime of managing weeds with a broad leaf or with self-sown plants the year after that crop.

I see genetically modified plant breeding and how that has come into play over time as really, in the main, an acceleration of getting through the generations of the crossbreeding of plants. It is blown up at times to be something far more than that. It does take out a lot of the time to get through where you get varieties that have certain traits. Into the future there is probably a lot of potential in both drought-tolerant and saline-tolerant crops throughout the country, and that would certainly be beneficial for some farmers to use in their toolbox in the cropping periods.

There are a few questions around the licences. How many licences are put out through South Australia for the propagation of material? There are also other issues around conducting the use of genetically modified material, whether it is through the propagation or the disposal of that material. As I said earlier, I would also be interested to know whether there was a reasonably simple method of genetic testing that could test whether a product is actually modified material, so that could be identified in a timely manner without waiting for a lab test to come back. Then it could be dealt with quickly instead of waiting a longer time.

There certainly have been some benefits from genetic modification. It does create a lot of debate, but one thing about it is that if growing genetically modified canola were ever authorised in this state it would not make it compulsory to grow it; that is an option people can take up. It would have to be managed through the storage systems, as it has been across the world as a matter of course with their cropping programs. With those few words—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** I could keep going, but that will do. On this side of the house we support the bill, and I will be interested in the minister's response.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:57):** I rise, from this side of the house as well, to support the bill and suggest that it is an extremely exciting time in human history to be alive. It is an extremely exciting time to be here in this place this morning, listening to the debate on gene technology.

I do not allude to the exciting time in human history lightly because, for the first time ever, we have been able to map the genomes not just of ourselves but of every living plant and animal on the planet. Of course, who knows what that might mean or what might come from that, but we will certainly need some management and some control around the developments that occur. Ultimately, it will give us a much bigger impact on the way we treat disease, our survivability as a species, and the way we manage our agricultural production system, which has already been alluded to by the member for Hammond and also by the member for Fisher in their contributions today.

This bill goes at least part way toward managing and controlling the development of the technology. Australia's national gene technology regulatory system came into force in June 2001 through the Gene Technology Act. It aims to identify and manage any risks to human health and the environment posed by or as a result of gene technology. Way back in 2001, this technology was in its infancy, but the recognition was there that legislation had to be put in place around its development.

The Gene Technology Act created the regulatory office, the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, within the federal government. This office is overseen by an independent Gene Technology Regulator, whose role it is to administer the laws and make decisions relating to gene technology research and development across Australia. The act also created a ministerial council, comprising the commonwealth health minister and ministers from each state and territory, to provide broad direction and regulatory guidance to the regulator.

The bill relates to the gene technology scheme, which regulates dealings with genetically modified material. The scheme quite specifically does not look at the regulation of genetically modified food or genetically modified drugs; however, it covers the use of genes as tools where the end goal is not a food product or a drug product. Possible uses include medical research or plant research.

Those of us in this place who have been involved with agricultural systems would have had to be hiding under a rock over the last 20 years not to realise that significant changes are going on around the world in our agricultural systems. In 2002, I was fortunate enough to travel as a Nuffield Scholar. I visited the United States where some of the larger chemical companies were taking out

patents on their genetic developments, which is in itself a discussion for another day. It was a very exciting time and farmers in North America were adopting quite quickly Roundup Ready corn and also Bt corn, which, as the member for Fisher suggested—

**Mr Pederick:** Cotton.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I will get to cotton, Peds. I want to talk about corn first. It meant that weed control within these crops was much simpler and much more effective. It essentially meant that the plants themselves were resistant to glyphosate, which is the major component of the labelled chemical Roundup.

These developments were embraced quickly by North American farmers and within a very short time a significant acreage in North America was assigned to Roundup Ready corn. Roundup Ready soy beans was another major crop. Also, in Australia, Bt cotton was developed and grown. As the member for Hammond indicated, it significantly reduced the amount of chemical applications that were required because inherent in this genetically engineered variety was an insect resistance that made it much less susceptible to chemical attack.

It has been a rocky road and, in this state, we still have a moratorium on the growing and production of genetically engineered crops. It is probably a pity in a way that the focus has been on the farming systems themselves. I think there will come a time in the very near future when crops and grains are produced that have a beneficial aspect to human health. As we speak, there are developments in canola where there is an increased level of omega-3 bred into the grain.

Of course, we all know, via fish, how important omega-3 is to human health, and possibly a way of we as humans ingesting more omega-3 and gaining the benefits of that is through the genetically engineered canola crop. Another example that has been widespread across Asia is GM rice. Rice, of course, is the most widely grown—

**Mr Pederick:** Golden Rice.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Golden Rice. Rice is the most widely grown cereal in the world. Probably a quarter of the world's population relies on rice for its sustenance. In 2002, as I mentioned, I was travelling and studying under a farming scholarship. It was exciting because the genomes of these plants were being mapped at the time. They did not have the final results but I know that, within the last 10 years, they have finally managed to map the human genome and also the genomes of a number of the more significant cultivars around the world.

The house may be interested to know that there are around 19,000 or 20,000 genes in a human being, which puts us somewhere in between corn and wheat. It sounds a lot but, in fact, corn has around 12,000 genes within its genetic make-up and wheat has an extraordinary 100,000 genes. There are variations on that through the number of chromosomes, of course, but it is rather humbling to think that we, as a species, sit somewhere between corn and wheat. It really brings it back to a very base level.

As I said, it is an exciting time. We do support this bill because, in a way, it will foster the further research and further development of this very exciting technology. We are probably, as a species, on the cusp of some great things as a result of this. It is an exciting time to be alive, and I would suggest, Peds, that it is also an exciting time to be a farmer.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:05):** I thank members for their wide-ranging contributions. Many of the issues raised do not actually go to this bill but are really in connection with the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004. I am more than happy to take questions raised to the house, in particular by the member for Hammond, and speak to the Minister for Agriculture, who has responsibility for that bill, and get answers to his questions. I thank all members for their contributions and commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:05):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **ROAD TRAFFIC (ROADWORKS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:06):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker on this bill. The opposition certainly welcomes improved governance of roadworks, which includes enforcing the appropriate use of speed limit signs and, to that end, the removal of signage when works have been completed or suspended. This will help reduce obstruction to traffic flows and alleviate some congestion on our roads. Road safety signs are a critical part of managing the safety of road workers and motorists. They make us aware of potential hazards and the need to adjust to changed conditions, and they help in protecting our road workers, just as our emergency services workers are protected when stopping at an incident, with 25 km/h speed limits applicable for passing motorists.

I certainly do not oppose reduced speed limits when passing road hazards, road workers or an emergency incident, but the problem is that reduced speed limits are enforced when there are no roadworks in progress or any other road hazards. It is frustrating, it is dangerous, and drivers are frustrated at being forced to slow down when it is unnecessary. I believe it fosters an element of complacency, with drivers less and less inclined to obey the signs when they do see them. I am very happy to see this bill progress and to see some changes in regard to signage.

I commend the member for Unley for his work in bringing this important matter to the house earlier this year. It has been a longstanding concern for him, but one that the government has failed to take any action on until the member for Unley compelled those opposite into action. Of course, they could have worked with the member for Unley to pass his legislation several months ago, but this would go against the government's own mantra. Rather than working with the opposition, they simply shut down debate and introduced their own bill.

Clearly, not only is the government lacking initiative and devoid of any new ideas but it is also incapable of putting aside political opportunism for the benefit of all South Australians. At least we are here now. Finally, those responsible for erecting reduced speed limit signs will also be responsible for ensuring that they are only in effect when necessary and ensuring that traffic keeps flowing after work has ceased, which is most important.

It is also encouraging to finally see positive steps towards improving the coordination between utilities and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. For too long we have seen the situation where drivers have been inconvenienced by expensive roadworks with traffic delays and congestion whilst roads are dug up, relaid and sealed, only for the new road to be dug up shortly afterwards by a different operator.

It begs the question: why has it taken so long for this government to act? Why has it taken so long for this government to move to end this waste? We know that this government is well into its fourth term, yet we are only now seeing some action in regard to this issue. In the minister's own words, he has acknowledged that it has been a longstanding problem, but it is only now that the government has taken steps to address the unnecessary disruption, the unnecessary congestion and, of course, the unnecessary duplication.

Within this bill, I think there is also a missed opportunity and the government's focus is too narrow. This government is so accustomed to quick fixes and bandaid solutions that it is unable to lift its gaze beyond the ground immediately in front of it. It has been distracted by failed land sales, a crumbling child protection system and the most expensive hospital in the world not to have a single patient in it, while its key personnel are busy safeguarding their own futures and appointing themselves to certain positions.

In the committee stage, the opposition will have an opportunity to seek some amendments in relation to the ability to make left-hand turns as part of this bill. The Australian Road Rules currently allow a left turn at a red traffic light but not a red traffic arrow if there is a 'left turn on red permitted

after stopping' sign. This is rule 56(1)(a) of the Australian Road Rules, and there are other provisions of the Road Rules such as the give-way rule at 62(1)(b) which also caters for the situation in which they were framed. In effect, the law already allows for left turns if the appropriate signs are put up at an intersection where this option is seen as desirable, and that is included in the member for Unley's amendments.

South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Northern Territory, Western Australia, ACT and Tasmania's Road Rules all allow left turns on red after stopping where the sign is displayed. After trials at five intersections in 2013-14 with strong support from commuters and locals alike, the Brisbane City Council introduced left turn on red facilities across Brisbane. There are now 49 signed locations to this effect. Indeed, across most of the United States and Canada, turning right on red after stopping is allowed, keeping in mind that driving in North America is on the right-hand side of the road.

It is a policy motivated not only by a desire to relieve traffic congestion at clear intersections but also importantly to reduce drivers' fuel costs and reduce the carbon footprint. Yet, despite the obvious benefits, there are only six intersections in South Australia signposted to allow a left turn on red after stopping, and this is despite the obvious need to take action to improve traffic flows on our roadways. Motorists, commuters and the general community are all too aware of the increasing congestion and increasing travel times on our road network.

In the last 15 years, traffic along many of our roads has been reduced to a crawl during peak times, with the city and surrounds often left motionless by gridlock. Average speeds on some routes have decreased by 15 km/h under Labor's watch, thanks to inadequate transport planning, unreliable public transport provision, a massive road maintenance backlog and poorly managed roadwork control. Each one has made a contribution to longer travel times for motorists. Each one has added to the frustration experienced every day by all road users.

The number of registered cars is now equal to the state's total population. As more people respond to Labor's failure to provide viable transport alternatives, they opt to drive. Motorists waiting to turn left are regularly forced to stop and sit idle, waiting for a red light to change. Whether in peak traffic periods or at times of lower traffic volume, it is an unnecessary delay. It is frustrating for motorists and encumbers traffic flows.

The proposed amendments will help get our traffic moving again by allowing motorists to access the turn left on red option at appropriate intersections and when safe to do so as a practical and low-cost way of decreasing individual travel times, easing congestion and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The amendments propose regular audits of intersections by DPTI to identify suitable and appropriate intersections to expand turn left on red signage. Each intersection would be assessed for safety against those Australian standards that are required, and intersections would be restricted to locations where the speed limit is 60 km/h or less.

Reducing road congestion, and keeping our traffic moving, is a significant challenge for our state and, of course, critical to our economy. We must make the most of our existing road networks and infrastructure and use them to our full potential. Allowing motorists to turn left on a red light after stopping is fundamental to this strategy. It is a simple step and one that is fully supported on this side of the house, and I do ask for the support of those opposite to allow common sense to prevail and show confidence that South Australian drivers are equal to those in other parts of Australia and overseas, and especially in Queensland. If they can safely navigate the turn left on red after stopping rule, I am sure we can as well. During the minister's second reading speech, he noted:

The bill also addresses the source of much public anger and criticism that drivers are subject to fines for exceeding the posted speed limit at roadworks when there have been no road workers present at the site. The reason for this is that the Road Traffic Act contains [a]...provision that deems all traffic control devices to be lawfully installed and therefore must be complied with. In addition, some drivers may not appreciate the lower speed limit is required due to a level of hazard associated with the roadworks. This...presumption will be amended so that the offence does not apply in certain times when, for example, workers are not within the vicinity of the roadworks, but the work area necessitates a slower speed due to certain conditions which create a hazard (such as loose gravel or steel plates).

There are some comments I would like to explore further in the committee stage, as they do at times seem a bit ambiguous: will a driver be able to escape penalty for exceeding the speed limit sign under certain conditions, when would it be considered okay for a motorist to exceed a speed limit,

how would drivers know if it is okay to exceed the speed limit, what if workmen are present, but the driver does not seem to see them, and is this not potentially placing road workers at greater danger?

The application and enforcement of the bill are also cause for further consideration. Will the department face the same penalty as construction companies or contractors in terms of erecting and removing signs? Who will manage and enforce the removal of unnecessary roadwork signs? How will the bill require public authorities to comply with guidelines and better align South Australia with nationally agreed road practices?

Operation Moving Traffic is an important aspiration, and it is good to finally see the government taking some positive steps in this regard to address traffic congestion and traffic flow. It is, indeed, long overdue. We all agree with that. It is a shame that this falls so far short of what South Australians need. As the minister noted:

South Australia depends on its road and public transport networks to reliably and efficiently move people and goods where and when they are needed. How we manage congestion on our road network has a direct bearing on the mobility of our community, our economy and our competitiveness, as a great place both to live and to do business.

I could not agree with the minister any more in this regard. It is why we need to address major bottlenecks and it is why we need to invest in our infrastructure.

Analysis of the road quality of Belair Road, Unley Road, Goodwood Road, Glen Osmond Road, Cross Road and Greenhill Road, obtained under FOI, indicates endemic lack of maintenance. Unley Road is rated as having the poorest road quality, with 60 per cent of the south-bound lane rated as mediocre or very poor. That analysis was conducted back in 2013. For those who use the road daily—as many people in my electorate do—they know that road has deteriorated even further since that time, with no substantial work having been undertaken to improve the road quality since 2013.

Poor road quality of our major arterial roads is not just inconvenient; it is a major safety issue as well. This month, the Mitcham council agreed to write to DPTI noting the unacceptable traffic congestion during peak hours on Belair Road, Blythewood Road, and Taylors Road. They will be asking the department to review measures, which include improving public transport options to reduce congestion.

Oaklands crossing has been a serious problem for motorists in our community for decades, yet of course we know the state Labor government still does not have a plan to fix this crossing; no plans to invest in infrastructure needed to help those South Australians who live, work and play in the region; and no plans to invest in the promised park-and-ride facilities, despite an election promise to commit \$7.5 million towards a number of sites around Adelaide.

Park-and-ride facilities are vital to attracting more people to use our train and bus services. Increased usage of our public transport system would help reduce demand on the road system and decrease road congestion across much of our road network. People will not catch a bus or take a train if they cannot find a park at a station. Year on year the state government has failed to invest in public transport infrastructure, investment that would make public transport more attractive, more accessible and actually improve patronage.

In my electorate, there has been little to no investment in existing infrastructure, investment that would help address increasing congestion and improve the road system for people commuting to work, for industry and for the movement of fast and reliable on-road public transport to and from middle and outer Adelaide. Traffic volumes along Main Road, Blackwood, and at the Blackwood roundabout are expected only to get worse as the population grows.

The state Labor government has failed to adequately invest in maintenance programs and ensure our infrastructure needs keep pace with demographic change. The minister may claim that the state government has delivered record infrastructure spend with projects such as Torrens to Torrens, Darlington, Port River Expressway, Northern Connector and the O-Bahn project, but the reality is that we can thank the federal government for the majority of this funding, having provided \$1.7 billion towards the \$2.5 billion north-south road corridor upgrade. At least we are seeing some progress through this bill, albeit at the behest of the member for Unley.

The appropriate use of speed limit signs, including the removal of signage when works have been completed or suspended, will help improve traffic flows and reduce driver frustration. Enforcing the removal of signage sends a clear message, ensuring that the signs are not left up through either laziness or forgetfulness, and it will improve the safety of workers on road sites. If signs are up for a reason, the motorist will be inclined to take them seriously.

**Mr GEE (Napier) (12:21):** The member for Davenport neglected to talk about the spectacular disaster that was the Southern Expressway and, yes, it was this side of the house that fixed that up. I did not rise today to talk about all of the other disasters that we inherited from that group on the other side of the chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Napier is entitled to be heard in silence.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Heysen and member for Hammond, you are both called to order because the Speaker told me I was to keep a tight rein on you all this morning.

**Mr GEE:** I rise to support the Road Traffic (Roadworks) Amendment Bill 2016 to ensure that there can be safe and efficient roadworks, while limiting the impact on our community. This bill will keep Adelaide moving as it addresses the inappropriate and incorrect usage of roadworks speed limits. I think one of the things that is most frustrating to motorists is driving through a roadworks zone at night, or on the weekend, where no work is occurring, and it is safe to drive at a higher speed limit.

I know from the road safety works that are currently occurring on Main North Road at Smithfield, and will occur in the future at the intersection of Dalkeith Road and Main North Road, that motorists, including those of heavy vehicles, would be frustrated at driving at 25 km/h when workers are not on site. Following the passing of this bill that will be illegal. The minister talked about Port Road, West Terrace and our record infrastructure spend, highlighting major roads that have or could be affected by this bill, but inconvenience also occurs on suburban roads, such as during the upgrades on Craigmore Road at Blakeview, the new One Tree Hill roundabout, and the future works on Yorktown Road. I believe this will be a very welcome law change that will benefit motorists across South Australia.

Another key part of this bill is to ensure more coordination between utilities and DPTI when major road upgrades are planned, so that a road is not resurfaced and then, within months, further roadworks are occurring on services under that road surface. I am sure every member in this chamber can identify roads where this has occurred. It is frustrating and totally unnecessary. This bill will require utilities to consider the impact of work on traffic flows, congestion and public transport routes and require them to better plan roadworks to avoid peak times.

The bill also increases penalties for failure to comply with the bill and overly disrupting the community. I am pleased to see this bill has come forward, following attempts by the opposition to score a few political points without any thought or policy judgement.

**An honourable member:** Who wrote this for you?

**Mr GEE:** So true. I encourage all members to support the bill and hope to see it implemented very soon as further works occur in my electorate and across the state as this government invests in the future, while the opposition struggles to make any real policy in this area at all. I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:24):** I rise to debate the Road Traffic (Roadworks) Amendment Bill 2016, and I come in after that blistering attack. The amendment bill seeks to prevent inappropriate and incorrect usage of roadworks speed limits and other traffic control measures which cause congestion on our roads. It comes on from a private member's bill, the Road Traffic (Work Area Speed Limit Signs) Amendment Bill, introduced into the house by the member for Unley in March this year. This government bill has covered off on roadworks and signage, and it covers areas of the legislation that could have been tidied up a long time ago.



There has been some debate in this house this morning about the congestion and disruption to traffic caused by roadworks and the increasing problems in Adelaide. We need to remember that the state is far bigger than Adelaide and that, when we have these major disruptions for up to a year at a time on some of our major highways, it is a real disruption for the effectiveness and the efficiency of getting our material transported to where it needs to go. This bill is primarily working to minimise the impacts of roadworks on commuters and to prevent inappropriate and incorrect usage of roadworks and other control measures that cause congestion.

As I indicated, we need to not only address the economic impacts and the lost productivity of this disruption and congestion but also ensure that people who work on our roads remain safe. We need compliance and we need the standards worked through to prevent situations where drivers may be subject to fines for exceeding posted speed limits at works where there are no workers present at the site and there is no safety need for those road signs to be there. There needs to be a permit regime whereby the Commissioner of Highways may issue a permit to a business or entity requiring to use speed signs for roadworks that may cause congestion where noncompliance would potentially void the permit.

The bill will introduce better coordination between utilities and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure when planning major upgrades, including timing and avoiding duplication. Penalty levels are updated so that breaching conditions or incorrect use will result in penalties from a maximum of \$20,000 for the first offence to a subsequent \$50,000. I note that the Civil Contractors Federation has voiced some issues around the level of the fines, but I think a lot of that is being dealt with in regard to when they will be applied.

The bill will also authorise officers to remove speed limit signs used inappropriately—for example, when workers are not engaged at the work area—and give rights of appeal to the District Court for any party aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner of Highways. It will exempt the RAA and emergency services and others who, temporarily, as part of their role, obviously need to control traffic speed when stopped to render assistance.

When you are going down the freeway, the Dukes Highway or the Mallee Highway, and you see blue and red flashing lights—whether it is an ambulance or a police car that has pulled someone up—and you need to get back to 25 km/h, that is a fair change from when you are sitting on 110 km/h. I understand the safety aspect, but a lot of people, especially on our highways, pull up in one heck of a hurry and the anchors are thrown out. I have been present when some people have not realised what the speed is and they are wondering why you are backing off. They then see the flashing lights and realise that you do have to get back to that speed.

Public authorities will also be subject to the permit regime, except where the roadworks are a matter of urgency. As I said, there were some concerns with the Civil Contractors Federation. They certainly support reasonable measures to ease traffic congestion and improve road safety, but they are concerned that some elements of the bill are over-regulatory and unnecessarily complex. In saying that, there certainly is some need for compliance, but there is also a need for roadworks to be completed in a timely fashion.

In regard to some of the major roadworks in my electorate—and I met with staff from the department about four weeks ago, and I thank the minister for allowing them to meet with me—there are some significant issues around the constant disruption to traffic on both the Mallee Highway and the Dukes Highway around the motorsport park development near Tailem Bend. It is a significant issue on each road. On the Mallee Highway, there is only a small area where you have to slow down to 80 km/h because roadworks are being conducted, and I believe this has been in place for up to 12 months. It has been ongoing for many months.

The Dukes Highway is worse, where on multiple occasions you have to slow down to 80 km/h, go back to 110 km/h for a few hundred metres, go back to 80 km/h, and so on about four or five times. It causes massive congestion. It is disregarded when truck drivers realise that there is no compliance happening. The radio buzzes and there is discussion about whether speed cameras, or the 'flash for cash' as they are known, are in attendance, and people disregard the speed limits. I know why the 80 km/h speed limits are still in place, even though not a lot of work has happened in the previous few months.

The excuse has been that it has been raining. Well, it has not been raining to any great extent for a little while now, for quite a few weeks. The issue is that the road has a partly damaged surface. I can understand why the 80 km/h signs are in place where there is an excavated shoulder—fair enough. But I did stress to the department staff that we need to get on with it, because at the time the hay season was in motion, and underway now is what I believe to be the biggest harvest in South Australia. It certainly has the potential to be the biggest harvest.

There are many trucks on the road as Tailem Bend is an inland strategic port, a strategic site. Viterra does a pretty reasonable job of receiving grain there, especially now they are manning their so-called unmanned weighbridge at the exit to the site, but that is another point. The issue for the Mallee farmers is that there will be many hundreds of movements per day of trucks because there is no access to the Mallee railway line anymore. In its last years of operation, it was getting down to where it could only operate in the cool weather, and then it was down to 25 km/h.

Trains would be loaded at Pinnaroo or Lameroo during the day, and then the trains would operate at night because of the poor maintenance of the track. Sadly, from both the Loxton line and the Pinnaroo line, we do not have any rail transport. That will put many hundreds of extra trucks on the road over time, thousands during harvest, and create another complication. It is complicated more by these roadworks that have been ever present on the Mallee Highway near the intersection with the Dukes Highway.

As I indicated, the issue along the Dukes Highway has been ongoing for many months and people get over it. I believe this is the fourth busiest highway in the country and it is certainly the connector between Adelaide and Melbourne. The overnight runners or the trucks can do that trip in nine or 10 hours quite easily. Even though there is a very good rail line between Adelaide and Melbourne, it makes that inefficient with the off-load and on-load time lines at each end, so you are far better off to put it on a B-double or a single semitrailer and send it direct from the freight terminus to your customer at the other end.

My issue is not just that these roadworks are happening currently next to the motorsport park but that they have happened there previously. When the overtaking lane was built there, it was excavated, laid out and we were left with a rubble strip on the new lane for many, many months. It is not good road making. It could have been compacted. I am prepared to cop it because I am not a road engineer, but I think it is outrageous that these roads are left in a half-made state for so long.

I must commend the minister's staff, one of whom emailed me and suggested that there was going to be some work down there, and there has been. There has been some re-sheeting, but the final bitumen or hot mix has not been put on, the lines painted and everything done so that we can get everything back to 110 km/h. It does cause a lot of frustration, and people wonder what is going on.

I do not need pointed out to me that the access point on the north-western end near the Mallee Highway, where there has been a small intersection point made there for travellers coming from Adelaide to enter the motorsport park, is not extremely obvious. It has road signs now in the way so that people know it is there, but there is a concrete kerb in the middle of the road and it is going to need some good signage when it comes into use, hopefully in the not too distant future.

It is a frustration and, as I said, not just at this time. A four-lane overtaking lane was put in between Cooke Plains and Coomandook, and there was the same effect, where a rubble side was left out and not worked on for months and, when they finally laid the bitumen, they still managed to leave a lump in at one spot. When I overtake trucks on my way home towards Coomandook, I notice that the trucks know where the lump is and try to move out around it so that they are not shaking their load.

We need to get on with the roadworks. Both federal and state money was put in to this project at the motorsport park at Tailem Bend. From what I understand, the Peregrine group has made some changes to some of its plans and I believe some of that is waiting for some development approval on where some of the infrastructure is going to go. However, in the main, I think a lot of that has been settled now.

The roadworks need to be done because of the increase in traffic. Especially when you have a big harvest like this one, with extended opening times, one farmer might be able to send a

semitrailer up that road six or eight times a day. If farmers do that multiple times, with hundreds delivering into Tailem Bend from as far south as Tintinara or even Keith, there are a lot more truck movements and a lot more movements on the road, and people do get frustrated.

I acknowledge that it has been a bit of a cash injection for the government when the speed cameras have been placed down there, but I understand people's frustration when the signs are constantly in place and people do not see any progress with a project. Get the work completed so that we can get the road up to speed and so that people know where these speed limits are into the future. At times, it seems like we are in a constant phase of roadworks, especially on these main highways in our state.

I certainly commend the bill. I commend the intent, but it is not going to address all the issues we have, because obviously roadworks have to comply with standards, and if the road is not built to the standard, they cannot just change the speed back to 110 km/h. I believe that is addressed through the amendments in the bill, but it does create that issue where people are frustrated by ongoing roadworks that seem to go on forever. I will be interested in the committee debate and to see the progress of this bill through the house.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:40):** I am very pleased to see this bill in the house. I think the main benefit of this bill, from my point of view, will be the coordination of roadworks. Obviously, the bill will do its bit in making sure that happens. The important thing will be the implementation, of course, and making sure that there is adequate forward planning amongst all the departments, agencies and government-owned corporations, such as SA Water and what have you, to ensure that there is a lot of forward planning around roadworks and public works and to make sure they are able to do that in the most efficient way possible.

This bill should see a broader saving across government in terms of a reduction in public works and the general price of public works across government, which is always to be commended. I think the reduction in inconvenience to commuters, of course, is to be celebrated and certainly encouraged, but also the cost to the economy. In the minister's second reading speech, he mentioned an example of how one hour's closure can cost in the area of \$100,000, just from delays experienced by people caught in that traffic. It looks to me to be a somewhat conservative estimation based on \$20 per hour per vehicle, and that has not really been adjusted.

The cost figures used in that have not been adjusted since that methodology was introduced in the early 2000s, if I recall correctly from the minister's speech. It is fair to say that it is quite possibly more, and that estimate of 6,000 cars, I think it was, caught up for an hour could cost upwards of \$100,000. This gives some justification for what may, at first glance, seem to be fairly heavy penalties in the fines and everything else, but when the effect on the broader economy is taken into account, that is certainly put in context.

I very much support the safety of the workers being paramount. In the event that speed signs around the roadworks area are to be removed, workers' safety or driver safety is to be the primary consideration before convenience, and that is as it should be, but where the safety requirement can be met and then convenience can be catered for, that is certainly a good thing.

As the member for Hammond said, it can be very frustrating, when travelling on a highway particularly, to have to slow down and speed up and slow down and speed up when there is no obvious safety requirement to be slowing down and certainly no presence of workers and no deterioration in the road surface or anything else like that. Being able to maintain a consistent speed is good for not only your fuel economy but also your trip time and it is certainly a lot less frustrating. Insofar as this bill assists with a reduction in those occurrences, that is obviously a good thing.

The final issue I will briefly talk about is the encroachment of building works onto a lane, particularly in the CBD. You might find that a lane would be closed or intruded upon by perhaps a boundary fence that gets extended out. When that intrudes onto a traffic lane, it takes a three-lane road down to two, and that may be the case for a very large part of the duration of that construction.

You might have a multistorey building going in and a lane is closed for no apparent reason. There may well be good reasons for it, and I am assuming it can be assessed on a case-by-case basis, but something that the city council may choose to consider, and I urge them to do so, is lane

rentals. Where a developer thinks they need to shut down a lane and inconvenience motorists, particularly in the CBD, the city council should have the right to charge them for that lane and to make them rent that lane, and thus perhaps encourage people to consider more fully the need for that lane closure and alternative ways of undertaking the development that would not inconvenience motorists by blocking off a lane for an extended period of time.

I think that is within the power of the city council to do, and it is something they should give serious consideration to. Obviously, the city has its peak periods when there are very heavy traffic loads. We have seen the effect of the cost of delay (I think it is an hour) on the broader economy from just the minister's example in his second reading speech and, given that you can replicate that in any given number of locations right across the state including the CBD, it is something that should be given very serious consideration.

I urge members to support the bill. I thank the minister for bringing it into the house because it is a very practical bill that will give rise to serious benefits for not only individual road users but right across the economy.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:46):** I rise to make a few remarks in relation to this bill and highlight a couple of local examples around the beautiful electorate of Schubert. Firstly, I would like to detail that, through good local government money but also through Black Spot road funding and supplementary road funding, we have had some good outcomes for the people of Schubert in recent times.

The Samuel, Seppeltsfield and Stelzer roads roundabout in the Light Regional Council was a great win, especially on the back of the sealing of Stelzer Road. Again, as people move through that intersection currently, it is good that the local works being undertaken are quite accommodating to residents and people needing to drive past. I was detoured down to Stonewall Road the other day, but I could see that the roadworks and the blockages that were in place were very much a response to things that were happening and the works being undertaken at that time.

We are also seeing an upgrade at the moment to the corner of Vine Vale and Light Pass roads. This is perhaps the most notorious intersection in the Barossa and one where I saw an accident happen where a non-local driver with his family went through the stop sign and had what could have been a much more major collision with a car coming up Vine Vale Road. It could have turned to real disaster but did not.

That intersection is being widened and upgraded and that is fantastic. Again, the local crews who are working on that are extremely mindful of the fact that residents still need to go around. The restrictions there are extremely sensible, and I have not driven past at a time when the signage was up but the workers were not there working. They seem very respectful and cognisant of people needing to get about their daily lives and that is absolutely fantastic.

The third one was around the Stockwell and Angaston roads upgrade where we had a significant win. We got the give way sign which was recently installed moved back to a stop sign after a long-running campaign by myself and the Barossa local paper, *The Leader*, and that intersection has also been upgraded. Again, it was done in the right spirit of how roadworks and traffic restrictions should be done.

I want to commend the council for their role in that. It seems to me that when the beautiful roses at the entrance to Tanunda are being pruned, for instance, that it is done in a way that minimises traffic restrictions. The main street of Tanunda is being resealed at the moment after a lengthy wait, and the people of the Barossa are extremely excited about it. Again, those roadworks have been negotiated so that they are conducted only from 6pm until 6am, allowing the local traders to be able to continue to trade. The main street of Tanunda, Murray Street, is perhaps the busiest road, or second busiest behind Murray Street in Nuriootpa, in the Barossa. For that whole stretch to be resealed whilst still giving people access for the vast majority of the time, I think it is a great credit to the council in the way that it was organised, and those traffic restrictions were done properly.

I have one example a local resident brought to me of perhaps a suboptimal example of road restrictions: the Sturt Highway. Barriers and restrictions were put up turning a 110 km/h zone into an 80 km/h zone around an area where some of the barrier operating in the median of the road was

blocked off. No work was undertaken for months, yet there was a traffic restriction in that area. I know it was frustrating to me, as somebody who has to drive that road at least four or five times a week.

A number of residents have talked to me about the fact that there were traffic restrictions for months when no work was being undertaken, and I know that was frustrating for everybody involved. Luckily enough, it has now been fixed, but it is an example of where road restrictions have not been used properly, to the detriment of local residents. I think we can all appreciate that workers need to be safe when they are doing the work. I do not think anybody in here would speak against that. By that same token, when motorists drive past traffic restrictions where no work is being undertaken, I think that can be quite frustrating and unproductive.

All the examples I have just talked about are along freight route corridors within the Barossa, which makes it even more important for the significant amount of freight that moves through the Barossa area. I commend this bill to the house and I look forward to seeing improvements in the way these things are conducted.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (12:52):** I thank the members who have made a contribution on this bill. As those members have said to the house, this is an important bill. This is another way in which we can improve the efficiency of the road transport network. All those efforts in those different areas, in my view, are not only necessary but are to be applauded.

I want to make reference to some of the comments that have been made today by members on this bill, particularly the contribution from the member for Davenport who, in the absence of the member for Unley, is leading the opposition's contribution. I thank him for support of this bill. The member for Davenport lamented that we were unable to accommodate or adopt the member for Unley's previous bill, which was before this place earlier this year. He claimed, somewhat erroneously, that we could have dealt with this matter fulsomely at that point in time had we only countenanced supporting the member for Unley's bill. Of course, that is not the case.

It was, as was described both in a press release I issued and also in news reports, a manifestly inadequate bill which was put forward by the member for Unley. It only contemplated penalising the inappropriate use of one particular traffic control measure: the 25 km/h speed sign which may have been implemented inappropriately on the road corridor. Of some concern, was the fact that that did not countenance all the other frustrations that motorists experience from roadworks which can delay their progress along the road network, such as other speed limits—and that is particularly important to consider in the context of the member for Hammond's contribution that we should always be mindful of how we treat regional roads; it is not just about roads in the metropolitan area.

Traffic control devices, particularly speed limit signs, in use in regional areas may be reducing a speed limit—as the member for Hammond said, if there are excavated shoulders, for example, or other hazards caused by roadworks—where there is a reduction in the speed limit from 110 km/h or 100 km/h down to, say, 80, 60 or even 40. None of those were considered by the member for Unley's bill, which he put up earlier this year, nor did he countenance detours, road or lane closures or temporary traffic lights. It also did not address traffic control signs used during events that contribute to delays if they are not removed appropriately and poorly scheduled roadworks that either clash with other significant uses of the road corridor or can cause significant disruption and interruption to motorists if those roadworks are delayed beyond their scheduled completion date.

All these matters, on the other hand, are dealt with in this bill, and it is important that we have a comprehensive reform of how roadworks are managed on our roads. I do applaud the member for Unley in one respect. Unlike many of his predecessors from the other side, he actually appears to be taking some interest in the transport portfolio. We have heard members opposite, in their contributions on both this bill and also other transport-related matters, lament the action, or lack thereof, by the government on matters regarding the efficiency of the transport network, whether that is congestion or improvements of the roads.

If they took a mere 15 seconds to peruse the transport areas of the 2006, 2010 and 2014 Liberal Party election manifestos—because that is all it would take—they would realise how little attention was paid to each of these. In fact, I can quote them verbatim. That was 2006. That was

2010. That was 2014. That is a verbatim recollection of the contribution they made on these important matters, so it is no surprise that when somebody, for the first time, has a crack at this, it is done in a cursory—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order. Member for Davenport.

**Mr DULUK:** If the minister could table that document, that would be appreciated.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Here it is, Deputy Speaker. Thank you, member for Davenport, for enforcing that that be on the record. That is much appreciated. Of course, the member for Davenport also says that an amendment is foreshadowed at the committee stage from, ostensibly, the member for Unley, about allowing left-hand turns at red lights. This has received some public and media attention. The government's position is that we do not support the measure. We do not support that measure for a couple of reasons. One is that allowing that in the form described by the member for Unley increases the risk of collisions between both motor vehicles and also other road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, for example.

An alternative treatment, which has been rolled out at major intersections around metropolitan Adelaide, is the introduction of the 'left turn any time with care', where there is effectively a slip lane on the left-hand side of the intersection, which creates a deliberate conflict between other road users, like pedestrians and cyclists, where they have to cross the path of a motorist who wants to turn left. That specifically draws the attention of both road user groups to that conflict and it also requires the motorist who is seeking to turn left to give way to the other road users.

That is a more appropriate treatment. If the opposition were going to suggest that they wanted to see more and more of that at other intersections, I could countenance that and I could support that. Obviously, as they have recognised through their suggestion, if we can allow more cars to make a turning movement at an intersection and free up road space, that would contribute to lessening congestion on our roads. However, in its current guise, we do not support the contingent notice of motion that I understand has been placed on the *Notice Paper* by the member for Unley. I also notice that there was some reflection from the member for Davenport. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### **INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today year 6s from Cowell Area School, who are guests of the member for Flinders.

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

#### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Examination of the Brown Hill and Keswick Creeks Stormwater Management Project Report for Period November 2016 [Ordered to be published]  
Health Information Technology Systems Report for Period November 2016 [Ordered to be published]

## Local Government Annual Reports—

Barossa Council, The Annual Report 2015-16  
Barunga West Annual Report 2015-16  
Ceduna, District Council of Annual Report 2015-16  
Elliston, District Council of Annual Report 2015-16  
Franklin Harbour, District Council of Annual Report 2015-16  
Goyder, Regional Council of Annual Report 2015-16  
Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2015-16  
Kimba, District Council of Annual Report 2015-16  
Murray Bridge, The Rural City of Annual Report 2015-16  
Port Lincoln, City of Annual Report 2015-16  
Tatiara District Council Annual Report 2015-16  
Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2015-16

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

A Fresh Start: Government of South Australia's response to the Child Protection Systems  
Royal Commission Report—The Life They Deserve Report

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

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office for Public Integrity—Review  
of the Operation— Annual Report 2015-16  
Police Act 1998—Review under Section 74A—Annual Report 2015-16  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Serious and Organised Crime (Control)—Prescribed forms of Association  
South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—Enforcement of  
Monetary Orders  
Rules made under the following Acts—  
Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 59  
Supreme Court—Special Applications Supplementary—Amendment No. 4

## By the Minister for Child Protection Reform (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Children and Young People (Safety) Bill 2016

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

Health Advisory Council—  
Balaklava Riverton Annual Report 2015-16  
Berri Barmera District Health Annual Report 2015-16  
Coorong Health Service Annual Report 2015-16  
Eudunda Kapunda Annual Report 2015-16  
Hawker District Memorial Annual Report 2015-16  
Mid North Annual Report 2015-16  
Mount Gambier and Districts Annual Report 2015-16  
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Annual Report 2015-16  
Northern and Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2015-16  
Renmark Paringa District Annual Report 2015-16  
Southern Flinders Annual Report 2015-16  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Health Care—Private Hospital

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

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Minister for Veterans' Affairs (Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton—Smith)—

ANZAC Day Commemoration Council—Annual Report 2015-16

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

Breakaways Conservation Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2015-16

Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Funds Board of Advice—Annual Report 2015-16

Regulations made under the following Acts—

SACE Board of South Australia—Fees

Children's Protection—Miscellaneous No. 2

By the Minister for Higher Education and Skills (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Construction Industry Training Board—Annual Report 2015-16

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

Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Department of—Annual Report 2015-16

#### *Ministerial Statement*

#### **DENTAL SERVICES**

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Last week, I wrote to the federal Minister for Health, Hon. Sussan Ley MP, to inform her of my deep concerns over the lack of advice from the commonwealth government about its commitment to funding public dental services. The National Partnership Agreement (NPA) on Adult Public Dental Services expired on 30 June and is yet to be replaced with a new agreement. Minister Ley wrote to all state and territory health ministers prior to the federal election, stating that the commonwealth would extend this NPA for six months to 31 December. However, since then the commonwealth has made no moves to formalise this apparent intention to extend the NPA.

No explanation has been provided for this delay and the reasons for it remain a mystery. In any case, even if the extension were formalised tomorrow, it would only last for another month before again expiring. The commonwealth government has previously announced plans to replace both the NPA on Adult Public Dental Services and the Child Dental Benefits Schedule with a new Child and Adult Public Dental Scheme. I understand the intention was for this new scheme to be in place by 1 January; however, negotiations around this proposal appear to have stalled due to the commonwealth government's difficulty in passing legislation through the parliament.

Minister Ley has made commitments to the COAG Health Council that, should the commonwealth's legislation not be passed in a timely manner, the arrangements under the current NPA on Adult Public Dental Services would be extended until 30 June next year. However, again, we have not heard anything further from the commonwealth on this matter. Time is quickly running out, and it is completely unacceptable that South Australia and other states and territories have been left in this state of limbo. Throughout the year, the commonwealth has only engaged in sporadic negotiations on this issue, and we have no idea what level of funding they will commit to dental services beyond the end of 2016.

All states and territories have been left in an uncertain financial position by this delay which has also created genuine operational risks for the SA Dental Service and compromised its ability to maintain an appropriately trained workforce. I call on all members, for once, to stand up to their federal colleagues and join me in strongly criticising the Turnbull government for the needless uncertainty it has created in this matter, as well as calling on the commonwealth to announce its intentions without further delay.



*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Finnis would have been called to order were it not for the provocation from the Minister for Health.

#### **JOBS AND EXPORT PROGRAM**

**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) (14:18):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** The 2016 international trade and business mission program has just been completed, and the 2017 program is being released today. It is a jobs and export program because its principal objective is to boost exports, create jobs and build new opportunities for the state. The success of the 2016 program and the government's strategy of regularly scheduling overseas missions has been endorsed by major business and industry organisations.

South Australia's cooperative arrangement with the Australian government's trade commission for exporters, Austrade, has been a cornerstone of our success. I thank the outgoing head of Austrade, Bruce Gosper, and congratulate him and the Austrade team on their efforts and also him personally on his appointment as Australia's High Commissioner to Singapore.

The aim of this government's trade and investment activity is to ensure that South Australia is internationally engaged and outward looking. Official data shows our strategies are working. Approximately 320 companies have been assisted during these missions, including 119 to China, 61 to India, 81 to South-East Asia and 18 to North Asia. A special defence-focused mission to Europe in October included 23 key South Australian defence-related companies, each given unprecedented access to the highest levels of international prime contractors and government organisations.

In these past 10 months, the outbound trade mission program delivered around 1,500 new business connections for participating South Australian companies and over 650 new export leads, with a combined estimated value of \$300 million. Earlier this month, the latest national and state accounts showed that South Australian gross state product was the third highest of the states, behind New South Wales and Victoria. Within those account figures, domestic spending grew 1.1 per cent in the year, while total GSP (measure of economic output) grew 1.9 per cent. The difference between these two figures reflects the export contribution to GSP growth.

Official Australian Bureau of Statistics data shows that, in volume terms, South Australia's exports of goods grew 11.2 per cent between 2014-15 and 2015-16, and exports of services 12 per cent. Both were significantly better figures than the national performance of 6.4 per cent and 8 per cent up, respectively. Since this jobs and exports program began, we have secured new direct flights into Adelaide by Qatar and China Southern—I thank the Minister for Tourism for the important role he has played in that—creating further cargo space for exporters. The number of small business exporters has increased by 14 per cent in the last year.

Our international engagement program is achieved at a total cost to government of around \$6.22 million. This compares with \$20 million by Victoria and \$33 million spent by Trade and Investment Queensland. We get better value for our expenditure by having a focused, scheduled program of missions, or as one senior Austrade official recently told me, our strategy is 'best in class'. A foundation of our success has been the involvement of the Premier and a minister to lead missions. This guarantees access in-country and support from Austrade and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Our international engagement and trade mission strategy is a key success of this government. The government's challenge now is to build on that success by adding programs for business that improve the conversion rate from engagement to contracts for delivery of goods and services.

To top off our successful year, in partnership with Austrade, the government hosted the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank in Adelaide for the International Aid Projects Business

Opportunities Seminar, which I had the pleasure of opening. This was the first time the seminar had been to Adelaide, and it gave 60 people and businesses an understanding of the process and opportunities for winning work with multilateral banks.

The government has today released the proposed calendar for outbound jobs and business missions for 2017. It prioritises China, Europe and India—of course, South-East Asia and other regions are also important—while providing thorough support to the many South Australian companies doing business in North Asia, South-East Asia, MENA and the US. I encourage all South Australian businesses ready for export, or considering such a move, to take part. We have turned around South Australia's international engagement approach. We are supporting 65,000 jobs and we are growing this number with every step into new markets.

I conclude by commending the work of government agencies, including the Department of State Development, Primary Industries and Regions, StudyAdelaide, Health Industries SA, Investment Attraction SA, Defence SA, Arts SA, the South Australian Tourism Commission, local government bodies and the many other agencies of government that have participated in our overseas trade missions and encouraged stakeholders to do so, and who have supported the inbound trade missions. The 2017 calendar will be available from 2.30pm today on [www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/investment/business-missions](http://www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/investment/business-missions).

*Parliamentary Committees*

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:26):** I bring up the 119<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Unconventional Gas (Fracking) in the South East of South Australia Final Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time*

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is to the Premier. After 14 years of promising to fix the state's broken child protection system, why should South Australians trust the Premier to deliver this time?

**The SPEAKER:** The tenor of the question gives the Premier a great deal of scope. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:27):** The reason why people should have faith in this government to deliver on reforms to the child protection system is that, at every step of the way, whenever there have been challenges in our child protection system it has been this government that has subjected itself to the most comprehensive inquiries to examine the system. Can I contrast that with what I was told by those child protection advocates when we came into office, and that is that when they were presented with similar descriptions of crisis in the child protection system they were told to actively redact that from the reports they sent to their ministers. So, that is the contrast.

That is a government that is prepared to be open and accountable for challenges that occur in relation to a system, and an opposition who is addicted to hiding and running away and not confronting the real issues that face our state. This is one of the reasons why the community should have confidence. The other reason why the community should have confidence is that we have consistently increased the amount of resources going into our child protection system, most dramatically with our announcement today of the \$432 million commitment of resource to this system.

At every step of the way, when the most vulnerable people in our community—our children who could not be cared for in their own homes—were seeking support, it was this government that supplied the resources necessary to ensure their care and protection. That is why today, when there have been further cogent requests for resources to supply this system, we have answered that call. We have been open, we have supplied the resources.

Thirdly, we have applied ourselves intelligently to one of the most complex public policy issues that confronts any jurisdiction. During this period of 14½ years that those opposite have been occupying those benches, almost every jurisdiction in Australia has, at one point or other, faced its

own child protection crisis. Indeed, many of them have faced multiple crises. It is the fate of a long-lived government that they are, from time to time, going to have to confront these challenges in our child protection system.

The truth is that there is no jurisdiction in the world that doesn't confront the challenges of dealing with child protection. All those systems, the ones that are most successful, apply themselves diligently and intelligently to learning the lessons about what has gone wrong and are making steps to ensure their systems improve. We are devoting the resources necessary to protect families and children to allow them—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I think anybody who is listening to this or witnessing those opposite realises there is only one group that could have confidence in implementing these reforms—and it is this side of the chamber.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Morialta, Flinders, Schubert, Mount Gambier, Hartley, Adelaide, Stuart, Morphett, Finniss and Davenport. I warn for the first time the members for Morialta, Schubert, Hartley, Adelaide, Mount Gambier, Morphett, Finniss, Stuart and the leader. I warn for the second and the final time the members for Morialta, Hartley, Schubert, Adelaide, Finniss, Stuart and the leader. The members for Morialta, Hartley, Schubert and Adelaide all committed breaches of standing orders that go well beyond three warnings. They are on notice that the jig is up.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32):** My question is to the Premier. After 14 years of promising to fix the state's broken child protection system and failing, does the Premier accept that he is part of the problem?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:33):** I suppose there was an opportunity in this question time for the Leader of the Opposition to ask some intelligent questions about the particular reform initiatives and critique whether he agreed with all of them. I simply put the challenge to those opposite: do they seriously want to participate in this debate and advance positive ideas for improving our child protection system, or do they want to play politics with the tragedies documented in our child protection system, which are sad and which those opposite seem to revel in playing politics with?

**Mr Marshall:** Give me a break—outrageous, absolutely outrageous.

**The SPEAKER:** If the leader makes another ejaculation outside standing orders, he will be out.

**Mr MARSHALL:** I ask for a ruling on improper motive. The Premier has just outlined to the house that we are revelling—revelling—in the situation which currently is the crisis in child protection.

**The SPEAKER:** Sounds very much like an impromptu speech to me.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Standing order 127, sir: I ask you to ask the Premier to withdraw and apologise for that remark.

**The SPEAKER:** For someone to call on the Premier to withdraw, the remark or the imputation would need to be applied to an individual member rather than a collective, so I would ask the Premier to return to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is very difficult to hear myself think with the barrage of abuse that emerged opposite. I am more than happy to talk about the substance of the issues, which includes the creation of a new child protection system which is better targeted at prevention and early intervention, that is, the initiatives that we have put in place: establishing a new early intervention research directory to develop new strategies to better support vulnerable families and to ensure programs are effective and include a specific focus on Aboriginal children; enhancing efforts to place children with family members earlier, with a new family scoping unit.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The question was very clear: does the Premier consider himself to be part of the problem? I ask you to bring him back to the substance of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is providing information to the house which is germane to the question, the topic, and I regard the member for Stuart's point of order as being very close to bogus.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I thought that those opposite might be interested in positive measures which are going to make a real contribution to improving our child protection system, and so—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, these are new measures which are based on a royal commission report that we commissioned that we are acting on—a family scoping unit, which is about a detailed analysis of all the family and kinship networks so that we can find anybody who has a connection with a child because that, of course, is preferable to placing a child with a stranger; providing increased support and training opportunities for staff to help them deal with the complexity of the cases that are actually at stake here.

It is the easiest thing in the world to say that we need to put children first and to make their interests paramount, but making those finely calibrated judgements about whether to keep them in a family, whether to remove them, whether to put them with a particular family member or other, requires an extraordinarily fine judgement. Sometimes those judgements, with the best will in the world, will be proven incorrect. That is the nature of human behaviour, and this is profoundly complex decision-making.

There is a cost in removing a child from a family. There was rarely a child I met in relation to this system who didn't ask to be placed back with their family. This is complex public policymaking, and in many of those cases it simply was not possible because those parents weren't able to care for their children.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier apologise to the children who have been left in vulnerable and dangerous situations because the South Australian child protection system is broken?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:38):** I certainly will, and it is appropriate that I apologise to those children, and to the family members and anybody who loves them and cares for them, that we have not been able to protect them in all circumstances. It is heartbreaking that, when we take a child away from a family to provide them with greater care, in some cases, sadly, predators have also decided to descend upon those children and commit awful crimes. That is at the heart of the Nyland royal commission and it's appalling. I am sorry that we have been unable to protect every one of those children. I have apologised in the past for that and I repeat that apology.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38):** Supplementary: does the Premier take personal responsibility for the failure of his government to keep our most vulnerable children safe?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:38):** Of course I accept responsibility. I accept responsibility for all the public policy measures that have been put in place that have been not successful, but this is incredibly difficult work. With the best will in the world, we have applied our resources, we have applied our policy and we have put in place the measures that we believe are necessary to protect children, but in some cases it's demonstrably the case that we have been unable to protect those children, just as their families have been unable to protect them. The state has tried to protect them in some circumstances, and in many cases we have been able to protect those children.

There are literally thousands of children who have been removed from their families and put in the care of foster-parents, and those foster-parents have brought those children up in beautiful loving homes, and they have created a new life for those children. Sadly, there are also other children who have been so damaged that they have been unable to make those connections. They have bounced from one placement to another and, sadly, in some cases ended up in commercial care. And in some cases again, they have been preyed upon.

That's nothing to be proud of and we are all devastated about that, and we are all doing everything we possibly can, including through the provision of the resources that we have applied today and the policy changes that we've applied today, to try to make sure that this, as far as possible, can be prevented in the future.

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:40):** My question is to the Premier. What is the state Labor government doing to secure the health of the Murray-Darling Basin?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:40):** This is an important public policy issue. Just a few hours ago—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Just a few hours ago, I—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Will the Premier be seated. The Premier hasn't had time to say anything provocative to the opposition and already there is a barrage of interjections. There are seven opposition members on full warnings; I will have to act if the Premier is interrupted in this answer. Premier.

**Mr GARDNER:** Sorry, sir, while there is a pause in the Premier's thoughts, under standing order 97 can you clarify whether the word 'Labor' is appropriate and in order?

**The SPEAKER:** I'm sorry?

**Mr GARDNER:** Is the Premier responsible for the government or the Labor government? Is the word 'Labor' in order under standing order 97?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Moriata's knowledge of parliamentary procedure I know transcends Erskine May—it probably goes back to a full understanding of the standing orders of the Witan—but that point of order has no merit of any kind. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Just a few hours ago, I received a letter from the Prime Minister, who was seeking to provide some comfort about the commitment of his government to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

**Mr Duluk:** Was Ian Hunter cc'd in?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** He was indeed. Well, I'm not sure; I'm sure he was. The letter seeks to provide some reassurance and points towards a COAG meeting next week, where we hope to make some progress in relation to that matter.

**Mr Marshall:** Who's going?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That will be me—COAG.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** You have to win an election to go to COAG.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is warned.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Of course, the reason why the Prime Minister was put into this position—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The reason why the Prime Minister was put into this rather difficult position was because of the remarks that were made in a letter that the Deputy Prime Minister sent to Mr Hunter of 17 November 2016, where he said:

...If it was genuinely possible to put an additional 450 [gigalitres] down the river without hurting people, then none of us would have a problem with it. The reality is that it will...

I think the only way to resolve this is to see if there are other ideas, which would be mutually beneficial to South Australia and the broader Basin community...

I cannot foresee them agreeing to the additional 450 [gigalitres] of water can be delivered without significant social and economic detriment...

That was the problem. The Deputy Prime Minister indicated that he wanted to walk away—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** What we have is the Deputy Prime Minister providing a rather substantial problem for the Prime Minister in talking about walking away from the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement. I just note in parentheses that when Mr Joyce was appointed water minister, I met with the Prime Minister and I said, 'This is a problem. This bloke doesn't believe in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.' The Prime Minister assured me, 'Don't worry about Barnaby. It will all be alright. I'll make sure it all gets delivered.' Okay, that's fine. So we get this letter to Ian Hunter. Then, of course, Ian Hunter calls out the breach famously—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will be seated. The member for Davenport is out of control. The member for Davenport and the member for Wright are both called to order for asking the question about ice-cream that we all want answered. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you Mr Speaker. Then, just a few moments before coming into question time, I had the pleasure of watching federal question time and saw the most extraordinary spectacle. After the Prime Minister, having sent this letter early in the day, we had the Deputy Prime Minister jump up in answer to a question from Mr Shorten, the Leader of the Opposition, where he says:

Mr Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to bring to light the fact we are dealing with a basin plan that was actually written by the Labor Party, a basin plan with all the incongruities which were orchestrated by the Labor Party.

He goes on in a longer answer and says:

...so all the problems are your problems.

So we have, first, a letter from the Deputy Prime Minister creating this whole problem about him backing away from the plan. The poor old Prime Minister has to write to me saying, 'We're committed to the plan in full and on time,' and now, just 10 minutes ago, he has been contradicted by the Deputy Prime Minister once again. You wonder why we have lost faith in this federal government to work with us to deliver this plan. That is why we need a campaign. What we don't need is the Leader of the Opposition flying to Canberra, seeking a photo opportunity and waving around a piece of paper—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Oh, that's right, yes: the Leader of the Opposition's thesis is that we're all on the same team. I've got some news for him: mate, he's not on the same team as us.

And if you think that the New South Wales Liberal Party and the New South Wales Coalition are interested in sending any more water down this river, you are sadly mistaken. The only thing they understand is a campaign which embarrasses them into doing the right thing.

I know that those opposite came out of that meeting—the Leader of the Opposition looked like Neville Chamberlain leaving that meeting saying, 'It's peace in our time. I've had the discussion with the Prime Minister and everything is fine.' Well, it is going to require much more than his support. It's going to require his active opposition to the upstream states because fundamentally this is a question of leadership. It's a question of standing up for your state and making your voice heard, just as the Hon. Ian Hunter stood up for South Australia and made it clear that he did not accept this repudiation of the agreement.

He was prepared to stand up and in no uncertain terms communicate his displeasure about the repudiation of this agreement. We need to stand together as a state—irrigator and conservationist, city and country—to resist this attempt to walk away from this national agreement. It goes to the heart of leadership. It goes to the heart of the opposition leader's leadership, which has been increasingly described as weak leadership—weak leadership, somebody who doesn't know how to stand up for South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is warned a first and second time and the member for Chaffey dissented in my giving him a second warning. Since then, he has interjected almost continually during the Premier's answer, and I forgot to call the member for Goyder to order earlier. The member for Ashford.

#### OAKLANDS PARK RAIL CROSSING

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:49):** My question is directed to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Minister, could you update the house on the progress of the government's plan to upgrade Oaklands crossing, and is the minister aware of any other alternate proposals?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The opposition will cease interjections. The minister has not even been slightly unpleasant yet as he hasn't said anything.

**Mr Knoll:** It's only a matter of time.

**The SPEAKER:** I agree with the member for Schubert, but I call the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:50):** As we know, the state government has been working to remove dangerous and congested level crossings across our state. We have removed level crossings at South Road with the Glenelg tram overpass, the South Road Superway, and we are currently removing a major level crossing on South Road in Croydon as part of the Torrens to Torrens project. As part of the Torrens Junction project, a further two level crossings will be grade separated at Park Terrace and at Gibson Street.

Ensuring we upgrade the Oaklands crossing to separate rail and road traffic will deliver benefits to motorists and improve safety for pedestrians, and that is why this project is a priority of this government. Since 2008, we have produced reports that provide extensive and detailed information—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is called to order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Since—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The next opposition member to interject will be leaving.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is warned.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Since 2008, we have produced reports that provide extensive and detailed information about the design; social, community and environmental issues; costings; assessment of needs; benefit/cost ratios; traffic analyses; and a host of other information so that, when funding was available, we could be ready to deliver this project.

We now have what the project was always missing: a funding solution which can deliver the project, and that's why the state government has been working hard towards reaching agreement with both the commonwealth and the City of Marion, as well as consulting the community. By combining the \$40 million committed by the federal Liberal MP, Nicolle Flint, with the \$150 million of savings from the north-south corridor project, particularly the Northern Connector, we have the funds that would be necessary to upgrade the crossing.

**Mr Marshall:** Got any new information?

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will depart for the remainder of question time under the sessional order.

*The honourable member for Dunstan having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We are continuing to work closely with the commonwealth. The Premier has recently met with the minister for infrastructure, Paul Fletcher, during his visit to Canberra and, like the discussions I continue to have with the minister, the Premier's meeting was very productive. What we won't do, in pursuing an upgrade of the Oaklands crossing, is what was mooted in a leaked shadow cabinet document just yesterday, and that is to reject the commonwealth funding just because there would be an opportunity to play politics. We won't reject commonwealth funding for the Oaklands crossing because that would mean South Australian infrastructure projects would have to be sacrificed to—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: standing order 98. The minister was asked about the government's intentions, not what they are not planning to do.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** The member is out of his place, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** For the information of the member for Newland, earlier today I gave permission for the member for Stuart to occupy the member for Unley's seat during the absence. The member for Newland is called to order. Regarding the point of order, I hope that the Minister for Transport will desist from debating the question.

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright is warned.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Further on that other alternative proposal, which has only recently emerged from the leaked shadow cabinet document, this government, unlike those opposite, won't ignore the importance and benefits of this project and what it will deliver for southern suburbs' residents and motorists. The focus of our policymaking in government isn't just to focus on those ideas which provide the opportunity for them to play politics and 'conduct social media campaigns'. To the government, the Oaklands upgrade is about benefits to residents of the southern suburbs and to motorists. To the opposition, again, it is about politics and social media campaigns.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir.

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My message to those opposite would be—

**The SPEAKER:** No, I'm afraid the minister's ability to deliver a message to those opposite is circumscribed by standing order 98.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is warned a second and a final time. The member for Adelaide.



**CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT**

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many of the more than 360 full-time staff promised and announced by then minister Rankine on 11 June 2013 have been employed, and what is the net increase in the Families SA staff (DCP, as it is now called)?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:55):** Net increase from that point in time I will have to take on notice. As the member will be well aware, and has raised in questions previously, we are carrying vacancies in the department that I firmly hope and expect will become easier to fill now that we have the response to the Nyland commission. There is a department that is solely dedicated to child protection, with a chief executive who has an excellent reputation around Australia, and a carefully thought-out blueprint—from Margaret Nyland, of course, but also in the government response.

My expectation is that we will be in a much better position to attract good staff—experienced staff and maybe staff who have worked for us previously and wish to return—and that not only will we be filling the vacancies we have at present but we will also be able to fill the new positions that we have identified through this response—positions in a family scoping unit, positions in a new team dedicated to working with children on short-term orders which not only will assist those children but also free up investigative resources. Making sure that we continue to fill those positions is extremely important, and we fully expect that to occur as a result of this positive step today.

**CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT**

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:57):** My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many of the 102 workers identified through the Hyde audit as requiring further assessment have now returned to work in Families SA or the Department for Child Protection? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain. As at 19 December 2014, 73 were cleared, 21 required ongoing assessment, four resigned and four were off work on workers compensation.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The next opposition member to utter something outside standing orders will depart under the sessional order. Deputy Premier.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert will depart under the sessional order for the next hour.

*The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Mr Speaker, the matter that is the subject of that question is presently the subject of an inquiry and the seeking of some advice, and we hope to be in a position shortly to know in detail where we are going in relation to that matter. It is something that the government has been seeking some advice about and we do not yet have the advice we are seeking.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:59):** Supplementary: will the minister now release the Hyde review in full?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:59):** No.

### FOSTER CARE

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What is the net increase in foster carers since the minister announced the extra \$9 million to recruit at least an extra 130 foster carers that was made in February 2016? So, it's the net increase.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:59):** I will get the detailed figure. There was last year a piece of work done to remove foster carers who weren't actually any longer looking after children and who had no further intention of being foster carers, so there was in some figures that were reported the perception that there was an absolute reduction in foster carers. In fact, in terms of the number of households with foster care children within them, or kinship care children, that number has grown steadily.

We won't see the complete payoff of the effort to recruit more carers for some time because it is a combination of people applying, being considered and going through the registration process, but then also the training process takes some time. It will take us many months to see that payoff which is why the sooner you start, the sooner you get to where you are going. I will get the detailed answer for the member for Adelaide and for the chamber.

### MINISTER FOR CHILD PROTECTION REFORM

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Given the minister has now fulfilled his ambition of becoming Senior Counsel, will he commit to spending the remainder of his time and energy on resolving the state's child protection crisis instead of preparing for a life after politics?

**The SPEAKER:** The question is out of order.

### ECONOMIC GROWTH

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:01):** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on recent economic milestones?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:01):** Finished? Are you ready? I thank the honourable member for this question. The government recently delivered a \$258 million surplus, the first since 2009-10 and the first since the end of the global financial crisis. In fact, it is the government's eighth surplus in 14 years which highlights this government's ability to manage the state's economy during uncertain times.

First, it was the global financial crisis which saw the government make a deliberate decision to forgo budget surpluses in favour of commencing an unprecedented infrastructure spend which was labelled a false economy by members opposite. Now we face significant challenges with the closure of the Australian car manufacturing industry, a global decline in mineral commodity prices and gaps in naval shipbuilding. Yet, despite all of this, there are still many positive signs in our economy.

Recent ABS data showed that the South Australian economy has grown above \$100 billion for the first time in our history. Gross state product increased by 1.9 per cent in 2015-16, outpacing our own budget estimates and forecasts and several key independent forecasts. It was the third strongest per capita growth of all states. We saw net exports up 55 per cent, mining up about 5 per cent, construction up about 5 per cent and household consumption—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get to unemployment in a second. Household consumption is also up, a real sign of confidence. This follows a drop last month in the headline unemployment figure, from 6.7 to 6.4 per cent, and 15 consecutive months of trend unemployment decreasing—15 consecutive months of decreasing unemployment—all signs that the economy is growing and business confidence is increasing.

This is on the back of the most comprehensive tax reform package in our state's history which saw us abolishing business stamp duties, returning \$670 million to businesses and families. Tax cuts, which members opposite opposed and then asked us to bring forward, have helped stimulate the economy. Tax reforms on top of our WorkCover reforms have delivered an annual return of \$180 million per annum to South Australian businesses. Last year's state budget was all about cutting taxes and creating efficiency in our economy, and this year's budget provides stimulus—\$109 million worth of incentives to businesses to directly employ people. Every business with a payroll of under \$5 million in South Australia will get \$10,000 if they pay payroll tax to employ a new FTE. We know from another leak, courtesy of the member for Mitchell, that they were also contemplating a similar policy but obviously on a much smaller—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —it's okay, it'll be over soon—form of stimulus, but we know that these stimuluses are working. In fact, they are working so well that nearly 1,700 businesses in South Australia have applied, with nearly 3,500 full-time equivalent jobs created on the back of this new incentive. That's the only way you are eligible, but of course, if you had read your leaked document that you gave to *The Advertiser* or someone leaked on you, you would have known that.

It is economic policies like these that are having a positive impact on small business in this state which will further cement South Australia's recovery. I ask members opposite to pose this question to themselves: had their colleagues in Canberra not supported the closure—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: the minister is debating.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —of the automotive industry, where would our unemployment rate be today?

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

#### FRACKING

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister agree with the unanimous finding of the parliament's Natural Resources Committee that a social licence to extract gas by fracking in the South-East of our state does not exist and that, without it, unconventional gas exploration development should not occur?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:05):** There are two parts to that. The first part is, yes, I do agree that there is not a social licence. You can't have a social licence without bipartisan support. The truth is that at the last state election the opposition ran a very good campaign to use the oil and gas industry to attempt to stop Independents from winning seats. They are the ones who instigated this inquiry. In fact, this inquiry—

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is warned.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —was only supported in the upper house with the support of the Greens. The only way the Liberal Party could get this inquiry up was via the support of the Greens. So, yes, I agree that there is no social licence while the Liberal Party have an opposition to oil and gas exploration. Until they enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century and actually speak truth to the communities they represent about the benefits of oil and gas mining, and the benefits of mining, and until we stop the infiltration of Lock the Gate into the Liberal Party, there will never be a social licence in the South-East. If we only had some leadership from the opposition, we might get bipartisan support.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order, sir: I believe the Treasurer is debating the issue.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you for your impartial ruling, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Don't mention it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** But, sir, I don't believe you can have a social licence, much like with the nuclear debate, without there being bipartisan consent. In fact, I have to say that for a long time in this state there was bipartisan support for this industry. In the development of the Cooper Basin and the development of unconventional gas and fracturing, which we have been doing in this state since 1968 I think, there has been long-term bipartisan support. I know that there are members in this house who are unhappy with some policies espoused by the shadow minister about unconventional gas, but that is by the bye.

Until we can recover that position and actually have an opposition that is forward thinking about these issues, it will be very difficult to gain the support of those local communities. Let's face it: those communities are, by and large, very conservative. Those communities are obviously having a very large problem about engaging with the impact of oil and gas exploration and mining alongside productive agricultural land. There are those members in this parliament who would like to see there be an either-or situation; that is, you either farm it or you mine it, but you can't do both. We don't accept that policy. We think there can be multiple land-use frameworks, on this side of the house.

I thank the Chair and the members who did the work on this committee. I know that they are people of goodwill, and I do accept that there is no social licence. Does that mean we should just stop? No, because there are industries that are reliant on oil and gas in this state that require us to continue exploring for oil and gas. I also point out to members opposite that if we are to truly unlock the puzzle of lowering electricity prices in the wake of their appalling privatisation of our assets, the only way we are going to do that is by having a liquid oil and gas market in this state where gas prices are competitive. The only way we are going to do that is with more exploration and mining.

We can take the point of view of the Lock the Gate brigade, and there are many in this chamber who support that Lock the Gate brigade, which would see vast tracts of very productive oil and gas reserves locked up forever. I know that it is a very difficult issue for some members opposite. I accept that. I don't have to live in a community where there are very entrenched farming interests, long-term families who have had generational connections with their land, seeing people come onto their land to try and explore. I can only imagine the impact that would have on families, but what we need to do is come up with a framework that makes every individual in this scenario a winner.

### FRACKING

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:09):** My supplementary question to the minister is: does the minister agree with the Department of State Development, which submitted to the parliament's Natural Resources Committee that fracking for gas should not occur if community concerns are not adequately addressed?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:10):** Again, that question needs to be unravelled slightly. Do I decide who gets to fracture stimulate or not? No, I do not.

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, I do not. What I do is I delegate that decision-making process to my independent experts, who have scientific backgrounds, who make an assessment based on the fundamental principle which we have set as a government, and that is to do no harm to the natural environment. Unless a proponent can establish that they will do no harm to the natural environment, they will not be granted a licence.

I also concur with the agency that you need to have broad political consensual support from the community because without it you won't have a prosperous industry; you won't be able to. This is the tough question for us as legislators. We know that there is this groundswell of movement of people who are being, quite frankly, I think unfairly influenced by people outside this state for their own political means to try and stop the fossil fuel industry completely in this state who are using the argument about landholding—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Lock the Gate is not a left-wing movement. Lock the Gate is a right-wing movement—let's be very clear about that. We can either kowtow to them or we can

use them for our own political partisan benefits, like I think we have seen in Victoria where first we had the former Naphthine government put a moratorium and a ban on unconventional and conventional gas and that was then followed on by the Andrews government, or we can speak the truth to our constituents and tell them the benefits of mining in South Australia. There are members in this house who want to speak the truth to our constituents and there are members who just want to get elected.

I submit that the best thing for South Australia is that we have a bipartisan approach to this industry, that we go out and we talk to communities about the benefit of oil and gas mining. Let's be very clear that in the South-East, where there is no social licence, one of the largest employers in the South-East is Kimberly-Clark. Without gas, they don't operate. We have vast reserves in the Otway Basin that we can unlock for Kimberly-Clark to go out and employ more of their sons and daughters to stay in the South-East but unfortunately, because of outside influences, we have lost that social licence.

What is incumbent on the local members and us as a parliament is to go out and re-earn that social licence. I don't believe there is anyone in this room who believes that we can't undertake these activities safely if we had independent experts in the science guiding us along the way. Of course, the easy option is to get up an election campaign and say, 'Vote for me. I'll stop this. Vote for me and your hens will continue to lay. Vote for me and fracture stimulation will never occur again. Vote for me and I'll conduct an independent inquiry into fracture stimulation.'

This industry employs thousands of people in this state, pays millions and millions of dollars in royalties that has helped grow this state. In fact, it wasn't us who started this industry: it was members opposite—it was their heritage. I would defend this industry because it's a good industry. It employs South Australians, it creates wealth and oil and gas are the building blocks of our economy. So, the cheap political points that the shadow minister wants to score don't serve him well—in fact, they demean him.

I know that there are members opposite who go to the Norwood group. I know that there are members opposite who are embarrassed by the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister's views on these issues. I will stand up for this industry where members opposite won't.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: the question was whether the minister agrees with his department, and I believe he is debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I think that the question was phrased in a way that gave the minister a lot of scope, and he took it to the limit.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** I just asked if he agreed with his department.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, and perhaps he—

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland is warned and I agree with him. The member for Morphett.

#### **ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:14):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that a completed EPAS is part of the state works required before technical completion of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, can the minister assure the house that EPAS meets the requirements of the construction contract and the project agreement and that the state has fulfilled its part in achieving technical completion?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:14):** There have been two requests to the independent certifier for delays as a result of EPAS, and both delays have been rejected by the independent certifier at zero days and zero dollars. I have complete confidence in EPAS and utterly, completely reject any suggestion that EPAS is in any way contributing to the delays of the builder. Indeed, if you don't take my word for it, take it from the independent certifier. In response to two claims for delays, he has assessed them both at zero days and zero dollars.

**ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:15):** Supplementary: given the minister's answer, does the minister agree with the Auditor-General, who in his report today says:

Our EPAS testing identified instances of workstation and device delays in responding to user input, document scanning inefficiencies and printing slowness. We also identified that not all details are electronically transferred between EPAS and ESMI—

That's the medical imaging system—

for known patient infection controls, alerts and precautions. These activities require additional resourcing effort to address hospital staff concerns...

EPAS patient treatment related orders can be placed by an administrative officer (non-clinical staff), increased controls are required for medical officer details registered in EPAS and hospital billing and transaction issues remain...

Full remediation of most issues is planned to be completed by March 2017.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:16):** I can only reiterate what I just said: I completely reject any suggestion that any delay in the hospital has anything to do with EPAS. With regard to our being ready to roll EPAS out to the hospital, of course we will be ready. EPAS is ready to go out to the hospital. The only issue will be the scope at which we roll it out, as we have already stated, not because of issues regarding EPAS readiness but just because of change management on the part of clinicians. We don't anticipate that we will be rolling out the full scope of EPAS, but we have workarounds to address those issues.

With regard to what is raised in the Auditor-General's Report, I haven't had an opportunity to be briefed by my department, but it would be very unusual for an Auditor-General's Report to not address any issues and to give a completely clean bill of health to any project in government. The Auditor-General's job is to go through all these projects with a very fine-tooth comb, and to pull out issues, no matter how small, and bring them to the attention of the parliament.

The Department for Health has been working very closely with the Auditor-General's Department to resolve all those issues and any issues which have been raised previously by the Auditor-General. When I had a quick look in the Auditor-General's report, he was reasonably complimentary about the steps which the department had so far taken to address issues that had been raised in previous reports.

**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:18):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister, or the government, not approved a proposed public statement by either HYLIC or SA Health Partnership?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:18):** I am more than happy for SA Health Partnership to make themselves available to speak to the media. I can tell the house that there have been a number of occasions when I have asked SA Health Partnership to make themselves more available to the media because, to be honest, I am a bit tired of having to be the public face of everything that happens on that site when we have a builder, we have a company, who is delivering the project. What I do expect, though, is SA Health Partnership, in all their statements, to be accurate and factual. I will always approve statements that are accurate and factual. What I will not approve are statements which are misleading and factually incorrect.

**QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:19):** My question is again to the Minister for Health. How much will the proposed stage 1 of The QEH redevelopment cost?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:19):** I don't have that information at hand. I am not even sure what preliminary assessments we have done, but if I have information I am happy to provide it to the member for Morphett.

**The SPEAKER:** I am now pleased to call a member whose behaviour today has been exemplary: the member for Kavel.

#### **MOUNT BARKER TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:19):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister explain why the Mount Barker transport infrastructure advisory committee has not been established, and the reason for the delay, given the minister last wrote to the council about this on 3 March this year?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:20):** Off the top of my head, I can't, but I will come back to the member with those details.

#### **NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE REDRESS SCHEME**

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:20):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Can the minister advise whether he has had any discussions with the Hon. Christian Porter (federal Minister for Social Services) or with any other relevant persons regarding the government's intentions with respect to joining the proposed single national redress scheme for survivors of institutional child sexual abuse? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will briefly explain.

The royal commission into child sexual abuse estimates that some 60,000 survivors were abused in institutions across Australia, including government-run institutions and church, charitable and community-run institutions. The commissioner has recommended that a single national redress scheme be established, which would ensure that all survivors throughout the nation have equal access to appropriate counselling support, as well as financial compensation. It is recommended that each state should opt into this nationally run scheme. Has the South Australian state decided to opt in, and if not, why not?

**The SPEAKER:** The member's explanation adds nothing to the question and gives the minister ample time to think of an answer.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:21):** Indeed it does. First of all, as I understand it, the question was essentially whether I've had communications with Christian Porter regarding the redress scheme. I have had a number of communications with Mr Porter. In fact, I met with him when he was in Adelaide a week or two back, and we discussed matters which were actually not focused on this topic at all.

We were discussing matters about the extent to which the commonwealth and South Australia might cooperate in using our respective data to achieve socially beneficial outcomes by, for example, looking at the question of truancy in schools and seeing whether we could do something to work together to improve those things. If my memory serves me correctly, I don't believe Mr Porter is the minister who has the day-to-day conduct of this matter; I think there is another commonwealth minister whose name presently escapes me who works essentially with Mr Porter and they are primarily responsible in this space.

As to the primary question, I don't recall having discussed this issue with Mr Porter. That said, it certainly has been the subject of conversations between the state and the commonwealth going back some time. It has been a matter which, if I am not mistaken, has been on the COAG agenda and the Premier has raised this with other ministers in that forum. The position South Australia has taken in relation to this matter is essentially this. States like New South Wales and Victoria, which did not go down the path we went down and have an inquiry like the Mullighan inquiry, did not establish the redress schemes that we established and had limitation of actions provisions within their equivalent of our legislation which were far more difficult to overcome in terms of abridgment of time.

For a whole bunch of reasons—I don't wish to be critical of other jurisdictions because it is their business—they did not move many years ago when we did. So we now find ourselves in the position of having done a great deal, particularly in respect of those people who got to tell their stories

to commissioner Mullighan, particularly in relation to all of those people who are victims of some sort of abuse in state care or in agencies into which they were placed by the state government. We have been going about trying to settle those claims with those people in a cooperative way, which has involved a very low bar, nothing like common law burden of proof. We have been trying to actually bring to an end the trauma for those people by resolving their claims.

The commonwealth has now said that it is going to come in and tell everybody what the gold standard is going to be, it is going to tell everybody what the compensation is going to be, it is going to say how high the bar is for people to enter the scheme and then it is going to send the bill, as the insurer of last resort, to each of the states. If the commonwealth wishes to be a participant in a truly national scheme and to underwrite the truly national scheme, I think you will find South Australia would be prepared to have a very serious conversation with the commonwealth.

**Ms REDMOND:** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland.

### UNCONVENTIONAL GAS PROJECTS

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:25):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources development. Will the government entertain a moratorium on unconventional gas exploration?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:25):** No, we won't. I have seen in dispatches that members opposite are proposing a moratorium for a decade on unconventional gas exploration in the South-East. That is a devastating blow, if they are elected, to investment in this state's oil and gas industry.

Members opposite have put at risk one of the largest employers in this state. They have put at risk Santos. They have put at risk Beach Energy. At a time when they are vulnerable with low oil prices and high debt, they have put South Australian iconic companies at risk, and they shake their heads because they don't understand. They do not understand the damage they have just done to the oil and gas sector in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition is acting like a vandal—a vandal on the oil and gas industry. First, he has shown his credentials on having a debate on the nuclear industry; now he has shown his credentials on the oil and gas sector. The Liberal Party have been taken hostage by a left green wing ideologue. They no longer represent the interests of business. They no longer represent the interests of shareholders.

It is interesting to note that Beach Energy and Santos's largest shareholdings are from mum-and-dad investors here in South Australia. What does the Liberal Party say to them? I note that there are members opposite sitting in disgust at what their leader has just done. Silence from the member for Hartley, from the member for—whatever your seat is called.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** Both debate and incitement to others to break the standing orders.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will not refer to the demeanour of opposition members.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I won't speak to the fallen chests and the long faces at what is another blow to the prestige of a once proud party. I say once again to the younger members of the Liberal Party: retake your party and retake your heritage; don't allow it to be overtaken by a man who believes in nothing.

This damage the Liberal Party are about to perpetrate on these companies should be reconsidered and reconsidered immediately. The Liberal Party should immediately convene a caucus meeting, overturn this decision and reinstate. There is no recommendation calling for a moratorium on oil and gas. There were members of the Liberal Party on this review and they didn't recommend a moratorium. I have to say this is a very sad turn of events for the oil and gas sector in South Australia.



We were a beacon to the industry after what was occurring in New South Wales and Victoria. It wasn't a partisan issue here in South Australia, but members opposite have just made it one and they have done immense damage to this state's reputation as an investment jurisdiction.

*Ministerial Statement*

**MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:29):** I table a statement made by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation in another place.

**HINDLEY STREET INCIDENT**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:29):** I table a statement made in the other place by the Minister for Police.

*Grievance Debate*

**PRIVATE MUSIC INSTRUCTORS**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:29):** I rise today to speak about music in schools. There are some critical challenges facing our young people who are learning instruments, their families and the schools that promote that, because they know that learning an instrument is good for a student's education, and of course the hundreds of private music instructors around South Australia who have no idea at this stage whether they will have a livelihood next year, as their business models and the work they have done for decades in public schools is under threat as a result of action taken by the Australian Education Union in the Industrial Relations Commission. The government has as yet been unable to address this issue. I am calling on the government to fix this issue which can, I believe, be fixed.

Members may be aware that in recent weeks this issue has caused significant stress for hundreds of private music instructors and thousands of students across the public school system. A number of schools have already advised parents that no private music instruction will be offered next year, in 2017. Other schools are currently grappling with the bureaucratic process they must now go through in order to allow private music instructors to offer tuition to students during school hours at public schools.

I understand that, despite some support from department staff—and I believe that some staff have been seconded to work on this full time—very few schools have as yet been able to fulfil the criteria they must go through, the hoops they must jump through, to offer the same level of service next year as they currently offer. I want to be very clear: this is not an issue where it should be either instrumental music service or private music instructors. It is not an either/or. Most schools that offer music, I suspect, have IMS staff (Instrumental Music Service), music teachers and private music instructors, or some combination of those different groups, working happily together for the best interests of their students, and we want that to continue.

Less than two weeks ago, I put a petition online. It has attracted nearly 1,500 signatures (1,464 at last check) of affected families who, and I quote from the petition:

Urge the Government to change the Education Department rules so that private music instructors may continue to work in public schools.

The only consideration that should be relevant is how we get the outcome that will be in the best interests of the children in our schools. That is the only thing that matters.

Reducing the range of musical instrument instructional offerings available during the school day is not in our children's best interest. It is not in the best interests of those students or their schools. The range of instrument choices, the opportunity for one-on-one tutoring and the model that works best in a local school environment are all matters that a local school should be determining, not head office.

A cascaded process has been handed down under a consent order in the Industrial Relations Commission. This was agreed to between the education union and the education department. I note

that tutors, students, families and people from schools were not present when making this consent order. There is a schedule in this consent order that identifies the process that schools must go through if they want to offer private musical instrument instruction as an option for families at the schools.

It has been put to me that the most significant roadblock to music programs continuing is in demonstrating the requirement that is identified at the start of point 4 in schedule 1 of the consent order, and I quote, 'where all of the options are exhausted'. It then goes on to say that private music instructors are available. Point 3 talks about students taking on hourly paid instructors. You have the Instrumental Music Service, and that is fine, and that is the first step. If you can employ them, that is great.

There are only so many to go around, though, and they offer only so many services. Of course, each teacher does not offer tuition for every single instrument and they also do not do one-on-one tutoring until year 12, but often at years 10 and 11 certainly that is necessary, and for some instruments you need it. Point 2 addresses teachers employed at the school and point 3 is about hourly paid instructors.

Given that hourly paid instructors are paid at a much higher level than private music instructors, it is hard to maintain the current service without significant extra expense. A very challenging part of the process for many schools is demonstrating satisfactorily that they have met that part of the process. We now need the minister to make a very clear public statement, a ministerial direction or direct correspondence with schools about the application of this policy. She should make it clear that she considers schools to have fulfilled their obligations under the consent order as long as the principal or governing council can confirm that they have considered engaging HPis.

If the principal and governing council determine that this model does not suit the school, whether for budget reasons or any other reason they consider relevant, the minister's advice should be that they have met the instructions to her satisfaction and can therefore allow families to engage PMIs (private music instructors), as many do now. I will have further words to say about this.

### MAIN SOUTH ROAD

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (15:34):** My electorate is a fantastic community and has one of the most beautiful coastlines in the world. However, being on the edge of the city does mean that transport is always a very topical issue, and one of the most important issues in my local electorate is Main South Road between Seaford and Aldinga. This issue has been raised with me many times, and I have continued to raise it with various ministers in the four years since I was preselected as a candidate, and it is one that I continue to raise on behalf of the community to this day, together with my fellow local MP the member for Mawson, who is also a very strong advocate for roads in the area.

There are three significant issues that have been identified with the road: firstly, the safety; secondly, the capacity; and, thirdly, the road surface. Safety is obviously the most important issue and it has, sadly, been the most tragic. This is a section of road that has suffered far too many fatalities and serious road injuries. There was a tragic fatality only a few weeks ago. That is why over the past couple of years the transport department has undertaken a major traffic management study, looking at the whole section of road between Sellicks Beach and Seaford and considering the safety of every intersection and all the crash data from along that journey.

This process was undertaken with public input, discussion with local community groups and extensive work and consultation with the City of Onkaparinga. The report, which is publicly available, identifies three priority sections that need modifications: firstly, the Port Road intersection, including the overtaking lane up to Malpas Road; secondly, the Aldinga Beach Road intersection; and, thirdly, the Tatachilla Road-Maslin Beach Road intersection.

Following the release of this report, the government committed \$11 million, which has been allocated to undertake significant safety upgrades on this section of road, from Port Road to Malpas Road, which was identified as the most urgent issue and where, sadly, a number of serious accidents have occurred. I thank, in particular, the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Road Safety and the previous minister for road safety for their commitment to this funding.

This project will involve the installation of a large roundabout at Port Road, which addresses a lot of the dangers with right-hand turns at that intersection, with road widening, safety barriers and resurfacing of the section of road, including the overtaking lanes, up to Malpas Road. That work identifies that there have been a significant number of head-on collisions that have occurred through that section. This will address the most urgent of those priority sections, with those other priority sections to be addressed in future funding rounds.

The second issue for the road is capacity. A large number of people have moved into the Aldinga and Sellicks Beach areas over the past decade, and this has obviously increased the traffic and the utilisation of this road. That is why the state government has identified the road between Seaford and Aldinga as requiring an extension to a dual lane road in the future as part of the Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan. That is to be completed as traffic on the road increases.

As the local member, I certainly continue to advocate to all ministers, across the government and officials that this needs to be a more urgent upgrade than would otherwise necessarily be the case. The only question is the timing of this. This is in our government plan to be upgraded, and I will continue to work with local residents that it should be sooner rather than later. Certainly, the current widening of the road project will be one of the first steps towards the full reality of a wider, safer Main South Road, as per the state transport plan.

The third issue is the road surface of this area. This is a section of road that undulates and, sadly, deteriorates over time, given the soil quality in the area. Because of that, the government, the Transport Minister and his department have spent millions of dollars over the last few years on upgrading and resurfacing that section of road, which continues to need to be done from time to time as that deterioration occurs due to the soil quality in the area. The community are thankful for that, but we will continue to advocate for that to continue to happen in the future.

The other important thing to say is that it is not just Main South Road that is an issue in the area. There are also a significant number of council roads that I will continue to advocate need to be upgraded, the major of those being Old Coach Road, between Maslin Beach and Aldinga. There are also a number of local council roads, including Aldinga Beach Road, Aldinga Road, How Road, Norman Road and the Esplanade, that have also been raised with me. Sadly, there will be some councillors that only want to talk about state roads, but I will continue to advocate on behalf of all the roads in the Aldinga area.

### SPORT AWARDS

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:39):** I would like to rise today to speak about South Australia's outstanding athletes and pay tribute to the many who have been recognised over the last couple of weeks, when I have been lucky enough to attend both the 2016 KPMG South Australian Sport Awards and the 2016 South Australian Sports Institute annual awards presentations. Both were well organised and attended, and I would like to acknowledge those involved in bringing these great presentations to the wider public.

We have a rich sporting culture in this state, and the passion and commitment of those who have contributed to our great sporting past give our young aspiring athletes inspiration for the future. I would also like to pay respect to the fantastic volunteer base that sits behind our great sporting athletes here in South Australia.

The Sport SA awards, *The Advertiser* Channel 7 Sports Star of the Year awards and the KPMG South Australia Sports Hall of Fame awards were presented in front of 435 people at a gala event. The 2016 KPMG South Australia Sports Hall of Fame honour roll is now 55 inductees long, with another list of greats having been inducted—Greg Chappell MBE (cricket), Jenny Cheesman AM (multi sports: basketball and softball), Matthew Cowdrey OAM (a great Paralympian, one of the greatest in history), and Ken Farmer (through the SANFL). His son gave probably one of the funniest presentations as a recipient of a hall of fame award that I have yet heard.

Julie Francou (netball) and Jan Stirling AM (basketball) were honoured, and joining this distinguished group for the first time since 2011 were two new legends in Victor Richardson OBE (multi sports) and the great Gillian Rolton, our gold medal equestrian. They were promoted to the highest status of legend. The award winners were:

- Sports Star of the Year and Junior Sports Star of Year was Kyle Chalmers. He has enjoyed an outstanding year. Everywhere he goes, he picks up awards, and they are certainly well deserved;
- Team of the Year was Adelaide United. I was there to witness that great win last year against Western Sydney Wanderers, and it was truly one of the most outstanding sporting events I have been to at the Adelaide Oval;
- the People's Choice award went to the lovely Jess Trengove, a bright, bubbly marathon runner;
- Elite Athlete with a Disability was Brayden Davidson, a gold medallist at the Rio Paralympics. What an outstanding story that young fellow has to tell, and it really is something worth listening to;
- Tanya Denver Award for Endeavour and Sportsmanship went to Paralympian Libby Kosmala;
- the Arthur J. Gallagher Administrator of the year was Michael Carter from Football Federation SA (soccer);
- Coach of the Year was Peter Bishop, whose name is certainly up in lights after the success in swimming at the recent Rio Olympics;
- the Volunteer Award went to John Holland from dragon boating.
- Official of the year was Glenn Errington (table tennis);
- Country Athlete of the Year was Aidan Stock (hockey);
- Significant Event of the Year went to Hancock Prospecting Swimming Australia Olympic Trials. I was lucky enough to see those trials, and it was truly outstanding to see the past olympians mentoring the up and comers. It really was a great event at the Marion swimming centre;
- Community Event of the Year was the Dragon Down Under in Adelaide 2016;
- the Richard Newman Primary School Sports Award went Ben Hinks (sailing). Ben is an outstanding young fellow who presented extremely well. He is only as tall as a grasshopper, but he truly is a talent in sailing; and
- the Secondary School Sports Award went to Liam Bekric (swimming).

Of course, Marg Ralston is well known to many in journalism circles and the sporting fraternity, and the Margaret Ralston Golden Door Award, presented for the second time, went to the late Lois Quarrell, who was a pioneer in sporting journalism at *The Advertiser* and in women's sport.

At the SASI Awards, champion cyclist Anna Meares was recognised for her outstanding contribution to sport and cycling, as was our new swimming sensation, Kyle Chalmers. Kyle was named the Male Athlete of the Year and Anna was named the Female Athlete of the Year. As I have said, Brayden Davidson won his second consecutive award for Athlete of the Year with a Disability. Brayden came up to me and said, 'Have a look at this medal.' It was an Olympic gold medal and it was already well worn with plenty of dents and scratches on it, so he has had it out and about which is great to see.

Chloe Moran and Kurtis Marschall won the respective Junior Female and Male Athlete of the Year. Chloe Moran is an up and coming cyclist, and Kurtis Marschall is a pole vaulter. Jared Tallent, captain of the Australian athletics team at Rio, won the Amy Gillett-Safe Memorial Award. He won silver in the 50-kilometre walk, which makes him the most successful Australian male track athlete in Olympic history. Peter Bishop was named Coach of the Year. Well done to Peter Bishop—truly outstanding.

The Program Sportsperson of the Year included canoe sprinter Callum Dunn; in cycling, Callum Scotson; in diving, Grant Nel; in hockey, Cameron White; in netball, Emily Burgess; in rowing,

James McRae; in swimming, Kyle Chalmers; and in beach volleyball, Zachery Schubert. Congratulations to all of South Australia's elite sportspeople.

Time expired.

### REYNELL ELECTORATE

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:45):** I rise today to talk about just a few of the many fantastic events that have happened in Reynell with and for our southern community over the past few weeks. I love spending time in my community with the incredibly passionate people who give so much of their time and effort to engage with community members in so many different ways, to include them and to get them active in various events and projects.

I was lucky enough to attend the brand-new Hackham West Community Garden last Friday. Community Health Onkaparinga, the Original Men's Shed and many community-minded volunteers have got together to ensure this excellent initiative was brought to life. People from around our local southern neighbourhoods gather at this garden and their efforts have seen a community space absolutely transformed with vegetables and fruit growing, outdoor cooking and preparation facilities, and beautiful plants, flowers and trees in bloom.

It is a great place to bring community members who may not have engaged in other activities to get together and to be part of it in a way that works for them. Sadly, just as I had to leave, wood oven pizza and salad created straight from the garden were being prepared by those present. These sorts of initiatives are important to our community, not just because of how they bring people together but also in terms of teaching our children about where their food comes from and how they can provide service to others. I congratulate everyone involved on their hard work towards this garden.

On Saturday, I was lucky enough to attend the Morphett Vale Youth Club awards and demonstration night. The outstanding work of their volunteer committee, coaches, instructors and assistant instructors, parents and kids was on display. This year, the club celebrates 49 years of supporting our southern kids to do their best in gymnastics, to try something new and to build their confidence to interact in other ways with our community.

Forty-nine years of keeping a community club or group going is an outstanding achievement and almost five decades of success speak volumes for the commitment of everyone involved in creating a safe and supportive environment for generations of our kids to enjoy together. It was also an absolute pleasure to witness the spectacular demonstration by the children, a demonstration that was extraordinary in terms of the level of skill on display but also a demonstration that made me feel both quite unfit and quite inflexible. Whilst I enjoyed watching, I am definitely not cut out for gymnastics.

Our City of Onkaparinga Christmas Pageant is always a fantastic day, and this year was no exception. Our community and Christmas spirit were, as always, on display with the day enabling an array of community clubs, sporting clubs and organisations that all work together to make the south such a connected, kind and resilient community to participate. The pageant is an institution in the south, and I was very proud to have a joint float along with my colleague the member for Karna. Whilst just a little smaller than its city counterpart, I believe that our southern pageant is the best in South Australia because of how well our community engages with it.

I was also very pleased over the last couple of weeks to be able to get along and speak at both the Wirreanda Secondary School graduation and the Christies Beach High School graduation for the class of 2016 at each of these schools. This kicks off for me, as I am sure it does for other members of this house, many graduations which are both sad and reflective times in terms of those young people reflecting on their years of schooling, but they are also a very hopeful times for parents, students and teachers alike.

I have to congratulate the students of both those schools on their extraordinary efforts, resilience and persistence during their final year of schooling and over their time at both primary school and high school. It was a privilege, as always, to celebrate with both schools and with these students who are moving on from their school life. I think it is one of the great privileges of our roles as members of parliament to be able to support those schools in any way we can, but particularly to

support those students as they transition from that part of their learning in their school life on to learning and working in other ways in our community.

As I said at the graduation, I hope those students take their next steps with full hearts, open minds and the knowledge that so many in our community support them. Thank you very much to all the parents and caregivers, who are these young people's first teachers and who lay the foundations for future learning, and thank you to the teachers and other staff at both these schools, who have ignited imagination and instilled a love of learning.

I want to quickly mention that I was able to give out awards at both these graduations. To Nick Ryan and Isbah Sarwar at Wirreanda Secondary School, congratulations on their citizenship award. To Jess, congratulations on winning the Edward Award at Christies Beach High School for her commitment and positivity about her school community.

### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:51):** I rise to talk about the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and reflect on a lot of the discussion lately and commentary certainly today as well from Judith Sloan from *The Australian*, who is recommending, of all things, the dismantling of the barrages at Goolwa. I want to speak from a submission I made to the Senate Select Committee on the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

After attending the Murray-Darling Basin public hearing in Goolwa on 8 December 2015, I think it is necessary for reasonable questions to be asked on some of the submissions given. Referencing the *Hansard* taken, one recommendation was:

that the Senate Select Committee recommend the restoration of the Murray River's natural estuary, that the tide return and that the Southern Ocean push in each autumn and for longer periods during the drought.

Further to those comments, I think it is relevant to discuss detail from a book called *A Fresh History of the Lakes: Wellington to the Murray Mouth, 1800s to 1935*. The information presented illustrates a time line leading up to the construction of the five barrages at Goolwa, Mundoo, Boundary Creek, Ewe Island and Tauwichee.

Prior to the 1935 construction, there were many years and decades of discussion and investigation into possible deterrents of sea water whilst still maintaining an ecological balance in the Murray-Darling Basin. It was noted that from 1887 to 1889, there were fears of seawater intrusion in the lower River Murray as a result of irrigation extraction. This occurred as river levels were unable to hold back the sea. This was when the discussion began in relation to building barrages and locking the Murray.

Throughout 1902, the Murray Waters Commission took evidence at Victor Harbor, Goolwa and Milang on the state of the lakes, which were becoming saltier. As a consequence of saltness in the water, reeds and waterweeds were dying. Further findings and comments by the interstate royal commission conducted on the River Murray indicated that, due to low water levels in the lakes, 'instead of water being fresh, as it should be naturally, it has either been brackish or as salt as the sea.'

By 1903, reports in *The Southern Argus* state that, 'instead of the river rushing out to sea, the tides of the ocean had flowed in', followed by a further report in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* regarding Hindmarsh Island, 'which used to support large herds of cattle in its succulent reed beds, has been turned into a saline waste'. In 1912, further reports in *The Southern Argus* stated that if barrages were not constructed, then there would be the chance of each year finding conditions worse and worse. I quote:

Evidence given to an Enquiry into the construction of barrages included from Mr Holtham of Narrung 'the reeds and rushes started to go out in 1914.' 'I worked at Narrung for 5 or 6 years before salt water appeared (in 1912)' Mr McNicol. ER Rankine of Hindmarsh Island 'I have noticed the reeds and grasses that grew along the edge of the river have gradually died. As soon as we get fresh water they come up again.'

The information above provides a clear indication of what implications the Murray River and Lakes could be presented with if the Murray were to be restored to an estuary. I believe that if this were to be the recommendation of the select committee, it should also recommend that all 3,500 other structures in the Murray-Darling system be removed and that all man-made channels be filled in.

This would be back to nature, and it highlights how ridiculous a proposal it would be to remove the barrages.

What should be considered is the upgrading of all five barrages to fully automated systems to increase their efficiency, along with a detailed investigation on a Lake Albert to the Coorong connector, including a full environmental impact statement. I am also a firm believer in irrigation upgrades throughout the basin to return water to the system. The great work that has been undertaken in South Australia in irrigation efficiencies over 60 years could well be replicated.

It is important to recognise that the already legislated Murray-Darling Basin Plan is in place so that all those who share this great resource, whether it be for critical human needs, food production, or the environment, have a responsibility to make sure this vital river system prospers into the future. I fully believe that with infrastructure upgrades, especially upstream from South Australia, we can return many hundreds of gegalitres of water to the system so that we can still maintain productivity, maintain the environment, and maintain access to vital water for critical human needs.

### WESTERN HOSPITAL

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:56):** Last Wednesday, 23 November, I was both pleased and excited to attend and participate in the official opening of the new and very impressive intensive care unit at the Western Hospital. The Western Hospital is located on Cudmore Terrace, Henley Beach, in the beautiful electorate of Colton. The Western opened in 1974 as a community-owned hospital replacing the old Henley Private Hospital located on Seaview Road, which we used to refer to as the 'blue hospital'.

From 1974 until around 2003, the Western had a successful history of providing surgical and medical acute care services to the residents of the western suburbs. In 2003, the Western Hospital was part of the Adelaide Community Health Alliance (ACHA), and this alliance made the confounding and short-sighted decision to sell the hospital. At the same time, ACHA also transferred the management of its three other hospitals to the national private hospital group, Healthscope.

It is safe to say that our local community found the decision to sell the hospital nothing short of contemptuous of a community that had put its heart and soul into this hospital. I am not going to rake over the coals of ACHA's decision. It is history. In hindsight, some might say it is the best thing that ever happened. I would particularly like to focus on the positive and outstanding contribution that the Western is making to the health and wellbeing of many of the residents of the western suburbs and beyond.

Following a brief closure in 2003, the Western reopened and was purchased by a group of progressive and visionary healthcare professionals in 2004. I acknowledge the work done by the community at that time in saving the Western and, importantly, the work that has been done since that time in re-establishing the hospital which is, without doubt, a jewel in the western suburbs.

Along with the establishment of the ICU, the Western provides a broad range of general and specialist surgical operations including orthopaedics, colorectal, ophthalmology, breast/endocrine, gynaecology, plastic/reconstructive/cosmetic, and oral maxillary. In addition, the hospital provides a high-dependency unit, day surgery unit, and a range of specialist clinics, as well as a GP unit and sports physio section.

The Western has an expert board of directors, and the hospital's CEO, Kathy Nagle, is an outstanding and dedicated CEO who has played no small part in the positive transformation of the Western into the hospital that it is today. Kathy also administers an outstanding staff dedicated not only to the Western but to delivering the best health and wellbeing outcomes for the hospital's users. This is a proper and appropriate measure for any hospital and, in this regard, the Western excels. The Western also has a vibrant and effective friends group, of which Annabel and I are card-carrying members. Angelo Piovesan (who heads up the friends group) has a very effective committee, which has raised over \$400,000 for the hospital since its existence.

Finally, I again want to pay tribute to the fantastic group of health professionals, the shareholders, who not only made the bold decision to buy the hospital but who have possessed a vision—a vision supported by staff and the community to rebuild the Western, transforming it into the

valuable and valued hospital that it is today. As we embark on the transformation of the metropolitan health system, it is more important than ever that the public and private sectors work closely together to complement one another and build the best system of care possible for all South Australians. In this regard, the Western is critical in the successful pursuit of this objective.

I congratulate all connected with the Western Hospital, the administration, the staff, the friends, the board and its shareholders. I am proud of all that the Western provides to our community and beyond. Long may the Western Hospital continue to provide the services it currently does and continue to expand its range of services. I am very proud to have it in my electorate.

### *Bills*

## **ROAD TRAFFIC (ROADWORKS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:00):** As we were discussing previously on this bill, I understand that there is a proposal from the member for Unley that the committee be directed to consider an amendment, which I understand includes a change of title of the bill as well as a new series of clauses for the consideration of left-hand turns at red traffic signals. I indicate that is not going to be supported by the government.

I want to address some of the other claims made by the member for Davenport, that the need for this legislation is the alleged culmination of a lack of attention or investment that has been paid to transport networks by the government since 2002. We know that nothing could be further from the truth. The member for Davenport quoted statistics that there are now as many registered vehicles as there are people living in South Australia, with both figures being approximately 1.7 million. That is a good way to conceive of the nature of the problem that we have.

As time goes on, as our population grows, what grows more rapidly than population is the number of vehicles that come onto our roads. That might not be just light vehicles, the cars we all might drive, but might include trailers, heavy vehicles and other types of vehicles as well. As the number of vehicles on our roads increases, so does the problem of congestion become more and more acute. What it requires is not just building more roads, not just adding more lane kilometres to existing roads or building new freeways and new interchanges, but it requires an improvement in how we are managing the existing road network that we have.

As I said in my earlier contribution on this bill when it was introduced to the house, this is very much what this part of Operation Moving Traffic aims to do, to make sure that we are removing unnecessary congestion from the road network around roadworks where people seek to take up road space in order to conduct changes or improvements to the road network. That is important, as is the other suite of Operation Moving Traffic initiatives which we continue to roll out and which continue to have some success in improving the efficiency of the road network in South Australia.

It is also important to remember the other efforts in which the government is engaged in giving South Australians a better service out of our road network. It is not just about the roads, although there is record investment in projects like the Northern Expressway, the Southern Expressway, the South Road Superway, and, as we are currently in the middle of building, the Torrens to Torrens, Darlington and Northern Connector upgrades to South Road. It is not just about those major projects but it is also about the record investment in public transport.

Back when the former member for Colton, the Hon. Patrick Conlon, was transport minister, we had a refurbishment of the diesel trains, and of course we are now refurbishing not just the interiors, as he did, but also the drive trains and bogies. We have also had the introduction of electric trains, the electrification of the line to Noarlunga and its extension out to Seaford, the introduction of the 4000 Class electric trains and the resleepering of nearly all of the metropolitan rail network.

We have also seen the introduction of the Metrocard ticketing system, which is the only introduction of a card-based ticketing system in Australia which has avoided the controversy in blowout and expense experienced interstate. We have also improved safety with the gradual



introduction of automatic train protection to ensure that the safety of our trains, as well as those people around the train corridors, is being enhanced.

We are conducting a significant improvement to the rail signalling system, which the member for Davenport would know quite well, given the works that have been undertaken at level crossings in his electorate. I am sure he would be grateful to see the improvement in the service of the Belair train line from approximately 90 or 91 per cent on-time running to roughly 96 to 98 per cent over the last few months. These are all a direct result of the investments that the state government is making in public transport.

One of the things that galled me that the member for Davenport said was that we rely on others to make our investments. Nothing could be further from the truth. When you think back on the improvements just to the road network—not the public transport improvements I have spoken about, but just the road network that we have delivered alone, without assistance from the commonwealth government—we have the Port River Expressway, the opening road and rail bridges over the inner harbour of the port, the South Road/Anzac Highway underpass, the Southern Expressway duplication, the Bakewell Bridge, the tram overpass and the works that are underway at the moment with the O-Bahn, a massive increase to capacity for the eastern part of the inner city ring route.

These are all important efforts that will improve our road network and improve the service that South Australians get from our road network. I will conclude my comments there because I understand that we are to have a contribution a little later on from the member for Flinders, who unfortunately was detained from making a second reading contribution. I thank the members for their efforts, attention and support of this bill, and I look forward to receiving their questions in the subsequent stage of its consideration.

Bill read a second time.

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (16:07):** I move:

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole that it have the power to consider amendments relating to reviewing and reporting on intersections controlled by traffic lights and the installation of 'Left turn on red after stopping' signs.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 17  
Noes ..... 20  
Majority ..... 3

#### AYES

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

Duluk, S. (teller)  
Griffiths, S.P.  
Pengilly, M.R.  
Speirs, D.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.  
Wingard, C.

Gardner, J.A.W.  
Knoll, S.K.  
Redmond, I.M.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hildyard, K.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Rankine, J.M.  
Weatherill, J.W.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Caica, P.  
Gee, J.P.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Mullighan, S.C. (teller)  
Snelling, J.J.  
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Close, S.E.  
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.  
Key, S.W.  
Picton, C.J.  
Vlahos, L.A.

## PAIRS

Chapman, V.A.  
Rau, J.R.  
Pisoni, D.G.

Digance, A.F.C.  
McFetridge, D.  
Odenwalder, L.K.

Marshall, S.S.  
Piccolo, A.

Motion thus negatived.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

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

Amendment No 1 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 4, after line 11 [clause 5, inserted section 20(1), definition of *work area*]—After paragraph (b) insert:

- (c) that is otherwise affected by works in progress (whether those works are occurring on the road or elsewhere);

Amendment No 2 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 4, line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 20(3)]—After 'this Part' insert:

and any regulations made for the purposes of this Part

Amendment No 3 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 4, line 29 [clause 5, inserted section 20(4)(a)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 4 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 4, line 39 [clause 5, inserted section 20(4)(b)(iv)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 5 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 3 [clause 5, inserted section 20(4)(b)(v)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 6 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, after line 16—After subsection (4) insert:

- (4a) An authority, body or person must not close any portion of a prescribed road in connection with a work area or work site unless the authority, body or person holds a roadworks permit and closes the road in accordance with the permit.

Amendment No 7 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 18 [clause 5, inserted section 20(5)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 8 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 20 [clause 5, inserted section 20(5)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 9 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, lines 23 and 24 [clause 5, inserted section 20(6)(a)]—

Delete 'operates as a relevant authorisation for the purposes of subsection (3)' and substitute:  
remains in force

Amendment No 10 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 31 [clause 5, inserted section 20(6)(b)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 11 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 38 [clause 5, inserted section 20(6)(d)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 12 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, after line 38 [clause 5, inserted section 20(6)]—After paragraph (d) insert:

(da) may be varied at any time by the Minister (including, without limitation, by extending any period or periods specified in the permit); and

Amendment No 13 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 39 [clause 5, inserted section 20(6)(e)]—Delete 'varied,'

Amendment No 14 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 5, line 40 [clause 5, inserted section 20(6)(e)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 15 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 6, lines 1 to 3 [clause 5, inserted section 20(7)]—

Delete 'Commissioner of Highways may refuse to issue a roadworks permit, the Commissioner of Highways' and substitute:

Minister may refuse to issue a roadworks permit, the Minister

Amendment No 16 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 6, line 7 [clause 5, inserted section 20(8)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 17 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 6, line 12 [clause 5, inserted section 20(8)(b)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 18 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 6, line 24 [clause 5, inserted section 20(9)(c)(i)]—Delete 'Commissioner of Highways' and substitute 'Minister'

Amendment No 19 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 7, lines 12 to 15 [clause 5, inserted section 20(12)]—

Delete 'on a road on behalf of the authority, this section applies to the contractor in relation to those works in the same way as it applies to the authority' and substitute:

on behalf of the authority, the contractor will, in relation to those works, be treated as if they were the authority for the purposes of this Act (and if the public authority holds an approval under section 17, or a roadworks permit, in respect of those works, the contractor will be treated as if they were the holder of that approval or permit)

Amendment No 20 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 7, after line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 20]—After subsection (13) insert:

(13a) For the purposes of this section, workers will be taken to be *engaged* at a work area—

(a) if the workers are present in the area or in the vicinity of the area; or

(b) if the workers are temporarily absent from the area for a period not exceeding 2 hours.

(13b) The regulations may prescribe standards or requirements for determining, for the purposes of this section—

(a) whether or not a work area involves a hazard to workers or a greater than normal level of hazard for persons using the road; and

(b) whether or not a work area involves an unusually high level of hazard to workers or persons using the road; and

- (c) the circumstances in which a portion of road will be taken to be—
  - (i) affected by works in progress; or
  - (ii) used to regulate traffic in relation to works or for associated purposes; and
- (d) the circumstances in which work will be taken to be required to be undertaken by a public authority as a matter of urgency.

Amendment No 21 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 7, lines 23 to 34 [clause 5, inserted section 20A]—Delete inserted section 20A

Amendment No 22 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, lines 4 to 5 [clause 5, inserted section 20B(1)]—Delete 'or the Commissioner of Highways (as the case may be)'

Amendment No 23 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, lines 9 to 10 [clause 5, inserted section 20B(2)]—Delete 'or the Commissioner of Highways (as the case may be)'

Amendment No 24 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, line 11 [clause 5, inserted section 20B(2)]—Delete 'or the Commissioner of Highways'

Amendment No 25 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 20B(4)]—Delete 'or the Commissioner of Highways (as the case may be)'

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6.

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

Amendment No 26 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, after line 23—Before the present contents of clause 6 (now to be designated as subsection (3)) insert:

- (1) Section 21—after subsection (1) insert:
  - (1a) An authority, body or person—
    - (a) who contravenes section 20(3) by placing a speed limit sign on a road without obtaining the relevant authorisation required under that section; or
    - (b) who contravenes section 20(4a) by closing a portion of a prescribed road without obtaining a roadworks permit,

is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty:

  - (a) for a first offence—\$20,000;
  - (b) for a subsequent offence—\$50,000.
- (2) Section 21(2)—after 'subsection (1)(a)' insert 'or subsection (1a)'

Amendment No 27 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, line 34 [clause 6, inserted subsection (4)]—Delete 'subsection (3)' and substitute:

'subsection (1a) or (3)'

Amendment No 28 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 8, line 40 [clause 6, inserted subsection (5)]—Delete 'subsection (3)' and substitute:

'subsection (1a) or (3)'

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7.

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

Amendment No 29 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 9, line 20 [clause 7, inserted section 21A(c)]—Delete 'section 21(3)' and substitute 'section 21(1a) or (3)'

Amendment No 30 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 9, line 22 [clause 7, inserted section 21A(d)]—Delete 'section 21(3)' and substitute 'section 21(1a) or (3)'

Amendment No 31 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 9, line 27 [clause 7, inserted section 22(1)]—After 'section 21(1)(a)' insert '(1a)'

Amendment No 32 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 9, line 37 [clause 7, inserted section 22(2)(a)]—After 'offence' insert '(determined in accordance with section 20(13a))'

Amendment No 33 [TransInfr-1]—

Page 9, line 41 [clause 7, inserted section 22(2)(b)]—After 'road' insert:

(determined in accordance with any relevant standards or requirements prescribed under section 20(13b))

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 and 9), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:15):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:15):** I want to make a brief contribution at this point because I was otherwise delayed during the second reading. I express my sadness at the way in which I feel the amendment was dealt with in this place; but, never mind, we did our best. Essentially, this bill deals with the importance of road signage and in particular speed limits in areas where roadworks are being undertaken. I am sure we have all felt frustration, particularly on weekends and after hours, when we come across a stretch of road where roadworks are being undertaken during work hours at least, when no work is being undertaken and the speed limit signs are still in place. That is something that needs to be dealt with in the context of this bill.

The bill allows for improved governance in roadworks and better coordination between utilities and the Department of Transport, and that is a good thing. It is unfortunate that it has taken so long. There are a lot of roadworks going on around the City of Adelaide at the moment. As an MP, I tend to drive around the city every second week at least and notice a lot of roadworks, and the closer we get to the city the more roadworks there are. I am sure a lot of them are designed to be completed in the lead-up to the 2018 election.

I appreciate the fact that roadworks are important, that signage around those roadworks is critical. In my patch, I would like to see more roadworks, in fact. That is an unusual thing for a country member to say. Other country members in this place would concur, I suspect, with what I am saying because even the Labor government eventually has to spend some money on regional roads. I must express my congratulations on the little bit of work that has been undertaken on the Tod Highway and my disappointment that it has not been completed as yet.

The minister and I have corresponded on this, and he has explained the reasons why work could not continue. In the end, the roadworks are not finished. Work remains unfinished on the Tod Highway, one of just three state highways on Eyre Peninsula in the seat of Flinders. Very important work that was being undertaken involved widening the road, particularly around corners. The bitumen on the road has been in place for a long time. It carries a lot of heavy traffic and, over the years, it has frayed at the edges to the point where I believe it has become quite unsafe, particularly at this

time of the year when heavy trucks travel up and down the Tod Highway in huge numbers, and particularly during this year of what looks to be a record harvest.

Essentially, I believe that a wider road is a safer road and that we need to understand our responsibilities, particularly with regard to state highways. The Tod Highway bisects not only Eyre Peninsula but also the Lincoln Highway and the Flinders Highway. They all have their areas of really quite narrow bitumen. Truck drivers and heavy vehicle drivers do a wonderful job, but my concerns and fears are for them, particularly at this time of the year. I ask the minister and the government to always consider those regional roads and their importance in our agricultural production and also their contribution to the economy of the state generally. With that, I am happy to support the bill and look forward to its speedy passage.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:21):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The State Government is introducing the Historic Shipwrecks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 to better protect South Australia's shipwrecks and relics of historic significance. These assets also hold educational, recreational and tourism value.

Under the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981*, shipwrecks and their relics are protected to prohibit the removal of or damage to these sites. Any wreck in South Australian waters older than 75 years is automatically protected under this Act. Approximately 270 historic shipwrecks have previously been declared under the Act in South Australia.

The development of scuba diving in the 1950's led to the discovery and exploitation of some of Australia's most significant shipwrecks. Wreck material was pillaged as 'treasure', souvenirs or scrap metal. Many vessels were illegally blown apart with explosives, with total disregard for the archaeological integrity of the site or its future enjoyment by others.

In 1976 the Federal Government acknowledged the need to protect significant shipwreck sites and relics with the introduction of the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976* for Commonwealth Waters extending from the low water mark to the edge of the continental shelf. Complementary South Australian legislation commenced a few years later with the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981* for South Australian Waters.

In recent years the Government has received a significant number of reports of illegal activity in South Australian waters, particularly in the Marine Park Sanctuary Zones.

The Offshore Ardrossan Marine Park Sanctuary Zone has been an area of focus following the introduction of fishing restrictions, which took effect in October 2014. As well as a sanctuary zone, the area immediately around the old wreck of the Historic Shipwreck *Zanoni* is a protected zone under the Act. This zone protects the 135 year old wreck. The *Zanoni* is the most complete 19th century merchant vessel shipwreck in South Australia and possibly in all of Australia. Such wrecks are very fragile; dropping anchor or line fishing nearby can cause significant damage.

From recent prosecutions, it became apparent that existing compliance provisions and penalties under the Act were outdated. It was recognised that the penalties had not been reviewed since the Act first came into operation in 1981.

The Government acknowledges the importance of South Australia's shipwrecks and relics and anticipates that increasing penalty amounts will assist with deterring illegal activity, and help to safeguard historic shipwrecks for future generations.

As part of the Bill, it is proposed that all existing penalty amounts under the Act be increased so they are commensurate with contemporary penalties.

The Bill also includes the head power to allow for expiation fees (not exceeding \$750) to be included for minor offences against the *Historic Shipwrecks Regulations 2014* (the Regulations). Expiation fees are currently not

provided for in the Act or the Regulations. Accordingly, the Regulations will require amendment following the Bill being assented to. The ability to issue expiation notices for minor offences will be a useful provision in compliance efforts.

A number of other minor amendments are also contemplated.

The Bill proposes amendments to the Act to make it clear that the Minister can only declare a shipwreck or shipwreck relic to be historic if it is not already historic by virtue of its age. Section 4A of the Act operates to make a shipwreck or shipwreck relic historic for the purposes of the Act if (1) it has been situated in the territorial waters of the State for 75 years or more, or (2) in the case of a shipwreck or relic that has been removed from waters, if the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the date on which it first came to rest on the seabed has passed. Consequential amendments are proposed to the provisions relating to the declaration of protected zones to ensure that a protected zone remains in place when a declaration that a shipwreck or relic is historic ceases to be in force because the shipwreck or relic has become historic due to its age.

It is proposed that more powers are given to historic shipwrecks inspectors, to bring these powers in line with standard provisions included in other contemporary pieces of legislation. Additional powers proposed include the ability for an inspector to give directions with respect to the stopping, securing or movement of a vessel; to require a person to state their full name and usual place of residence, and to produce evidence of their identity; and to take photographs, films, video or audio recordings.

An amendment to the Minister's ability to delegate duties, functions or powers conferred to the Minister, under other Acts, is further proposed. The Minister is currently unable to delegate the power to provide direction in response to development referrals related to development impacting on historic shipwrecks, as currently conferred by the *Development Act 1993* and the associated *Development Regulations 2008*. It was never intended for the Minister administering the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981* to respond to every development referral request personally. It is appropriate for this power to be delegated to a suitable officer.

The Government has consulted widely on the proposed amendments with the community and key stakeholders including boating, fishing and scuba diving groups, the Local Government Association, the South Australian Maritime Museum, the Australasian Institute of Maritime Archaeology, the Department of Archaeology at Flinders University, Australia's International Council on Monuments and Sites and other relevant State and Commonwealth government agencies.

The proposed reforms received positive support from the community and stakeholders during the 5-week consultation period that ran from 20 May until 24 June this year.

We must take this opportunity to contemporise the historic shipwrecks legislation in order to protect our State's valuable shipwrecks and relics for future generations.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981*

###### 4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause redefines the terms *historic relic* and *historic shipwreck* by reference to section 4A, and it inserts a definition of *vessel* for the purposes of the Act.

###### 5—Substitution of section 4A

###### 4A—Certain shipwrecks and shipwreck relics are historic

Under this section there are two ways that a shipwreck or shipwreck relic can become 'historic' for the purposes of the Act: (1) automatically by force of the section if the shipwreck or relic has been in territorial waters of the State for 75 years, or in the case of a shipwreck or relic that has been removed from such waters, if 75 years have passed since the shipwreck or relic came to rest on the seabed of territorial waters, and (2) by notice in the Gazette if the shipwreck or relic is declared historic by the Minister under section 5 or 6. The second method allows shipwrecks and relics to become historic earlier in time if the Minister is of the opinion that they are of historic significance.

###### 6—Amendment of section 5—Declaration that shipwrecks and relics are historic

This clause amends section 5 to clarify that the declaration of shipwrecks and shipwreck relics as historic does not apply to those which are historic by force of the operation of section 4A.

7—Amendment of section 6—Provisional declaration that shipwrecks and relics are historic

This clause amends section 6 to clarify that the provisional declaration of shipwrecks and shipwreck relics as historic does not apply to those which are historic by force of the operation of section 4A.

8—Amendment of section 7—Declaration of protected zones

This clause amends section 7 so that a declaration of a protected zone remains in force, despite a declaration under section 5 or 6 being revoked or no longer having force, if the notice relates to an area in which there is a shipwreck or shipwreck relic which is historic by force of the operation of section 4A.

9—Amendment of section 9—Notice of location of historic shipwrecks and relics

This clause amends section 9 to increase the maximum penalties for offences against the section from \$1,250 to \$10,000. Also, references to gender are altered to be gender-neutral.

10—Amendment of section 10—Power of Minister to ascertain location of historic shipwrecks and relics

This clause amends section 10 to increase the maximum penalty for an offence against the section from \$1,250 to \$10,000.

11—Amendment of section 11—Power of Minister to give directions in relation to custody of historic shipwrecks and relics

This clause amends section 11 to increase the maximum penalty for an offence against the section from \$2,500 to \$10,000.

12—Amendment of section 12—Register of Historic Shipwrecks

This clause amends section 12 to require the Minister to include certain information in the Register of Historic Shipwrecks.

13—Amendment of section 13—Prohibition of certain action in relation to historic shipwrecks and relics

This clause amends section 13 to alter the maximum penalties for an offence against the section from \$5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years to \$20,000 or imprisonment for 4 years.

14—Repeal of section 14

This clause repeals section 14 which contains regulation-making powers relating to protected areas. These powers are to be included in the substituted section 29.

15—Amendment of section 15—Permits for exploration or recovery of shipwrecks and relics

This clause amends section 15 to increase the maximum penalties for an offence against the section from \$2,500 to \$10,000. Also, references to gender are altered to be gender-neutral.

16—Amendment of section 16—Defences

This clause amends section 16 to alter a cross-reference. This amendment is consequential on the repeal of section 14.

17—Amendment of section 17—Discovery of shipwrecks and relics to be notified

This clause amends section 17 to increase the maximum penalties for offences against the section from \$1,250 to \$10,000. Also, references to gender are altered to be gender-neutral.

18—Amendment of section 21—Appointment of inspectors

This clause amends section 21 to increase the maximum penalty for an offence against the section from \$125 to \$500. Also, references to gender are altered to be gender-neutral.

19—Substitution of section 22

22—Powers of inspectors

Section 22 sets out the powers of inspectors for the administration and enforcement of the Act.

20—Amendment of section 23—Arrest without warrant

This clause amends section 23 to alter a cross-reference. This amendment is consequential on the repeal of section 14. Also, references to gender are altered to be gender-neutral.

21—Amendment of section 24—Seizure and forfeiture

This clause amends section 24 to allow an inspector to seize and retain any vehicle, vessel, equipment or other thing that the inspector has reason to suspect has been used in, is otherwise involved in, or affords evidence of, the commission of an offence against the Act.

22—Amendment of section 27—Delegation



This clause amends section 27 to allow the Minister to delegate any duties, functions or powers that are, under another Act or statutory instrument, assigned to the Minister for the time being administering the Historic Shipwrecks Act.

23—Substitution of section 29

29—Regulations

Section 29 sets out the powers of the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (CO-MANAGED PARKS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2016.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:21):** I indicate that I am not the lead speaker.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** You should be.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you, member for Colton. I want to speak to the National Parks and Wildlife (Co-managed Parks) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill amends the co-management provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992 and also provides retrospective approval to two existing mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park, which have operated unregulated since 1972 due to an administrative error.

The National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Wilderness Protection Act exist to establish and protect parks and wilderness areas. In 2004, the National Parks and Wildlife Act was amended to allow for the co-management of parks, a move designed to recognise and include Aboriginal communities in the management process of their traditional lands. Similarly, in 2013, amendments were made to the Wilderness Protection Act 1992 to provide for co-management over the state's wilderness areas.

These co-management agreements have allowed Aboriginal communities to care for sacred places, upskill people, build land management expertise and pursue potential cultural tourism and economic benefits. I am informed that the state government has now entered into 12 co-management agreements over 35 of South Australia's parks and reserves covering 13½ million hectares or 64 per cent of the state's reserve system. These 12 agreements currently include seven boards and five advisory committees. Some of these boards advise several parks but have no legal authority to manage them.

The bill provides for administrative amendments to clarify the wording used to allow the co-management by one board over several parks. Additionally, this amendment will allow for existing co-management agreements to be updated to allow existing co-management boards to merge. This is of particular relevance where one Aboriginal community is represented across multiple boards in the same region.

Additionally, this bill includes an amendment which allows regulations to be made that fix expiation fees for alleged offences against the act in addition to the regulations. Furthermore, the bill includes discussion surrounding the two mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. The bill includes an amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act that provides retrospective approval for the two mining leases in Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park while not allowing mining rights to be acquired over any other area of the park.

I indicate that we are supporting the bill, and it is nice to be able to tidy up administrative errors after 44 years, but better late than never. I note that we have had discussions here in the past, and I met with people from the department of environment in regard to Coorong National Park becoming co-managed. I certainly think it is, obviously, a way of getting everyone in society involved in the management of national parks and I just hope that, one day, we can get some better outcomes for shacks in national parks, which we are certainly keen on looking at. Overall, this co-management plan, as long as it is sustainable, will take us into the future.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:26):** I rise today to speak in favour of the National Parks and Wildlife (Co-managed Parks) Amendment Bill 2016. Co-managed parks are not just an alternative way of managing our national parks but a core component of reconciliation with the traditional owners of our state. As a government, we continue to pursue reconciliation with the aim of achieving a mutual understanding and respect between Aboriginal peoples and other South Australians. South Australia has taken a significant step in its reconciliation journey by becoming a formal campaign partner of the national RECOGNISE campaign.

The state government recognises the special connection Aboriginal Australians maintain with the land and the primary role of the natural environment in Aboriginal culture and tradition. In accordance with this special relationship, we have committed to involving Aboriginal peoples in the management and maintenance of national parks and other public spaces with which local Aboriginal people have affinity. The introduction of innovative new arrangements for the co-management of parks with Aboriginal people in 2004 was a major achievement of the state government which has been recognised nationally and internationally.

There are currently 12 co-management agreements covering over two-thirds of the land area of the park system. Native title holders now co-manage over 32 parks and reserves around our state. These arrangements cover approximately 13.5 million hectares, which represents over 60 per cent of the total protected area system. At the same time, a number of parks have been renamed to give them a more meaningful Aboriginal name.

In February 2014, new and refreshed state government reconciliation action plans were launched. This was reportedly the largest number of RAPs launched under one initiative since the Reconciliation Australia RAP program commenced in 2006. We continue to monitor and promote the state government's RAP implementation. The state government developed South Australia's Strategic Plan, which recognises the central role Aborigines play in our state's culture and history and acknowledges that Aboriginal people do not currently share in the full benefits of our society. Over 10 per cent of the plans' targets are now Aboriginal-specific and many of the other targets also benefit Aboriginal people.

The state government has also announced The Next Steps—Stolen Generations Reparation Scheme, which provides for up to \$6 million in ex gratia payments to be made to Aboriginal South Australians removed from their families without court order, and \$5 million for whole-of-community reparations.

The Aboriginal Regional Authority model seeks to recognise and strengthen Aboriginal governance structures at the regional level, to foster enhanced community decision-making and to establish a new relationship between government and Aboriginal people. During NAIDOC Week 2016, three Aboriginal organisations were announced as being recognised as South Australia's first Aboriginal regional authorities. Part of the government's \$10 million Job Accelerator Fund is \$1.4 million for new Aboriginal economic development initiatives in the state's north-west pastoral region with project partner, the Indigenous Land Corporation.

At the last state election, we committed an additional \$300,000 to increase South Australia's system of parks and reserves. Since coming to government in 2002, we have proclaimed 72 new parks and have made 81 additions to our parks. In 2013, we provided the iconic Nullarbor Plain with South Australia's highest level of conversation protection. It is now a wilderness protection area and has contributed to the almost doubling of area in South Australia which receives this level of protection to approximately 1.8 million hectares of land.

Over 2.2 million hectares have been added to the state's reserve system or reclassified to a higher conservation status under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992. South Australia now has the largest percentage of land area in both public and private protected areas of any Australian mainland jurisdiction, a total area around the size of the state of Victoria. At the last state election, we committed \$1.7 million to establishing the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary and the second national park for Adelaide.

At the last state election, we also committed \$10.4 million to upgrade our metropolitan national parks to better connect residents of the north and south with nature. We recently launched a strategy to activate South Australia's nature based tourism sector, Nature Like Nowhere Else. As

part of this strategy, we are providing longer term licences for our white shark tourism operators—a key component of the state's \$1 billion a year nature based tourism sector. Another state election commitment we have recently launched is the new \$5 million five-day walking trail on Kangaroo Island.

I would like to thank everyone across South Australia who has gone to such an effort to ensure the success of our co-managed national parks, and indeed all our national parks. They can be enjoyed by all South Australians now and into the future. I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:32):** I rise to speak on the National Parks and Wildlife (Co-managed Parks) Amendment Bill 2016. I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. I note that the South Australian Liberal Party will support this bill. In 2016, this version of the bill essentially amends the co-management provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992. The bill also provides retrospective approval to two existing mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park which have operated unregulated since 1972 due to an admin error.

By way of background, the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Wilderness Protection Act were established to protect parks and wilderness areas. In 2004, the National Parks and Wildlife Act was amended to allow the co-management of parks, a move designed to recognise and include Aboriginal communities in the management process of their traditional lands. Similarly, in 2013 amendments were made to the Wilderness Protection Act 1992 to provide for co-management over the state's wilderness areas.

These co-management agreements have allowed Aboriginal communities to care for sacred places, upskill people, build land management expertise and pursue potential cultural tourism and economic benefits. The state government has now entered into 12 co-management agreements over the 35 South Australian parks and reserves, covering the 13.5 million hectares or 64 per cent of the state's reserve system. These 12 agreements currently include seven boards and five advisory committees. Some of these boards advise on several parks but have no legal authority to manage them.

This bill provides administrative amendments to clarify the wording used to allow the co-management by one board over several parks. Additionally, this amendment allows for existing co-management agreements to be updated to allow existing co-management boards to merge. This is of particular relevance where one Aboriginal community is represented across multiple boards in the same region.

The bill also includes an amendment that allows regulations to be made that fix expiation fees for alleged offences against the act, in addition to these regulations. Furthermore, the bill includes discussion surrounding two mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. South Australia's parks make an important contribution to the economic development of the state through its nature-based tourism, recreation and biodiversity.

I note that in the 2015 Flinders Ranges National Park Draft Management Plan the board renamed the park as Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. To run through the story of the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park, I think Glenys Coulthard, one of the board members, explained it pretty well:

Our land cannot survive without its people, and its people cannot survive without the land. Co-management recognises the connection between Aboriginal people and the country.

That really does reflect that the bill includes discussions surrounding those two mining leases, that South Australia's parks make an important contribution to economic development and allows Indigenous people to be a part of that and to be able to upskill.

The Adnyamathanha people are the traditional owners of the Flinders Ranges National Park. They have co-managed the park in conjunction with the South Australian government since 2011 and recognise the importance of the park to all South Australians. The formation of the Flinders Ranges National Park Co-management Board honoured the wishes of the old people by enabling the Adnyamathanha people to resume responsibility for the care of their country.

Arrangements for the co-management of the park are guided by the Flinders Ranges National Park's Co-management Agreement. It assists the Adnyamathanha people to exercise their traditional rights and cultural practices. Management was further enhanced by drawing on the traditional knowledge and experiences of the Adnyamathanha people. Essentially, the bill provides for one board, rather than many smaller co-managed boards, to cover a larger area.

I note that at the Port Augusta to Northern Flinders Ranges Country Cabinet, the protection of the Aboriginal sites at Sacred Canyon was an issue raised. This site is within the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. In response, the state government stated:

The Government is investigating how to manage visitor pressure on the rock art at Sacred Canyon. Traditional Owners are being consulted on appropriate ways to manage the site.

The State Government has signed an Indigenous Land Use Agreements with the Adnyamathanha Traditional Land Owners Association which includes commitments to support appropriate management of these significant areas. The Government is currently working to progress the incorporation of the Sacred Canyon site within the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park, which will afford the site a greater level of protection into the future as access to the site can be controlled.

This is an example of the challenges of managing our national parks. Hopefully, through tight legislation such as this bill, we can continue to see the traditional owners, the community and the state government working together to address these types of issues.

While we are speaking about our national parks, I would like to acknowledge the volunteers who are dedicated to watching over and caring for our parks. Volunteering is an industry that I feel does not get recognition here in South Australia. The passion, the time and effort and the expertise that volunteers present, particularly to national parks—the way that they show their skills and leadership and the way they care for the country—I think is just an outstanding achievement. For example, the Friends of Flinders Ranges National Park was started in 1995 by a group of people interested in preserving the natural and pioneering assets within the park. Obviously, the Flinders Ranges National Park has been a focus of this bill with a retrospective approval for two mining leases, one within the this park.

Many of these volunteer groups exist across the state, with mainly active retirees attending the parks through the year, contributing in some way to completing projects to general maintenance. They have a joint passion for flora and fauna, Aboriginal heritage and culture, geographical features, pastoral and mining history and the magnificent beauty of the parks. I trust that the amendment bill will go through smoothly, without any interference from the government, and I note that the opposition supports the bill for a speedy passage.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:40):** I can assure the member for Chaffey that the government will not be interfering with this bill in any way. Of course, it will go through in the way and manner that it is intended, but I do appreciate the fact that the member for Chaffey has provided the opposition's support to this bill. You might find this somewhat bizarre, Deputy Speaker, but I could have sworn that the member for Fisher used almost exactly the same types of words I was going to use. Be that as it may, it was an excellent contribution—and I am not saying that just because it was almost identical to the one I was going to present.

This is a relatively simple bill, and I do not mean that in any disrespectful way. It is correcting some things that were not seen when co-management was first established; that is, through the passage of this bill, it will allow for co-management agreements with Aboriginal people to establish a co-management board over more than one park. That makes a lot of sense given the proximity of some of our parks and reserves to each other that are under the care and control of the co-management board, and it is a very sensible and proper thing to do.

Others have spoken also about the retrospective approval to the two existing mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park, and that is a good thing, too. That is actually formalising something that was occurring anyway but was an oversight at that time as well, so it makes a lot of sense. I say that it is a simple bill, but it is a very important bill. You might not believe this, Deputy Speaker, but the Wilderness Protection Act was established in 1992 in what were then the dying stages of the Labor government after the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I think you guys came in 1993.

**Mr Whetstone:** I wasn't born.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, that's a lie and he's misleading the house, Deputy Speaker. Irrespective of the year that it came into existence, what I do know is that at the end of the Labor government at that stage there were approximately 70,000 hectares that were under the care and control of proclamation of being a wilderness area. Again without being disrespectful to the opposition, Deputy Speaker, I ask you a rhetorical question: how many extra square metres were provided that level of protection during the period of 1993 to 2002?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Six.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Exactly none—not one square inch. Today, we have in existence over two million hectares of land provided the highest level of protection they possibly can be under the Wilderness Protection Act.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** What we have is far more parks under co-management than ever existed before. I promise not to respond to the interjections of the member for Chaffey. I do not need any protection.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Because he is already on two warnings.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I don't need any protection at all.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are both on two warnings.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I am a very disciplined person, Deputy Speaker. You know that I will not warrant a third and final warning from you because my behaviour will not require you to do so.

Getting back to the bill, the point that I was making was that it is a bit rich for any opposition to question the credentials of this government when it comes to providing the appropriate level of protection for vast tracts of land here in South Australia. We should be rightly proud of the work that we have done in the area of environment and conservation through the proclamation of parks. We can be especially proud of the role that we have had in expanding—and through this bill further expanding—the way by which co-management occurs.

The member for Fisher said a lot about the benefits that arise from co-management. I will not recap too many of those, but we know that Aboriginal people have a connection with their land the like of which we could never have. They have always culturally been a part of the landscape that they have inhabited for many tens of thousands of years, and that relationship continues today with respect to their views, their feelings, and their compatible living in their land. What better people to manage the vast parks that we have here under co-management, which is essentially on those first people's lands. It makes a lot of sense because they can bring something to it that we never can.

What we can do is assist our Aboriginal people in the ways by which effective management can occur from an administrative perspective. I look forward to nothing more than having those boards in the future not be co-management boards, but be managed by Aboriginal people. I look forward to the day that will occur. Whether that happens with our friends down the Coorong way, or our friends in the Flinders Ranges, or our Aboriginal people out on the West Coast, it will happen, and the sooner it happens I will be a happy person. Having said that, there is still work to be done that requires and warrants it being under a co-management arrangement, but the inevitable fact is that it will eventually be transferred to management by the Aboriginal people whose land it is, and that is an appropriate and proper thing to do.

**Mr Whetstone:** Cost shifting.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I beg your pardon? It is not cost shifting at all. That was a very inane statement. It is actually returning back to the people, in another mechanism, what is actually theirs.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I broke my promise earlier and allowed myself to—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Tim, I am not being disrespectful to you, but when you make a stupid comment it is incumbent upon me and other people to respond.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, it is not. It is unparliamentary on both sides.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The record has to be corrected. I have done that, and I will move on. I do not think I will speak for much longer. There is nothing more I can say beyond what I have already said. I commend the bill to the house. Again, it is taking this government's commitment to the care and protection of land to another level by making these simple changes that allow for a co-management board to cover more than the existing area than was previously proclaimed. I congratulate the minister in another place on bringing this bill to the house, and I congratulate the Minister for Education on her exceptional work in her role in bringing it to this chamber.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:47):** I rise to support this, as the member for Colton described it, very simple but very important bill. I agree with that because, as a member of the Natural Resources Committee, we had the privilege very recently of travelling to the far west of the state and seeing firsthand evidence of successful co-management in a number of the parks out there, and the enthusiasm with which the local Aboriginal people, and also the local NRM board, embraced co-management. It was really a delight to see, and a success story unfolding for that part of the world.

The government's National Parks and Wildlife (Co-managed Parks) Amendment Bill amends the co-management provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992. The bill also provides retrospective approval to two existing mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. The National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Wilderness Protection Act exist to establish and protect parks and wilderness areas. In 2004, the National Parks and Wildlife Act was amended to allow for the co-management of parks, a move designed to recognise and include Aboriginal communities in the management process in their traditional lands.

Similarly, in 2013 amendments were made to the Wilderness Protection Act 1992 to provide for co-management over the state's wilderness areas. These co-management agreements have allowed Aboriginal communities to care for sacred places, upskill people and build land management expertise—not that it did not already exist amongst the local Aboriginal communities, but it is important that these skills be continued so that they are not lost. It also allows for the local communities to pursue potential cultural tourism and economic benefits. The state government has now entered into 12 co-management agreements over 35 of South Australia's parks and reserves covering 13½ million hectares (or 64 per cent of the state's reserve system). So, almost two-thirds of the state's parks and wilderness areas are under co-management.

These 12 agreements currently include seven boards and five advisory committees. Some of these boards advise several parks but have no legal authority to manage them, so this amendment bill provides that authority. The bill also provides administrative amendments to clarify the wording used to allow the co-management by one board over several parks. Additionally, this amendment will allow for existing co-management agreements to be updated and to allow existing co-management boards to merge. This is of particular relevance where one Aboriginal community is represented across multiple boards in the same region.

Additionally, this bill includes an amendment that allows regulations to be made that fix expiation fees for alleged offences against the act in addition to the regulations. It is a very simple and important bill. I did a quick bit of research because I did not know off the top of my head, and I learned that on Eyre Peninsula there is a total of 19 national parks and conservation parks—a combination of both. Some of these at least now fall under co-management agreements.

The member for Chaffey was talking about the Adnyamathanha people who of course are impacted by the mining agreements in the Northern Flinders Ranges. In the electorate of Flinders, we have five traditional owner groups, namely, the Kokatha, Wirangu, Mirning, Barngarla and Nauo people. Their skills and input into the management of these parks, and the enthusiasm with which they undertake it is a delight to see. I mentioned earlier the NRC's trip to the far west of the state to visit the AW NRM Board as part of our undertaking to visit as many of the NRM regions as we can in the life of this parliament.

We went to a part of my electorate that I do not have the opportunity to visit very often: the far west, out onto the Nullabor. There we met with some Mirning people out on the plain itself, and they talked us through the importance of some of the bush foods and the importance of the cave structures to their people. I spoke with one delightful older Aboriginal woman who told me quite openly the story of her life. It was the story of a life that unfolded for her in a different time. She was a lady of 70-odd years and, she told our group that she had been married off at the age of 16 to a 54-year-old man. That was not uncommon. She said it was relatively commonplace; they were the arrangements that were made.

She had 11 children to this man. Eventually, he died, and in the end she said that she was not sorry that he died. She said, 'I never really liked him,' but she was married to this man at the age of 16. She was not bitter about it; she spoke about it very matter of factly, but as I said, it was a different time and a different era. Arrangements such as those were altogether different and in many ways accepted by the people at the time, as was indicated by this lady.

I digress a bit, but Auntie Dorcas was her name, and we were out in her country, on Mirning land on the Nullabor. She was teaching us and showing us about the bush foods that were available in this very sparse and desolate landscape. It is a beautiful landscape—it is a beautiful part of our state and a beautiful part of Australia—but it is not productive in any sense of the word. Yet, these people survived for tens of thousands of years out there. Those people—the Mirning people, and the Kokatha, the Wirangu, the Barngarla, the Nauo and the Adnyamathanha people all have the opportunity to be involved in the co-management.

The management of these parks is very critical because it is not about shutting the gate and walking away, and I have spoken about that before in this place. It can never be about shutting the gate and walking away because we have moved past that. We are at a point now where we can no longer do that because other things come into play, such as introduced species, feral species, significant numbers of native animals in plague proportions and the incursion of weeds.

All these things have to be managed. Sometimes revegetation needs to occur, and those revegetation sites need to be managed until they are robust enough to look after themselves. All those things need to be considered, but this bill goes further than that even: it allows for those sacred sites and those important sites to the Aboriginal people to be considered, acknowledged and cared for.

The member for Chaffey picked up on something that had not really occurred to me, but I guess should have, and that is the importance of volunteers in the management of these parks. I should have done so before, but quite recently I became a member of a Friends of Parks group, one of the 19 national parks and conservation parks on Eyre Peninsula. I had a very enjoyable day out with a group in the Lincoln National Park. There is just one group of many Friends of Parks groups that not only take great delight in that natural landscape but also are very happy to be involved in the active and effective management of those parks.

All these things come into play. I am pleased that we are able to support the passage of this bill and it should allow for more effective and consistent management of all our parks going into the future.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:56):** I would like to thank all members for their contributions to this debate in amending the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Co-management brings together traditional Aboriginal and contemporary Western perspectives to take care of the cultural and natural values of South Australia's parks. It allows Aboriginal people to look after and use land in accordance with their traditional values. In recognition of the success of this initiative, the

state government has entered into co-management agreements that cover 35 of South Australia's parks and wilderness areas, covering 13.5 million hectares or 64 per cent of the state's reserve system.

The National Parks and Wildlife (Co-managed Parks) Amendment Bill 2016 strengthens co-management by making amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992 that clarify co-management governance arrangements and allow co-management boards to be established to manage multiple parks. This amendment will provide greater flexibility for both the government and Aboriginal people to enter into co-management. I commend the bill to members.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:58):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Adjournment Debate*

**PRIVATE MUSIC INSTRUCTORS**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:59):** I continue the comments I was making in the earlier grievance debate in which I was seeking to bring to the attention of the Minister for Education her singular opportunity to resolve an issue that is causing great stress to thousands of South Australian students and hundreds of private music instructors.

Prior to my time expiring in the earlier part of the day, I had identified that the minister is in a position, I hope, to make a public statement, a ministerial direction or correspondence to schools about how they can ensure that private music instructors continue to be engaged by families at public schools during the school day with the support of those schools.

If the suggestion I made to the minister or if her application of that suggestion is not to the satisfaction of the Education Union, then point 5 of the consent order allows parties to apply to the Industrial Relations Commission on issues of implementation. If they do not like what the minister should do, and what I am suggesting she does, in writing to schools to let them know how they can identify that, if they have a reason not to undertake hourly paid instructors and have private music instructors instead, the education union can use point 5 of the consent order.

If there is some problem with the process, the department can exercise the same right. Point 5 of the consent order states that they can return to the Industrial Relations Commission. This is something that the minister could do now if she does not want to give that direction to schools. If she does not feel that she can take that on, she can apply to return to the Industrial Relations Commission and get this sorted out. The Industrial Relations Commission's consent order already flags that, if there are implementation issues, they will have another look at it.

Frankly, if all these means are insufficient to resolve the problem, the parliament has a number of sitting weeks between now and 30 April, the deadline that was put on the department by the Industrial Relations Commission, when it can make changes to the act that may be needed to resolve the issue. The point is that we need the willingness of the minister to engage seriously where the outcomes sought are exactly what she identified previously as her priority. In the parliament, the minister stated:

The intention is absolutely that no student will receive any less music education than they do currently, and we will do everything that is required to reach that end point.

To date, the government has not done everything that is required to reach that end point. To date, the government has not acted in that way.

The Liberal Party stands ready to support any reasonable endeavour that the government wishes to propose, if amendments to the act are needed, that ensures that our children are not disadvantaged as they head into the 2017 school year. At the moment, there are year 11 students



contemplating doing year 12 studies in solo music performance. If year 11 students are engaged with a private music instructor at the moment, they need certainty going into year 12 that they will continue to engage with that private music instructor during the school day at their public school if they need to learn that instrument.

Private music instructors are able to teach one on one the instruments that students wish to learn. If Instrumental Music Service instructors who teach the instrument that that student wishes to learn are available at that school, then that is great and they are sorted out. However, there are 100 or so Instrumental Music Service teachers around South Australia to service over 500 sites, and they are unable to look after the needs of every child. That is why we have music teachers and that is why we have private music instructors engaged at school sites, and those sites at the moment use the model that works well for their school.

Time is running short. The 2016 school year is very nearly over. Students, families, schools and private music instructors need certainty going forward into the 2017 year. We need a decision before the end of 2016 about whether those services will be available next year. We need support not just from staff giving advice to schools about what they need to do but also from the minister to help schools and reassure their families that they can have private music instructors on their school site next year.

Private music instructors, schools, parents and students alike need to know what circumstances they will face in the new year prior to the end of this school year. We urge the minister to act immediately to fix this situation. I speak on behalf of the Liberal Party and on behalf of the many thousands of students who are undertaking private music instruction at public schools, the several hundred private music instructors and, as we identified previously, the 1,500 petitioners on the online petition and hundreds more who have signed hard copy petitions. On their behalf, we urge the minister to allow music to continue in our public schools.

#### **PRIVATE MUSIC INSTRUCTORS**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (17:04):** Can I echo the words of the member for Morialta. What the state government is doing in regard to private instrumental tuition in government schools is an absolute disgrace and a shame. It is extremely short-sighted and it is going to be to the detriment of young children and those at school who want to continue to have private music tuition. This is not a case of needing or having private instrumental teachers going into public schools at the expense of the instrumental music program.

**Mr Gardner:** The Instrumental Music Service.

**Mr DULUK:** The Instrumental Music Service. It is a complementary provision for children who are in our schools. It really is no different—and this is the short-sightedness of the department and the minister—from having a private provider come in and perhaps coach cricket or take the cricket team or the footy team or a private provider who has an expertise in drama who might come in and take a special course. We are doing a great disservice to students who are currently learning musical instruments from private providers. We are hurting private providers who use going to schools as an income stream.

My own dad was a private provider of music services in a public school for about 20 years, teaching flute, clarinet and sax. I find it hard to believe that, under this proposal, my dad would not have been able to be a private provider in a government school. I wonder how dad would have been able to do his part in terms of providing food on the table for his family if he had not been able to be a private provider in the music system. It is very short-sighted. It smacks of union control, once again, in the Education Union.

I commend the member for Morialta for the work he has been doing in this area, with almost 1,500 signatures on his online petition, which is actually quite a lot of people. Knowing that you can learn the saxophone at a private school is not at the front of everyone's mind. We are not talking about affecting hundreds of thousands of kids, but we are saying that it is affecting quite a number of schools and quite a number of private providers. If we want to offer the best education in our system, if we want to offer choice in our education system, which we do on this side of the house, we should allow children to have the opportunity in all disciplines—in this case, in the music

discipline—to learn from those who are wonderful providers as we have wonderful private providers and wonderful IMS providers of musical services.

As I said, this is not about choosing one over the other. It is about giving children and families choice in our education system. You would have thought that, after all the mishaps and the poor NAPLAN results in our system at the moment, the government would be doing all it could to offer that choice to parents, to offer that choice to private providers and to really celebrate and acknowledge the importance of instrumental music in our schools.

I also want to talk about education this afternoon and the recent Your School report, published in *The Weekend Australian* at the beginning of October. The report provided a comprehensive assessment of the school education system in Australia. The report was a celebration of achievement, but for South Australia there was very little to celebrate in the report. For those who have not read the report, I would like to highlight some of the figures to the house.

Only one South Australian school was in the nation's top 100 primary schools in reading, writing and numeracy, and this was not a government school. Only two South Australian schools were in the nation's top 100 secondary schools in reading, writing and numeracy, and indeed these schools were not government schools. There were no South Australian schools in the nation's top 50 comprehensive public primary schools, and only one South Australian school was in the nation's top 50 comprehensive private primary schools. No South Australian school was in the nation's top 50 comprehensive public secondary schools, and only two South Australian schools were in the nation's top 50 comprehensive private schools.

As I progressed through the report, I reached page 11, which featured the names of a number of South Australian schools. I thought, 'This must be good,' but then I looked at the title. Sadly, it was the list of the nation's least funded schools per student. An incredible 31 South Australian schools featured, more than in any other state in this list. Moreover, South Australian schools made up seven of the top 20 in that list, and that included Coromandel Valley Primary School, located in my electorate. The report made me wonder: what has the state Labor government achieved in education in this state in its 14 years to date in office? Unfortunately, it appears not a lot and, unfortunately, there are more examples of government failings.

An analysis undertaken of NAPLAN results between 2010 and 2015 shows that in years 3, 5, 7 and 9 South Australian students finished at or above the national minimum standard only once, and that was in 2010 when the year 7 cohort was at or above the national minimum standard. In South Australia the average was 93.82 per cent and the national average that year was 93.42 per cent. So, South Australia was below or above national minimum standard on every other occasion. When all the results from the period are averaged out, South Australia was well below the national average and only marginally ahead of Tasmania and Northern Territory.

It is interesting that, whether it be in education, the state of our economy, our job statistics or when we measure young people leaving South Australia (which I know the member for Chaffey is very passionate about), we are only marginally ahead or with Tasmania and the Northern Territory. We are not up there competing with New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland or Western Australia. We continue to fall behind in the exodus of young people leaving our state. In our jobless figures, we are well behind in terms of reducing the unemployment rate. In economic activity, we have some of the lowest business confidence in the nation.

Of course, when it comes to education and NAPLAN results, we are pretty much at the bottom. This is a pretty outrageous statistic in terms of our educational achievements when you consider that, in the 1990s and early 2000s when the Liberal Party was last in government, South Australian students were Australia's best performers in literacy. Obviously, I have been following education quite a lot and following closely the decision to cap enrolments at primary schools, particularly those in the eastern and southern suburbs. On the topic of enrolment capping, the SA Association of School Parent Clubs President, Ms Jenice Zerner, said:

Increased investment across all schools will mean fewer families from outside the area will choose to send their children to eastern schools.

Ms Zerner hit the nail on the head and she was indeed right: if schools across our state were better funded by the state government, we would not see the need for capping of certain areas and caps on certain popular government schools.

Of course, one does wonder why the state government does not choose to invest more wisely. Indeed, you get the feeling they would rather spend money on refurbishing space in the education department for bureaucrats to review schools, costing about \$200,000. As the member for Morialta has indeed previously mentioned, this money could have been used to upgrade classrooms in disadvantaged areas. But, no, the government has other priorities. It seems that the bureaucrats in Flinders Street get priority over teachers, other staff and students in our schools. The bureaucrats are heavily tied to the education union, which seems to be pulling all the strings when it comes to our education system.

Education is fundamental to the development and growth of all South Australians. Indeed, it is the best tool to unleash the full potential of the human mind but, unfortunately, South Australian children are being denied this opportunity. They are being let down by a government that, as is so often the case, has no coherent plan for improving a failing system.

### MURRAY RIVER

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:14):** I would like to talk about the platform on which I came into this parliament which was about reform. It was about the River Murray and ways that South Australia could negotiate a better outcome for our water security. The Murray-Darling Basin Plan is something that I have pursued for a very long time. I think back to 1996 when I first went over to Canberra to lobby the federal government. Back then, there were many different opinions, and as time went by the most significant meeting for me was with the then environment minister, minister Turnbull—we had prime minister Howard—to negotiate a better deal for South Australia.

While we were doing that, the undertaking of the federal government at the time was that we would look at the fact there was only a certain amount of water in storage, there was a certain amount of water being used for consumptive use and it did not add up, so at that point in time governments were relying on rainfall, and that was a real concern. Over time it has evolved. We are trying to mend 100 years of overextraction, and it is of real concern to me now that what we are seeing is a huge amount of political pointscoring.

We are seeing all sorts of politicians—whether it be the Premier in South Australia, the federal opposition, Independents—out there scoring cheap political points while all the irrigators and the communities are doing the hard yards. They are the ones giving up their water for environmental flows, they are the ones who are going through the heartache of having to restructure and install new and more efficient methods of using their water.

What we are now seeing is this pointscoring, and why? We are in a progress phase. We are trying to implement the 2,750 gigalitres by 2019. Yes, we are going through a review phase at the moment. Yes, we have the ministers coming to the table. Nothing is going to change while we still have the same legislation in place. Yet, we have politicians standing up and taking points for no apparent reason other than their own. The people of the Riverland, all of the river communities and the irrigators are the ones doing the hard yards.

We have a minister in another place, a foul-mouthed minister, who yells abuse at women ministers, who yells abuse at an acting prime minister, who walked out on an opportunity to better negotiate a deal for South Australia. South Australia's contribution out of the 2,750 gigalitres will be 183 gigalitres. We are about 20 gigalitres short, so we are going along quite nicely. By 2019, we are on track to meet the 2,750 gigalitres. All states have agreed to do that. The further 450 gigalitres has been a contentious issue, but it is legislated. There is \$1.77 billion on the table for environmental improvements on farm, various constraints and ways that we can get environmental water down the great River Murray and through the Murray-Darling Basin.

The issue I have at the moment is that the Premier of South Australia negotiated with the then prime minister Gillard an extra 450 gigalitres—\$1.77 billion to achieve that 450 gigalitres. He agreed that there would be no adverse social and economic impacts and that all the water will come from the eastern states. South Australia now has to contribute another 36 gigalitres towards the

450 gigalitres, so where is the Premier's promise on not having any adverse social and economic impacts on South Australia, let alone pointing the finger across the border and saying, 'You are going to have to achieve all of that water?' It is having a huge social and economic impact.

Steven Marshall, the Leader of the Opposition, is committed to 3,200 gigalitres, a full rollout of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. Let me assure you, Deputy Speaker, that he has been over and visited the assistant water minister. He has been over and visited the PM. It is not about a photo opportunity. The Premier of South Australia has missed the photo opportunity, and that is what he is dirty on. Steven Marshall has acted responsibly and has backed 3,200 gigalitres of water to come back into the environment.

What I want to ask the South Australian government is: how many environmental works and measures below Lock 1 have they achieved? Where is the audit of the South Australian government's water organisations to find efficiencies in their businesses so that they can contribute towards the basin plan? There are none. What every South Australian and every Murray-Darling Basin person wants is a healthy working river—and that should be the priority, not a number that distracts from the main game. The main game is putting water back into the environment while maintaining a healthy working river with viable communities and viable irrigation to grow food for our economy for our people. There is much more to be said on the Murray-Darling Basin.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Unfortunately, it can't be said today.

*Bills*

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ELECTRICITY AND GAS LAWS - INFORMATION COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION) BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:20 the house adjourned until Wednesday 30 November 2016 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***ECARL**

**200 Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (15 December 2015).

1. What KPI's or determinants will be used to evaluate the success of the proposed 10 non-social workers to be employed at a cost of \$500,000 to work on the CARL?

2. What improvement in the 20 minute 16 second waiting time is expected; what improvement in the 15,000 calls unanswered last financial year is expected and has a script been prepared?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** Members will be aware that this pilot has now been abandoned, in response to a recommendation of the royal commission into child protection systems.

**EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION LEVY**

**218 Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (9 August 2016). With respect to the 2016-17 State Budget—Budget Paper 4, volume 2, page 16: Program Summary indicates sale of goods and services has increased from \$2.7M in 2014-15, and a \$2.8M budget for 2015-16 to a \$6M actual result in 2015-16. While on page 17, \$3M of this is identified as being related to increased revenue from family day care due to the introduction of the educator administration levy.

1. What is the purpose and benefit of the educator administration levy and who pays it?

2. With \$7.4M budgeted in 2016-17, the explanation for this increase from the \$6M collected last year is \$900,000 extra from the educator levy and \$400,000 from higher revenue from the sale of land and buildings. What land and buildings were sold?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

1. The educator administration levy is paid on a fortnightly basis by 'active' Family Day Care educators registered with the Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) Family Day Care (FDC).

In the May 2014 federal budget the Australian government announced changes to the Community Support Program (CSP).

These changes have had a significant impact on services across Australia, with the Australian government reducing support by \$157 million. For DECD FDC, the changes have resulted in an estimated reduction of \$3.2 million in operational funding for 2015-16. This represents a 75% reduction in funding from the Australian government.

As a result the educator administration levy was introduced on 5 October 2015 at 65 cents per child per hour.

DECD FDC did not make the decision to pass on the federal cut lightly. The funding has ensured that there is a viable and accessible family day care service for families.

DECD FDC is a not-for-profit service. The educator administration levy remains set at 65 cents per hour per child to continue operation of the FDC schemes on a cost recovery basis. The coordination units provide a range of services to support FDC educator including (but not limited to):

- regular home visiting
- home safety assessments
- curriculum and planning support
- ongoing professional learning
- advice and monitoring compliance with the National Law, Regulations and National Quality Standards
- referral of families
- specialist business centre for the administration of, and compliance with, child care payments.

2. The increase of \$400,000 from land sales is the estimated revenue to be received in 2016-17 from the sale of early childhood facilities.

**BI-NATIONAL FRENCH-AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL**

**220 Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (9 August 2016). With respect to the 2016-17 State Budget—Budget Paper 4, volume 2, page 23: Targets identifies the government's plan to introduce a new bi-national French-Australian school. Is that school going to receive the same level of support as the Chinese school?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

The 2 schools selected to deliver the French binational stream, Highgate School and Unley High School, will receive support which is tailored to their specific circumstances.

The department is working closely with the principals of each school to determine the necessary support. The initial scope includes:

- A coordinator to oversee the programs at both schools.
- Release time for teachers to prepare the binational and daily lesson programs.
- Professional learning activities for staff.
- Additional administration support.
- Funding for any necessary classroom refurbishments and ICT upgrades required to successfully run the programs.
- Funding for the purchase of resources required to successfully teach the programs.

The department is working with the principals to establish the longer term needs required to successfully sustain the program.

#### VOLUNTARY MERGERS

**221 Mr GARDNER (Moriaita)** (9 August 2016). During the budget estimate's hearings, the minister identified that there are 23 expressions of interest which involve 47 sites in relation to voluntary mergers of schools. What are the details?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** The details of the 23 voluntary amalgamation expressions of interest involving 47 sites are listed below:

The following schools and preschools expressed interest and have since agreed to voluntarily merge:

- Edithburgh Primary School/Yorketown Area School
- Farrell Flat Primary School/Clare Primary School
- Gilles Plains Primary School/Gilles Plains Preschool / Windsor Gardens Secondary College.
- Gladstone Primary School/Gladstone Kindergarten / Georgetown Primary School
- Lake Wangary Primary School/Lake Wangary Preschool Centre
- Loxton North Primary School/Loxton North Kindergarten
- Maitland Area School/Maitland Children's Centre/Point Pearce Aboriginal School
- Orreroo Area School/Orreroo Kindergarten
- Port Kenny Primary School/Streaky Bay Area School
- Wilmington Primary School/Wilmington Kindergarten
- Winkie Primary School/Glossop Primary School

The following schools and preschools expressed an interest in the program, and after seeking further details have decided not to proceed further:

- Flagstaff Hill R-7/Flagstaff Hill Kindergarten
- Glossop High School
- Lockleys Primary School
- Meningie Area School/Meningie Kindergarten

The following school and preschool voted against the amalgamation after considering the information and options available to them:

- Hampstead Primary School/Hampstead Preschool

The following schools and preschools have submitted an expression of interest and are currently considering their options:

- Coonalpyn Kindergarten/Coonalpyn Primary School
- Laura Primary School/Laura Preschool & Rural Care
- Ngura Yadorim Children & Family Centre (Ceduna)/Minya Bunhii (Ceduna)
- Pasadena High School/Unley High School
- Salisbury Primary School/Salisbury Kindergarten

- Salisbury Downs Primary School/Salisbury Downs Kindergarten
- Swan Reach Area School/Swan Reach and Area Kindergarten

#### CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (20 September 2016).

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

The Child Protection Systems Royal Commission report has no specific recommendations relating to the requirement for staff in the Families SA Call Centre to have a minimum of three years' experience.

The report under Part III, Children at Risk in the Community 'The need for experienced staff' supports the case for staff to have at least three years' field experience (optimal being five years or more) in child protection work.

Of relevance is recommendation 38, which suggests abandoning the proposal to engage unqualified call agents to receive telephone notifications and that calls 'must only be taken by degree-level, tertiary qualified and experienced practitioners'.

This recommendation has been accepted by the government and has resulted in Families SA dismissing a proposal which would have seen trained non-social work staff answer calls to CARL during business hours and record notification information.

The Call Centre has not replaced any staff nor has it established minimum years of child protection experience as a recruitment prerequisite.

#### *Estimates Replies*

#### BUDGET EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

The approved budgeted expenditure for new and existing projects across the forward estimates as per the 2016-17 State Budget is:

	Total Project Cost	16/17 (\$'000)	17/18 (\$'000)	18/19 (\$'000)	19/20 (\$'000)
New Projects					
Families SA Northern Office	15,000	3,400	11,600	0	0
Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Facilities in Schools	250,000	35,000	100,000	115,000	0
Existing Projects					
Children's Centres - Stage 2	15,500	14,780	0	0	0
Christie Downs Primary School	4,000	3,360	200	0	0
Christies Beach High School Disability Unit	5,000	3,960	580	0	0
Community Residential Care Facilities	10,651	5,944	0	0	0
Evanston Gardens Primary School	6,000	3,131	0	0	0
Le Fevre High School	1,000	760	0	0	0
National Quality Agenda - Compliance	9,750	4,500	4,500	0	0
National Quality Agenda - Preschools	12,026	3,000	0	0	0
New City High School	85,000	17,800	41,000	24,700	0
Playford International College	7,000	4,560	1,920	0	0
Preschool Outdoor Learning Areas	6,000	2,250	1,500	0	0
Preschool Relocation Program	21,790	1,300	0	0	0
Seaview High School	2,630	2,000	0	0	0
Swallowcliffe Primary School	5,000	3,960	580	0	0
Trade Training Centres in Schools	78,815	0	0	0	0
Yalata Anangu School	2,010	821	0	0	0
Small Projects	n.a.	1921	2,235		

**SACE MODERNISATION**

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

The SACE Board's new modernisation program is providing an additional 11.0 FTEs in 2016-17.

No staff are being exited in 2016-17. The budget paper does not include a further 11.0 temporary positions that were included in the 2015-16 figure and will continue in 2016-17.

The 2016-17 FTE figure will therefore be 120.0.

**FOSTER CARE**

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

Counting carer households rather than individual carers gives the most accurate picture of the foster care sector. This is because carer households are matched to placements and it is the registration of the household which includes the number of children a household can place.

The number of new foster and specific child only carer households for the financial year ending 30 June 2016 was 149. This includes existing carer households where the registration status has changed for the household.

The number of primary foster and specific child only carer households that left the system during the financial year ending 30 June 2016 was 180. This includes approximately 100 carer registrations being cancelled due to the carer being inactive, which was the result of an audit conducted in relation to carer registration during the 2015-16 financial year.

The total number of foster and specific child only carer households registered for the year ending 30 June 2014 was 1,413, for the year ending 30 June 2015 it was 1,385 and for the year ending 30 June 2016 it was 1,359. Data for 2014 and 2015 includes inactive carers, removed as part of the 2015-16 audit.

**CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE**

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

Based on total accommodation expenditure recorded in the general ledger and the average number of children in commercial care for each year, the average cost of accommodation for children in commercial care for the 2014-15 year is estimated at \$145.70 per child per night and \$133.85 for 2015-16 year.

A breakdown of accommodation cost by month for 2014-15 and 2015-16 is as follows:

2015/16		2014/15	
Month	Amount	Month	Amount
July	428,508.55	July	383,770.40
August	478,212.50	August	416,640.11
September	513,011.63	September	319,015.72
October	632,089.34	October	479,790.32
November	656,932.88	November	355,492.64
December	469,116.40	December	338,296.28
January	570,611.76	January	312,686.68
February	614,453.67	February	376,110.82
March	579,379.11	March	353,640.02
April	708,965.15	April	339,685.05
May	799,520.89	May	451,335.33
June	995,611.42	June	660,136.79
Total	7,446,413.30	Total	4,786,600.16

**ECARL**

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)



**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

The tier response rating is determined using the internationally recognised Children's Research Centre (CRC), Structured Decision-Making® (SDM®) Response Priority Assessment tool (SDM®-RPA).

When the department receives a report of suspected child abuse or neglect, a Social Worker will firstly apply the SDM® Screening Criteria and Definitions tool to establish a ground for child protection intervention and determine that the reported concerns meet the statutory threshold.

Once this has been concluded the social worker will apply the SDM® Response Priority Assessment tool (SDM®-RPA).

SDM®-RPA guides the social worker through a series of decision making trees dependent on the established grounds for intervention. The process guides the social worker in determining the tier rating and the expected response time:

- Tier 1 (24 hour response)
- Tier 2 (3 days for infants at risk; otherwise 5 days or 10 days depending on the outcomes of assessments)
- Tier 3 (non-investigative response—no specific time frames).

#### **TAFE SA**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** Only the TAFE SA campuses situated on land owned by the Minister for Higher Education and Skills and managed by TAFE SA and the Department of State Development are to be transferred to Renewal SA.

Sites to be retained include those where the land is not owned by the Minister for Higher Education and Skills, as follows:

- Parafield campus located within the Parafield Airport—on land owned by the Commonwealth of Australia.
- Urrbrae campus located within Urrbrae Education Centre Agricultural High School—on land owned by the Minister for Education and Child Development.
- Kangaroo Island campus located within the Kangaroo Island Community Education Campus—on land owned by the Minister for Education and Child Development.
- Wudinna campus located within Wudinna Area School—on land owned by the Crown with Wudinna District Council as custodian.
- Bordertown campus located within Bordertown High School—on land owned by the Minister for Education and Child Development.
- Bordertown Meatworks located within the JBS Meat Exporting and Packing compound at Bordertown—on private land.
- Murray Bridge Meatworks located within the Thomas Foods International Meatworks compound at Murray Bridge—on private land.
- Lobethal meatworks located within the Thomas Foods International Meatworks compound at Lobethal—on private land.

Additionally, Millicent campus is not being transferred to Renewal SA as the Department of State Development is in the process of exploring alternative ownership options with other government departments.

#### **TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES**

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** Information on TVSPs can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament.

There is no budget over the forward estimates and any packages offered are to be funded within existing agency budgets.

#### **MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** I have been advised of the following:

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non-ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
2	AS07
2.4	AS06
2	AS05
2	AS04

#### CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**  
The following provides information with regard to:

There were no attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants or contractors within Regions SA

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
P1RSA	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
PIRSA	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL

#### GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

**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):**

Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

Minister for Forests

Minister for Tourism

Minister for Recreation and Sport

Minister for Racing

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more for 2015-16:

Primary Industries and Regions SA (Controlled) (1)

Please note, that the question asks whether expenditures made were subject to a grant agreement, as required by Treasurer's Instruction No.15 (TI 15). Grants that have been made to other state government agencies, South Australian universities or are \$10,000 or less are not required to have a grant agreement and are reflected as 'Not Applicable' in the appropriate column.

(1) Controlled—relates directly to an agency's operational objectives and arises at its discretion and direction

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Food South Australia Incorporated	550,000	South Australia's Food and Wine Industries project 2015-16.	Y
South Australian Wine Industry Association Incorporated	250,000	Contribution for the South Australian Wine Industry Market and Industry Development Program 2015-16.	Y
Parafield Airport Ltd	450,000	Specific technical investigations, concept and site planning to prepare	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
		for the implementation of a Food Park at Parafield Airport.	
DairySA Regional Development Program Incorporated	58,000	Collaboration between Dairy SA and Dairy Innovation Australia Limited to deliver a project that provides benefits across the value chain from milk suppliers and industry bodies through small processors and sales.	Y
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	58,000	Develop collaboration across the red meat value chain to create a deeper understanding of the industry, its barriers and inefficiencies.	Y
Environment Protection Authority	42,000	South Australian Murray Darling Basin Land Use Mapping project.	Not Applicable
Mackillop Farm Management Group Incorporated	40,600	Establish an industry led steering committee to collaborate across the Limestone Coast cropping industry to enhance innovation and profitability through the value chain.	Y
Ricca Terra Farms Pty Ltd	40,600	Develop a cluster of Riverland alternative wine grape growers, wine makers and supporting partners that are directly linked to the production of premium wines from the region that are sold both domestically and internationally.	Y
Coonawarra Grape and Wine Incorporated	40,000	To optimise water use efficiency for improved wine quality in Coonawarra vineyards using remote sensing technologies.	Y
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland Incorporated	29,000	Advance the Murraylands Food Group to work in conjunction with relevant Government organisations to achieve goals that cannot be achieved as individuals.	Y
South Australian Murray Irrigators Incorporated	29,000	Building productive opportunity through customised water stewardship adoption.	Y
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland Incorporated	10,000	Workforce Innovation project to review the workforce development and human resource management needs to support future Murraylands food industry growth.	Y
Food South Australia Incorporated	170,000	Agribusiness Growth Program to assist small food and beverage agribusinesses by providing expert consultant business evaluation and business coaching services designed to enhance their ability to plan and manage their growth.	Y
South Australian Wine Industry Association Incorporated	148,000	Agribusiness Growth Program to assist small food and beverage agribusinesses by providing expert consultant business evaluation and business coaching services designed to enhance their ability to plan and manage their growth.	Y
Organic & Raw Trading Company Pty Ltd	28,000	Optimise alcohol management for raw and naturally fermented Kombucha (fermented tea) via	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
		collaboration with Australian Wine Research Institute Limited.	
Kangaroo Island Living Honey	20,000	Increase the value of honey product and utilise the waste or by product of propolis (ie bee glue).	Y
Kangaroo Island Shellfish Pty Ltd	20,000	Develop frozen pre-topped premium oysters for retail and caterers to point of commercialisation.	Y
Potatoes South Australia Incorporated	20,000	Develop a new product range, transforming waste (graded out) potatoes into pure, nutritious, premium food products targeted at the paediatric, geriatric and convenience market segments.	Y
The University of Adelaide	18,000	Enhance innovative management practices to achieve year round supply of premium pasture-finished cattle in the Limestone Coast region.	Not Applicable
Willunga Pasta Trust	16,000	Develop effective and efficient small-scale low temperature drying equipment for a unique high value gluten free pasta in collaboration with Envirotec Group Pty Ltd and Logifish Consulting.	Y
Fruit Dehydrators Australia	15,000	Development of a range of dehydrated fruit and vegetable superfood products that achieves a 5 star health rating in accordance with the Health Star Rating System.	Y
Flinders Ranges Premium Grain Pty Ltd	14,000	Increase shelf life of whole grain cereals and pulse flour for export and domestic markets.	Y
Natural Fractions Pty Ltd	10,000	Grant to further fractionation techniques to enable recovery of more specific natural (high value) components from essential oils.	Y
Savannah Farm Pty Ltd	10,000	Savannah Stress Free Pod Systems project to design and construct a mobile meat processing unit for use by local, national and/or international producers.	Y
Department of State Development	20,000	Examine the impact of the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement Impact Study on the South Australian economy in terms of potential trade gains, investment effects, employment effects and overall welfare improvements for the South Australian economy.	Not Applicable
AusVeg SA	15,000	To prepare a comprehensive China intelligence report which outlines the potential markets for vegetables in China.	Y
Livestock SA Incorporated	100,000	Develop and implement a working, in-plant Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) hook tracking system at the Bordertown abattoir.	Y
Food South Australia Incorporated	80,000	Funding to employ a Project Manager to facilitate the delivery of the Manufacturing Works, Competitive Foods Initiative.	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Food South Australia Incorporated	70,000	2015 SA Food Industry Awards Program and business management and coaching sessions to entrants.	Y
Livestock SA Incorporated	70,000	Portable Real Time Test for Detection of Sheep Lice project.	Y
Agricultural Societies Council of SA Incorporated	60,000	2015-16 Young Rural Ambassador Awards and Rural Ambassador Awards, and for the Royal Agricultural Shows.	Y
Livestock SA Incorporated	60,000	Improve the financial literacy of farm operators and work with key groups to deliver a course targeted at improving the financial literacy and management skills of livestock producers.	Y
SA Dairyfarmers' Association Incorporated	60,000	Dairy Marketing Program to support the current consumer goodwill towards branded milk, promote continued growth in demand and develop a campaign strategy to maintain consumer awareness of the need and benefits of buying local.	Y
Barossa Grape & Wine Association Incorporated	50,000	Barossa wine industry capability development program, to build capability in the Barossa wine industry using consumer and market insights that drive innovation and value creation through the chain.	Y
Cherry Growers Association of South Australia	50,000	Adelaide Hills fruit growers market engagement strategy project, to develop a comprehensive strategy to engage with Vietnam to gain market access for fruit specifically from the Adelaide Hills Pest-Free Area.	Y
Vinehealth Australia	50,000	Improving South Australia's capability and leadership in Biosecurity management by enhancing Vinehealth Australia's Vineyard Register through the application of leading edge technology.	Y
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	48,000	Kangaroo Island Beverages Industry Transformation project for the promotion, distribution and sales of Kangaroo Island beverages on the Island and in the Adelaide CBD.	Not Applicable
Potatoes South Australia Incorporated	25,000	Potato waste transformation project, to explore commercialisation options, conduct additional market research interstate and internationally, and establish a new business model for the pathway to market.	Y
Horticulture Coalition of South Australia	20,000	Research project to identify and address any weaknesses of the Adelaide Hills and Northern Adelaide Plains Pest Free Areas and help progress South Australia's new Pest Free Areas to being ready for market access negotiations.	Y
Livestock SA Incorporated	12,100	To support twenty-two South Australian students to attend the National Merino Challenge.	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of State Development	10,000	Contribution towards the Kuala Lumpur Gala Dinner Event.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	10,000	Regional food systems grounds for sustainability project.	Not Applicable
EP Shellfish	160,000	Funding to support the industry in addressing the critical shortfall of spat supply following Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome outbreak in Tasmania.	Y
Sustainable Aquatic Industries Pty Ltd	160,000	Funding for the Pacific Oyster facility, upgrades and equipment following Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome outbreak in Tasmania	Y
South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council Incorporated	120,000	PIRSA contribution to South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (RecFish SA) for 2015-16.	Y
Conservation Council SA	15,000	PIRSA contribution to the Conservation Council for 2015-16.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (Queensland Government)	660,662	SA contribution to Red Imported Fire Ant Eradication Program 2015-16	Y
New South Wales Department of Industry	185,000	Supply of Sterile Queensland fruit fly pupae.	Y
Department of Agriculture (Commonwealth)	169,650	SA annual contribution to the Australian Plague Locust Commission.	Y
Animal Health Australia	124,230	SA annual contribution for national programs managed by Animal Health Australia.	Y
Plant Health Australia	115,803	Plant Health Australia annual contribution for 2015-16.	Y
Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (Victoria)	35,333	SA contribution to Giant Pine Scale emergency response plan 2015-16.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (Queensland Government)	28,311	SA contribution to Electric Ant Eradication Program 2015-16.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (Queensland Government)	24,699	SA contribution to the management of Exotic Fruit Fly in Torres Strait.	Y
Plant Health Australia	20,000	SA contribution to the operation of the National Fruit Fly Strategy Advisory Committee (as a member of that Committee).	Y
New South Wales Department of Industry	19,307	SA contribution to Red Imported Fire Ant response costs 2015-16.	Y
Horticulture Innovation Australia	2,181,462	Co-investment project to establish the Sterile Insect Technology (SIT) facility for Queensland fruit fly (Qfly) production at Port Augusta and SITplus three year agreement for the (Qfly) SIT factory pilot operation.	Y
Dog Fence Board	509,000	State Government Agreement for \$1:\$1 matched payment of Dog Fence Board Levy Collections.	State agreement- <i>Dog Fence Act 1946</i>

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Dog Fence Board	400,000	To aid drought recovery in South Australia through strengthened regional pest control by upgrading dog fences in drought affected areas.	Y
Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources	250,000	To aid drought recovery in South Australia through strengthened weed and pest control.	Not Applicable
Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources	180,000	To aid drought recovery in South Australia through strengthened regional pest control.	Not Applicable
Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre	50,000	PIRSA contribution to Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) as a participant organisation.	Y
Animal Health Australia	45,918	PIRSA contribution to manage a number of programs aimed at enhancing animal health in Australia.	Y
Vinehealth Australia	45,000	To undertake a trial of current ge-fencing software and investigating the opportunity to further trial the system in the animal sector.	Y
University of Melbourne	38,000	To undertake a review of South Australia's metropolitan fruit fly trapping grid and assess for optimal trapping density and trap layout for the detection of Queensland Fruit Fly and Mediterranean Fruit Fly.	Y
Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources	35,000	Regional landscape surveillance for new weed threats and silverleaf nightshade biological control.	Not Applicable
Meat & Livestock Australia Limited	20,000	Contribution payment towards Meat & Livestock Australia national project to develop new weed biological control agents.	Y
The University of Adelaide	10,000	To combine the feral cat control and disease management on Kangaroo Island.	Not Applicable
Rural Counsellors program for the state rural sector (various grant recipients)	245,000	Grant to support delivery of counselling services for farm businesses across the State.	Y
McLaren Vale Grape Wine & Tourism	121,000	Payment for the McLaren Vale Water Plan, assisting irrigators replace mains water used for irrigation purposes, with connection to treated wastewater supply.	Y
Pinery Bushfire Recovery (various grant recipients)	29,989	Grants to provide short term targeted assistance to those in the fire affected region by reimbursing clean-up and reinstatement costs to eligible primary producers.	Y
South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program— Irrigation Efficiency (various grant recipients)	16,274,070	Grants to support on-farm and off-farm improvements to the efficiency of delivery and use of water by irrigation water providers and irrigators.	Y
South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program—Water Purchases (various grant recipients)	11,061,500	Grants for irrigators to return water access entitlements from the South Australian River Murray Prescribed Watercourse.	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program— Irrigation Industry Assistance (various grant recipients)	37,153,043	Grants for irrigation water providers and irrigators who wish to reposition their businesses to be more productive, competitive and resilient to variations in seasonal and trading conditions, and better positioned to respond to future business challenges and opportunities.	Y
The University of Adelaide	134,064	Grants under the South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program—Industry-led Research Sub-Program for applied research to improve regional productivity and innovation in priority research areas.	Not Applicable
South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program – Regional Development and Innovation Fund Sub-Program (various grant recipients)	3,442,193	To deliver further employment opportunities and regional economic diversification in the South Australian River Murray region.	Y
The University of Adelaide	60,000	To provide scholarships to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.	Not Applicable
Regional Development Australia—Yorke and Mid North Incorporated	10,000	Provide assistance to stakeholders and proponents to develop viable project proposals for the Mid North Forests Future Strategy Request for Proposal.	Y
The University of Newcastle	10,000	PIRSA contribution to Cooperative Research Centre High Performance Soils project to develop an application focused on improving soil performance and productivity.	Y
SA Dairyfarmers' Association Incorporated	60,000	Provide one-to-one support services to dairy farmers affected by the farm gate milk price step down.	Y
Livestock SA Incorporated	275,000	Engagement of the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board to assist pastoralists control wild dogs in South Australia's Arid Lands region.	Y
Adelaide Research and Innovation Pty Ltd	100,000	Funding for investigation into the application of drone technology to control wild dog population in South Australia's Far North.	Y
McLaren Vale Grape Wine & Tourism	40,000	Funding for Sustainable Australia Winegrowing program chapter review.	Y
McLaren Vale Grape Wine & Tourism	40,000	Funding for Supporting Brands: McLaren Vale—One Region—One Brand.	Y
Langhorne Creek Grape and Wine Incorporated	40,000	Funding for Supporting Brands – Langhorne Creek—'Table Talk' an interactive video.	Y
Clare Valley Winemakers Incorporated	31,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—Clare with Fresh Eyre: Marketing premium Clare Valley riesling with Eyre Peninsula seafood.	Y
Adelaide Hills Wine Region Incorporated	40,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—to produce a documentary video highlighting the Adelaide Hills as a desirable food and wine destination	Y



Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
		and hold a food and wine event for selected media and trade.	
Kangaroo Island Industry and Brand Alliance	40,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—Kangaroo Island delivering workshops and mentoring to build brand expertise with industry groups.	Y
Kangaroo Island Industry and Brand Alliance	30,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—Kangaroo Island Social Media Alliance.	Y
Barossa Trust Mark Incorporated	30,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—establishing value in the Barossa Trust Mark by building awareness and understanding.	Y
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland Incorporated	25,200	Funding for Supporting Brands—Riverland—where great ideas flow project.	Y
Regional Development Australia—Yorke and Mid North Incorporated	40,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—Branding Yorke Peninsula Produce Project.	Y
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland Incorporated	10,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—Murray River, Lakes and Coorong: Building the Brand digital strategy.	Y
Horticulture Coalition of SA Incorporated	26,000	Funding for Supporting Brands—Northern Adelaide Plains' regional marketing strategy project.	Y
Spencer Gulf and West Coast Prawn Fisherman's Association Incorporated	34,425	Marine Stewardship Council Sustainability Certification for the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery.	Y
South Australian Blue Crab Pot Fisher's Association Incorporated	15,000	Marine Stewardship Council Sustainability Certification for the South Australian Blue Crab Fishery.	Y
Marine Fishers Association Incorporated	15,000	Marine Stewardship Council Sustainability Certification for South Australian garfish Fishery.	Y
Southern Fishermen's Association Incorporated	14,400	Marine Stewardship Council Sustainability Certification for the Lakes & Coorong Fishery's Pipi and Finfish.	Y
South Australian Oyster Research Council	25,000	Management System based on the Total Quality Certification Services International SA Oyster Growers Association Quality Health Safety & Environment Code.	Y
Southern Rocklobster Limited	29,701	Implementation of the Clean Green Program across the South Australian Rock Lobster Fishing Industry.	Y
Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association Ltd	35,000	Funding for third-party independent certification of the environmental sustainability performance of tuna catching and ranching in South Australia.	Y
Adelaide Research and Innovation Pty Ltd	142,700	Partner payment—Horticulture Innovation Australia project—Developing and optimising production of a male-only, temperature-sensitive-lethal, strain of Queensland Fruit Fly, <i>B. tryoni</i> for Sterile Insect Technique.	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Birchip Cropping Group	29,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Profitable crop sequencing in the low rainfall areas of South Eastern Australia.	Y
Central West Farming Systems Incorporated	29,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Profitable crop sequencing in the low rainfall areas of South Eastern Australia.	Y
Charles Sturt University	142,330	Partner payment – Australian Grape and Wine Authority and Development Corporation project—Practical management of grapevine trunk diseases.	Y
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	32,349	Partner payment—Australian Grape and Wine Authority project—Managing the impacts of climate change rainfall decline on vine balance and root activity.	Y
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	59,695	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Improved Management of Snails and Slugs.	Y
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	30,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—National improved molecular diagnostics for disease.	Y
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	68,297	Partner payment—South Australian Grains Industry Trust, Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Field trials to assess the efficacy of farm practices associated with Fungicide control of Rhizoctonia.	Y
Curtin University	139,768	Partner payment—Australian Grape and Wine Authority project—Understanding fungicide resistance in powdery mildew, downy mildew and botrytis.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (Queensland)	50,203	Partner payment—Horticulture Innovation Australia project—Specialized Pheromone and Lure Application Technology Cuelure based management of Queensland fruit fly.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Food (Western Australia)	50,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—National improved molecular diagnostics for disease.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Food (Western Australia)	303,716	Partner payment—Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation, Grains Research and Development Corporation project—National oat breeding program.	Y
Department of Agriculture and Food (Western Australia)	111,565	Partner payment—Australian Grape and Wine Authority project—Assessing clonal variability in Chardonnay and Shiraz for future climate change.	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (Victoria)	25,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—National improved molecular diagnostics for disease.	Y
New South Wales Department of Industry	50,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—National improved molecular diagnostics for disease.	Y
New South Wales Department of Industry	67,626	Partner payment – Horticulture Innovation Australia project—Specialized Pheromone and Lure Application Technology Cuelure based management of Queensland fruit fly.	Y
Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC)	150,000	Contribution towards project—growing a profitable, innovative and collaborative Australian Yellowtail Kingfish aquaculture industry: bringing 'white' fish to the market.	Y
Heritage Seeds Pty Ltd	66,800	Partner payment—Meat and Livestock Australia project—Acid tolerate Lucerne.	Y
Chile Institute of Agricultural Research (INIA)	68,034	Partner payment—Global Crop Diversity Trust project—The potential of wild crop germplasm to improve drought tolerance in alfalfa to increase food production for a growing population with less water.	Y
Kazakh Scientific Research Institute of Agriculture	17,324	Partner payment—Global Crop Diversity Trust project—The potential of wild crop germplasm to improve drought tolerance in alfalfa to increase food production for a growing population with less water.	Y
Mallee Sustainable Farming Incorporated	34,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Profitable crop sequencing in the low rainfall areas of South Eastern Australia.	Y
Meat and Livestock Australia Limited	122,048	Partner payment—Meat and Livestock Australia project—Acid tolerant Lucerne.	Y
Murdoch University	20,000	Partner payment—Pork Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) project—Optimising the time of mating in easy to manage lactation systems to improve pregnancy outcomes and weaning.	Y
Papua New Guinea National Agriculture Research Institute	56,486	Partner payment—Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research project—Enhancing role of small scale feed milling in the development of the monogastric industries in Papua New Guinea.	Y
New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries	16,024	Partner payment—Review of pest and disease diagnostics protocols.	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Philippine Department of Science and Technology	52,767	Partner payment—Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research project—Action ready climate knowledge to improve disaster risk management for small holder farmers in the Philippines.	Y
Philippine Institute for Development Studies	27,557	Partner payment—Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research project—Action ready climate knowledge to improve disaster risk management for small holder farmers in the Philippines.	Y
Philippine Department of Agriculture	27,531	Partner payment—Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research project—Action ready climate knowledge to improve disaster risk management for small holder farmers in the Philippines.	Y
Pork Cooperative Research Centre Limited	75,000	Contribution towards Essential Participants Agreement for an incorporated entity – Cooperative Research Centre for High Integrity Australian Pork.	Y
The Australian Wine Research Institute	10,000	Contribution to Wine Innovation Centre facility and executive support.	Y
The Australian Wine Research Institute	29,750	Partner payment—Australian Grape and Wine Authority project—Understanding fungicide resistance in powdery mildew, downy mildew and botrytis.	Y
The Australian Wine Research Institute	45,000	Partner payment—Transferring Riverland food loss and industry waste into profit project.	Y
The University of Adelaide	99,360	Contribution towards building and maintenance for the Piggery Research Building at the Roseworthy Campus.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	155,493	Contribution towards the statistics for the Australian Grains Industry, Southern Node.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	10,000	Contribution to Wine Innovation Centre facility and executive support.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	267,168	Contribution to Woolhouse library and grounds maintenance at the Waite Campus.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	28,000	Partner payment—Australian Grape and Wine Authority project—Cost-effective viticultural strategies to adapt to a warmer, drier climate.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	49,000	Partner payment—Australian Pork Ltd project—Key differences underlying top and bottom reproductive performers: analysis of management programme data.	Not Applicable

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
The University of Adelaide	10,070	Partner payment—Australian Water Recycling Centre of Excellence project—Methods to increase the use of recycled wastewater in the irrigation industry by overcoming the constraint of soil salinity.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	58,710	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Improving weed management in pulse crops through herbicide tolerance.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	10,000	Partner payment—Pork Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) project—Effects of group housing after weaning on sow welfare and sexual behaviour.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	500,000	PIRSA research support towards the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics.	Not Applicable
The University of Queensland	31,218	Partner payment—Pork Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) project—Development of an infrared spectroscopy online test for boar taint.	Y
University of Sydney	109,843	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Improved resistance to oat pathogens and abiotic stress management.	Y
University of South Australia	62,407	Partner payment—South Australian Grains Industry Trust, Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Field trials to assess the efficacy of farm practices associated with Fungicide control of Rhizoctonia.	Not Applicable
University of Southern Queensland	25,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—National improved molecular diagnostics for disease.	Y
Upper North Farming Systems	15,000	Partner payment—Grains Research and Development Corporation project—Profitable crop sequencing in the low rainfall areas of South Eastern Australia.	Y

## Department of Primary Industries and Regions – administered (1)

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
South Australian Grains Industry Trust	1,800,000	Industry levy collections returned to Industry to facilitate the sustainable development of the grain industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Grain Producers SA Ltd.	1,200,000	Deliver a program of eligible activities benefiting contributors to the Grain Industry Fund.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Riverland Wine Industry Development Council Incorporated	700,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Barossa Grape and Wine Association Incorporated	500,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
McLaren Vale Grape Wine & Tourism	500,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Wine Grape Council of South Australia Incorporated	420,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Langhorne Creek Grape and Wine Incorporated	300,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Adelaide Hills Wine Region Incorporated	265,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Citrus Australia Ltd.	170,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the citrus industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Pork SA Incorporated	72,308	Facilitate the sustainable development of the pork industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Clare Region Winegrape Growers Association Incorporated	65,000	Facilitate the sustainable development of the regional wine industry.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Pork SA Incorporated	10,750	Pig Industry Fund contribution to Pork SA to convene the 2016 SA Pig Industry Day.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
Dr Barry Lloyd Pty Ltd	10,410	Completion of reviewing truck washing facilities and Biosecurity protocols at Big River Pork and Primo abattoirs to strengthen the Biosecurity of SA pig farms.	<i>Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act, 1998</i>
The University of Adelaide	10,320	Project for maternal caffeine supplementation pre-farrowing: effects on stillbirths and piglet survival in a commercial setting.	Not Applicable
The University of Adelaide	10,000	Control of antibiotic-resistant commensal E-coli in SA pig's project.	Not Applicable
Livestock SA Incorporated	550,800	Operational costs associated with providing services to promote the interests of all SA cattle, sheep and goat producers.	Y
Livestock SA Incorporated	180,000	Development of a five-year strategic plan for the South Australian sheep industry (called 'SA Sheep Industry Blueprint').	Y
Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources	139,500	A co-funded program delivered by South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board (SAAL NRM) to assist landholders to implement best-practice wild dog control methods across South	Not Applicable

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
		Australia's pastoral districts, predominantly in areas south of the SA dog fence.	
Plant Health Australia Limited	40,000	Implementation of the National Bee Biosecurity Program and Biosecurity Code of Practice for the South Australian apiary industry.	Y
SA Dairyfarmers' Association Incorporated	40,000	To assist in the development and promotion of policies for South Australian dairy farmers at the cross commodity level (through membership of Primary Producers SA); and in the national arena.	Y
The University of Adelaide	27,427	Funding to investigate eradication options for sheep lice in Cleanskin Sheep research project.	Not Applicable
Mid North Young Guns Incorporated	21,770	Provide development, training and networking opportunities to help build the capacity of young sheep farmers in the Mid North region of SA.	Y
SA Stud Merino Sheepbreeders' Association Incorporated	10,000	Contribution to the World Merino Insight event with a focus on information exchange and networking amongst delegates from South Australia, Australia and across the globe.	Y
ForestrySA	3,709,000	Community Service Obligations Funding.	Y
ForestrySA	389,000	SA Government Radio Network Funding 2015-16.	Y

(1) Administered—an Agency has no discretion to alter the resources provide or determine how they are spent.

#### South Australian Tourism Commission

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Adelaide Hills Tourism Committee Inc	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer—Adelaide Hills	Y
Eyre Peninsula Regional Development Board	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer—Eyre Peninsula	Y
Yorke Peninsula Tourism Marketing	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer—Yorke Peninsula	Y
Tourism Kangaroo Island	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer—Kangaroo Island	Y
Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer—Fleurieu Peninsula	Y
Murraylands Tourism Partnership	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer —Murraylands	Y
D'Arenberg Wines	\$30,800.00	Funding D'Arenberg Documentary	Y
Kangaroo Island Council	\$11,000.00	2016 Grant KI Airport Upgrade	Y
57 Films Pty Ltd	\$200,000.00	Chef Exchange Project Grant—China	Y
South Aussie with Cosi Pty. Ltd.	\$44,000.00	Qingdao TV series—South Aussie with Cosi	Y
Regional Development Authority—Yorke & Mid North	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer Grant Clare Valley	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Destination Riverland	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer Riverland 15-16	Y
Flinders Ranges & Outback SA Tourism	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer Flinders Ranges & Outback SA	Y
Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North	\$22,000.00	Visitor Research—Clare Burra	Y
Limestone Coast Local Government Association	\$33,660.00	Local Contact Officer—Limestone Coast	Y
The Tailor	\$110,000.00	Grant—South Australia Campaign USA	Y
Australian Tourism Data Warehouse Pty Limited	\$118,124.00	ATDW online supplementary	Y
Regional Development Australia Whyalla & Eyre Peninsula Incorporated	\$11,000.00	Far West Indigenous Tourism Strategy	Y

## Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure – Office of Recreation and Sport

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Football Federation South Australia	10,000,000	Artificial pitches and club facility upgrades	Y
Port Pirie Regional Council	5,000,000	For Port Pirie Memorial Oval Redevelopment	Y
Various sporting groups	4,152,000	Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program (CRSFP) – For the planning, establishment and improvement of South Australian sport and recreation facilities.	Y
Various sporting groups	4,066,907	Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program (SRDIP)—To grow and develop state-wide sport and recreation programs and projects	Y
Various sporting groups	2,668,500	Sport and Recreation Sustainability Program (SRSP) To provide leadership and policy development	Y
Sports Vouchers	2,511,265	The Government committed to providing up to \$50 vouchers to all primary school children as a discount toward sports membership fees	Y
Active Club Program (ACP)	2,350,000	For programs, equipment and minor facilities	Y
Marion Council	2,000,000	For the construction of a regional level BMX facility at Majors Road, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Reserve	Y
YMCA of SA	1,489,208	Operator Subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the Parks Community Centre.	Y
YMCA Aquatic & Event Services	1,336,905	Operator Subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre (SAALC).	Y
State Facility Fund (SFF)	500,000	To maintain, develop and establish state level facilities	Y



Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Pathway Programs	132,900	Delivery of Sport Pathway development coach education workshops	Y
Modbury Bowling Club	750,000	Towards the upgrade of its facilities including the installation of synthetic grass and shade covers	Y
SA water VACSWIM program	414,896	To provide primary school aged children with opportunities to develop a range of skills and positive experiences in the area of water safety, confidence and competence in the water, personal survival activities and basic aquatic emergency procedures.	Y
Special Purpose Grants (SPG)	120,000	Planning, establishment and improvement of sport and recreation facilities and programs	Y
Water Polo Australia	70,000	For developing and delivering High Performance & Talent Pathway Programs for Water Polo in SA	Y
Sports Field Officers	52,000	For delivery of targeted services for regional clubs & associations	Y
Enventive	20,000	Incentive payment to support the further marketing and promotion of Vacswim SA and actions to secure additional long term program supporters.	Y
Leed Consulting	12,000	For the delivery of 'The Leadership Shadow – Champions of Change Program' to State Sporting Organisations	Y