

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 13 April 2017

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

Bills

CONSTITUTION (ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION) (APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Constitution Act of 1934 is one of the most important documents that we have in the state, and more will be said about that, I am sure, when members speak on the motion on the 160 years of responsible government of the state, which is on our agenda for consideration. However, from time to time even the constitution is identified as being deficient, sometimes in only a small way, and so it needs to be updated and to be contemporary.

On other occasions, the Supreme Court identifies for us any deficiency that might be exposed during litigation. Similarly, the High Court not only is the judicial watchdog for the federal parliament but also receives matters which are case stated and which, on appeal or review, might need to have an identification as to either the validity of a law or, indeed, how it may be improved if a deficiency is identified.

In this instance, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has brought to our attention a matter that in his view needs to be considered by this parliament. Accordingly, this bill is introduced. In particular, it will have the effect of amending section 86 to enable a registered political party, or any other person with an interest in an electoral redistribution, to be an appellant to a decision of the Electoral District Boundaries Commission. The wording is slightly different in the bill. As the mover of this bill, I am happy to identify that 'any other person' will be incorporated in the words 'any elector or registered political party to appeal'.

At present, section 86(2) of the Constitution Act provides that only an elector—that is, a person registered on the electoral roll—may appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court against any order of the commission. As members will know, the only ground is that that order 'has not been duly made in accordance with this act'.

Most recently, on 10 March 2007 the Full Court of the Supreme Court handed down a decision in *Martin v Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission* [2017] SASFC 18. Five judges, including Chief Justice Kourakis and Justices Kelly, Blue, Bampton and Hinton, unanimously dismissed an appeal by the Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, SA division. The order of the EDBC dated 7 December 2016 therefore remains, and accordingly the boundaries for our 47 state seats in the House of Assembly will be as per published in the order at that time.

It was a momentous occasion for some of us, probably not those in the ALP, but I think it is fair to say that when you have a 5-0 decision of the Full Court it is a smashing in anyone's terms, but in legal terms it makes it very clear that the Full Court fully endorsed the decision of the Electoral District Boundaries Commission, which included Her Honour Judge Vanstone.

I place on record my appreciation of all those who undertook work in relation to the Electoral District Boundaries Commission. It is a difficult exercise; it is a lot of work. Mr Gully and others in the Electoral Commission SA have to undertake an extraordinary amount of work, together with the third party, to form the commission. It is a lot of work. A number of people and parties put submissions, and I thank them for taking the time, because this really is at the core of ensuring that we have a fair and democratic process in respect of our elections.

The commission allowed for a redistribution in the December determination, which involved six rural electorates having electoral numbers with an estimate of 7 per cent below the average in respect of the population of electors, seven semirural electorates with an estimate of 3 per cent below the average and 34 city electorates having elector numbers slightly above the average.

Importantly, the judgement of the Full Court confirmed that the government by majority objective, which is set out in section 83(1), is clearly an objective and not just a matter to be considered and that the question of the equality of electors provision in section 77 was a mandatory consideration but not an objective. At last, for the purposes the 2018 election, we have a redistribution that is likely to result in government of the political party that achieves more than 50 per cent of the statewide vote. I also place on the record my personal appreciation of our Senior Counsel, Mr Tom Duggan SC, and his further counsel, Mr Joshua Teague, for their advocacy during this important occasion.

During the course of the hearing and delivery of judgement, the Chief Justice pointed out that the current law requires the appellant to be an elector, hence we have Mr Reggie Martin as the applicant and Ms Sascha Meldrum for the Liberal Party as the second respondent in the course of the proceedings. They will be forever recognised in legal posterity but, in any event, clearly the EDBC was the first respondent and our Liberal Party director, Sascha Meldrum, was named as the second respondent.

His Honour pointed out that the current law produces the result that the elector is a member of a political party which made representations to the EDBC but who did not personally appear before it. His Honour further noted, at page 4:

Parliament may wish to consider whether a registered political party, or any other person with an interest in an electoral redistribution, particularly if that party or person has made representations to the EDBC, should be entitled to bring an appeal against an order of the EDBC. It may also be prudent to allow the Court a power to preclude a political party from appearing on an appeal through a proxy if that party made representations before the EDBC. As a practical consideration, Parliament may also wish to contemplate prescribing a procedure for the giving of public notice that an appeal has been instituted and of the right of persons to be joined.

Unsurprisingly to me, the Attorney-General has not acted on this piece of advice from the Chief Justice. I do not imagine that anyone from the government side, on the ALP side, is going to be rushing to want to quote a judgement that completely annihilated their attempt at appeal; nevertheless, what is important is that the Chief Justice has identified a matter which we should consider. It should be resolved, and I would urge the government to review it and support this bill to ensure that we remedy what has been identified as a matter worthy of consideration by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. I ask that favourable consideration be given to the bill.

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

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2016.)

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:45): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	21
Noes	17
Majority	4

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Koutsantonis, A.	McFetridge, D.	Snelling, J.J.
Pisoni, D.G.	Vlahos, L.A.	Redmond, I.M.
Weatherill, J.W.	Griffiths, S.P.	

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL HEMP BILL*Second Reading*

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (10:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Industrial Hemp Bill 2017 will provide for a licensing system for the new industry of industrial hemp production in South Australia. The bill being debated today started as a private member's bill in the other place from the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, and I acknowledge her work on this bill. Since the introduction of the bill there, the government has made the decision to support the implementation of this policy. The Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, Minister for Employment and Minister for Manufacturing, has been working with Ms Franks on the bill, including on the inclusion of a number of government amendments. I understand that the bill received unanimous support in the other place.

Currently, industrial hemp may be commercially grown in all states and territories, except for the Northern Territory and South Australia. The legalisation of industrial hemp production in South Australia would open up a new avenue for the further expansion of our state's agricultural industry. According to the New South Wales parliamentary research library document, 'Hemp as food and fibre', while international hemp production in 2013 was well short of the record high of 670,000 tonnes reached in 1966, it is generally trending upwards. In 2013, China was the leading producer of hemp fibre, with 16,000 tonnes, and France was the leading producer of hemp seeds, with 48,000 tonnes.

In 2014, the US industrial hemp market was estimated to be worth at least \$US620 million. This includes food and body care products, clothing, auto parts and building materials. Australia is a newer participant in the global industry but certainly a possible future force. Currently, those in South Australia who are manufacturing and selling products made from hemp are forced to source their hemp from interstate and overseas. To remedy the situation, this bill provides for a scheme for South Australia to cultivate industrial hemp, known as low THC hemp.

THC, otherwise known as delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, is the psychoactive compound associated with the use of cannabis as a drug in marijuana or, in some cases, used for medicinal purposes. To clarify—and this is very important—the hemp being used for this production for industrial purposes is very different from the use of cannabis for marijuana.

As mentioned previously, commercial cultivation of industrial hemp is already legal in six Australian jurisdictions: the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia and Victoria. All six of these jurisdictions now permit the cultivation, possession and supply of industrial hemp for commercial purposes. Five of these, being the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania and Victoria, permit the cultivation, possession and/or supply of industrial hemp for research purposes. In New South Wales and Tasmania, licences may be granted for up to five years. The remaining jurisdictions have a three-year upper limit.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Ma'am, I call your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON: This bill provides for a licence of up to five years. The main difference between the Australian jurisdictions when defining industrial hemp in their respective acts is the amount of THC permitted. Typically, the older the legislation is, the lower the THC levels that are allowed. The more recently the legislation has been amended or updated, the more THC is permissible, with no jurisdiction exceeding the amount of 1 per cent THC. I am advised that at this level there is no likelihood of a plant creating a psychoactive effect associated with the recreational drug. The best you could hope for, I am told, is a headache.

Victoria and Western Australia set an upper limit of 0.35 per cent in the leaves and flowering heads. The ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania set two limits: leaves and flowering heads of a plant must have less than 1 per cent, and hemp seed may only be used if supplied on the basis that it would not produce hemp plants with a concentration of THC in its leaves and flowering heads of more than 0.5 per cent. This bill provides that leaves and flowering heads of a plant must have less than 1 per cent THC and certified hemp seed must not produce hemp plants with a concentration of THC in its leaves and flowering heads of more than 0.5 per cent. This is consistent with the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania legislation.

Under the provisions of this bill, a licence may be granted for the cultivation and supply of low THC hemp for the purposes of commercial production, use in manufacturing processes, food production, scientific research, instruction, analysis or study, or any other purpose approved by the chief executive. The maximum penalty for breach of that licence is \$15,000 or imprisonment for 12 months or both. While the number and type of conditions vary slightly between jurisdictions, this is comparable in terms of penalties.

The bill also follows the pattern of provisions already set in place in South Australia around the poppy industry. For example, the bill requires the maintenance of an industrial hemp register. This provision, resulting from a government amendment to the bill, is consistent with the requirement under division 7 of the Controlled Substances Act 1984 to establish and maintain an alkaloid poppy register. Although there is no requirement under this bill for an applicant for an industrial hemp licence to have a contract in place prior to applying for a licence, there are benefits in maintaining a record of all licences, past and present, and all locations where hemp has been grown.

Another condition common to every regime is that the applicant, and in some cases their very close associates, be a suitable person and/or a person of good repute. The government has amended this bill in the other place to provide a framework for establishing that. The bill is also in accordance with a number of commonwealth statutes that impact the cultivation, production and use of cannabis and cannabis products, including the Therapeutic Goods Act, Narcotic Drugs Act and Customs Act.

The commonwealth Narcotic Drugs Act 1967 deals with a licensing and permit scheme to regulate the cultivation of cannabis plants and the production of cannabis and cannabis resin. Cultivation, production and related activities under the scheme are for medicinal purposes or for research relating to medicinal cannabis only. This bill is also in accordance with our international obligations. As I mentioned, minister Maher introduced a number of government amendments to the

bill to ensure appropriate regulatory processes and consistency with the approach for poppy cultivation that is already part of our law. These amendments were supported in the other place.

They include the inclusion of a definition of 'criminal intelligence'. The original bill referred to criminal intelligence but did not define the term itself. Secondly, the definition of 'inspector' is amended to include a police officer. Given the potential for criminal activity, it is important that police officers have the rights of an investigator, should this be appropriate. Thirdly, a new clause 3A is inserted to define the meaning of 'an associate'. The government believes that it is important that not only the applicant but also the associates of the applicant are considered in the application process to determine whether the applicant is a fit and proper person.

The amendments include the insertion of a detailed fit and proper person test, consistent with the Controlled Substances Act 1984; the amendment of provisions relating to the suspension, cancellation or renewal of a licence; the inclusion of a requirement for the chief executive to issue a certificate to inspectors; and the insertion of a new clause relating to the interaction of the industrial hemp legislation with the commonwealth Narcotic Drugs Act 1967. Should there be any inconsistency between the industrial hemp legislation and the Narcotic Drugs Act 1967, the commonwealth act takes precedence. Lastly, the requirement for the chief executive to maintain an industrial hemp register is added.

With these amendments from minister Maher in the other place, the government supports this bill and the opening up of the new industry of industrial hemp production in South Australia. This bill will give growers and manufacturers the opportunity to explore any potential benefit for the industry in South Australia. With the appropriate rules and regulations in place, our primary producers will be able to consider whether they want to become involved in the hemp sector with the potential to further develop industries through the growth and manufacturing of these products.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:04): I rise to speak on the Industrial Hemp Bill 2016 and indicate that I am not the lead speaker but that in fact my learned colleague the member for Hammond who is well versed in the opportunities in the primary industries sector, will be outlining our party's position.

I want to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks of another place for her progressing of this matter. It follows similar legislation by the Liberal Party to take up the opportunity in respect of poppies and the commercialisation of that introduced by and passed by the state Liberals in respect of opium poppy growing on a commercial basis, which passed last year.

I think everyone agrees that there is some urgency for the advance of legislation to deal with the structure under which hemp is grown in South Australia. One only has to read the newspaper about those who are in the plight of wanting to use a cannabis product, including cannabis oil, for medicinal purposes to appreciate there being some resolution of these matters. Only last week, someone was prosecuted for the manufacture and distribution of cannabis oil, and so there is a general view across the board that if we are going to have hemp, which is to be defined as a plant or any part, including the seed of a plant, of the genus *Cannabis*, then we need to make some amendments to our laws.

I fully support that, and in doing so I say that it is absolutely critical when we are dealing with drugs, alcohol and dynamite that we have a registration and licensing model of protection. We have obligations for people to reach a threshold as a fit and proper person to undertake responsibility. Whether they are going to grow it, manufacture it, distribute it or prescribe it, we have to have responsible people in charge of it. Ms Franks' bill advances the regime under which there would be a regulation of the cultivation of industrial hemp in this bill and it will have my support.

The matter I wish to bring to the attention of the parliament is that, in progressing amendments to the Controlled Substances Act in South Australia to facilitate a new regime, there is a question about whether it will offend in some way or fall short of being valid as a result of there being existing national legislation to cover some of these matters. The remedy to ensure that there is no failing of the introduction of this regime is outlined in clause 7 of the bill, entitled 'Interaction with Commonwealth law'. In particular, it prescribes:

- (1) A provision of this Act—

which is the South Australian legislation—

has no effect to the extent of any inconsistency with the Commonwealth Act (and this Act is not to be taken to authorise the performance of a function or the exercise of a power under this Act that would result in operational inconsistency of this Act with the Commonwealth Act).

That is because, as members well know, there is an inconsistency clause in our national constitution so that, when there is conflict between a state and federal law, the federal law prevails. This clause in the bill is to reaffirm what is already there.

I think that is important because at the moment we have national laws which deal with hemp seed and this bill before us is also to deal with all genera of *Cannabis* including seed. It really is going to be a delicate dance around which act is to apply at this stage. It should not hold the bill up but, in short, I am advised—and I thank Ms Franks for making available Mr Lou Jansen, from the South Australian Department of State Development, to confirm this position. I am only naming him so that, if we end up in the High Court at some stage, he will take the blame.

However, it is to really identify that, if there is an inconsistency, the federal law prevails. If the use is for a scientific purpose and for medicinal purposes, then the commonwealth narcotics legislation will be activated and that will be the ruling law to deal with that, but if it is done for food, then there is use of the Industrial Hemp Bill. These are the complications that come about when we advance things or when a product is both a food and a drug for a medicinal purpose.

I fully support the bill. I have raised this issue and I hope that it does not fall foul. It will require some consultation at the next meeting of ministers, which I am told is later this month here in Adelaide, and the minister for primary industries will attend that event. They need to sort these issues out because there need to be very clear guidelines which act is to apply so that we do not have a failing in respect of that. When our farmers line up to seek an opportunity to be licensed to undertake this cultivation work, we do not want them to be met with myriad legislative inconsistencies or to fall foul of it. With those few words, I commend the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:11): I rise to speak to the Industrial Hemp Bill. I am the lead speaker with regard to the bill. I note that the Hon. Tammy Franks first put this bill in the other place and that there were quite a few contributions made there, including from the Hon. David Ridgway.

This bill aims to legalise the cultivation of industrial hemp in South Australia. It seeks to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984 to authorise and regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp. Currently, South Australia is the only state in which it is illegal to cultivate industrial hemp. Various state legislation has one key difference, being the tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) limit permitted. THC is the psychoactive compound found in hemp and marijuana.

In Victoria and Western Australia, the THC maximum limit is 0.35 per cent in the leaves and flowering heads of a hemp plant. In the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania, there are there two THC limits: the leaves and flowering heads of a hemp plant must have less than 1 per cent, while hemp seed may only be used if supplied on the basis that it will not produce hemp plants with THC in its leaves and flowering heads of more than 0.5 per cent. This bill adopts the latter limits prescribed in the respective ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania legislative frameworks and adopts the Tasmanian model.

Hemp has a relatively low concentration of THC (under 1 per cent) and, by way of contrast, the average marijuana plant, from what I have been informed, could have between 15 per cent to 20 per cent. The legislative framework in this bill is similar to the opium poppy legislation which was introduced by the Hon. David Ridgway in the other place and which passed last year.

In order to cultivate hemp, a farmer must obtain a licence and approval from the Chief Executive of PIRSA. There are a number of checks and balances in place to screen potential applicants, including powers for the chief executive to require documentation so that a report can be produced and provided to the Commissioner of Police for review. Licences are limited to a maximum five-year period and may be suspended or cancelled by the chief executive if a farmer breaches conditions.

The chief executive also has powers, which mirror those in the opium poppy legislation, to order inspections in which the inspector may seize material and take samples. The state government

has provided a number of amendments, which were all passed in the other place. The amendments aim to ensure there are appropriate regulatory and security requirements. The majority of those amendments bring the legislative framework in line with the existing opium poppy legislative framework.

As I indicated, the Liberal Party initiated legalising the cultivation of opium poppies. They are soon to be cultivated in the state's South-East. That does encompass a very strict regulatory framework. It is anticipated that a similarly stringent regulatory framework will be developed and released for consultation following the passage of the bill. I note that poppy cultivation—and I have witnessed where they do it in Tasmania—is very heavily regulated. There are signs on fences around the farmer's land and strict regulatory licence arrangements are made with companies for growing opium poppies, obviously for the legal pharmaceutical drug trade.

Opium poppy growing is very heavily regulated, and so it should be. Obviously, there will be some similar arrangements in the regulatory framework around growing industrial hemp. This bill is limited to the cultivation of hemp, does not seek to amend any other legislation that may affect its uses and does not touch on medical cannabis. Legalising the cultivation of hemp will enable South Australian farmers to access another crop, which is currently being farmed around Australia.

The Hon. David Ridgway represented our party at the government's industrial hemp and medical cannabis round table held this year by the Hon. Kyam Maher. A broad range of stakeholders were in attendance, including various government departments and government representatives, a number of hemp and medical cannabis associations and medical professionals, amongst others. With respect to what we are talking about here today—cultivating industrial hemp—this component had the overwhelming support of the stakeholders at the round table.

The opposition is supporting the bill that has come down from the other place. We are the only state in which it is illegal to cultivate industrial hemp. As I indicated earlier, it will give South Australian farmers more opportunities to access another crop, just like poppies. It is currently being farmed elsewhere around Australia for a range of products that can be made out of industrial hemp.

I want to note that the state Liberal Party will always support initiatives that benefit our regions and primary producers. Farmers are the ones who are going to have to make the decisions, and if they have the right land, the right rainfall, the right conditions, I believe, from conversations I have had, that hemp does not need the same amount of water that poppies may need, so there is probably a broader range of places where it can be cultivated. If farmers decide that it is commercially viable to farm a particular crop, then cultivating industrial hemp could represent a great opportunity for some primary producers to do so.

The legislative framework, as I have indicated, is quite similar to that of the opium poppy legislation the Hon. David Ridgway introduced in the other place. In regard to the THC levels contained in hemp, they are well below the levels found in marijuana. A strict regulatory framework must be in place. We on this side believe that the bill before parliament has adequate safeguards to regulate and prevent the possible improper use of industrial hemp.

I want to identify a couple of people who have been involved in promoting the use of industrial hemp over time, and one is a person who, prior to the mid-nineties, lived not far from me at Coomandook. Caroline Graham was quite a pioneer in her day. I remember her coming to Agricultural Bureau events promoting the growing of industrial hemp. I think she was involved in trials on Yorke Peninsula when she went back to the home properties of the Graham family at Arthurton. Dianah Mieglich has been involved and promoted this use for regional development and for our agricultural sector to take on board.

From a personal point of view, anything that gives our farmers more agricultural options to pursue is a good thing, as long as the regulatory framework is correct, policed properly, regulated properly and the licences are managed properly so that a successful business can operate in this state. With those few words, the Liberal Party supports the legislation and hopes for its speedy progress through the house.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:21): I rise to speak to the Industrial Hemp Bill 2017 and to offer my support for this legislation. In doing so, I also congratulate minister Maher from the other place and assistant minister Picton on bringing this matter forward. I also pay tribute to and thank the many people in our community who have campaigned and been active for a very long time around the introduction of this industry into our community for their courage and the tenacity they have shown in pushing this industry forward.

I also say thank you to the many people who participated in quite extensive community consultation, as part of round tables and in a number of other forums, for their efforts and for their voice. By removing legal barriers to the cultivation of industrial hemp, we are giving growers and manufacturers the opportunity to explore the significant economic potential for this industry in South Australia, including the potential for significant job creation and growth—a goal that our government is deeply committed to advancing.

With the appropriate rules and regulations in place, our farmers will be able to become actively involved in the hemp sector, with the potential to further develop industries through the growth and manufacture of this material. South Australia and the Northern Territory remain the only jurisdictions that do not yet permit the commercial cultivation of industrial hemp. By establishing a regulatory framework, South Australia will be on equal terms with other states and we will be able to advance our interests in the sector—an important issue in the context of fully realising the economic and jobs growth potential that can come through this work.

Changes to our South Australian law will allow only for the regulated cultivation and manufacture of hemp for industrial purposes. Using the criminal intelligence principles contained within the opiate poppy regulatory scheme, the regulatory framework will ensure compliance with Australia's international treaty obligations and address the risk of using hemp cultivation as a cover for growing illicit cannabis.

On 1 December 2016, the Hon. Tammy Franks from the other place introduced a private member's bill, the Industrial Hemp Bill 2016, which sought to authorise and regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp in South Australia. The Franks bill was also raised during the recent industry round table I have just spoken about and held by minister Maher. Our government made minor amendments to the bill in the Legislative Council, including the following:

- that the legislation will commence upon proclamation;
- alterations to the process for the renewal of a licence;
- consideration of penalties to ensure they are consistent with other state legislation;
- allowing police officers to be defined as inspectors under the legislation, in addition to inspectors appointed by the chief executive of the relevant department;
- the inclusion of clear guidelines on what constitutes a 'fit and proper person';
- the inclusion of a definition of criminal intelligence provisions; and
- a process to allow for the rectification of any breach of a licence.

Our government is continuing to support innovative solutions like this, and many others, to the challenges and opportunities that face South Australia and South Australians.

We will continue to create job opportunities that support working people, and their families, and we will continue to invest in economic growth through opening new industries like this one. With proper protections in place, I deeply support the hemp industry in South Australia and the many benefits that it has the potential to bring to our state.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:25): I also rise to support this bill. I think most people here would know that I am a reasonably cautious person who tries to look at things thoroughly before making a move, but I have to say that I have never had any hesitation about supporting this issue in principle.

This is nothing to do with drugs: this is to do with industry and agriculture and cultivation. The plants that would be used for industrial hemp are not the plants that would be used for drug making

or drug taking; they are totally different. In fact, this is a potentially tremendous opportunity for many who operate in agriculture throughout South Australia. Many people in my electorate welcome the potential to grow this crop for these completely aboveboard and constructive purposes.

I would like to give credit to the Hon. Tammy Franks for bringing this issue forward, and I also give credit to all MPs in this parliament because we have reached a bipartisan position on this issue, and I think that is important to recognise. I would also like to acknowledge Dianah Mieglich and Teresa McDowell, particularly Teresa McDowell whom I met and who, by coincidence, is a former Port Augusta resident and very active in this space.

It was terrific to have a couple of opportunities to sit with her as a person who is deeply involved and whose business involves the use of hemp products. She was able to explain to me, in the sort of detail that often MPs can only get from outside Parliament House, how useful this product is. I know that many MPs received briefings from many places and many people, including one that was organised for all of us in Parliament House, but Teresa McDowell's one-on-one information for me on a couple of occasions was a very big help.

The member for Hammond mentioned Tasmania and the poppy industry there. I lived in Tassie for four years a very long time ago, but I still get back there every now and again. The growing of poppies in Tasmania is completely uncontroversial because, again, it is the growing of poppies for a well-regulated purpose. It is not about making opium for home use, or recreational use or any unregulated use whatsoever.

If you drive around rural areas of Tasmania, you see the regular fence that you would see around any cropping or grazing paddock anywhere else in Australia; the only difference is that it has a sign that says, 'This is a poppy crop and you cannot enter,' and everybody understands. If you happened to jump the fence, for whatever reason, and be found, you would have some very serious questions to answer. Guess what? Nobody does it. It is just a crop. I am sure that if we can progress to growing hemp for industrial purposes in parts of South Australia that is exactly how it would eventuate here.

Regulation will be very important. It very important that this is nothing about drugs and it is very important that it seems that this legislation is being supported in a multipartisan way in our parliament, and I certainly personally support it.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:29): I rise to support the Industrial Hemp Bill. To start, I would like to acknowledge some of the community people who have advocated so strongly on behalf of this industry and on behalf of the people who will benefit from it, including Dianah Mieglich and Teresa McDowell and other advocacy groups we have met with in Parliament House. I thank them for their work.

Unfortunately, South Australia and the Northern Territory remain the only jurisdictions in Australia where commercial cultivation of industrial hemp currently is not permitted. The commercial cultivation and production of hemp have a long history around the world and has produced a range of products, including paper, paint, fuels and medicine. South Australia has always been a state of innovation, and we should encourage individuals and business to explore new industries and opportunities.

Currently the Controlled Substances Act 1984 is the barrier to the development of this particular industry, which has such enormous potential to generate jobs and wealth in South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

FOSTER CARE

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:31): I move:

That this house calls on the state Labor government to adopt the following policies released by the state Liberal Party to help protect our children by—

- (a) extending foster care and kinship carer payments for young people to the age of 21 years;

- (b) championing for a national register for social workers; and
- (c) auditing all children living in residential care and identify if they can be moved into a foster care or kinship care home environment.

Currently, once a child in foster care reaches 18 years of age, all government support for their carers ends. This has led to a lot of vulnerable young people being asked to leave their homes once they hit 18, and this increases the rates of youth homelessness and drug abuse. The Nyland royal commission mentioned explicitly the difficulties faced by children in foster care as they approach their 18th birthday. In 2016, Anglicare Victoria, and most recently AnglicareSA, launched their Home Stretch campaign to lobby governments to provide support to foster care children up to 21 years of age.

The campaign highlights the added cost to the government of having an 18-year-old care leaver suddenly made homeless and interacting with the juvenile justice system. The Anglicare report states that young people who leave care at 18 have much higher rates of homelessness, arrest, hospitalisation and mental health issues. That is because the state has abandoned them too soon.

A Deloitte Access study revealed that governments would actually save money by investing in extending care from 18 to 21. The study showed that, for every dollar spent on extending support to age 21 the community would save between \$1.40 and \$2.69, depending on which state, in lowering the cost of social security benefits, hospitalisation and the justice system.

The savings to government are mostly accrued through the justice system. The Anglicare report shows the statistical positive impact to service providers of providing foster care support through to age 21, and the key findings were:

- the probability of arrest is down from 16.3 per cent to 10.4 per cent;
- the probability of homelessness is halved from 39 per cent down to 19.5 per cent;
- the probability of hospitalisation is decreased from 29.2 per cent to 19.2 per cent;
- the probability of pursuing further education is increased by staying at home from 3.6 per cent to 9 per cent; and
- the probability of alcohol or drug dependence is decreased from 15.8 per cent to 2.5 per cent.

There are also benefits across a number of other domains, including improved mental health and physical health outcomes, reduced intergenerational disadvantage, and an increase in social connectedness. The greatest benefits are seen to exist in the estimated savings to housing supports, justice costs, and alcohol and drug costs. There are also saved costs that relate to commonwealth spending, namely, the reduction in welfare costs and a proportionate reduction in hospital funding costs. I will read from an earlier media release from the Liberal Party:

The State Liberals have announced a policy that will increase the age limit for which foster carers and kinship carers can receive support for children in their care from 18 to 21.

'This policy is driven by the realisation that cutting off support to out of home carers when the young person they are looking after reaches 18 increases the chances of these young adults ending up on the streets or in prison...

The National Swinburne study on youth homelessness found that 63% of Australia's homeless young people has been in care. Another study found that 50% of care leavers will end up in jail, unemployed, homeless or a new parent soon after leaving care.

'It makes no sense to push these vulnerable young people out of the home they are being protected in the moment they turn 18...

'Sky high rents, a very tight jobs market and the absence of a broader familial network all work against these young people being able to find their feet if forced to leave the protection of their foster carers' home.

Foster carers who love the children they have been looking after are often unable to continue to support when the carers payment is withdrawn leaving the young people in an incredibly vulnerable situation.

Those that do continue to support these young people out of their own pocket are consequently much less likely to be able to care for other, younger foster children.

Forcing these young people out of their foster carers home at 18 is at odds with the trend for children to stay in the family home well into their twenties...

A Deloitte Access Economics study revealed that governments would actually save money by investing in extending care from 18 to 21 years.

As I have mentioned, governments could save between \$1.40 and \$2.69 for every dollar spent by lowering the costs of social security benefits, hospitalisation and the justice system. I request that the government look into that as quickly as possible so that South Australia can be the first state to pick up such an excellent initiative that will really help our children and young people. Most recently, I heard that 30 per cent of foster-children leaving care are homeless within the first 12 months.

The second policy initiative I am calling on the government to follow that the Liberal Party has announced is the registration and regulation of social workers. To give a time line of how long this has been going on in the industry, the request for this to happen took place in 1988 when the PSA, following a motion that was passed by the PSA social workers industrial committee, determined to pursue the issue of state registration for social workers. On 14 March 2007, the Legislative Council appointed a select committee to examine and report on Families SA. It was held in the executive summary section 2:

Although much of the work undertaken requires, as a minimum, the skills of a qualified social worker, many caseworkers are underqualified for the task they are required to undertake. A better system of training is required.

Lack of experience and training may also explain why some caseworkers fail to adequately verify facts and case notes...

On 31 March 2008, the commissioner Mullighan report into the Commission of Inquiry (Children in State Care and Children on APY Lands) report recommendation 5 and 6 published that 'Families SA extends its screening process for employment'. In 2009, a parliament select committee report noted that Professor Scott, Director of the Centre for Child Protection, recommended registration of social workers. The recommendations similarly upheld the recommendations of the Mullighan inquiry. In January 2015, the Public Service of South Australia (PSA) submission to the South Australian royal commission into child protection, at part 1, section 8, published that 'the PSA considers that registration would be of benefit to the clients of the department and to social workers'.

On 9 April 2015, in findings of the inquest into Chloe Valentine, the State Coroner, Mark Johns, stated, 'I recommend that a measure be introduced which provides for registration of social workers.' On 28 January 2016, in findings of the inquest into baby Ebony, the Deputy State Coroner, Anthony Schapel, repeated the recommendations of the Chloe Valentine inquest and also recommended that a measure be introduced which provides for the registration of social workers. I worked on this policy for several years, which was released over a year ago as a Liberal initiative.

There is growing community concern in light of coronial findings of both the baby Ebony and Chloe Valentine cases that social workers should be registered and regulated within South Australia. This profession is responsible for protecting and enhancing the wellbeing of some of our community's most vulnerable and marginalised members. It is therefore very important that social workers are suitably trained, qualified and competent. At the present time, there is no legal registration for social workers in any state or territory jurisdiction.

In comparison, psychology is a profession that requires registered members, where claiming to be a psychologist when not registered can attract a significant penalty of \$30,000. The Australian Association of Social Workers has been particularly vocal on this topic and believes that regulation will put in place standards for the entire profession, that a regulatory body will set safe and competent scopes of practice as well as the provision of continuing professional development, that there is further possibility of disciplinary process or processes and that there is a need for a higher level of scrutiny in general.

The Australian Association of Social Workers is a professional body representing social workers throughout Australia. Membership is voluntary and it has more than 7,500 members, having been formed in 1946. In order to assist the Australian Association of Social Workers with its self-regulation, it has a code of ethics, a practice standards manual and other guidelines. Its strongest attribute is, however, the accreditation standards that it sets for social workers at universities.

In light of the above, between 1 July 2013 and 30 July 2014, the ethics complaints management service of the AASW received 50 complaint inquiries. Of these, 27 inquiries were told that the AASW could not assist because the particular social worker was not a member and it was out of the scope of the AASW in general.

It is therefore hard to ascertain the precise harm being done in the community as a direct result of the lack of regulation. Where it takes place, harm can be significant and wideranging psychological, sexual and/or physical to children, the elderly and others. Some estimates provide that up to 18,000 social workers around Australia are working outside a regulatory framework. There is no doubt that this poses a strong risk to the wellbeing of the community's most vulnerable.

It is evident from the reports provided to the Chloe Valentine and baby Ebony cases that the safety and general wellbeing of the community would be assisted and enhanced with such registration. The matter was also raised in the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. There are examples from overseas, including from the United Kingdom, where misconduct has led to social workers being struck off the register and therefore being unable to practice.

The AASW proposes that its social workers be identified by a trademark logo that confirms their accreditation. This could inform members of the public that the social worker has accreditation, membership with the AASW, a commitment to a strict code of ethics and a commitment to a minimum amount of annual continuing professional development. I call on the government to follow that through on a national basis.

The third point of my motion is to call on the government to undertake an audit of all children and young people living in residential care facilities to ensure every effort is being made to place them with a family. Residential care is an option of last resort, yet there are currently around 345 children in residential care, and 188 in emergency care, as at 28 February 2017. Research shows that home-based care is the best option for our children and young people. Residential care can be challenging for children and young people and the workers. For many children, residential care adds to their feelings of instability and uncertainty.

Not only is it not an ideal situation for our most vulnerable children and young people but residential care is also one of the most expensive services to provide. In the latest ROGS, I believe residential care was up around \$389,000 per year per child, whereas home-based care would be a maximum of \$61,880 per child per year. It should be noted that the former guardian for children and young people, Pam Simmons, has previously called on the government to close larger residential care facilities as the best model is in-home based care.

A visit to Tregenza House in 2015 with minister Close revealed four children aged five, seven, eight and nine years old who had been living in residential care for three years. Three of the children were siblings who had three other siblings and another one on the way who were living at home with their parents. So, they were a family group living there for three years at \$389,000 per child in a very poor form of care.

There was a five year old there who suffered from cystic fibrosis. She was removed because her mother could not manage her medical condition. I asked why a nurse was not provided in order to keep the family together rather than separating the family. I think this policy was enacted in Victoria and they were able to place children very quickly, because many of them go in, are left and simply forgotten. There are many children who, with other enhancements to their family life, could be at home with their family or in foster care. I commend this motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

RECREATIONAL FISHING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:46): On behalf of the member for Chaffey, I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the economic and social benefits of recreational fishing to South Australia;

- (b) condemns the state government for not undertaking a regional economic impact assessment statement prior to introducing changes to recreational fishing bag, size and boat limits in South Australia; and
- (c) acknowledges the impact on communities, particularly along the South Australian coast, affected by the changes to fishing 26 species and spatial closures.

This is a motion brought to this house by the member for Chaffey, but I will get the debate started. This is a very important issue for all of us in South Australia, not just MPs whose electorates have coastline as part of their boundary. Everybody in South Australia should be aware of the very important economic and social benefits of recreational fishing in South Australia.

I should also say that it is not only saltwater fishing; there is important recreational fishing in other parts of the state as well, but the regulations that this motion addresses are particularly about coastal and saltwater fishing, and the economic benefits are massive. People think immediately just about tackle shops and boat sales potentially, but this flows through to fuel, accommodation and clothing, and it is not only the coastal communities.

The coastal communities benefit the most, but every single service station in Adelaide would have customers who fill up their car, and potentially put fuel in a boat as well, so that they can then drive to a coastal community to go fishing. Every single part of South Australia benefits from recreational fishing on our coastline and not just from people who particularly actively fish. There are many families who go on holiday to caravan parks or stay in a motel somewhere where maybe half the family are active fishers and the other half might pursue other activities while they are in the region.

There is absolutely no doubt about the economic benefits of recreational fishing. The social benefits are very important. They are much harder to quantify but, without a doubt, anybody who has ever wet a line can attest to the very important social benefits. I do not think it would be too great a stretch to say that there are also personal mental health benefits associated with going fishing. Just the fact that people interact with others from other communities is very important socially as well.

Paragraph (b) calls for the house to condemn the state government for not undertaking a regional impact assessment statement prior to introducing the changes. The opposition is perpetually frustrated and angry with the government about this. The government wants to make changes that affect regional communities. The government has said for many years that it will undertake regional impact assessment statements but regularly does not. In my submission to the Minister for Fisheries, one of the points I made was, 'Please do a regional impact assessment study. Please share the results of that if, in fact, you have done it.'

It was very disappointing to find out that that has not been done because that must contribute to the thinking of the government when they make these types of decisions. It is straightforward that, if the government want to make changes that will affect regional communities, they must assess the impact of those changes before implementing them. They must assess the impact of those changes when actually determining what changes they really want to make. It is just common sense that you cannot, should not, must not make changes that affect regional communities without assessing the impact of those changes. It is a very straightforward point made by the member for Chaffey.

Paragraph (c) calls for the house to acknowledge the impact on communities, particularly along the South Australian coastline. Every MP who is involved in this issue is very aware of the impact because they engage with their communities all the time and that applies not only to regional MPs. Colton, for example, has a significant amount of coastline, Morphett has a significant amount of coastline, and several metropolitan electorates have coastline as well, but, of course, this is a much bigger issue in regional areas. It is a very big issue in my electorate of Stuart, where we have a very particular marine environment. I know every MP believes that their electorate is special, unique and different, and in most cases that is true.

Let me share this with you. The very top of Upper Spencer Gulf is what is called a hypersaline inverse estuary, and what is unique about that is that there is a marine environment at the top of Spencer Gulf where the water is more salty than in the southern part of Spencer Gulf, where it is warmer than in the southern part of Spencer Gulf and where there are marine animals and plants that do not exist anywhere else on the Australian coast until you start to get up around the

mid-Western Australian coast or the mid-New South Wales coast. It is a very unique environment. It is the only one of its kind in South Australia. In fact, there are not too many of them around the world.

The reason I mention that is the impact of the government's change to King George whiting regulations in Upper Spencer Gulf. I want to put on the record that I acknowledge that when I made a grievance speech on this topic last sitting week—it was a very short notice opportunity—I actually made a mistake. I said that the government's regulations had increased the minimum size from 30 centimetres to 31 centimetres. It is actually worse than that: it was an increase from 31 centimetres to 32 centimetres. I needed to correct that error that I made.

What is so important about that change is that Upper Spencer Gulf is considered a 'gauntlet fishery'. It is a breeding ground for King George whiting. As they mature and grow, they head south and they breed. The fish in the Upper Spencer Gulf are relatively small fish. We do not get the larger King George whiting that are found in the bottom end of Yorke Peninsula, the bottom end of Eyre Peninsula and on other parts of the coast. They just do not exist in our part of the world because, when they get bigger, they vacate. They head south to get on with their lives on other parts of the coast.

To impose a 32-centimetre minimum size in Upper Spencer Gulf is essentially imposing incredibly unproductive fishing in Upper Spencer Gulf because people will catch fish under that size all day long and very rarely catch fish over that size. Please do not take my word for it. While I enjoy a bit of fishing, I am far from an expert in this area, but I do talk to genuine experts in my area. Some of them, like Mr Robin Sharp from Port Augusta, who has presented to committees in parliament on a range of different topics over a couple of decades, have shared a lot of information with me.

He is probably a bit frustrated that I have not learned it quite as well or as quickly as he would have liked me to, but the information I get from him and from many other people in Port Augusta and around Upper Spencer Gulf with regard to fishing is very valuable and informs the contribution I make in this parliament. To bring together my comments about size limit and the unique features of Upper Spencer Gulf, the government has the state divided with a north-south vertical line on the map into two fishing areas. It is very reasonable that Upper Spencer Gulf should have a zone of its own and it would also be quite reasonable that the Upper Spencer Gulf regulations could be comparable with the regulations in the western part of South Australia.

Only Tuesday this week, a petition was tabled in this parliament, on behalf of several hundred people in my electorate, recommending exactly that. That is a very straightforward and very sensible thing for this government to consider. The very top of Spencer Gulf is, by any definition, a unique piece of water. To impose fishing regulations that mean that people just will not catch fish above the size limit is crazy. What is very important, too, is that this is not about saying, 'It's hard to catch big fish, so just let them catch little fish, and bugger the environment.' It has nothing to do with that at all.

The reality is that the people of Upper Spencer Gulf are incredibly concerned about their environment. There is a really strong community of people in Port Augusta particularly, and certainly in the surrounding area as well, that is very concerned about the environment. What has happened is that this minimum size has been increased regularly over time in an effort to help larger fish to be in Upper Spencer Gulf. It is just not working. There is a low minimum size limit and you are only catching fish up to 31 centimetres, so they increase the minimum size limit, and you are still only catching fish up to 31 centimetres. They increase it again, and you are still only catching fish up to 31 centimetres.

This mechanism is not working to try to get larger King George whiting in Upper Spencer Gulf. The reason it is not working is that those fish just do not stay in that part of the world. Those fish move out of that part of the world. There is no shortage of those smaller fish in Upper Spencer Gulf. People should be allowed to catch them. History has proven that perpetually increasing the minimum size limit is not doing anything to get larger King George whiting in Upper Spencer Gulf, because those fish just do not stay there. I support the people of my electorate very strongly on this issue.

I would also like to say that I am particularly concerned that the Minister for Fisheries says that he has been advised by his staff and his department that people who attended the public meetings to discuss this topic are comfortable, in the majority, with these regulation changes. I have

to tell you that, in my experience, that is not true, so I am very concerned about whether the minister was given all the information he needed to be given before he made this decision to change the regulations. I appreciate the fact that the Minister for Fisheries met with me and Mr Robin Sharp, and his wife, Christine, to discuss this issue. It was really good of him.

I have found him to be open and willing to engage in topics I have taken to him. He did say that he had been told that people are comfortable with this change. I went to the meeting in Port Augusta and I can tell you, absolutely without any shadow of a doubt, that people there are not comfortable with this. They are not comfortable with it now. They were not comfortable with it at the meeting. Overwhelmingly, they opposed this change.

I also went to a meeting in Glenelg because it happened to be a sitting week and there was a public meeting on this topic being held there. I thought that I would try to learn a bit more about it, go to a different community that I am not particularly connected with and see what they thought. I can tell you that at that meeting they were not comfortable either, so I am concerned about the information that has gone to the minister. Where do we go from here? The regulations have been imposed.

The Legislative Review Committee has said that it is not going to seek to have them changed. I find it particularly unusual that the Legislative Review Committee has said (and I am paraphrasing here) that it is not going to seek to change the regulations because these are the regulations the government wants to put in place. The purpose of the Legislative Review Committee is to second-guess the government's decisions, to consider whether what the government wants to do is appropriate. For them to say that they are not going to do it because they do not want to cross the government seems to me to be the Legislative Review Committee dodging its responsibilities to a certain extent.

This is an important issue. We all know that we need responsible regulations in place that protect fish and other marine species throughout the South Australian coast, but I can tell you that the benefits and the costs associated with this on South Australian communities have not been fully considered. I can tell you that the government did not take seriously any request for them to undertake a regional economic impact assessment study. I can tell you that the impact on regional communities is much greater than they realise, and it is very great in the Upper Spencer Gulf, which is the part of coastal South Australia I represent. I ask the government to reconsider these regulations.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:02): I move to amend the motion, as follows:

- (b) Delete 'condemns' and substitute 'recognises'.
Delete 'for not undertaking' and substitute 'undertook'.
- (c) Delete paragraph (c).

We know that South Australians love to fish. Nearly 300,000 people enjoy getting out and catching some fish, whether it be from the shore, in their boats or off the jetty. I speak to many of them in my electorate at Henley Beach Jetty and Grange Jetty, popular spots for throwing in a line or dropping a net and taking some of the iconic blue swimmer crabs. We have had a sensational year for crabs this year.

Self-praise is no recommendation, and I am not a bragger, as you know, but in 1969 I was the Henley Beach fishing champion.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That actually looks like a prosthetic. Is that a prosthetic or a trophy?

The Hon. P. CAICA: It is a trophy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It looked like an extension of your hand.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It has seen some action over the years. Thank you for mentioning that I was also a dual world champion at the World Police and Fire Games—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is 60 seconds of your allotted speaking time.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —in the art of fishing. Getting back to—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I didn't interrupt you. As we know, recreational fishing is a vital economic driver for the many coastal towns and communities in South Australia. It used to cost me hundreds of dollars to go to Browns Beach to catch salmon that you can buy at the shop for 99¢ per kilo. It would cost me a lot of money and I would always spend that money in regional areas as I went through. As a government, we are committed to ensuring the long-term sustainability of our fish stocks while also providing more recreational fishing opportunities to benefit fishing communities, particularly in the regions, and I will focus on that a little bit later.

With respect to the review, there was a comprehensive statewide recreational fishing review, reaching communities across the state, engaging with more than 800 people at public meetings to hear the viewpoint of the people that the changes would impact. It is always safe to say that when you do this you are not going to please everyone all the time, but I would also note that probably about 90 per cent of recreational fish is taken by, at most, 10 per cent of recreational fishers and they, of course, would be the ones who are most upset with some of the changes.

Throughout this consultation process, information was received from the community on potential regional and local impacts of the management proposals and options. As part of this process, to further understand the potential impacts of the changes to recreational fishing a regional impact assessment statement was prepared, which is available on the PIRSA website. I acknowledge that when the member for Chaffey put in this motion he was not aware at that stage that there was and had been a regional impact assessment undertaken.

The response from these communities was, I am told, fantastic and their responses, along with the regional impact assessment statement, were all considered prior to implementing any changes to recreational fishing size, bag and boat limits, and spatial closures for key species in South Australia. These measures will keep our fish stocks in good health so that the future of recreational fishing will be sustainable for our future generations and the coastal communities who benefit from recreational fishing. Without raining on the parade, sometimes I question whether they go far enough and, of course, time will tell whether or not that is the case, but it is a positive step in ensuring that our fish stocks remain sustainable.

Since 2014, the government has also invested in a range of initiatives to boost recreational fishing and tourism opportunities. As you would be aware, Deputy Speaker, the state government has committed \$3.25 million to boost recreational fishing experiences in South Australia, and part of this funding is \$2.25 million for the Recreational Fishing Grants Program over three years. People in my electorate have been lucky enough to receive some of those grants—for example, the Star of the Sea Marine Discovery Centre.

These grants will support South Australian fishing clubs, community groups and councils to undertake projects that will clearly benefit recreational fishing for the state, particularly regional areas. Funding is going towards projects such as fish cleaning stations, habitat enhancement, fish stocking programs, shelter infrastructure and Come and Try Fun Days. One recipient that will benefit from the grant is the volunteer group, Edmund Rice Camps, which provides holiday experiences for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds.

I note that on 22 April the Edmund Rice Camp will be conducted down at West Lakes and I will be attending to toss a line with some of those young people who will be in attendance there. With the funds, Edmund Rice Camps will be able to run fishing events for disadvantaged youth and their families to be able to enjoy the recreational fishing experience. It is a fantastic way to connect with the marine environment and relax.

Another exciting initiative—and I know this will excite you, Deputy Speaker—which is an exciting initiative for further improved recreational fishing opportunities in our regional communities is South Australia's first artificial oyster reef on Yorke Peninsula. The state government is investing \$600,000 towards this initiative. This native shellfish reef will attract marine life, increase fish production and increase recreational fishing opportunities in the region. Like you, I am terribly excited

by this initiative. Well-designed and ecologically sustainable artificial reefs will create new places for fishing, increase tourism and generate social, economic and employment benefits in regional communities.

We have also seen the investment of \$400,000 to build infrastructure associated with opening up offline reservoirs to recreational fishing and provide additional fishing opportunities for locals. In early February 2016, PIRSA released 100,000 Murray cod fingerlings in the South Australian section of the River Murray and Murraylands as part of a trial to boost the local population. A successful stock enhancement program may generate fishing and tourism opportunities for our river communities. I know that the member for Chaffey welcomes this initiative.

Further to these projects, the state government, recognising the social and economic importance of jetties and marine infrastructure to local communities, particularly for fishing and tourism businesses, committed \$3.5 million towards the repair of damaged infrastructure following the storms of 2016. I look forward to some money being invested in the Henley jetty to have that match the quality that is now the Grange Jetty or the Semaphore and Largs jetties, and I am sure that will occur.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would be excited about that.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The minister has left, but I am sure the minister is listening intently to this. Our coastal and inland waters are home to exceptional fishing experiences and the state government is committed to protecting and enhancing these opportunities for all South Australians.

I must admit and again fess up that I have been fishing all my life. I should not really tell people this but, with respect to this outstanding trophy that I received in 1969 for being the Henley Beach fishing champ, it is true that I caught more 'shitties' than anyone else. That is not an unparliamentary word because they are trumpeters and that is what they are called because they are not too good to eat. I was able to catch more trumpeters than anyone else. Also, there was no truth in the rumour that was started at that stage by premier Rann when I won my gold medals that those fish had actually not even thawed out by the time I pulled them out of the water. That was a terrible thing to say at that particular time.

However, I know that once you are bitten by the fishing bug, it will be something that you continue to do all your life. It is critically important that we as a government, and as governments of all persuasions, do what we can to ensure that fish stocks are maintained at proper levels of health and numbers and, if not, put in whatever measures are necessary to make sure that they can make a comeback.

For example, garfish is a fish that I am very concerned about. Believe it or not, I have been out in the gulf on a couple of occasions and it is very rare that you come home having caught one or two garfish, so there are certain things that need to be done in that particular sector. I acknowledge a difference between Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent when it comes to that particular species of fish. Garfish is an iconic South Australian fish and one that can be caught by most anglers when they are out and about.

With those few words, I commend the motion to the house in its amended form. I congratulate the government on its role in making sure that it is doing what it believes is necessary to maintain our fishing stocks here in South Australia. This is a commitment that this government and this house have to make to ensure that in the future we have fish available for people to go and catch and enjoy the environment in which they are fishing. I commend the amended motion to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:11): I would like to speak to my motion:

That this house—

- (a) notes the economic and social benefits of recreational fishing to South Australia;
- (b) condemns the state government for not undertaking a regional economic impact assessment statement prior to introducing changes to recreational fishing bag, size and boat limits in South Australia; and
- (c) acknowledges the impact on communities, particularly along the South Australian coast, affected by the changes to fishing 26 species and spatial closures.

As an avid recreational fisher, I am aware just how important recreational fishers are to the South Australian economy. I put forward this motion in my previous role as shadow minister for recreation, and I now speak on the motion as a passionate fisher.

The day I announced in this house that I would be speaking on this motion today, there was no regional economic impact assessment statement available publicly to the proposed changes for bag, size and boat limits for the 26 fish species and spatial closures under the recreational fishing review despite a decision already being made. A day or so before the implementation of the changes, an assessment was uploaded to the PIRSA website, and it was just seven pages in length. There were more than 900 submissions and 12 community meetings, but the state government could only find seven pages telling how these changes would impact the regions. It was just a routine exercise—I called it a box-ticking exercise, if I have ever seen one—just to say that it had occurred.

I would like to take step back and provide some background on the recreational fishing community here in South Australia. I believe the importance of recreational fishing to the economy and to the communities of South Australia is often underestimated. The fact is that there is no up-to-date data that provides a dollar figure on the contribution that recreational fishers make to the state's economy. This is a big hole in the state's approach to recreational fishing.

Just talk to anyone with a small business in coastal towns. I know that the member for Stuart comprehensively outlined the impact it has had on his regional coastline communities, as it will on every coastline community, and as it will on every facility that sells petrol, bait or ice or that provides accommodation or commercial charter boats. In all or most cases, these people's lives and businesses revolve around it.

I talked to people in many tackle shops across metropolitan and regional South Australia during the consultation process, and they were very cynical. They said that this is just a typical government decision that had already been made and that this was now just ticking off the boxes so that they could make this announcement. The state government estimates that there are around 277,000 recreational fishers in South Australia. This figure is based on data collected in 2013 and does not include any visitors who like to throw in a line. We know that many interstate visitors come to South Australia to catch prized King George whiting and to experience the beautiful coastal communities and what they give to visitors.

When South Australia drew up the contract for the 2013-14 recreational fishing survey with the Victorian government, it outlined that it did not want to capture details on visiting fishers. Why would that be? They put it into the too hard basket, of course. So they have targeted South Australian recreational fishers as a collective group to make up for the number of people who come in from interstate and overseas. The accountancy and the amount of data collected by the Victorian government, under a \$440,000 contract with the South Australian government, has come under scrutiny during public meetings. I attended seven public meetings to get a different concept of what it meant to different communities and different economies, and it was wide and varied.

The review is predominantly shaped around phone and fisher surveys, which date back to 2013-14, that were collected under an honesty system through surveying households at random. I know that the member for Colton is probably as much of a culprit as I am when we talk about who caught the biggest fish. Well, of course it was me, or it was the member for Colton. When you ask him how big it was, he can only get out one hand and say, 'It was this big.' We all know that, when we give that data, sometimes it is a little bit one sided.

The fishers along the way raised concerns with me, as they did to the panel that made these presentations. There were 50 per cent fewer survey participants in the 2013-14 surveys than in the 2007-08 surveys. In the 2007-08 screening survey, 5,541 households responded and 1,261 fully responded to the survey. In contrast, 2,782 responded to the screening survey in 2013-14 and 610 undertook the full review.

At some of these community consultations and community meetings, many people were asked to put up their hand to show who had had their boats and bags checked and who had been part of the survey. In many instances, one or two people put up their hand, in all of these meetings, so out of the 800 people who attended these public meetings, very few had been part of the survey.

The recreational fishing survey conducted in 2007-08 cost the government \$412,000. It allocated \$73,000 for employee expenses and \$40,600 for operating expenses, with the remaining \$298,000 allocated to the contractor. That contractor was the Victorian government. Haven't we got the expertise here in South Australia to conduct a survey? It just beggars belief. The 2013-14 contract has the full \$480,000 that went out of South Australia into Victoria to the Victorian government as a contractor.

Under the PIRSA allocation policy, a recreational fishing survey is not meant to be more than five years old. The previous one before 2013-14 in South Australia was undertaken in 2007-08. Furthermore, participants who took part in the logbook survey were based in areas where Fishcare volunteers operate. At the time, a number of regional areas with prime recreational fishing areas had a very low number of Fishcare volunteers, with Port Pirie having none in 2015-16. These are surveys that our state government bases decisions on for recreational fishing stocks. These are surveys that impact on businesses and communities. These are surveys that are based on very grey areas of data.

In 2015-16, PIRSA announced and undertook a review of recreational fishing in South Australia, proposing changes to size, bag and boat limits for 26 species and spatial closures. In early 2016, the state government released three documents for public consultation as part of the recreational fishing review process. More than 800 people attended 12 public meetings held across the state in February and April and there were 900 submissions, mostly the government surveys. PIRSA claimed that all the feedback was carefully considered and played an important role in shaping the final outcomes of the review, which were announced on 31 October 2016 and came into effect on 1 December last year.

Of all the changes the most controversial was, of course, regarding King George whiting. As the PIRSA website states, new arrangements to improve the stock status of one of the state's most iconic fish species, the King George whiting, include a reduction in the statewide daily bag limit of 10 and boat limit to 30 (previously 12 per person and 36 per boat) and an increase in the legal minimum size to 32 centimetres (previously 31) in all waters east of Cape Catastrophe on the tip of Eyre Peninsula, including all gulf waters.

They also include the introduction of spawning spatial closures for King George whiting from 1 to 31 May in an area of southern Spencer Gulf, southern Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait to protect these key spawning areas during the critical reproductive period. During this time the take, targeting and possession of King George whiting by all fishing sectors, including professional and recreational as well as people visiting the state under the tourism banner, is prohibited in the closure area. The first King George whiting spawning spatial closure will commence on 1 May 2017.

One of the things that did trouble me, that really got my goat, was that there was no impact on treated water run-off. There was no impact on urban water run-off into these spatial area breeding ground closures. There was none. So was there a significant survey, a significant impact assessment done on what outside forces are doing rather than just targeting recreational fishers? No, there was not.

Most interestingly the state government, through Tasting Australia (and this is a good one, Deputy Speaker, you have to hear this), is encouraging people to go catch a King George whiting on the Yorke Peninsula during the event, which goes from 30 April to 7 May. The King George whiting spatial closure begins on 1 May and runs through to 31 May. That just shows that the minister is not talking to the minister, yet it is the same minister, tourism and fishing. So he is not talking, his department is not talking—

Mr Pengilly: He needs to write to himself.

Mr WHETSTONE: He needs to give himself a brief. The website reads:

Catch your own King George Whiting for dinner in the Yorke Peninsula.

By the way, Yorke Peninsula is a great place to visit, a great place to fish. It continues:

The stunning beaches and national parks plus friendly coastal towns are the reason this is a favourite holiday spot with South Australians. 'Yorkes' is famous for its fishing, so this is the perfect place to snag your own fresh fish dinner.

I have also been advised by recreational fishers that the spatial closure areas for King George whiting are actually different from what was proposed during the consultation. It has been recognised on social media, and in response to the questions put forward by the community fishing group South Australian Fishing Alliance. RecFish board member Danny Simpson, who is currently acting in the role of executive director, said, on social media, that they were consulted on the two areas left, as everyone else was, and suggested that if they are so important for the breeding of King George whiting then perhaps the closure is warranted, but not during the Easter period, and maybe it should be moved to May. I will continue my remarks.

Time expired.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Giles, I draw the attention of the house to the visitors in the gallery today. It looks like the entire Woodcroft Primary School, but it is only some of them, guests of the member for Fisher, who, I believe, is being ably assisted by the Hon. John Gazzola from the other place. We welcome you to parliament today and hope that you have had a really good tour of the place, or are about to have a really good tour, that you learn lots of wonderful things about parliament and go home and tell your mums and dads what a fabulous place it is. So welcome to parliament and we hope you enjoy it.

Motions

RECREATIONAL FISHING

Debate resumed.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:24): I have listened with interest to all the speakers who have contributed to this debate so far, but I especially listened to the member for Colton because he has this incredibly impressive trophy which means he is obviously a serious fisher. As members are probably aware, the member for Colton and I have a number of things in common: we are both short, we are both bald, we are both tireless and we are both incredibly good-looking.

The Hon. L.A. Vlahos interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: I said 'tireless'. But the other thing that we have in common is that we are both very keen fishers. For many years I have been a recreational fisher. I started with my dad when he used to take us to Ireland to fish in the rivers and canals, so when I came out to Australia at the age of 10, there were no rivers or canals or anything like that around Whyalla but there was a beautiful coastline. Over the years I have explored much of South Australia's coastline—and I am often quite jealous about this, not that I want your seat—but the coastline that the member for Flinders has is just an exceptional part of the world.

The importance of recreational fishing is that it has a very significant economic impact, especially on regional communities, but the other very important element is the social element that the member for Stuart raised. I am sure that when I am on my deathbed some of the fondest memories I will have will be those of camping on the West Coast, often in isolated locations, with my kids. Fishing was always, and is always, an integral part of those fishing trips to the West Coast. I would classify myself as a conservationist, and I think it is incredibly important when we are looking at our fishing stocks that we take a conservative approach in order to sustain them so that they are going to be there for future generations, both in the recreational sector and the professional sector.

Many years ago, when I was on the Whyalla city council, I received a letter from an individual who had fished the waters of Spencer Gulf going back to the 1940s, and in the letter he described what it was like to fish the waters of Spencer Gulf in the late 1940s into the 1950s. The point that he made was that the range of species, the size of the fish and the quantities (the size of the schools) are all gone. We no longer see what he used to see.

When we carry out these scientific assessments, and scientific assessments are of a more contemporary nature, what is often missing is the real baseline. What was the gulf like? What were our coastal waters like in back in the 1920s and 1930s? It has fundamentally changed, as have the world's oceans when it comes to fish stocks. It is incredibly important that we get this right. There are

often gaps in the scientific assessments we do, but at least the scientific assessments have a degree of rigour that goes beyond the anecdotal and the personal experience.

I listened to the member for Stuart with some interest because obviously the increased size limit on King George whiting has an impact on Upper Spencer Gulf, and I think that is something we should revisit at some point. Much of what the member for Stuart had to say strikes me as reasonably accurate. I fully support many of the other changes to bag and size limits. There are some recreational people go out there and really hammer it. I wonder why they need so many fish; they do not fish responsibly. Fortunately, most people do.

The state government is committed to sustaining our fisheries. There is always going to be a degree of difference and controversy. There is always going to be a clash between what the scientific assessments are telling us we should be doing and what we end up doing politically. Often, the science is pushing us farther and farther out. We know that in oceanic waters, globally, 90 per cent of the top-order predators have gone—they have been wiped out, and this is leading to fundamental changes in marine ecosystems.

In South Australia and Australia generally, we do attempt to manage our fish stocks quite well, but there is always room for improvement. I know there was a lot of controversy around the closures and the protected areas, but once again the science was telling us that those closures and protected areas need to be far more extensive than they are now. At least we have a start. It is a balance, but at the end of the day it is the science that should be driving us. I would be a very strong advocate of the state government investing more in that area so that we have a fuller and more comprehensive understanding of the marine environment in South Australia.

It is a marine environment that is undergoing change beyond just the recreational and professional impacts. You just have to look at what has happened in Adelaide. Unfortunately, those of us who live in more distant areas are largely spared from some of this. The destruction of the coast around Adelaide and the wiping out of the seagrass beds off Adelaide—largely due to effluent and turbidity—have had a major impact on the fishing experience in this part of the world.

Where I come from, in Whyalla, the coke ovens for many years spewed out ammonia into the marine environment—essentially, spewing out a fertiliser. That destroyed close to 20 square kilometres of seagrass beds in False Bay. That was addressed some 10 or 15 years ago, and we are seeing somewhat of a resurgence in those seagrass beds in False Bay. These elements—the loss of habitat and the changes that are happening in terms of both ocean acidity and the warming of the ocean—are going to have profound effects on our fisheries.

There is already significant movement in a number of our fish species. These are things that are going to continue to have an impact and, if we do not address that, there will be some very serious and negative impacts. The fishing people I speak to in my community were not all on board with the changes, especially the changes around King George whiting, but in general there is a very strong conservation ethic amongst most of the fishing people I know. They do realise that they have to look after our fish stock.

It would be tragic if my kids—who have inherited the fishing bug, especially one of them—when they go on to have their own children, were not able to go to the West Coast to go camping, put a line in and get a good feed.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:34): I rise to support the member for Chaffey's motion:

That this house—

- (a) notes the economic and social benefits of recreational fishing to South Australia;
- (b) condemns the state government for not undertaking a regional economic impact assessment statement prior to introducing changes to recreational fishing bag, size and boat limits in South Australia; and
- (c) acknowledges the impact on communities, particularly along the South Australian coast, affected by the changes to fishing 26 species and spatial closures.

Unlike members opposite, and the member for Chaffey, I am actually a terrible fisherman. I am the person on the boat who has to have the hook baited for him, basically the rod put in the right spot, and I still cannot seem to land a whiting while my mates are pulling them in by the dozen.

Mr Whetstone: What about crayfish?

Mr BELL: However, when it comes to crayfish, which is more prevalent in my area, we do a little bit better.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: They go in the pot on their own, don't they?

Mr BELL: Correct. You bait them, have a little bit of local knowledge of where to put them and you put them down there. I do like scuba diving and hunting for crays with friends in an aqua environment, but that does not mean that I am not passionate about fishing and do not see the economic impact that it does have.

A number of my good friends have shacks at Port Hughes and, with the amount they spend on a boat, fishing, fuel, bait and rigs, they could seriously have two investment houses and be doing a lot better than perhaps they are. It is there that I gain a lot of insight into the recreational fishing area, and nearly 300,000 recreational fishers in South Australia are certainly an economic driver for this state. I do appreciate the synergy between tourism and recreational fishing, and I think that should be enhanced at every level.

What disappoints me, and something I would fight very strongly for, is that those people caught doing the wrong thing should be penalised severely, and far more severely than I think they are at the moment. I know of professionals down home who have been caught time and time again doing the wrong thing, and the penalty does not in any way address the seriousness of the issue.

I would be a strident supporter if the government introduced far tougher penalties, and I am talking about the immediate confiscation of equipment, boats and the like, to be forfeited to the Crown and sold. I really do not care, because what we see is a group punished for the actions of a very small minority. It is that minority that needs to be addressed and looked at in a severe way and not tarnish the whole group.

Out of the 300,000 recreational fishers in this state, the vast majority do the right thing, and I see it very close up when we are measuring crayfish out of pots. Even if the measure just hits the back of the crayfish, we put them back in the water because (a) it is not worth taking the risk, and (b) we know that future healthy stocks rely on people doing the right thing. Those caught doing the wrong thing need to understand the seriousness of it, and that will spread like you would not believe as soon as there are one or two convictions for what they would determine as pretty minor offences. Well, I do not think they are minor. I think everyone knows the rules, and they should be strictly applied.

To come back to the member for Giles' contribution—and he made a very good contribution—one of the problems we have is that the recreational scene is an inexact science. If you are going to use science to predict bag limits, boat limits and size limits, I do not think the current method works. It is a sampling and then an extrapolation of that sample group. It is much easier for professional fishers to have a scientific approach to it because, first of all, obviously they are licensed so you know who they are. Their catches are weighed and you can see what stock is being taken out of the environment.

Recreational fishing does not have that same level of science wrapped around it. I actually agree with the member for Giles that we should let science determine appropriate catch rates, bag limits, boat limits and sizes. However, we will need to do a hell of a lot more work in that space to adequately inform us of that. I just want to go back to a local story. I probably should have said it at the start.

The number one present my daughter wanted for Christmas was a fishing rod. I said, 'That's okay, darling. I'll get you a fishing rod and we'll go fishing.' She is only eight years old. I bought a pink fishing rod from BCF—there is no sponsorship involved there. We went fishing down at Pelican Point and it was one of the best days I have had with my children in a long time—my 10-year-old son, my eight-year-old daughter—no hook, just practising casting with a sinker, talking about who could get

the farthest, who could not hit dad in the head with a sinker, who could get the line tangled, all that type of stuff.

After about an hour of practising how to cast properly, we decided to put the hooks on, put the bait on and go fishing, which was wonderful until she caught her first fish, which she reeled in and then started crying uncontrollably because she did not want me to kill the fish. Little did she know that I have absolutely no idea how to fillet the thing because my mates always do it and I provide the beers. So we released it back into the water even though it was very nice sized bream. She has not gone fishing since, but we have to encourage her back into that space. It impacts on me the importance of quality family time, and fishing, particularly recreational fishing, provides that for many families in South Australia.

One of the problems the government has, though, is a distrust. I hear it all the time around marine parks. Lots of locals say that if the government was serious about marine parks, they would have a marine park in the metropolitan waters of Adelaide because that is where most of the damage has occurred. I do not necessarily agree with that. I am just saying that that is one of the comments they make.

In terms of the King George whiting initiative to catch and fillet King George whiting between 1 and 30 April, save/freeze the frame (skeleton, including head, tail and guts intact) and return the form in a bag to the local tackle shop, I got on a website called RecFish SA: Selling South Aussies Short. I thought I would read a bit about this initiative and see what people are commenting on because the government loves talking about knocking on people's doors and getting really positive responses on a whole range of things. It would do the government a bit of a favour to look at some of these. Here are just some of the comments. Chris writes: 'Simple. The powers that be no longer hold the trust of South Australian anglers.' Cal Charters commented:

The reasons are pretty obvious when you know how government work. If you send in a fish frame in May, for example, and it has eggs ready to spawn, then wherever you caught it will be called a spawning area and closed next May. That is the stupid, impulsive they do with limited, uneducated advice at PIRSA and RecFish.

The comments go on and on. There is a distrust between elements within the recreational industry and the government.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:44): Thank you Madam independent Deputy Speaker. I wish to speak to the motion from the member for Chaffey, namely:

That this house—

- (a) notes the economic and social benefits of recreational fishing to South Australia;
- (b) condemns the state government for not undertaking a regional economic impact assessment statement prior to introducing changes to recreational fishing bag, size and boat limits in South Australia; and
- (c) acknowledges the impact on communities, particularly along the South Australian coast, affected by the changes to fishing 26 species and spatial closures.

As we are having a discussion about our fishing expertise—and mine is very limited—I had my best fishing as a young lad with my brothers on the Port Lincoln jetty, of all places, in the electorate of the member for Flinders.

Mr Treloar: Nothing like fresh tommies.

Mr PEDERICK: That's it. I think I was the only one that day to catch some fish; it was a yellow-looking thing. I do not even know what it was, but someone advised me you could not eat it. I was keen to take it back to show my family what I had caught, but one of my brothers threw it back. The fish was long dead by this time, so I was not impressed, and I think I let him know.

Beyond that, a few years ago my boys got some fishing rods from their grandmother. We went down to Robe and were there just in the harbor, baiting up the hooks and putting them in and it was all good. Nothing was happening of course. I pulled them up at one stage and there was no bait on the hooks. I thought my wife was not looking, and I just threw the line straight back in. She said, 'What are you doing?' I said, 'Well, I'm fishing.' She said, 'You haven't baited up the hooks.' I said, 'We're getting the same result and just saving on bait.' I got a bit of a reprimand after that.

The Hon. L.A. Vlahos: Did she call you 'fish lips' after that?

Mr PEDERICK: She calls me lots of things, but I will not say. A couple of years ago we were up at Cooper Creek near Innamincka and the Cooper was pretty cold, especially first thing in the morning when you go for an early morning dip. We threw our lines in there and I think all we managed to do was tangle them up in the trees and the undergrowth and it was a bit of a mess.

The most recent enjoyable experience was when I drove over to Western Australia with the family and stopped at Fowler's Bay and caught up with Di and Brian Smith and a whole of crew of people there—a magnificent community in the electorate of the member for Flinders, who could really show a lot of people how life should be lived and how to relax. It is totally off grid, but that is another debate I can have another day.

I went up to my boys and said, 'They're going to take us out to check the craypots.' My boys, being like me, are real landlubbers and just thought we were going out in a little aluminium dingy. It was a bit better than a dingy; it was a little power boat about seven or eight metres long with a very small cabin on it, and we were going out to check the pots. I had no idea how far out we were going either. Fowler's Bay is very protected by a natural peninsula, a beautiful bay.

So, we all got on the boat, about six of us—myself and my two boys and these other blokes. Thank God we had a professional deckie so that they did not have to rely on me! We charged out, went around the end of the peninsula, and there we were in the chop. We were just going up and down, up and down. I was looking at my boys for their reaction. They were not too bad at this stage.

We got around the corner and we were offshore maybe a couple of kilometres, certainly well within sight of land. I looked at my young bloke, who was 12 at the time, and said, 'How you going, Angus?' He said, 'Don't even speak to me.' I thought, 'Okay.' I said, 'Well, look, if anything happens, you can see the land, you know which way to swim', but I do not think he took that as a very happy comment.

We checked the pots—there were only six to check, I think—and we managed to get one cray, so that was a bit of an experience. When we came back into Fowler's Bay itself, the other fishing blokes gave my boys some hand reels and we started hauling in snook. That was a magnificent experience, just essentially trawling along—

Mr Hughes: You didn't eat them, did you?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, we ate them that night—absolutely—on the barbecue. I got some good photos of the boys having a good crack at these snook. I must say that Fowlers Bay is a gem of a place and if you ever get the opportunity you should go there to visit, especially with the very fine company that we had.

There are a whole lot of things that need to be taken into account about fishing. I note the recent meetings that were had around the state, and I got to several of them. When I was the shadow minister for fisheries I was opposite to the Hon. Gail Gago, who was the minister at the time when there were some recreational fishing limits brought in. I must say I had very good negotiations with Mehdi Doroudi and had a couple of wins.

There is no secret that fishing does need to be managed, but I think there is something else we need to acknowledge, and I know there are some people in the department who will acknowledge this, and that is the impact of the notorious New Zealand fur seals on fish stocks. I know I have talked in this place about their impact on the Lakes and Coorong fishery, and they are still having a heavy impact.

I went to the Northern Zone rock lobster fishery dinner late last year and some of those people said to me, 'Why stop there? I am looking for some sort of program and control,' in regard to New Zealand fur seals. I said that we need to work something out on the inland waters before we get out to sea. What I was reflecting on before is what people in the department are aware of, that I have heard, in regard to declining fish stocks. We know that garfish are fully fished, we know whiting are under pressure, and this is what many people believe is the impact that the well over 100,000 New Zealand fur seals are having on our ocean species, including whiting and their breeding and spawning grounds up around Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula.

I believe there does need to be true science, as the member for Giles indicated earlier, in regard to the management of fisheries and that includes what is happening with predator species, no matter what they are, offshore. If we do not do that, we will not have fisheries—we just will not. I know for a fact that, especially in a netting situation, New Zealand fur seals kill for fun.

Other things that need to be managed, obviously, are things like the recreational catch of Goolwa pipis in my electorate. They have become very much a favoured item for human consumption, especially over the last few years. They used to be recognised as bait but are now very much for human consumption. People are very keen to catch as many as they can and, dare I say it, probably take more than they should.

The South Australian Research and Development Institute was looking at getting whiting fish frames to do some research, and I know that has been mentioned by the member for Mount Gambier. I can understand why fishermen (a) do not want to give up where they caught them, and (b) just do not want to be involved with anything to do with government, because basically they got done right over with the marine parks process when fishermen took to government where they fished, where their hotspots were, and guess what? That is where the marine parks turned up.

I have always said in this place that it should not be up to the Department of Environment to manage fisheries, it should be up to the fisheries department. We have one of the best acts and one of the best legislative programs and regulatory processes in the world and to leave it in the hands of the environment department, I have always said, is an utter disgrace.

We already had excellent legislation. The fishermen know that if they cross the line—especially commercial fishers—they are in real strife. We certainly need to manage fish stocks, but if we are going to do the science let's not just manage human intervention, but let's also look at predator species so that we can get an accurate picture of what is happening on our fish stocks now and into the future so that our kids and grandkids can enjoy fishing well into the future.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:54): In the few minutes remaining, I would like to make a contribution to this motion brought to this place by the member for Chaffey which, amongst other things, notes the economic and social benefits of recreational fishing to South Australia. As mentioned by previous speakers, part of my electorate has an extraordinary length of very beautiful and, in many cases, pristine coastline. I acknowledge particularly the member for Giles' comments who, by the sound of it, spent much of his youth, and now with his children, visiting the West Coast of South Australia, and also the member for Hammond, who talked about his recent trip to Fowlers Bay.

The electorate of Flinders extends all the way from the township of Cowell down to Port Lincoln, around the corner, and all the way up to the Western Australian border, so there is well over 1,000 kilometres of accessible coastline, that is very attractive to both recreational and professional fisherman. It is often mentioned that the fishing fleet at Port Lincoln is the largest professional fishing fleet in the Southern Hemisphere, but it is also home to a significant recreational fishing population, as are all the other towns right around. Without wanting to list them all, it extends from Cowell, Arno Bay, Port Neill, around to Streaky Bay, Ceduna and on to Fowlers Bay.

Many members have spoken about their childhood memories of summer holidays and fishing expeditions. For me, it was at our family shack at Coffin Bay. We learned how to row a boat, catch fish and fillet them. We were much better at catching tommy ruffs than we were whiting, but anyway we got to know and love fresh tommies.

I attended some of the community meetings that were held around the state and on Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast in the lead-up to the change in these regulations. They were robust meetings, and not all but certainly most people at those meetings recognised that something needed to be done. They were not exactly sure what that should be, but something needed to be done about managing declining fish stocks because everybody recognised that fish are harder to catch and that we have to go out farther to get them. People now have bigger boats and are able to do that, but they are certainly going farther to get them.

The recent change in regulations was about reducing bag limits and increasing size limits for a number of species, but probably the focus in my part of the world will always be on the King George

whiting. Interestingly, the size increase was moved to 32 centimetres east of 136 longitude, which aligns with Cape Catastrophe. That recognises the importance of the gulfs in the marine scale fishery and also recognises the fishing pressure that comes in those gulfs. By default, it makes the West Coast more attractive because, first and foremost, it retains the 30 centimetre size limit, and probably is not so impacted by the spatial closures during the month of May that exist at the bottom end of Spencer Gulf, adjacent to Kangaroo Island and Yorke Peninsula.

I regularly hear reports, particularly from constituents farther west, to Streaky Bay, Ceduna and that area, about concerns relating to what they term the 'tinnie brigade', visitors primarily from interstate who come to those towns. They are recognised by interstate numberplates and, at this time of the year, there might be up to 50 interstate plates at the boat ramp at Ceduna, and they fish hard for a period of time. We have introduced, through this parliament, possession limits and everybody recognises that that was a good move.

The member for Hammond and others have mentioned compliance. I believe that is an issue. Our fisheries officers do a very good job. They are always busy, they have an extraordinary area to cover and they cannot always be where they need to be. Even though we are making efforts towards managing fisheries through boat and bag limits, size limits and possession limits, it still seems that there is pressure on the fishery and I think that at some point in the future we are going to have to make more significant changes in the way in which we manage these fisheries overall. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates—Amendment No. 60

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—AGL Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—ElectraNet SA Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—ETSA Utilities Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—NRG Flinders Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—Synergen Power Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—Terra Gas Tender Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board—TXU Report 2002
Electricity Industry Superannuation Board Report Actuarial Investigation as at
30 June 2008
Statement of Advice in relation to the report to the Electricity Industry
Superannuation Board on the Actuarial Investigation as at 1 July 2005

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:02): I bring up the 94th report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into issues faced by South Australian Primary Producers in retail supply'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier sack the employment minister, who is pleased South Australia has maintained the highest trend unemployment rate in the nation for the past 18 months?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): A typically empty contribution on a day when we should be addressing the fundamental issues about employment and the capacity to create jobs—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in the South Australian economy.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the same political party that was predicting double-digit unemployment when they were celebrating back in mid-2015, when unemployment was 8.1 per cent. It must be a source of enormous disappointment for them that over the previous 18 months we have had 18 consecutive months of jobs growth, increasing by 16,900.

What the people of South Australia expect, instead of an empty cheer every time there is disappointing news on the job front, is to see a party that pretends to be the alternative party of government promoting a platform for change for the South Australian community. But we know that they are philosophically incapable of offering anything because out of the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition, one year out from the next state election, he declares himself a free market guy. He is the free market guy who believes you just sit back and let things happen. That's the vision that he offers the people of South Australia at a time when they want somebody to stand up and protect them and their jobs.

They want somebody to go out and fight for the big companies to come here—like DCNS, to build the Future Submarines; like Boeing, making sure Boeing comes to town and creates jobs and opportunities here; and like the other 3,200 jobs that have been attracted through the Investment Attraction body and the excellent work of the Minister for Trade and Investment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In a week when we open up the Northern Plains to an exciting irrigation project that promises 3,700 jobs in the Northern Plains, we have the Leader of the Opposition come here with his empty rhetoric about criticising a Minister for Employment who is using every moment of his waking hours dedicated to creating jobs and opportunities in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, if I can be heard for a moment in silence.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have a long list of warnings to deliver as soon as the Premier is finished.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What people are crying out for isn't more market. They are crying out for government to use intelligent policies to attract and retain jobs in this state. Sadly, for those opposite, once again the world has shifted beneath their feet. This idea of, 'Let's remove the handbrake and let's take our hands off the wheel,' is all over. It's just very old-fashioned. It's all over for you.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Your ideas are completely unpersuasive. That's why they are counting the numbers. That's why they are counting the numbers and thinking about whether

they need new leadership because certainly the people of South Australia understand that you are offering nothing. It is empty. It is over for you and your side.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm trying to read out the list of warnings and the leader is interrupting my sentencing remarks. These members are called to order: the members for Morphett, Chaffey, Mitchell, Morialta, Hartley, Unley, MacKillop, Davenport, Kavel, Wright, the deputy leader and the Treasurer. These members are warned a first time: the deputy leader and the members for Morialta, Hartley, Chaffey, Mitchell, Morphett and Davenport. These members are warned a second and final time: the leader and the members for Morialta, Hartley, Morphett and Mitchell and the deputy leader.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I thought so. I didn't catch half of them.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Will the minister today release the report of the independent review into the Older Persons Mental Health Services by the Chief Psychiatrist?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:08): No, I won't.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): Supplementary: can the minister provide an update to the house on when this is going to occur?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:08): I will be happy to be working on that over the Easter break.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Can the minister inform the house whether she has now read the report and recommendations?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:09): I will be receiving a large black bag over the weekend and I will be working my way through a number of files.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Will the minister provide clarity to this house as to whether or not she has read the report which she received earlier this week?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:09): As I stated yesterday, I have yet personally to receive the report. I am waiting for the department and my team to provide recommendations to me—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I reiterate the statement I made yesterday: I am waiting for the department to provide me, with my team, the appropriate recommendations to act upon, and I will be looking at my black bags over the weekend to deal with this matter.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Again, just for clarity, can the minister confirm to the house that she has not requested a copy of this report, received by the department on Monday this week?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:10): I have requested a copy of the report and I believe it will be in my bag this evening.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Supplementary: is the minister satisfied with the delay that the department has presided over in providing her with a copy of the Chief Psychiatrist's report?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:10): As I have stated to the parliament on several occasions over several weeks—and I have made two ministerial statements on this matter—we are taking this matter incredibly seriously—

Mr Pisoni: You haven't read the report.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

Mr Williams: She's got no interest in this matter.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —and I will respond in an appropriate way with a rigorous approach—

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned a second and final time. It would be a pity if such a venerable member were removed under sessional orders. Minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: My apologies, Mr Speaker, I couldn't hear you because of the noise. As I have stated previously, we are taking this matter very seriously. We will respond when I have the recommendations from the department and give an appropriate response that helps the people in that site achieve the care and concern for issues that need to be addressed. The consumers are the most important thing in this topic, and it's why we should take all care to make sure we address all the issues thoroughly and not be rushed.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Supplementary sir: why did the minister inform the media last week that this report would be released today?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:12): I believe there was a delay from the Chief Psychiatrist in completing all the interviews, and it didn't arrive until Monday, I am advised, and I have advised the house about that.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Will the minister commit to releasing the report in full, including all the Chief Psychiatrist's original recommendations?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:12): I need to read the report first.

Mr Bell interjecting:

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

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): A question to the minister: why is the department and the minister's office, according to her own statements this week, and I

quote, 'preparing appropriate recommendations in response to the Chief Psychiatrist's report' and not just releasing the report and recommendations as they have been received?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:13): Once you receive a report, it is wise to read it thoroughly, consult with your department—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Well, very few members across the other side of the chamber have had their bottom on this side of the chamber to understand how governance and governments work correctly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Absolutely! I don't remember hearing you defend the patients at Oakden when your federal government withdrew \$20 million from the mental health system last year. No, it was the state government that stepped in to support Oakden and the accreditation in that space, which was continued from February 2016 until recently. It is our government that has been supporting these frail and vulnerable consumers—and we will continue to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Davenport and Chaffey are warned a second and final time. Leader.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Did any part of SA Health have the opportunity to consider or comment on a draft report of the Chief Psychiatrist with or without the final recommendations?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:14): I will have to take advice from the department about that.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. Can the minister provide an update on the contribution of naval shipbuilding to the South Australian economy?

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) (14:14): Can I thank the member for his question. I recently attended, in Langkawi, the International Maritime and Aerospace Exhibition (LIMA), hosted by the Malaysian government. LIMA is one of the largest maritime aerospace exhibitions in the Asia-Pacific region focused on both defence and civilian industries.

Fifteen Australian companies participated, along with the Chief of Navy, including four South Australian companies aiming at maximising defence export opportunities for themselves and for Australian industry more broadly. The event was attended by Chiefs of Navy from around the region, and their representatives, including 38 countries—all countries from South-East Asia, but also from other nations.

As part of this event, I met with the Malaysian Chief of Navy, the Malaysian defence minister and key leaders in the South-East Asian defence industry. I was honoured, on behalf of the South Australian government, to have been invited by the organisers not only to attend and participate in the round table but to address the round table about the emergence of the premier naval shipyard in the Southern Hemisphere, at Techport in South Australia, about which there is considerable international interest.

The address focused on our vision for the local defence industry and our goal to make a long-term significant contribution to the local economy as outlined in South Australia's various strategic documents on this subject. It's very much front of mind for our neighbours that

South Australia is emerging as the destination and the home of naval shipbuilding in our precinct, in our strategic area of interest.

The timing could not have been better because the visit coincided with the federal government's announcement of a \$25 million maritime technical college, to be based in Adelaide, to train Australian workers for our \$90 billion shipbuilding program. The announcement followed news that three South Australian public universities, TAFE SA and the defence industry sector had grouped together to ensure that Australian jobs were at the forefront of shipbuilding programs. It's another indication of the benefits this program will offer. That's what our three-year campaign for the local build of submarines and frigates has been all about—jobs, jobs, jobs.

I congratulate the federal government on backing the local option. We will work closely with them to make this happen, but I do make some observations of concern to everyone in this house. I am advised that the federal government and French shipbuilder DCNS are on the record as committing to a 90 per cent Australian industry content for the submarine program. DCNS said it, the federal minister (member for Sturt) repeated it over and over and over and was happy to have ownership of that promise.

Now it appears that the federal minister and the federal government are backing away from that commitment that 90 per cent of the work would go to Australians and we're talking about 60 per cent. Notably, he says 60 per cent in South Australia. Well, we will at least hold him to that. But a promise made during an election campaign is a promise. Ninety per cent is what was told and what was indicated. What the federal minister should be doing is holding DCNS to account on that.

The RFT for the nine ship frigate build has been given. We are expecting the shipbuilding plan shortly. Australian workers and Australian industry were told by DCNS and the federal government that 90 per cent of the work would go to Australian industry. That is what they expect. That is what must be delivered. I hope members opposite are doing all that they can to ensure that promise is delivered. They were complicit in it and I hope they are raising with the member for Sturt their concerns—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —that he's backing away to 60 per cent because it's about South Australian jobs and South Australian industry.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned, and the member for Hammond is called to order. Leader.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Can the minister provide any plausible explanation to this chamber as to why the minister didn't immediately visit the Oakden facility after the College of Psychiatrists raised concerns with her in 2016 about patient care at the facility instead of waiting until the ABC reported on the facility's failings in January 2017?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:19): I have been endeavouring to get out to visit as many disability and mental health and substance abuse sites across the state. In fact, I did have some time put aside late last year, but we had to move things around in my diary and it took several attempts before I managed to get out there and visit the site. However, I did go out to the site, because I had care and concerns. Late last year, I triggered the independent review into the Older Persons Mental Health Unit at Oakden as soon as I became aware there was a problem. I have made two ministerial statements in this chamber about that, and the house is well aware of that.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): A supplementary, sir: can the minister now update the house on what dates she has visited that site so far this year?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:20): I visited on 10 February.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Health. Following the minister's comment yesterday that transfers from Modbury to the Lyell McEwin Hospital are less than modelling suggested, what did the modelling predict and what is the current rate of transfers?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:20): I'm happy to get back to the house with a full answer, but I can state again what I stated yesterday: the number of transfers is well within what our modelling suggested when we made the changes to Modbury Hospital.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): A supplementary: in those circumstances, could the Minister for Health explain to us, if there was a reduction, why the ambulance shuttle services were suddenly extended until—

The SPEAKER: It is a supplementary. The member appears to be reading it.

Ms CHAPMAN: That's fine. Why were the ambulance shuttle services extended as a result, you say, of a reduction?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21): I think I know what the deputy leader is getting at, but I can't believe she would be so foolish as to ask such a question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Maybe I should. From the very beginning we had a dedicated ambulance, not a shuttle service but a dedicated ambulance, whose job it was to assist in the transfer of patients from Modbury Hospital, and that continues. We have no reason to get rid of it. When I say that it was within what we had modelled, I was not trying to suggest that there had been a reduction; I said it was well within what we had modelled in terms of the number of transfers. It seems the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has some difficulty understanding that.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

UPPER SPENCER GULF AND OUTBACK FUTURES PROGRAM

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house about the latest grant to be awarded to the \$2 million Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback Futures Program?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It would be good if the deputy leader didn't shout down ministers.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:22): I thank the member for Giles for his question, and I am sure the member for Stuart will be very interested in the answer. I am pleased to announce a \$63,000 grant for a new cafe and museum at Farina. Farina is 60 kilometres north of Leigh Creek, and this grant will generate seven jobs in the Far North of our state. This development will help to attract more visitors to the region as well as provide a valuable resource for school field trips.

Farina is growing as a tourist destination, even though many of its facilities, including the post office and rail line, were closed in the 1980s. The township is centrally located to other nearby tourist attractions, including Wilpena Pound and the Flinders Ranges, and is on the major route to the Marree, Birdsville and Oodnadatta tracks. In 2010, the Farina Restoration Group was incorporated to develop the town's tourist potential. I have met these people and consider them one of the hardest working of groups, especially in an isolated place such as Farina, to be able to do what they are doing up there.

The first building to be restored was the town's historic underground bakery, which now operates in the winter tourist season. Farina offers a premium food experience, with bread baked in its unique underground bakery. The traditional Scotch wood-fired oven—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: That's right, a Scotch wood-fired oven, which retains heat through the sand and stone structure and produces wonderful bread and pastry products on a daily basis during the eight-week winter tourist season. The next stage of the restoration will be to develop a new bakery training area in the restored underground bakery which will offer work experience for training bakers.

The \$2 million Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback Futures Program is a once-off grants program that opened in November 2015 in recognition of the challenges faced with the downturn of the resource sector and the closure of the Port Augusta power station and the Leigh Creek coalmine. This program supports the delivery of small projects contributing to the economic diversification, resilience and capacity building in the Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback communities, creating sustainable economic benefits to the region and the state.

Overall, 17 applicants have accepted a grant offered under this program, leading to the creation of 71 jobs and generating almost \$10 million in investment in the region. This project aligns with the state government's economic priorities of premium food and wine—no wine at Farina, though—produced in our clean environment and exported to the world, and South Australia is a growing destination choice for international and domestic travellers.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is on two warnings. It is probably not helpful to interject that there is nothing at Farina.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: It's not true, Mr Speaker. There is a lot to offer at Farina, and I will pass that on to the people who go there.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am not going to comment, but yes.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I congratulate the Farina Restoration Group on the fantastic job they have done in realising the tourism potential of the township and developing its attractions. This is exactly the type of project we want to support to further stimulate economic development in our regions and to strengthen regional communities.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the capital cost of fitting out the two operating theatre shells at the Flinders Medical Centre as proposed by the SALHN surgical reconfiguration document, released yesterday?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): I haven't got the figure in front of me, but it is a modest cost.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (14:26): A supplementary: under the same plan, what is the cost of accommodating 120 Flinders Medical Centre staff at the Tonsley site to make way for staff moving from the Repat?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): I need to check. I am not sure whether it is a facility we already own or not. Obviously, if it is a facility we already own, there would be no cost or a very small cost. I will check and find out.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

SOUTHERN ADELAIDE HOSPITALS

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (14:26): A supplementary: is the government still planning that our southern hospitals will lose 240 jobs?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27): I repeat what was said yesterday, and that is that as part of this reconfiguration no clinical jobs will be lost. That is the information that has been provided to staff, that no clinical jobs will be lost.

WOMEN IN HORTICULTURE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, how is the state government recognising women in horticulture?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:27): I thank the member for Reynell for the question. Of course, women are so important to the entire agricultural sector here in South Australia, and we support them across a number of different ways in terms of promoting the work they do and making sure that we can hold up the women who are currently there as beacons so that those girls going through school now have something to aim for to get a job in the agribusiness sector which employs one in five working South Australians.

Last night, I was at the AUSVEG industry awards dinner. I was very pleased to present on behalf of the government the Women in Horticulture Award, which was won by Zurriyet Braham who is a capsicum grower on the Northern Adelaide Plains. Of course, this week the Premier was out in the Northern Adelaide Plains announcing a \$110 million commitment for the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme. It is a great project, one where we are working very closely with the commonwealth. It was terrific to have Senator Anne Ruston at the dinner last night. We both spoke at the awards function and we mentioned how we are working collaboratively. The member for Hammond and the opposition spokesperson, David Ridgway, were also at the dinner. It was great for the industry which has done such a good job in the past few years in collaborating.

You could see the work that we were doing here at a state level and also with our federal counterparts for the good of the whole horticultural industry in South Australia, but particularly for the northern region of Adelaide where we know at the end of this year Holden will be closing and people will be looking for jobs. This NAIS program will create 3,700 jobs.

Ms Braham runs Braham Produce with her husband, Andrew, producing more than 200,000 kilograms of high-tech, soil-grown capsicums per year. To hear her talk last night about the passion that she and Andrew put into that business and the way they want to innovate and make sure that they can grow not just capsicums but grow the markets where they sell those capsicums was terrific. Ms Braham is actively involved in the horticulture industry. She is the deputy chair of Hortex Alliance and has participated in numerous overseas trips to further her business opportunities and export produce to international markets.

Ms Braham has demonstrated a willingness to share knowledge with other growers and to be a leader in the Northern Adelaide Plains region. She is very proactive in applying new research and development in the business and is committed to expanding knowledge in the local community. Ms Braham has been instrumental in demonstrating and applying R&D, including a National Landcare-funded project investigating water and fertiliser management, acting as one of the first adopters of integrated pest management in capsicum production, utilising advanced poly houses and implementing computerised irrigation, fertigation and climate control.

The state government's sponsorship of the Women in Horticulture Award through PIRSA aligns with our economic priority of premium food and wine produced in our clean environment and exported to the world. I congratulate Ms Braham on her award win, as well as the other award winners: Mr Henry Liu, who was Grower of the Year; Mr Chris Musolino, Young Grower of the Year;

FarMate, the Industry Impact Award; Matthew Stein as Researcher of the Year; and Bill and Emmanuel Cafcakis, who won the Environmental Award.

The winners of the AUSVEG South Australian Awards for Excellence are now in the running for the national awards for excellence to be held during the Hort Connections 2017 conference here in Adelaide from 15 to 17 May. It is going to be great to have the national industry here in Adelaide next month for that conference. There was one other winner, but he doesn't go through to the Hort conference, and that was the member for Hammond. He picked up six bottles of Pepperjack red in the raffle, so well done, member for Hammond.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Health. Was a business case prepared for the move of Ward 17 to the Glenside campus and, if not, why not? If so, will the minister publicly release that business case?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:32): We had an expert panel that examined all the options for sites for the move of the patient delivery for that. I will have to make an inquiry about a business case, but I know that we had extensive committees working across a number of spaces to ensure that the new Jamie Larcombe Centre, a \$15 million build of this state government, is committed to providing veterans currently serving, past serving and future serving so they are adequately and professionally dealt with for the future, for their own wellbeing and for their families.

WILLUNGA BASIN WATER

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture. Does the minister have an interest in any vineyard that receives water from the Willunga Basin Water company?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:32): I thank the deputy leader for the question. I have an interest in a lot of vineyards in McLaren Vale because they produce some amazing wine that I love to drink. Not only do I love to drink it but so many people from around the world love to drink it. We have one of the world's best wine regions within a 45-minute drive of Adelaide. I might put in a little plug for the Sea and Vines Festival, which is on over the June long weekend. It's going to be terrific.

The Willunga Basin Water company provides recycled water, just like the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme is going to do for the growers north of Adelaide, and it is a tremendous scheme. In fact, we helped a lot of vignerons get water to their vineyards by coming up with a grant program a few years ago because a lot of the smaller growers couldn't afford the \$6,000 to \$8,000 connection fee. So, the Willunga Basin Water company scheme is a terrific scheme. It uses recycled water that would otherwise be pumped out into Gulf St Vincent.

It is great technology, working with great grapegrowers, who are then providing our winemakers with fantastic grapes that we can turn into fantastic wine. This current vintage is shaping up to be an absolute beauty. It's—

Mr Pisoni: Yes or no?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I was asked if I had an interest. I've got a big interest in all the vineyards in the area, not just the ones at McLaren Flat. It is vital for the jobs in the southern suburbs of Adelaide and in my electorate that we all have an interest in it.

Everyone should have an interest in these vineyards. Everyone has a financial interest in it because it creates jobs. Do you know how many thousands of people are employed in the wine, tourism and food sectors? Yes, of course I have a great interest in it. I have been going in to bat for the people who have those vineyards since back in 2005. I have been out there campaigning for them. I know a lot of them traditionally voted the other way and now vote for me because they saw the way I stuck up for them. I had fights with our own government over water, as you had—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, no.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: They like the way I go in to bat for the area, so I've got an interest in what they do and they've got an interest in what I do. Absolutely I've got an interest not just in a vineyard in McLaren Flat but right throughout the area. Adelaide is now a Great Wine Capital. We fought really hard for that. Originally, the proposal came from McLaren Vale to join that, but what we've got is—

Mr Whetstone: South Australia is the wine capital, not Adelaide.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Again, this member over here from the Riverland wants to tell the people who run the Great Wine Capitals how you run it. It has to be named after a city, Einstein, okay? It's named after Adelaide because that's what the international rules say it's got to be.

The SPEAKER: The minister will refer to the member for Chaffey as such, rather than Einstein.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry, the member for Chaffey.

The SPEAKER: A point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As the member referred to you, sir, as Einstein, I ask you to bring him back to order.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am glad the Treasurer enjoyed that.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you, and I apologise to Einstein. The member for Chaffey thinks he knows better than the people who do the international rules who run the Great Wine Capitals. What most other cities in the world that are in Great Wine Capitals have are like Adelaide and one wine region. What we did is we went in and fought for all 18 wine regions in South Australia. So, it comes under Adelaide as the capital, because it's the capital of our state, and then all 18 of our wine regions are involved in that. Just getting back to the nub of the question—do I have a financial interest? No, I don't.

BOWERING HILL DAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): A supplementary: does the minister have any interest in any land, or beneficial interest in any enterprise, that will benefit from the proposed Bowering Hill dam water proposal?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:37): I thank the deputy leader again for the question. This is a proposal put up by a person who was the favoured candidate to be the Liberal candidate for the seat of Mawson, Mr Jock Harvey. He is actually the person behind this proposal. Jock and I don't actually see eye to eye on politics, so I don't think I am going to be in business with him. Again, let me just think. I have to go through this because there was a fair bit to the question. Do I benefit from it? I do because there are some amazing wines that come off there. As I mentioned in my earlier answer—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —we all love the great wine that comes from McLaren Vale so, yes, that is—

The SPEAKER: It would be very good if the deputy leader didn't make personal reflections on members across the chamber.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: There are wonderful wines that come out of there, but I am not the only beneficiary. Anyone who enjoys wine is going to benefit from this wonderful region.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: This is good. I might sit back, get some popcorn and watch these guys go at it. This is going alright, isn't it? I might pop my Easter egg—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You thought sitting between Mundine and Green was—

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, Mundine and Green was good. This is even better.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I think what happens is that a lot of people put a lot of stuff up on Facebook. It's a bit like when you get dodgy documents delivered to you, like the member for Unley—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Here we go!

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: Quarrels in the house are disorderly.

The SPEAKER: But they're having such a good time. Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: A bit like when the member for Unley got those dodgy documents: you shouldn't always believe what you see. There was some stuff on Facebook—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: A lot of people put a lot of stuff on Facebook. We have seen some stuff this week that was not very pleasant on Facebook, and people say things that aren't true on Facebook. People send things in the mail to the member for Unley that aren't true, but only fools believe stuff and take stuff at face value. The member for Unley did that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned a second and a final time. Minister, McLaren Vale.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: While we have spent the past 12 months building the tourism industry by \$900 million, creating an extra 4,000 jobs, and while we have taken the agribusiness sector up by \$1.6 billion, while we have been doing that, working side by side with the agriculture sector, working side by side with the tourism sector and putting \$40 million extra into the sport budget, while we have been doing that you guys have been googling Facebook to see what untruths have been written about me so you can come in here and ask questions.

I have no interest in any land on vineyards in McLaren Vale or any other part of South Australia. The only bit of land I own in McLaren Vale is my own house, which is inside the town boundary of McLaren Vale. I think there might be a glory vine out the back.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

BOWERING HILL DAM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): As the minister has identified that he is aware of the project in particular, could he confirm whether he has had that cup of tea yet with the Attorney-General, in response to yesterday's question?

The SPEAKER: Is the kettle boiling?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection

Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:43): Mr Speaker, I have very good news. As you would know, on *Hansard* yesterday, on the record, I invited the minister to share with me a cup of tea and we made several attempts to have our diaries together. As luck would have it, today at about 13:30 on the 24-hour clock, we went to the Blue Room. What happened there was that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey will withdraw from the house for the next hour under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As the member for Kaurna says, what happens in the Blue Room stays in the Blue Room, but I can tell the parliament this: there were two mugs of tea shared in the Blue Room today. There was milk in both, if I remember correctly. I would like to say thank you to the minister for shouting me a cup of tea. It was actually terrific to catch up.

Ms Chapman: So, what was the answer?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What was the question again? Yes, we had a cup of tea.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Good point. We did have a discussion. I have been able to ascertain some interesting facts, and they are that a gentleman, whom I understand to be a Mr Jock Harvey, has been a proponent, along with a fellow (you don't read that much about him these days) called Jamie Briggs and somebody called Anne Ruston. They were involved in promoting a project for the southern regions, in particular around Bowering Hill. In fact, in the context—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am just reporting to the parliament, as I have been asked. In the context of the last federal election, there was some undertaking obtained—I use the word 'obtained' because it is a neutral word—by Mr Briggs that there would be money in the sum of about \$2½ million put forward by the federal government to assist Mr Harvey, who was the unsuccessful Liberal candidate for Mawson.

Mr Marshall: How did you get your SC? How did you get it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: By speaking slowly. Mr Harvey, who was the unsuccessful Liberal candidate for Mawson, apparently has an—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is my advice.

The SPEAKER: It would be very good if the deputy leader did not shout down ministers while they are trying to give an answer.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He was the unsuccessful Liberal candidate for preselection for the seat of Mawson, and—

The SPEAKER: Alas, the Deputy Premier's time has expired.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What a shame.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER REPORT

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:47): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer publicly release the Small Business Commissioner report he was provided earlier this year regarding the company B.J. Jarrad?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:47): We are considering the release of that report. There is obviously a lot of sensitive commercial information in that report. The government is considering its position on those matters. It is something I am very

concerned about. It is very concerning. I understand the local member has concerns about that, and I have been lobbied by many members about this. The concern that we have, of course, is that in that example the government I think did everything it could to help companies like B.J. Jarrad. This is the situation we are in.

When we have a master contractor who goes out and gives out work and they attempt to bring companies back into the fold after they perhaps may have issues in the past, and they have subcontractors, the government does its part and pays its bill for the work done, and then a company somewhere along the chain either is unable to pay their bills or goes into administration or liquidation, the question for us is: does the government pay twice? If the government pays twice, what does that mean for future precedents?

Every time the government goes out to work, how will that alter the behaviour of contractors if they know that the government will not only honour its original contract but will pay again using the taxpayers' fund because we have the deepest pockets? People keep on coming back to us. The question is: where do we draw the line? There are consequences for holding the line. There are consequences for families and businesses who are let down by contractors who have done the wrong thing. In the B.J. Jarrad case, I understand the situation is that SA Water had engaged with a contractor who, after a period of time, had rebuilt its ability to tender. It was given a second chance, and then it let SA Water down again. The question then is: do we pay twice?

I have to say that I have a lot of sympathy for companies affected by B.J. Jarrad. I have a lot of sympathy, but there is a broader principle at stake here, and that broader principle is: how often do we let unscrupulous behaviour get away with the fact that the state government will pay? The question then is: how do we structure our contracts? I know that the Minister for Small Business and the Minister for Infrastructure are working away—

Mr Knoll: You've been working on it for two years.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. They are working away at a structure to deal with this. It is a very complex issue, and I have had a lot of personal lobbying from the member for Finniss about this because he is concerned about it as well, as has the Small Business Commissioner. I know that people are concerned about it, so we are trying to come to a solution, but it is a very difficult and complex issue because if the government does just pay what that means in the future is that every time that a contractor—

Mr Marshall: When will you know what you're going to do?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You try and give a considered answer and when the house goes silent and it's not going the way the Leader of the Opposition wants, he interjects, which speaks volumes about who he is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader and the deputy leader are both on two warnings. If they make an utterance outside standing orders, they will depart.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the question from the member for Flinders is a reasonable one. I am considering releasing that report and we are considering government policy on how to deal with those situations in the future.

SOUTH ROAD UPGRADES

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house of any plans to create a dual carriageway from Seaford to Sellicks Beach along the Main South Road corridor?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:51): I thank the member for Finniss for his question. It has been a concern for residents who use that southern part of South Road about the condition of the road and certainly the number of representations I have had from the member for Mawson, as well as from the member for Kaurana in particular, have highlighted the number of people who have

approached them directly as being active local members who constantly raise these matters with me as the Minister for Transport.

We have had transport department staff go out and liaise with the council. We have also asked them to go and meet with some of the residents who have been concerned about it. In fact, as a result of the member for Mawson raising this issue with me, we have even had a couple of the department's engineers meet with a couple of retired council engineers to talk about one of the main problems with this part of Main South Road, and that's that there are some variable types of soil which underpin that road, in particular some reactive clays which, due to wet weather and then dry weather and so on, cause the undulations to form over time.

Certainly, the member for Mawson has made it clear to me that I need to be thinking about and the department needs to be thinking about some further works on top of the nearly \$10 million we are spending on the Malpas Road intersection upgrade—where of course there have been quite a significant number of road accidents, including casualty crashes—and what else we can do. The member's question to me was: are we investigating dual carriageway? I can't, with my hand on my heart, say whether that particular solution is being investigated, but are we investigating solutions for the problem of that particular road? As a result of the strong advocacy of the member for Mawson, we absolutely are.

ROAM ZONE SERVICE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (14:53): My question is also to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is Adelaide Metro's Roam Zone service designed to drop bus users to their doorsteps?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:53): We certainly do have some services provided by Adelaide Metro that provide to the door service for some people, and those services traditionally have been a number of after-hours services, obviously, on the bus network, rather than on other networks.

As for the Roam Zone services, I might need to come back to the member with the precise details of what that is designed to do and whether we are, in fact, referring to the same service or if it's one of the particular services which Adelaide Metro has been looking at introducing which is providing that to-the-door service at other times of the day or week beyond those late-night services, those after midnight services, which we are able to provide to people either to designated bus stops or, for people who live not too far away from those bus stops, where we are able to drop them to the door.

ROAM ZONE SERVICE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (14:54): Supplementary: minister, will you advise why bus 683 at Hallett Cove refuses to drop users at their doorstep during the roam zone period despite assurances from you, Adelaide Metro and the Lonsdale depot that this is a possibility?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:55): I think, in response to the member for Bright, understandably that matter might need some specific investigation. I will come back to the house with the details of that.

OAKLANDS PARK RAIL CROSSING

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:55): My question is also to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister explain why the signals at Oaklands crossing have failed numerous times in the past few months, banking up traffic on occasions for more than 50 minutes?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:55): I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. Members would be aware of the problems that the Oaklands crossing has been providing to the road network and, more importantly, to those people who have had to rely on that part of the road network for many years. The frustrations of having newly electrified and more frequent train services on the Seaford line of course have only been exacerbating those frustrations, as the record number of patrons we have on the Seaford line have the unfortunate consequence of bringing the boom gates

down over that road crossing at Oaklands more often, and that is a massive frustration during peak periods.

I'm very glad to say that, due to some very good design work and some fantastic procurement outcomes on the north-south corridor, we have identified sufficient savings on both the Northern Connector project and the Torrens to Torrens project so that finally, after it being long awaited by the communities of the southern suburbs, we now have not only a solution for Oaklands crossing but we now have the funding for it. We now have the funding to deliver a solution to Oaklands crossing where we can remove those train services from the intersection, whether that's—

Mr WINGARD: Point of order: No. 98. I just want to bring the minister back to the substance of the question as to the extended number of boom gate delays, where the boom gates have been stuck over the past few months.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the minister says.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This solution to fixing the Oaklands crossing boom gate issue, which is frustrating so much traffic, can be fully funded from the savings that we've identified on the north-south corridor projects. This will mean that, at no further cost to the federal government—

Mr Wingard: But why are they getting stuck now?

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This will mean that, at no further cost to the commonwealth government and no further additional cost to the state government, which of course is co-funding those upgrades to the north-south corridor, we can fix Oaklands crossing. There is absolutely nothing standing between the residents of the southern suburbs and the people who rely on this part of the road network from getting what they have long wished for—and that's an upgrade to Oaklands crossing.

The terrific thing about it is that, just like those other projects that we have been funding with the commonwealth, they are jointly funded. It means we are putting money in and it means the federal government is putting money in. So, when there have been those erroneous communications by the South Australian Liberal Party, which have been masterminded by the member for Unley and also the member for Mitchell, we are actually putting our money in to fix that problem with the boom gates at Oaklands—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 98, debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, as the member for Mitchell said, it was a lie. Yes, it was a lie, and that's why the Electoral Commission required the Liberal Party to retract that misinformation that they gave to those people in the southern suburbs.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: he is defying your ruling, plus the same point of order again: debate—98. He just continued doing exactly the same thing.

The SPEAKER: Has the minister finished?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, not quite, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Well, in that case I will have to call him to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In progressing this solution for the problem with the boom gates at Oaklands crossing, we are proposing that the entire cost can be met from both the federal and the state governments with no further budget burden to either level of government.

As soon as we get that stroke of the pen from the federal government that enables us to redirect this funding from those other projects, which are being delivered and delivered successfully—indeed, in one instance at least, the Torrens to Torrens Project ahead of schedule—we will be able to move on to the Oaklands crossing project. That nearly \$200 million project will not only support hundreds of jobs during its construction, supporting better employment outcomes for

the South Australian economy, but will give a much smoother, faster and more reliable journey on that part of the southern road network.

OAKLANDS PARK RAIL CROSSING

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:00): Supplementary, sir: why has the minister not submitted this project to Infrastructure Australia where all dual projects are submitted? The minister hasn't actually put a formal application in.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:00): I am pleased to report to the member for Mitchell that we have submitted three separate reports on the Oaklands crossing to the federal government which—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is on a full set of warnings.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —was what was requested by the federal minister. So, have I followed those processes and procedures which have been required by me of the Coalition federal government in order to expedite this project? Yes, I have, absolutely, and we have sufficient detail in front of the commonwealth government for this project to be given the tick. Rather than play misleading politics with this issue, like the South Australian Liberal Party has been caught out doing by the Electoral Commission, they should be lobbying their federal counterparts to support the figures—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: standing order 98. The minister is debating.

The SPEAKER: I'm afraid I was just taking advice from the Leader of the Opposition, who was expressing his concern about sitting in Holy Week, and I didn't hear the minister, I'm sorry.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker, what I was saying—

Ms CHAPMAN: He clearly outlined a complaint about the misleading statements of the opposition. That needs to be a substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: I'm advised that the minister claimed that the Liberal Party misled, not the opposition, and that doesn't attract the standing orders.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Perhaps I can take the opportunity to remind the deputy leader that the Electoral Commission has already ruled on this matter against the Liberal Party, which was ordered to publish a retraction—just in case she had forgotten. In fact, it is the first time in recent electoral history that such an order has been made by the Electoral Commission.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When it comes to disingenuous misleading behaviour about politics, the deputy leader should hang her head in shame. This is the party that she so desperately wants to lead, and this is the way that they behave.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to the deputy leader's interjections. Has the minister finished?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, I think so.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta gets to ask the 28th opposition question.

TAFE SA

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:02): Excellent. I will see if I can do two in one, sir. My question is to the Minister for Higher Education and Skills. Will TAFE SA be commercially competitive in 2018, as has been stated as a target by the minister and former minister Gago? Can the minister provide clarity as to which services will be protected from commercial competition to enable it to meet its social community and equity roles?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:03): The target, as I understand it, is that from 2019 TAFE will be competitive in those parts of its business that are appropriate for competitive action and that there is a transition that begins at the beginning of the next financial year this calendar year, a transition where there is the beginnings of the steps towards that.

The task that we've set TAFE is a reasonably stiff one, a difficult one, and we will need to handle it with enormous delicacy in order to make sure that we support our public provider and that we make sure that the infrastructure and training in this state are well supported for the students of this state.

Grievance Debate

KANGAROO ISLAND AIRPORT

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:03): A short time ago in the house, the member for Flinders asked some questions of the Treasurer in relation to B.J. Jarrad. I was particularly pleased to hear the member for Flinders ask those questions, and I am not pleased with the answer that was provided by the Treasurer. He has been sitting on this for some time, and these poor devils of subcontractors have still not been paid. Quite frankly, it is not good enough. That leads me to the latest debacle about unpaid subcontractors which is to do with the Kangaroo Island airport project.

The company, NBS, went into receivership just recently, and I have a couple of subcontractors on the island who have not been paid and it is seriously impacting on their capacity to do business. I am worried because I believe this has been extremely clumsily handled by the council on the island. I remain unconvinced that they have done their job properly. Indeed, one of the questions that went from the Public Works Committee to the council was around the question of due diligence; the committee was questioning whether due diligence was done on particularly NBS.

At this morning's Public Works Committee, in answer to a question, a government officer explained that there was a procurement process and an assessment process based on a basic framework of DPTI. To quote the government officer, it would appear unfortunate that the council had not undertaken a detailed financial review, and so I said, 'Due diligence,' as a comment. The officer went on, 'Or at least a financial review of NBS'.

This is where it gets particularly messy. I have concerns that there have been things untoward going on with this whole deal. Unfortunately there is only one officer of the council who has knowledge of it. Other officers are excluded, and it all boils down to the CEO of the council over there, who seems to be behaving in a psychopathic way, wanting to run the whole show. Here we now have two local businesses that have not been paid.

NBS were running a quarry run by a Mr Hardy, and there was another quarry run by a Mr Willson. What further concerned me was that in a letter of response to the Public Works Committee today from Mr Deegan, the CEO of Transport, the council was quoted—and this is why I suspect there has been something untoward going on right through this in relation to the procurement of crush materials. In the answer from the council, Mr Tony Willson is referred to as 'Tony Willson' and Mr Mark Hardy is just referred to as 'Hardy'. I detect a distinct clash there between the council officer and the crushing contractors. I believe that there may well be something that needs to be looked into seriously.

I do not intend to rest on this. I want to see these people paid. They should be paid. No money has gone out whatsoever. They are now unsecured creditors and, according to the letter that has come back from Mr Deegan and the information on there, there is every likelihood that they will not get paid, or will not get paid very much. It is simply not good enough for this to take place in this day and age, particularly after what happened with B.J. Jarrad and the creditors there, which the Treasurer referred to today, who are still waiting on their money. It is not good enough.

I do not know where things are going with some of these contractual arrangements on the island in relation to the airport. It is \$18 million of taxpayers' money, half and half from the state and the feds. I look forward to the project being completed. It has now been held up for a variety of reasons, not the least being NBS going into receivership. However, the simple fact is that NBS should have had an in-depth analysis of its financial position. Due diligence does not appear to have been

done and, as a result, we have people needing money. Their bills keep coming in, and they are being required to pay that money without any cash flow coming in. You cannot operate like that and have a fair playing field. It is a disgrace and there is more to come on it.

HUB NETBALL CLUB

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:08): Last Thursday night, I had the privilege of attending the annual general meeting and summer 2016-17 presentation night for the Hub Netball Club. This was a fantastic event, and brought together a small community netball club to celebrate their success over the summer season. The Hub Netball Club was founded in 1979 and its committee prides itself on being a family club with the emphasis on participation with a strong club structure.

In the early days, Hub Netball Club had an affiliation with the Hub YMCA at Aberfoyle Park. The club is now a strong participant within the Southern United Netball Association (SUNA) which is based in Morphett Vale, with their training courts now located within the Reynella Sports and Social Centre and shared with the Reynella Tennis Club at Old Reynella.

For this season, Hub Netball Club had 11 teams participating in the SUNA competition, with eight of these teams competing in the finals. Hub came away from the grand finals with their A1 team winning their premiership, making it four in a row. The C3 team won their grand final to make them back-to-back premiers and the under 11 Green team played an amazing grand final to come away with a one goal win.

However, as much as this was a time of celebration for the club, it was also an extremely sad time. On Wednesday 8 March 2017, Hub lost a dear and valued friend, Geoff Robertson, in tragic circumstances while he was umpiring an A grade game at SUNA. SUNA and its associated clubs, along with the wider netball community, highly respected Geoff and his contribution to netball, and this was evident by the outpouring of respect after this tragic event. It was fantastic to see all grand final teams from all clubs in the association come together for a minute's silence prior to their games.

At the senior grand final games on Wednesday 15 March 2017, SUNA renamed their A grade best and fairest to now be the Geoff Robertson Memorial Trophy. It is a very fitting tribute to a man who was so well respected within the wider netball community. Geoff was an iconic figure at Hub Netball Club for over 15 years. He was a life member, brilliant coach, respected committee member, a previous vice president, amazing umpire and, above all, a mentor and friend to many—all this whilst also running a very successful advertising business.

To ensure that the legacy of Geoff remains, the club has introduced a new award this season, being the Geoff Robertson Memorial Award for Most Outstanding Club Person. This award will acknowledge a club member who has gone above and beyond to help develop the club for the year prior, whether it be by umpiring, coaching, being a committee member or a team manager. It requires that a person does more than is expected of their role and really assists behind the scenes, as Geoff always did for the club for many years.

This year, the first winner, very appropriately, was Belinda Rigney. She goes above and beyond her role of secretary. She has provided immeasurable support to the president, dear friend and old netball buddy of mine, Kendyl Dunk. In particular, when Kendyl's work and family made it very difficult for her to juggle her role, Belinda has assisted with filling umpire positions, handling issues that arise on game night, even when just attending as a spectator. She is the consummate organiser of meetings, does all her roles and tasks without complaint and is always available to assist others. She was courtside when Geoff passed away and has been the club contact with Geoff's family. She has provided enormous support and, while grieving the loss of her dear friend, she even ensured the day after that respect was shown by the wearing of black armbands.

It was very fitting that the inaugural award was presented by two of Geoff's children, Brittany and Amy. My heart really went out to the girls who were so very brave on the night. They and their mum, Jayne, sister Victoria and brother Alex have suffered the greatest of losses, but they are surrounded by a wonderful community at the Hub Netball Club and in Happy Valley who love them dearly and are there for them. I know this will be at least some comfort.

The Hub Netball Club is a great club which over the past few seasons has also played its A1 team in other competitions to give them a bit of variety, last winter participating in the Southern

Hills Netball Association where they came away as runners-up. Over summer, as a training run, they also participated with another team in the City Night competition at Priceline Stadium. One of the two teams played in the finals but unfortunately did not come away with a win. It may be one of the smaller clubs, but they bat above their average. They have enormous volunteer numbers who provide great help, and the club would not survive without them. I look forward to being involved in the club in the future.

LOSS OF POWER GRANTS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:14): As all members here know, on 28 September 2016 last year our state endured an unprecedented statewide blackout. Business SA has made it very clear that the cost to businesses was in excess of half a billion dollars from that event, but I want to touch on the equally important other side of that—the cost to households. Households all across our state were plunged into darkness and fridges and freezers did not work. Very necessary breathing apparatus did not work for many people. A whole range of necessary medical equipment, all the way through to normal household items, did not work because they did not have electricity.

Where electricity lines went down that were SAPN's responsibility, those households in most cases did get financial support from SAPN for that. Keep in mind that, while Adelaide was only out for a few hours, some parts of our state were out for days. It is fair to give credit to the state government for offering the loss of power grants at the time to help households meet the financial hardship, most notably where fridges and freezers did not work. Some families and households would have lost hundreds of dollars of food because, once it thawed out it and went rotten, it needed to be replaced.

Those loss of power grants were administered by Housing SA. When I visited the relief centres that Housing SA staff operated, I have to say that they were doing an absolutely outstanding job. They were working very hard to support the people who came in to seek assistance. It was a two-phase system where people essentially came in, explained their loss, filled out some forms and made it really clear what their issue was. In the second phase, they got to sit down one on one with personnel to answer some questions more fully and outline their issue, and then later on they found out what support they were going to get.

While I understand that it is not possible to leave these grants open forever, there are sections of my electorate of Stuart that were completely unaware of the opportunity to apply for them. People have approached me from Nepabunna, Iga Warta, Leigh Creek, Lyndhurst, Port Augusta (including Stirling North), Melrose, Booleroo Centre and Wirrabara, and they all said that they did not even know that the opportunity to apply for the grant was there until many weeks afterwards.

I have great sympathy for these people, but particularly for the people farther north, in places such as Nepabunna, Iga Warta, Leigh Creek and Lyndhurst, many of whom did not have any form of communication for a very long time as well. The Leigh Creek broader district, including the communities to the north and the east, were without power on more than one occasion and for extended periods of time.

It is also important to point out that people, particularly in the communities east of Leigh Creek, do not have Facebook, do not have Twitter and do not have internet access on a regular basis; it is not the way they live their lives, so they were just not aware of the opportunity to access these grants. I have approached the state government and said that these are special cases and that these are people who really do deserve some extra support.

Unfortunately, in almost all these cases the state government has said no, that they were not prepared to offer extra support for them. The only support I am seeking for them is the opportunity to apply after the official closure date because they did not know about the grant. I am not asking that their assessment would be any different in any way. They should be assessed in exactly same way as anybody else in the state, but I do think it is only fair that they get an extended period of time.

I have no doubt that, through no fault of their own, many of my constituents were completely unaware of this opportunity primarily because of the reasonably remote location where they live

and/or work. I again ask the government to give these people the opportunity to apply for the same assistance that other people in the state received.

SIKH FESTIVAL OF VAISAKHI

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:19): I rise today to speak about a celebration that is very important to members of our Sikh community. The Sikh Festival of Vaisakhi celebrates the birth of the Khalsa, but it is often mistaken for being just a harvest festival or the Sikh new year. Vaisakhi celebrates the foundation of Sikhism, a religion that is cemented on the notions of equality, freedom of religion and community service.

The core essence of the teaching of the Sikh tradition is that all Sikhs must cultivate spirituality while serving the world around them. I have had the pleasure of attending many events with our Sikh community, who are an amalgamation of people from India, Malaysia, Singapore, England, New Zealand, Canada and East Africa to name just a few. In coming days, these dedicated members of our community will come together to commemorate Vaisakhi, also known as Khalsa Sirjana Divas.

In the Sikh spirit, Vaisakhi is fundamentally about community and inclusion, and these values are at the forefront of the South Australian government's vision for our community. Our model of multiculturalism is about inviting every South Australian to express and share their cultural heritage and to support and realise their full potential. Rather than dividing us, cultural diversity compels us to be clear about those things that unite us, such as justice, equality and democracy.

That is why our government remains committed to cultivating people's interest in celebrations such as Vaisakhi and many other cultural celebrations and continues to promote people's natural interest in emerging cultures through cross-cultural understanding. Our Sikh community in South Australia is flourishing. They are very well known for their hospitality and generous spirit. We are very lucky to have such a dedicated group of people who choose to call South Australia home, and I thank them for sharing their unique culture with us.

Over the Easter long weekend, the 30th annual Australian Sikh Games, which is an exciting initiative that embodies the rigorous discipline of sport and the warmth and spirit of our Sikh community, will be hosted here in South Australia. The games provide a great platform for athletes to be involved in competitive sporting events and the wider community to be involved in what promises to be an exciting cultural experience. I would like to acknowledge the hardworking organising committees for volunteering their time to bring traditional Indian sport to South Australia, to share the wonderful culture and to help develop long-lasting friendships.

The popularity of the games is such that they are rotated between major cities and key regional locations across Australia. Interestingly, I am told that the first Sikh Games were held in South Australia 30 years ago. I am very pleased that South Australia will host this wonderful event this year and that our government was able to assist with the cost of the event.

I am also pleased that the Hon. Zoe Bettison MP (Minister for Multicultural Affairs) will host a parliamentary reception in coming days to celebrate Vaisakhi—an event that holds great significance for our Sikh community. I am proud to be part of an inclusive and cohesive multicultural society where cultural diversity is widely celebrated. On behalf of the South Australian government, I wish members of our Sikh community a happy Vaisakhi.

IRON ROAD

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:23): I rise today to make some comments on the back of a story that appeared in today's *Advertiser* newspaper on page 53 in the Business Daily. It is headlined 'Major Chinese banks back Eyre iron ore'. This relates to the iron ore project Iron Road at Warrambo, and I quote:

Iron Road has attracted formal expressions of interest from three major Chinese banks to fund its \$US4 billion Eyre Peninsula iron ore and infrastructure project...

The banks involved are set to contribute about \$3 billion worth of the debt component, and Iron Road also has China Railway Group involved in the Central Eyre Iron Project as a project development partner.

According to the article, Iron Road are also talking to a consortium of international pension funds that wish to participate in the equity pool. China Railway Group already has an agreement to take 10 million tonnes of the magnetite ore a year should the project go ahead. I notice that, on the back of this announcement—and the market was probably aware that this announcement was in the wind—the share price for Iron Road has been sneaking up in recent times and has peaked today at 28¢. I have been watching this project proposal with great interest over the last seven years that I have been the member for Flinders.

The proposal consists of three separate parts, although they are all required, should the mine site develop. The first is the mine site itself, situated just east of Warramboe on Eyre Peninsula. It is a magnetite ore deposit. In fact, it has been known since the early 1960s that iron ore has been situated here at Warramboe. Various companies have come and gone over those years. This time, however, Iron Road have been much more serious with their development proposal and are well on the way to raising capital and getting approvals from government as well, pending improvements. I have no doubt that there will be conditions imposed on those approvals.

Along with the mine site, there is an infrastructure corridor for a railway track and a water pipeline to carry desalinated water to the mine site from an underground basin to the east. The rail track, via train, will take magnetite to a new port development at Cape Hardy, just south of Port Neill—exciting times, should this go ahead. It has taken many years to get to this point, and it comes on the back of what turned out to be the final meeting of the community consultative group at the Warramboe football clubrooms just last week.

I have been a member of that community group for the last four or five years. It has been ably chaired by Helen Lamont as an independent chair. Helen is well known across Eyre Peninsula and did a sterling job in what was sometimes a very difficult discussion. Also present on the committee were local government, the Iron Road company itself, local business owners and also affected landowners. Those affected landowners, I would suggest, fall into two categories: those who are directly affected by the mine footprint and those indirectly affected, who are adjacent or a little way away.

It has been an extraordinarily difficult time for those landowners particularly and there has been a spectrum of opinion throughout the landowners and across the committee itself. The biggest concern for me all through this has been the uncertainty not just for the landowners but for all interested parties—local government, local business owners—because nobody has really known throughout this process whether or not this project is going to go ahead.

We are getting closer to an answer, and I certainly hope that this uncertainty can be resolved soon one way or the other. If this project does go ahead, it will no doubt bring significant change to the Eyre Peninsula landscape. It will drive significant investment, not just in the mine site but also around services such as electricity, water and transport infrastructure. In fact, it will drive investment into those things that we so desperately need investment in.

BOWERING HILL DAM

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:28): Some days, sitting in this parliament, you are very proud of what happens here. You are proud to be a member and proud of the work other members do. Then there are some days when members abuse their positions, abuse the parliamentary procedures and throw dirt around in the parliament. Sadly, today was one of those days. We saw dirt being thrown around and allegations that were completely unfounded being raised here in question time, merely in the hope that some of that dirt will stick to a member and to create some air of conflict or suspicion where none exists. I refer to what happened during question time.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bragg, came in here to ask questions of the member for Mawson, the Minister for Agriculture, about his interests in wine holdings or vineyards in the southern region and any connections to proposals for dams at Bowering Hill. She had no evidence whatsoever that any of that was the case and, of course, none of it is the case because, as all members would know, you can easily find out any of our pecuniary interests just by looking online because we all declare our interests.

As the member for Mawson said today, he owns his house in McLaren Vale. He does not own wineries or anything like that in McLaren Vale. The reason she came in here today to ask those questions was to throw dirt, to create suspicion and to hope that these completely unfounded allegations would create an innuendo that would stick around this issue. What was her research for doing this? She found some random Facebook post from back in January this year where somebody who was very disgruntled made up these allegations and posted them online.

Apparently that is the standard now: you see something crazy on Facebook, you come into the parliament and ask ministers questions about their personal holdings based on that. I think that is a pretty poor effort from somebody who hopes to be the Deputy Premier and who hopes to be the Attorney-General of this state. I would have thought that somebody who wants to be the chief law officer of this state would hold themselves to a slightly higher standard than just using some rubbish on Facebook to come in here and wave around accusations like that.

Of course, we know that this whole proposal for the Bowering Hill dam is being proposed by a gentleman called Jock Harvey. Jock Harvey was putting himself forward for Liberal Party preselection. He is a well-known Liberal in the southern suburbs and he was putting himself forward for preselection for the seat of Mawson. Apparently, he pulled out for Mawson at the last minute. It was not last sitting week or the sitting week before that we had these allegations coming in here to the house. It is only after he has pulled out for preselection for the Liberal Party that we get all these questions—11 questions this week—about the Bowering Hill proposal being put up by Jock Harvey and other winemakers in the southern suburbs.

If he were to be the Liberal candidate for Mawson, you can bet they would be supporting it. They would be doing everything to support him and to support the project, but since he has pulled out now they are suddenly against it and they are suddenly trying to create all this smoke and dirt around the whole issue in the parliament. The other thing we know very clearly is that this whole project is being funded by the federal government. It was the former member for Mayo Jamie Briggs, who has long departed the federal parliament now, who proposed this whole project, got \$2½ million to fund it, got the support of Senator Anne Ruston and got the support of Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce to get that funding for the project.

This is a Liberal, federal funded project. Now the deputy leader is coming in and creating suspicion about the member for Mawson, completely unfounded, to try to attack him. We know there are some quite significant community concerns about this project in the southern suburbs, given that it is not an ordinary dam. It is a 14-metre tall 'turkey nest', as they call it. To most people, it would look like a big mountain of dirt as they drive around the southern suburbs, if this project were to proceed. It has not been through the development assessment process through the council, so it has not been approved.

It is still state government-owned land, owned by Renewal SA, as I understand, so the land has not been sold yet. The only element that is in place is the funding from the federal government. I think what should happen is that the deputy leader should come into this place and apologise to the member for Mawson. Not only that, she should stop using these sorts of allegations if she wants to be Attorney-General because this standard is far beneath somebody who wants to be Attorney-General in this state.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:33): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Bills, Order of the Day No. 6, Industrial Hemp Bill set down on the *Notice Paper* for today to take precedence over other Government Business forthwith.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There only being eight members present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

*Bills***INDUSTRIAL HEMP BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:35): I think when I left off I was talking about the Controlled Substances Act 1984 being a barrier to the development of the industry and this industry having such enormous potential to generate jobs and wealth within our beautiful state of South Australia.

There is enormous potential for the commercial cultivation of hemp, including building products, fuels, paints, food products, cosmetics and plastics to name a few. If the state were to establish a regulatory framework for industrial cultivation, we would be putting ourselves on the same playing field as the other states and, as this state has a strong history as a manufacturing and technological hub, we would be well placed to attract further investment into the industry.

Late last year, the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC introduced a private member's bill, the Industrial Hemp Bill 2016 (a Franks bill), seeking to authorise and regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp in South Australia. I thank the honourable member from the other place for her advocacy on this issue. I am in favour of progressing the necessary steps, including introducing the regulatory framework for industrial hemp production. It would remove the current barriers to a potential new agricultural industry and bring South Australia into line with all other jurisdictions, except of course the Northern Territory.

As I stated earlier, this remains as a jurisdiction where commercial cultivation is currently unable to occur. Many industries, businesses and individuals would benefit from these opportunities, which include, as I have said, agriculture; construction, interestingly; retail, manufacturing and production of food; textiles; clothing; ecofuels and more. The government made minor amendments to the bill in the Legislative Council, and I will summarise these amendments that enhance the bill. They are:

- a process for the renewal of a licence;
- consideration of penalties to ensure they are consistent with other state legislation;
- the inclusion of clear guidelines of what constitutes a 'fit and proper person';
- that in addition to inspectors appointed by the chief executive of the relevant department, they will allow police officers to be defined as inspectors who can exercise the functions of an inspector under the legislation;
- inclusion of a definition of 'criminal intelligence provisions';
- a process to allow for the rectification of any breach of a licence; and
- that the bill proposes to come into operation three months after assent, whereas it would be more appropriate for legislation to commence on proclamation.

The bill does not open up the cultivation of hemp for use in the manufacture of drugs or medicines at this stage, but it does open up boundless opportunities for these other new industries and for jobs and investment in South Australia.

I would like to state my support for investigation using evidence-based research around the provision of cannabis products for use in the treatment of medical conditions. Over the years, in my nursing role as well as in my parliamentary role, I have spoken with many people in the community about the use of cannabis oils, and I do see real opportunities for use in conditions where treatment currently is not effective. It is an adjunct for me rather than a complete medicine. The appropriate regulatory controls that will be put in place will be a fundamental principle of authorising and regulating the cultivation of industrial hemp in South Australia.

With the appropriate controls and legal framework, we will ensure that South Australia complies with any international treaty obligations, such as those defined by the United Nations Single Convention of Narcotic Drugs 1961. Currently in South Australia, there are a number of business

operating the supply a range of hemp-based products, including skincare, cosmetics and clothing businesses, such as Ecolateral and Hemp Hemp Hooray. Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sure that you, being the progressive woman that you are, have also used some of these hemp products yourself.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I actually have a hemp outfit, but that's about as far as I go.

Ms COOK: Very impressive.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I don't even breathe in when people breathe out.

Ms COOK: Perhaps we could invite Madam Deputy Speaker to wear it to parliament next sitting week for us to have a look.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will keep you guessing as to what day I will wear it.

Ms COOK: Fantastic, thank you. With legislative change, I really feel we could see dozens and dozens of new businesses develop in new industries, including those exporting their hemp-based products whilst boosting the state's finances. South Australia must remain a state of innovation and opportunity. We must not allow this very important opportunity to slip away. I welcome Mr and Mrs McDowell and the honourable member from the other place to the gallery to listen to this important speech, as well as those from other members. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:41): I also rise today to support this bill on industrial hemp. As we heard, it was introduced in another place by the Hon. Tammy Franks last year. It aims to legalise the cultivation of industrial hemp in the state. The bill seeks to change the Controlled Substances Act 1984 and authorise and regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp. When we as legislators seek to regulate this kind of product, obviously it is very important that we reach the right balance between the market and the consideration of the relevant and right safety and regulatory environment.

There is ample state legislation covering this area. South Australia, I believe, is the only state that does not allow this kind of industrial hemp to be cultivated. Various state legislation has one key difference: the THC limit that is allowed, which is the psychoactive compound found in hemp and marijuana. In states such as Victoria and WA, the THC max limit is 0.35 per cent in the leaves and flowering heads of hemp. In the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania there are two THC limits: the leaves and the flowering heads of the hemp plant have to have less than 1 per cent.

Hemp seed may only be used if it is supplied on the basis that it will not produce hemp plants with more than 0.5 per cent of THC in the leaves and flowering heads. I understand that the proposed bill adopts the latter limits prescribed in the respective ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmanian legislative frameworks, and it takes up the Tasmanian model.

Hemp has a relatively low concentration of THC: under 1 per cent. By contrast, the average marijuana plant could have anywhere from 15 per cent to 20 per cent. The framework created in this bill is very similar to another bill that was introduced and passed last year in another place concerning opium poppy legislation. In order to cultivate the desired hemp, a farmer would have to obtain a licence and also seek approval from the Chief Executive of PIRSA.

As you would expect, a vast array of checks and balances are required to screen any potential applicant because obviously, like any area, it is important that we have these checks and balances so that the process is not abused. There are powers for the chief executive to ask for documentation so that a report can be produced and also provided to the Commissioner of Police for review. There is a maximum term limit on the licences, and they can also be not only suspended but cancelled by the chief executive if a farmer actually breaches any of these conditions.

As we have heard, a wide array of products can be produced from hemp in all kinds of industries, ranging from the agriculture industry to textiles; recycling; the automotive industry; furniture; food and nutrition; beverages; paper construction materials; and personal care. The member for Bragg also alluded to some of the constitutional issues that may be raised. I trust that these have been looked at in the other place and also looked at by the government concerning section 109 of the constitution whenever a bill from the federal parliament is inconsistent with a state bill. I know that would have been looked at, and I trust that if there are any concerns that they will be perhaps fleshed out in the committee stage.

Overall, this has been a long time coming. This area has been ignored far too long by this government, and I look forward to seeing the bill progressed through the house and to this market developing here in South Australia, as it has in other states around Australia. Down the track, I look forward to a debate on other related areas, such as medical cannabis. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:46): I rise to speak on the Industrial Hemp Bill and provide my support for the bill and the proposed amendments. As we progress the bill to committee stage, I am sure that there will be more specific questions around particular amendments. This bill essentially aims to legalise the cultivation of industrial hemp in South Australia by seeking to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984 to authorise and regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp.

Currently, South Australia remains the only state in which it is illegal to cultivate industrial hemp. I would say that the Riverland's economy could very well benefit from the cultivation of industrial hemp, and I understand that there has been interest from farmers and landowners in this area. I know that particularly in the Riverland they have the right temperature, the right sunlight hours and also the right humidity and environment, as I understand it (not being an expert in this area), to produce the right fibre length in the plant.

In order to cultivate hemp, a farmer must obtain a licence and approval from the Chief Executive of PIRSA, and a number of checks and balances are in place to screen potential applicants, including powers for the CE to require documentation so that a report can be produced and provided to the Commissioner of Police to review. Licences are limited to a maximum five-year period and may be suspended or cancelled by the CE if a farmer breaches conditions. The chief executive also has the powers to order inspections, and the inspector may seize material or take samples.

The bill is limited to the cultivation of hemp and does not seek to amend any other legislation that may affect its issues and does not touch on medical cannabis. The new laws will limit the level of THC (the substance associated with the psychoactive properties of marijuana) in any crops grown in South Australia. As the Hon. Kyam Maher said in the other place:

...the amendments create the regulatory and licensing framework that is, in part, borrowed from the work done by the Hon. David Ridgway in his bill to allow the growing of poppies in South Australia and what was inserted into the Controlled Substances Act in relation to that.

What I would like to say is that this is just another example of what could be achieved if this bill were passed, what could be achieved as another diversified crop here in South Australia. It is an opportunity for South Australia to benefit. Sadly, it shows that we are lagging behind with a product that we can grow, can use, to help our economy. We can contribute to the potential of industrial hemp and be part of a greater platform to bigger and better things.

Legalising the cultivation of hemp would enable South Australian farmers to access another crop that is currently being farmed in other parts of the country, other parts of the world, and the state Liberals will always support initiatives that benefit our regions and primary producers. If farmers decide that it is commercially viable to farm a particular crop, then cultivating industrial hemp could present a great opportunity for some of the primary producers to do so, particularly in the Riverland.

I am a very strong advocate for any diversification in farming practices, particularly in the Riverland and in the Mallee. We cannot forget those two great growing regions, great agricultural pioneers, if you like. I know that the Mallee Sustainable Farming group have been pioneers in introducing new styles, new methods of farming, and I think they would also be a very strong advocate and a good, progressive tool in helping to understand how South Australia could grow industrial hemp or be part of the industry, as well as to progress how we grow it and make it a bigger, better and stronger product.

It is also my understanding that in Victoria and Western Australia the THC maximum limit for industrial hemp is 0.35 per cent in the leaves and flowering heads of a hemp plant. In the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania there are two THC limits: the leaves and flowering heads of a hemp plant must have less than 1 per cent, while hemp seed may only be used if supplied on the basis that it will not produce hemp plants with THC in its leaves and flowering heads of more than 0.5 per cent. The bill before the chamber adopts the latter of the limits described in the respective

ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmanian legislative frameworks and is based upon the Tasmanian model.

When the Hon. Tammy Franks—and I welcome her here to the chamber—introduced this bill here last year, I attended a showcase held in the parliamentary library relating to industrial hemp product and was delighted to see the diversity of products for which industrial hemp can be used. If it is allowed to be grown and produced in South Australia, I am sure it could also be one of the great leaders in being able to develop new products, to develop some of the new technologies that I am sure would be a great platform to adhere to if this bill were passed.

Overseas, many fibre operations are subsidised by the food and oil markets where hemp seed is used to make medicinal products, milk, cereals, granola, cakes and flour. The *Hemp Business Journal* has circulated that US sales of hemp products in the 2015 year are 25 per cent greater than the 2014 total of \$400 million. The Hemp Industry Association estimated that US hemp product sales in 2014 reached a massive \$620 million.

There are 36 countries throughout Asia, Europe, South America, Africa and North America that permit hemp production, so more than 30 industrialised nations, including Canada, cultivate industrial hemp for commercial purposes. As an example of the investment in the industry in Canada, to meet increasing demand for hemp foods Manitoba-based Hemp Oil Canada built a \$14 million processing plant to triple its production capacity. Now, that is something I think South Australia could get on the back of.

We do not have to export the raw product to Canada, but what we can do is grow that product and value-add it here in South Australia. Providing that we can deal with the high cost of power, I am sure it would be a great industry that we can support and grow. Industrial hemp can be used legally throughout the Australian commonwealth for fibre, topical oil and processed cannabis products other than food for human consumption or as a medical product.

Victorian farmer Harry Youngman took part in a trial recently. He said, 'The market is very much, in the first instance, for seed production, but we'd like to set up a business that will look at the hurd, which comes from the stalk—it's used for biodegradable plastics—and fibre aspects of it as well. We see a lot of potential in the industry—we just need to master growing hemp. We harvest using a normal header, then windrow, dry and bale to stalk. The only difficulty is the regulatory requirements which is really just police checks that can take up to two months.' I hope that South Australia can stream like that. As I understand it, the short growing period of between 100 and 120 days is a big advantage, and it can be grown in most soils using conventional machinery. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:56): I will make a few short remarks, although I was not going to speak on the bill but I am going to. I am not going to oppose the bill, I am going to support it, but I want to sound a couple of notes of caution about the bill. First of all, I understand the economic arguments and the case made by the proponents of the bill in regard to the economic opportunity linked to the industrial production of hemp.

I have been involved in the use of hemp. In fact, when I first learned to abseil, repel and descend from helicopters in the Army it was using hemp ropes. They have wide application, and I understand their applicability, but I must say I have some concerns that the proponents of the bill and some who are supporting and pushing the bill earnestly may see it as an opportunity to open the door to the recreational use of hemp.

I know that people are saying that will not be the case, but my experience with these matters in parliament is that they tend to be incremental: you pass one measure, then pretty soon somebody comes in with a bill to amend that act and to add new aspects to it. These things creep up, and pretty soon you are talking about the industrial use of hemp having established the industry on a commercial basis for non-recreational purposes. That gets back to the core issue about marijuana and hemp and their recreational use.

I know there are diverse views in the community about this issue, but I must say that I was convinced by Professor Susan Greenfield, former Thinker in Residence and expert on the brain, in

her final presentation to Adelaide prior to her departure. She assembled one of the largest audiences I have seen in the Convention Centre to share her views on her experiences as Thinker in Residence. Someone got up and asked her about the recreational use of cannabis and its effect on the brain, I think assuming that her response would be supportive of its use. Quite to the contrary, she then proceeded in about a 20-minute dissection to explain, from her scientific experience, the effect of recreational cannabis on the human brain and the damage that she had seen it cause to patient after patient.

For those who might argue at a later time that the recreational use of cannabis is a good thing, I refer them to Professor Greenfield and to many in the medical and scientific community who have strongly divergent views. It is a blight on many families. The continual and abusive recreational use of cannabis addles the brain. I have seen this within my own extended family. It has caused chaos, mayhem and tragedy to individuals in my extended family. It is a blight on society and on families, along with most illicit drugs.

I simply signal that I for one will be looking to see whether the economic benefits that have been promised in arguing for this bill are delivered. I ask the question: if it is such a good deal, why is everybody else not doing it? Producing industrial hemp and poppies for that matter, which is the other side of the argument in respect of opiates, which I know has been put forward by the Hon. David Ridgway in the other place and others, is fine.

However, if you talk to any family—and my family is one of them—that has suffered terrible losses at the hands of illicit drugs of one form or another, including marijuana, it is no laughing matter; it is bloody serious. If the arguments that have seen this bill come before the house stand up and we finish up creating a new industry with economic benefits, and provided that it does not extend into a subsequent argument about recreational use, will that not be a good thing?

I have listened to member after member get up and herald the benefits of this bill, but I for one want to signal a note of caution. I think all of us need to go into this with our eyes wide open because some of the proponents of this have another agenda. Some may think that is a great agenda, but I am not one them. I will be looking very carefully at the outcomes of the bill and I hope that we are not here in this parliament in a year or two saying, 'Now that we have opened the gate to the production of industrial hemp, why don't we just broaden out its applicability?'

I also note that the opinions of the medical community are diverse on the benefits of the medicinal use of cannabis. I have seen the various documentaries and I have heard people argue the case, but I observe that there is an element of zealotry in a lot of arguments that I hear—those who enthusiastically purport change on matters such as this and other issues, such as euthanasia and same-sex marriage. There are lots of issues and people tend to be very zealous on both sides of the argument.

I recently noted an argument in the media that this can sometimes verge on bullying behaviour: 'If you don't agree with me, then you're a terrible person and you're against progressive change in our community.' I do not swallow any of that. I just look very clinically at whether or not the arguments are true. I have seen the economic arguments, I hope that they are right and I hope that we are not here creating an industry that proves not to deliver the economic benefits that we have been promised.

Most importantly, I can tell you that I will be watching this most closely because I hope we do not ever get to a stage—and I am sure that Professor Susan Greenfield would agree with me—where as a parliament we are saying to young people and people of all ages everywhere, 'It's okay to go away and smoke marijuana.' Alcohol is just as bad and so is tobacco, by the way; they both have their own outcomes. I hope we are never in a position where we are signalling to young people or people anywhere that it is okay to go out and abuse yourself with the recreational use of marijuana—because it delivers heartbreak and ruin.

Often, people do lose control of their ability to manage their use of marijuana, and as a parliament we need to be a gatekeeper to protect the emotional, mental and physical health of those we represent. I will not be opposing the measure, but I can tell you that I will be taking a very keen interest in its progress.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:03): I rise to speak on the Industrial Hemp Bill that was introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place to legalise the cultivation of industrial hemp in South Australia. Currently, South Australia remains the only state in which it is illegal to cultivate industrial hemp. We have heard from speakers before me about the benefits that this material can bring as a cloth, as well as all the other uses it might have, and that the industry could present itself as a result of its legalisation.

We have talked about the THC level and that South Australia will be following the model of the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania to have the limits of THC at the very low end. Of course, THC is the chemical hallucinogen that we often refer to when talking about hemp in the social sense, as the member for Waite was discussing before.

I do not want to go too deeply into the discussion he had about recreational use. I do not think anyone condones that at all. More explicitly, I think 'recreational use' is perhaps a poor term and it should more correctly be called illicit drug use, but that is not what this bill is about. There are opportunities from an industrial point of view. As the shadow minister for industry, I think we are always looking for ways to grow industry in South Australia and catch up with the other states, and this could well be one.

So, put aside the illicit use we have talked about, which is not what this bill is about. Let's make it abundantly clear that this bill is not about illicit use: it is about using hemp as an industrial tool for the benefits that can come from the cloth, fabric and whatever can be made from industrial hemp. That is the point of this bill. The legislative framework of this bill is similar to the bill put forward by the state Liberal Party. The Hon. David Ridgway in the upper house put forward his opium poppy legislation, which was passed last year. That was a great bill that again looked to find more industry in South Australia.

In order for a farmer to cultivate hemp, the licence must be approved by the Chief Executive of PIRSA, which is just one of the ways in which this will be policed and managed. I notice that the state government has provided a number of amendments with the aim of ensuring that this is appropriately regulated and that the security requirements are met. I trust that these amendments will bring the legislative framework in line with the existing poppy legislative framework, so I think the structure there is very positive.

Again, we are talking about this from an industrial point of view. As I said, as shadow minister for industry, I think we need to be looking at every opportunity we have in South Australia. We saw today in the ABS employment data that again South Australia is the worst state in the nation, which is incredibly sad and disappointing to see. For 28 months now, we have been the worst state in the nation on trend. Today, at 7 per cent, South Australia is the worst seasonally adjusted as well. The national figure is 5.9 per cent, so South Australia is a big outlier. We are the only state in the 7 per cent category, and that is really disheartening.

That is where this government has got us. We are looking for industries that we can lift up, grow and expand in South Australia. With this bill coming before the house, we see this as one such industry. I again go back to the point the member for Waite made just before me. I think he referred to it as recreational; I will refer to it as illicit drug use. Can I stress that this bill is in no way tied to that.

This is about industrial hemp and creating an industry to produce a product of cloth and material that can be used in a variety of different ways that very strictly has a very low level of THC, which is the compound often found in hemp and marijuana. Keeping it at that very low level will ensure that the product is safe and will not have any bearing on the illicit drug scene, and we will be producing a product that can be utilised in many ways for the benefit of industry in South Australia. To that end, I support the bill.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:08): I rise today to speak on the Industrial Hemp Bill, which was introduced in the other place by the Hon. Tammy Franks and which has moved to this place with support from both government and the opposition. I will speak in support of the bill as well.

I come to this as a primary producer. I know many aspects of this bill have been canvassed during the debate but, as a primary producer, I have been an agriculturalist for almost 40 years now. Time flies when you are having fun. I really believe that it is not a government's place ever to tell our

farmers what they can or cannot grow. From that perspective, this provides an opportunity for our growers in South Australia. That said, it is most likely that, under South Australian conditions, this is going to require irrigation, which of course counts out a big part of this state without access to irrigation water or any groundwater.

The bill seeks to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984 to authorise and regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp. As the previous speaker stressed, it is about industrial hemp. Taking on board the member for Waite's comments too, this is purely and simply about the industrial opportunities that exist for this plant, which has been grown for some 8,000 to 10,000 years. In fact, it was one of the earliest plants cultivated by humankind and has its origins in the Northern Hemisphere, in China and Japan.

Currently, South Australia remains the only state in which it is illegal to cultivate industrial hemp. One key difference in the various states' legislation is the THC limit permitted. THC is the psychoactive compound in hemp and marijuana. In Victoria and Western Australia, the THC maximum limit is 0.35 per cent in the leaves and flowering heads of the hemp plant. In the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania, there are two THC limits: the leaves and flowering heads of a hemp plant must have less than 1 per cent, while hemp seed may only be used if supplied on the basis that it will not produce hemp plants with THC in its leaves and flowering heads of more than 0.5 per cent. It does not sound very much.

The proposed bill adopts the latter limits prescribed in the ACT, New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania legislative frameworks and adopts the Tasmanian model. In fact, Tasmania has not only an industrial hemp industry but also a poppy industry, which the shadow minister for agriculture, the Hon. David Ridgway in the other place, successfully introduced legislation for earlier this year. Hemp has a relatively low concentration of THC, being under 1 per cent. By way of contrast, the average marijuana plant could have anything between 15 and 20 per cent.

The legislative framework in the bill is similar to that of the state Liberals' opium poppy legislation I just mentioned, and there are a number of checks and balances in place to screen potential applicants, including powers for the chief executive to require documentation so that a report can be produced and provided to the Commissioner of Police for review. I can say to the house that landowners and agricultural producers in my electorate have already made approaches to me seeking to explore the opportunities that might present themselves when this legislation passes.

Licences are limited to a maximum of a five-year period and may be suspended or cancelled by the chief executive if a farmer breaches conditions. The CE also has powers that mirror those in the opium poppy legislation to order inspections in which the inspector may seize material and take samples. It will be highly regulated. The state government has provided a number of amendments, the majority of which bring the legislative framework in line with the existing opium poppy legislative framework.

The bill is limited to the cultivation of hemp and does not seek to amend any other legislation that may affect its uses and does not touch on medical cannabis. Legalising the cultivation of hemp will enable South Australian farmers to access another crop that is currently being farmed around Australia—another potential opportunity and another crop that farmers can use in their farming system and in their rotation. No doubt, it will have agronomic characteristics that could potentially be of great benefit to intensive cropping systems and rotations.

In the end, I have come to the conclusion that this is a natural product. It has been produced in the east in the Northern Hemisphere for some 8,000 to 10,000 years, and we are simply catching up with the rest of the world. Its uses are wide and well known. It can be used as a food. Probably most commonly it is known for fibre production. In fact, Deputy Speaker, you have an article of clothing, I think, made from hemp.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a two-piece outfit. I may wear them together to shock you all.

Mr TRELOAR: No doubt you look very smart in it. How long have you had it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Since the *Rainbow Warrior* was at Port Adelaide the very first time, in about 1998. It is vintage.

Mr TRELOAR: I am sure you still have occasion to wear it, so that is nice. Certainly, it has historically been used for fibre, rope, sailcloth and things like that. It can be used as building material in hemp fibreboard, for insulation blocks and for acoustics, and it is even used in lightweight, convenient and relatively cheap concrete building blocks sometimes used in Europe. It can be used for plastic and composite materials. Most of the plastics we use are based on the petrochemical industry. By contrast, this is a natural and renewable product that can be used for all sorts of plastics and things we require in the modern world.

It can be used for water and soil purification, and as a farmer I picked up on this. Hemp can be used as a mop crop to clear impurities from wastewater such as sewage effluent, excessive phosphorus from chicken litter or other unwanted substances or chemicals—all products of the modern world and our modern urban and agricultural systems. In the rotation, it can be used for weed control and, obviously, biofuels.

In Australian circumstances, it would need to be sown in the early spring. It grows rapidly. It would probably be sown here in about August and harvested towards the end of spring and early summer. It matures in about three to four months. As the member for Chaffey mentioned, often in more intensive farm situations, it is hand weeded and hand harvested, but on a more broadacre approach modern farming machinery and equipment can be used to harvest and process this crop. It is widely grown around the world, although the total acreage is not great.

My reading suggests that France is the biggest producer in the world, with about 70 per cent of the world's output. The opportunities are relatively niche; it will be a niche market. It is not going to provide opportunities for all our agricultural producers, but certainly we see it as having potential growth. From an agronomic and agricultural perspective, I am quite excited about the opportunity to give our farmers in South Australia another crop in their armoury and the potential to make a productive contribution to the state's agricultural sector.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:17): I would like to thank all the speakers in the debate on the Industrial Hemp Bill, particularly the members for Reynell, Fisher, Bragg, Mitchell, Hammond, Stuart, Chaffey, Flinders, Hartley and Waite. We heard some excellent contributions on both sides discussing what will hopefully be a new and growing industry for South Australia. As people think about this topic, they immediately think about high THC uses for this plant, but I think that most speakers have properly understood that the limits of this bill are to those low THC uses that are allowed in law in every state around the country.

When we find that something is legal in every other state and not legal here, it is either because we are leading the way or because we need to take some steps to address our laws. This is definitely a case where we have needed to take some steps to address our laws. On behalf of the government, I particularly thank the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place for bringing this issue to the parliament's attention via the bill. I also thank minister Kyam Maher in the other place for his work on this with his task force, as well as his officers, including Lou Jansen and other people in the Department of State Development, and his adviser Andrew Christie.

I would particularly like to thank those people who have been campaigning on this issue and are involved in the industry, particularly Teresa McDowell and Graeme Parsons, who are here today in the chamber. I am also aware of Dianah Mieglich, who is very proactive on Twitter in supporting this industry and has been supportive today. Thank you to all of them for helping to educate people on this issue and on the importance of addressing this industry for South Australia. I would also like to thank Gemma Paech from my office for her work on this bill. I hope that it receives wide support from the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2017*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 April 2017.)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (16:21): I began my speech in support of the Supply Bill yesterday, and I will continue my remarks now. One of the things I spoke about was our preparation for future industries. Although our traditional automotive industry and manufacturing are changing, we still have the opportunity for advanced manufacturing in some other areas. What we do know is that we need science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM). I was talking about the fact that in my electorate \$250 million will go to STEM in schools.

It is very important to me as Minister for the Status of Women that we support women to gain experience in these industries. It is important for us to support girls and women to continue their education in this field. We know that girls and women drop out at certain ages and at certain stages of their lives. I am continuing to work with the Office for Women to support women. We already have the STEM Sisters program, which provides some mentoring. We also have some work experience opportunities for those who are involved in STEM, where they can go for the day and see how those things work—a traineeship in those STEM areas.

We had a wonderful time on International Women's Day when we took STEM selfies. I had the opportunity to go to BHP and meet those who had been part of the STEMSelfie campaign. More than 20 women were working in science and technology. We were hosted by Jacqui McGill at BHP. There was a great feeling of excitement about them enjoying working in those industries and potentially being mentors for girls and women in the future. This is going to be particularly important, obviously, because of our 12 submarines. We are keen to participate in that and have many girls and women skilled, trained and interested in working in that area.

The other point I want to touch on—and I think the member for Kaurana also mentioned it—is that in the last budget we talked about many different policies that support business directly. Our job accelerator grants amount to, I think, \$109 million in the budget. There was \$10 million for small business grants, particularly for the council areas of Port Adelaide Enfield, Salisbury and Playford. Those grants are incredibly important because we know that the north is undergoing quite a substantial change, and we have support in terms of small business grants, the expansion grants and also the start-up grants.

These are ways that this government is focused on the key thing: the state where people and businesses thrive. I am very proud of being a member of the cabinet and the caucus of this government because that has been a key feature of the budget and obviously, by supporting the Supply Bill, we have continued to be able to do those things. The Premier has talked many times about our 10 economic priorities and there are some very exciting areas where we are seeing substantial growth.

International student numbers are up to about 34,000, as I have seen in the latest statistics. We have also seen really interesting growth in the amount of business migration to this state. I had the figures in front of me previously, but we are substantially up on the previous year. I thank the Minister for Investment and Trade who has done a lot of work in getting the South Australian brand out there to lots of different areas in our communities and overseas. This includes some communities who already have linkages to South Australia, but also some new areas as well.

While we have our economic priorities, we have made it very clear to South Australians what it is that this government stands for, what we are working for and where our future is heading. One of the areas I always go back to because of where I grew up—and I look at the wheat on the green carpet here—is our primary industries. While we see the development of value-added products like wine, we have had the best harvest ever this year and this is a very exciting time.

Many people would know that I worked my way through university working the weighbridge at the Kapunda silos. It was under AusBulk at that time and I saw firsthand our farmers who came in with wheat, barley and oats. It is still a fundamental, key part of our economy, so they are exciting times there. We also see a variety of products. I know we hear the Minister for Agriculture talk at length about lentils and canola that people are looking at. There is some diversity within the products that we are growing.

I rise today to support the Supply Bill. While we are going through a transition, we are looking to the future and we have energy, commitment and, most importantly, leadership. It is leadership that is looking to the future of where South Australia is going and working together in partnership to achieve that goal. I encourage all members to support the Supply Bill.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:27): I acknowledge the member for Hartley's cooperation in letting me speak first; thank you. I rise today to support the government's Supply Bill. The government's determined fiscal targets are a series of strategies put in place to ensure that South Australia has a sound financial foundation over a long period of time.

Through the 2016-17 Mid-Year Budget Review, the government's fiscal targets of achieving a net operating surplus, limit to trend growth in household income and affordable net debt to revenue ratio remain on track alongside an environment which sees the government implementing stimulus measures to assist households right across the state. The government continues to fund the key measures that promote investment and growth, job creation and measures that ensure the state's tax system gives business some great opportunities to thrive and grow.

In addition to these measures, the Mid-Year Budget Review has seen significant spending in the areas of child protection, energy efficiency, grants to assist exploration and production, additional money to assist the indexation of a range of household concessions, assistance for storm damage and the accelerated recruitment of additional police officers. The state government is also making a substantial investment through a series of energy initiatives, which we have spoken of widely in this house over the last month.

The \$300 million operating surplus delivered by the government creates the conditions which provide the capacity and ability to deliver investment in key government services and crucial areas of security for the state, such as energy. The government's investments in energy will improve reliability and push down prices for consumers by delivering the following initiatives. We are building Australia's largest battery storage to help store the energy we get from the sun and wind to improve their reliability around environmental fluctuations.

We are building our own gas plant, owned and operated by the state government, which can come online quickly to bolster the state's energy production. We will be using the state government's electricity contract to attract new generation to South Australia, making more of our energy locally produced and keeping more jobs here in South Australia.

We are also taking back powers from the national regulator, which has failed to deliver reliable energy to South Australia, and we are incentivising local gas to provide more local jobs and to ensure the necessary supply of this important transitional fuel. I will continue to advocate for these measures as the feedback from my community is one of widespread support and acknowledgement that the government is taking action in this area. Of course, initiatives like these that support the investment in renewable energy and cleaner fuels are the responsible course of action to take for the long-term livelihood not only of our state but of course of our planet.

Another of the government's key initiatives that I can completely support is the \$250 million investment in 139 public schools to redevelop and upgrade their science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities, while providing a \$250 million loan program for private schools to access so that they, too, can invest in these important areas of education. Several schools in my electorate and also in the upcoming electorate of Hurtle Vale have been the recipients of these important initiatives. Both the Aberfoyle Park High School and the Wirreanda High School were very excited to receive \$2.5 million of funding. They also feel that the work they have been undertaking in science and technology is being acknowledged.

Wirreanda High School, which is in the newly formed electorate of Hurtle Vale, was the high school attended by most of my friends when I was growing up in my community and many of my

friends still live very close to that area. It is about one kilometre from my childhood home, so I am very excited that the new area of Hurtle Vale encompasses that high school. I will continue to work closely with the principals, staff, students and parents to see that their dedicated work continues with modern redeveloped facilities into the future.

As a healthcare professional, I keenly support the government's continued investment in our health facilities. The \$159 million investment being undertaken at the Flinders Medical Centre is really taking shape. This investment includes a 55-bed rehabilitation centre, including a palliative care ward, gym, hydrotherapy pool, psychogeriatric service and a new multilevel car park. This car park will have well over 1,000 additional car parks for visitors, patients, staff and users of the hospital.

I also welcome the \$12 million transformation of Noarlunga Hospital and I am really looking forward to the open day being held on Saturday 13 May when the public can see firsthand the new facilities and services. The improvements include a dedicated elective surgery centre, which will be a centre of excellence; a dedicated paediatric health space within the emergency department; a very spacious new dialysis unit; and of course emergency services will remain open at this hospital.

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital will provide excellent health care, and the state government should be congratulated on having the foresight and the courage to undertake such an enormous project. This key initiative demonstrates that the government's priorities and ongoing commitment in providing quality health care for all South Australians are key.

Some of the features include an emergency department which is 25 per cent bigger than the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital, nearly 20 more beds in the intensive care unit, a dedicated 24-hour on-site stroke team, and a range of outpatient and diagnostic services. There is no doubt that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will be one of the most advanced hospitals in the world for years to come, becoming a super site for major emergencies, including heart attacks and strokes, and having the capability to deal with major disasters.

As a resident of the southern suburbs, I hear a lot of positive feedback also about the works on the Main South Road-Darlington upgrade. Certainly anyone driving through this area will see that construction is really accelerating, with work due to be completed by the end of next year. This, following on from the duplication and creation of the two-way Southern Expressway, will see travel from the south to the city being much more efficient.

Improving our roads is a key initiative for this government and, alongside the federal government, a \$620 million investment has been made in the Darlington upgrade. This project sees improvements for all road users, eliminating a number of traffic lights, providing improved access to Flinders University and, importantly, the Flinders Medical Centre. Moreover, the project will support approximately 370 jobs during each year of construction, providing jobs for local construction workers and a valuable boost to the southern economy.

This project is of course a crucial part of the north-south corridor, the government's ongoing plan for Adelaide to have a nonstop corridor covering 78 kilometres from Gawler to Old Noarlunga. Because of these carefully considered and crucial initiatives, I of course support the government's Supply Bill and priorities, as it is in the best interests of all South Australians and supports and builds upon our collective wellbeing.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:35): I rise today to support the Supply Bill 2017, a bill to allow the continued payment of public servants and public services until the Appropriation Bill (the budget bill) is passed by the parliament later in 2017. The amount for appropriation for the 2017 Supply Bill is \$5.9 billion. I note the significant jump in appropriation funds from \$3.444 billion in 2016. I would like to take the opportunity now to reflect, however, on the current state of the economy in South Australia.

We have seen that it has been a bleak day for the jobless in South Australia. We have seen, under this government, under its failed energy policies, that it has short-circuited the South Australian economy in the process. Regardless of what the government wants to say about their new schemes, or about their new glossy brochures, or about their new trade delegations, we have seen the state's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rise to a completely unacceptable 7 per cent. If the exports

in recent times are up, it is not because of the government: it is because of the hardworking farmers in rural South Australia.

We have seen a government that, through its job-killing policies, is absolutely driving this state economically into the ground. We cannot keep going the way that we are going. What we need in South Australia is a change of government. There has been a combination, unfortunately, of skyrocketing electricity prices, punishing water prices and huge increases in the ESL tax, which are starving and killing job creation in South Australia.

We saw today's ABS figures and how they show that the number of full-time jobs in the South Australian economy has fallen during the past 12 months, whilst the number of unemployed has risen during the same time. The numbers for youth unemployment are particularly concerning. When I am out there doorknocking, I see many of these unemployed youths. They want to get jobs, but under this government and the economic environment that this government has created, they cannot not find jobs at the moment. Youth unemployment for 15 to 24 year olds is running at 17.3 per cent in South Australia, up from 16.1 per cent during the previous month, which is way above the national average of 14.2 per cent.

South Australia's job market is driving away other growth in this state. Unfortunately, so many South Australians have so little confidence in what is an arrogant and inept Labor government that has delivered all the wrong unemployment numbers for far too long. Their punitive tax policies have certainly left South Australia with an enormous underutilisation rate, which is the highest in the nation and way above the national average of 14.7 per cent. I note that more than 150,000 South Australians are either unemployed or underemployed, and those figures are totally unacceptable.

What we need in South Australia is a government that fosters population growth, that fosters a pro business climate and fosters accountability. We have seen in recent times this government's arrogant response to measures like the recent FOI bills that we have tried to put in this place. We need better incentive schemes and we need to improve exports in a much better way.

The South Australian government is trying to support businesses that depend on it. The South Australian government is trying to pick winners; however, when the government tries to pick winners, we know, mathematically, that it is unfortunately also going to pick a lot of losers. This government has been backing too many losers for too long. Unfortunately, when you back losers and you throw good money after bad, it costs the taxpayer money.

Rather than creating an environment which fosters and harnesses businesses and allows them to thrive and to start, this government has tried to pick winners. When the government has not been able to successfully back these winners, it is costing the taxpayer money. This government has backed a lot of losers and it has cost our taxpayers for far too long.

What we need in South Australia is the right economic strategy to maximise the amount of businesses that are attempting to be successful; a strategy that makes the overall business environment attractive and provides an environment where businesses are able to thrive. We have seen how the costs they have imposed on this state relative to productivity are far too high.

Members may recall that last year's budget was labelled a 'jobs budget', as was the 2015 budget. However, the shame has been that South Australia's unemployment rate remains consistently the highest or the second highest in the nation, which shows that the government's budgets and the government as a whole have failed. They have failed the people of South Australia. They cannot be proud of the unemployment rate. It is simply unacceptable. May this government be judged on its ability to provide employment for the people of South Australia.

In last year's budget, we saw a predicted jobs growth rate in SA of just 0.75 per cent, and this was reaffirmed in the Mid-Year Budget Review. In comparison, the national jobs growth rate in the federal budget is 1.8 per cent, meaning that we are not even reaching half of that. The Mid-Year Budget Review confirms that GST revenue this year will be \$512 million more than in 2015-16. In 2017-18, GST revenue is estimated to increase by another \$410 million. So, GST revenue next year will actually be \$922 million more than collected.

The Mid-Year Budget Review also shows that total returns from the privatisation of the MAC are now estimated to be about \$2.5 billion. Of this amount, \$1.16 billion assisted the net operating

balance of the budget in 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17. The MAC dividend in 2016-17 of \$298 million compares to the estimated net operating surplus of \$300 million. As we see in the latest NAB Monthly Business Survey, there has been a downturn in business conditions and also in business confidence.

Confidence is extremely important, because when people in South Australia have confidence they want to take more risks and they want to go for more returns. At the moment, that is not happening enough in South Australia. In fact, SA stood alone as the only state in the country to record a fall in business conditions in March and was one of only two states to record a reduction in business confidence. One factor that I am sure is contributing to such a sting to business confidence in this state is the unreliable power supply that exists in South Australia that this government has fostered.

After more than 15 years of this government, state Labor policies and state Labor ideology—ideology for the sake of ideology, without any regard whatsoever to practicalities—have resulted in South Australia having the highest electricity prices and yet the most unreliable grid. This is embarrassing. Many of us in our electorates have felt firsthand this impact of Labor's flawed and failed approach towards reliable power. Because of this ideological pursuit of intermittent renewable energy at any cost whatsoever, reliable and affordable base load power has been pushed out of this state. This has led to higher prices and a smaller, less reliable generation mix in South Australia.

South Australia's electricity supply is reliant on the wind constantly blowing and Victorian brown coal fired generators when it is not. Renewable energy is, in theory, a good thing and we welcome more of it, but the current technology alone is not enough to provide South Australia with a constant supply of reliable, affordable energy. In my own electorate, we unfortunately have had a spate of outages in recent times under this government's management. As we know, local businesses and local people have suffered as a result.

The most recent outage in my electorate was on 21 February when we had an outage that affected 2,089 people in the local areas of Campbelltown, Glynde, Tranmere, Felixstow and Hectorville, which is completely unacceptable. In fact, my own office was forced to work in darkness during the outage. I stayed at work and worked in the darkness, and then I went out and did some doorknocking to do what I could for those people who were affected by the outage. A local business owner wrote to my office explaining how his business was without power the whole day, would you believe, on 28 December 2016.

On 27 November last year, a power surge occurred that saw homes in Hann Street and Barnes Road in the suburb of Glynde without power for several hours, with many appliances damaged or even destroyed. There was also Wednesday 28 September 2016, a day we all recall when it seemed that the whole state descended into darkness. How much did that cost South Australian businesses and the state as a whole? Talk about waste, talk about things that affect confidence in this state and people's ability to want to continue to invest in this state and take more risks and grow more jobs. These are the one percenters that, when they add up, contribute to this dire state of the economy that we have in South Australia.

Members may also recall a recent Business SA survey that was released in December that found that many businesses that were affected by the September blackout did not have business interruption insurance. What if you are a business that does not have business interruption insurance? What is the government doing for those businesses? Of those that did have insurance, more than half found that they were not covered for losses from the blackout.

In my doorknocking, when I get out there and talk to these people, they say, 'Vincent, if there was food in the freezer, more often than not it's not even worth putting in the insurance claim in some instances.' The economic loss to the state, and the economic loss to confidence in this state, is absolutely enormous. It has been said that the quantified financial damage to South Australia was at least a loss of \$367 million. By occurring late in the trading day, the effect of the blackout was even lower than it would have been had it happened first thing in the morning according to a recent survey of 260 businesses.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the house some of the local projects in my electorate we continue to lobby for that are currently and have for too long been overlooked for

funding by this state Labor government. There has been a lot of talk about the O-Bahn this week, and we know that the O-Bahn extension is happening. We know that it will be finished before the election and that the ribbon will be cut before the election.

However, what about commuters in my electorate and in your electorate, Deputy Speaker, who need to park at Paradise Interchange? At the moment, under this Labor government, there is not enough car parking at Paradise Interchange. We have been lobbying for many years to improve the parking at Paradise Interchange, and we know that only a future Liberal government will deliver the parking facilities the people of Paradise want, and I would like to bring the attention of the house to that project.

Firstly, in relation to parking infrastructure at Paradise Interchange, many commuters using the O-Bahn service know all too well the frustration and the stress of looking for a park at Paradise Interchange each morning. The answer to providing a new car park at Paradise is not to burden the people of South Australia with another tax. In a future Liberal government, we would do it with the taxes we have. We in South Australia know that what is happening under this government is that they are wasting money and that they are wasting money left, right and centre. They can provide the parking at Paradise with the current taxes they have; however, they are choosing to make this a political gameplay.

The people of Paradise are not silly. They know that the government can provide parking amenities at Paradise Interchange with the current taxes that exist. So, I implore the government, in the next round of funding, to provide for that parking at Paradise Interchange. I spent a morning there this week—it has been a busy week—and I noticed that the car park filled up in just a 30-minute period, after which commuters were forced to park their cars on the quite ominous main road and nearby on the surrounding side streets.

We know that prior to the last election South Australian Labor made a promise to provide parking infrastructure at the Paradise Interchange. Where are we three years later? Recently, the Minister for Transport took aim at me and my colleagues in a speech to the parliament, blaming the Liberal Party and me for his absolutely absurd comment. Instead, what the minister should do is own a failure to follow through on this election promise. I do not recall an asterisk on the pre-election promise that it was conditional, based on the passing of legislation to implement a new tax. They did not go to the election with a new tax.

The people of Paradise and the people of South Australia want this government to provide the parking amenities they were promised at the last election, and this government will be judged on its inability to provide on that promise. I call on the government to make good on its promise and fix the parking at Paradise Interchange.

East Marden Primary School in my electorate has been overlooked again by this state government for funding upgrades. East Marden is an outstanding school, with a lot of heart, but unfortunately it still struggles with the state of some of its archaic facilities that have been ignored by the state Labor government. As I have spoken on time and again in the past, the school has incredible demand from families looking to send their kids there, a product of its outstanding results and learning environment and well-known culture, that is exacerbated by the increased population density in the surrounding areas.

To date, the state Labor government has not delivered East Marden Primary School the facilities it needs to give students the best learning environment possible. Where is all the money going? We need schools like East Marden Primary School to be upgraded so that they can be fully equipped with the resources they need to prepare our youth for the future because children deserve every opportunity in education.

I commend East Marden Primary School, the principal, the staff, the governing council, with whom I am in regular contact, for the exceptional job they do with the facilities they have. I empathise with them and know that they have been let down by this current Labor government, but be sure that, if we are elected to government, we will fix the woes at the East Marden Primary School. I hope the government does not overlook such needs in future budget allocations because the government has a clear responsibility to this school to improve facilities and improve them quickly.

The Magill Training Centre development is another issue I would like to speak about. Another rising concern amongst the residents of Hartley is that of traffic problems in the area. We have seen time and again road traffic management plans announced by various members, even by the former member back in the day, Lindsay Simmons. Unfortunately, what has not been followed through by this Labor government are intersection upgrades following those roads traffic management plans. The development occurring at the old Magill Training Centre site in particular is certainly set to worsen the existing traffic issues in the area.

I have continuously called on the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Planning to address the pressing need for a full road traffic management plan and also to undertake intersection upgrades to ensure that all necessary steps are taken to keep traffic moving in the area. There are a significant number of problems in the area at the moment that need to be addressed, even without the added traffic burden of the new development. The ministers and the departments have now been provided with a summary of my hundreds of survey responses provided by local residents.

The survey highlights the need for solutions to problematic intersections in the area, intersections such as Norton Summit Road and Glen Stuart Road and Norton Summit Road and Magill Road. Other notable themes to come from the surveys were the need for cycling paths and the widening of Glen Stuart Road. They have all been brought to the attention of the ministers and all are being ignored at the moment by this current Labor government. I encourage the government to take a good hard look at itself and look at allocating funds for solutions to not only these traffic issues moving forward but also to some of the other issues I have brought to the government's attention. I commend the bill to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Napier, I acknowledge in the gallery a visitor from England, who is the guest of the member for Reynell, Grace Siame. Welcome to parliament today. We hope you enjoy your time here.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2017

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr GEE (Napier) (16:54): Today, I will speak in support of the Supply Bill. I will not take very long as I know everybody is eager to get out of here. I concentrated on the member for Hartley's contribution, which was a very interesting speech.

Today, I am going to speak in support of the Supply Bill and speak about the Labor government delivering for South Australia. Our state, thanks to the leadership of the Premier and the Treasurer, has given us Australia's third strongest economy. It is an economy that has now grown to above \$100 billion per annum, and it is an economy that will continue to grow. New jobs are being created through the state government's business tax cuts and grants to those businesses that employ additional staff, again helping businesses grow the economy, create jobs, reduce unemployment, and in turn help the federal government to improve their economic position.

It is clear that since the 2016 federal election the federal government really needs all the help it can get. In fact, the Liberal government were lucky not to have been wiped out. You can probably make a pretty good case to show that the whole country would have been better off if they had been. Anyway, why dwell on the inertia of the federal Liberal Party? At least they have spent some time in government, unlike the South Australian Liberals, just hopelessly wallowing in their policy vacuum. How things have changed in the Liberal Party. What would the great Sir Thomas Playford think if he were here today?

Labor, on the other hand, continues to deliver important infrastructure outcomes for South Australians. Recent examples include the Adelaide Oval, the two-way Southern Expressway, the Northern Expressway, the South Road Superway and an almost total rebuild of Lyell McEwin

Hospital. Across South Australia there are new schools and new police, ambulance and fire stations. Across country SA there are new facilities in rural hospitals including a new \$2.29 million renal unit at the Gawler hospital, and the investment in roads and the CBD have been significant.

As a new member of parliament, I am incredibly proud to be part of a government that has fought to secure our water future through a healthy Murray River system and desalination plant. This government is now securing South Australia's energy future. An energy plan is progressing well, and is overwhelmingly supported by South Australians. We received over 30 expressions of interest to build the government owned gas-fired power station. Just to remind the parliament, the reason we are building this piece of energy infrastructure is—that is right—because the Liberals sold it. We have also had over 90 expressions of interest to build a new battery to store surplus clean, green energy—the biggest battery in the Southern Hemisphere. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS NO 3)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 16:58 the house adjourned until Tuesday 9 May 2017 at 11:00.