

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Tuesday, 28 November 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 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.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (11:01):** By leave, I move:

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

**The SPEAKER:** It is very important.

Motion carried.

#### *Bills*

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (DRUG OFFENDERS) BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November 2017.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:02):** I rise to indicate that I will be the lead speaker, complemented by other of our members, on the Statutes Amendment (Drug Offenders) Bill 2017. This is a bill introduced by the Attorney-General on 15 November to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984 and the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005.

We are told by the government via the second reading and various press announcements that this bill seeks, firstly, to allow courts, when sentencing, to consider an offence to be aggravated if a child was present at any stage when an offence occurred. We fully support this; it is not before time. The government were clearly embarrassed subsequent to a raid of a property, which received significant publicity, where children were in the environment of a residence that was also a place where drugs were manufactured. It has been too long before this matter has been addressed.

Secondly, the bill allows funds to be paid to the authorities administering the seizure, storage, selling and disposal of assets under the criminal assets confiscation laws before the net funds are paid into the Victims of Crime Fund. It appears on briefings provided by SAPOL and members of the department, and also a representative from the DPP, that there is some concern about the definition of what has to be seized. As I understand it, this amendment is to remedy what is seen as an impossible task by those confiscating assets if in fact they are obliged to take everything.

Frankly, if they come across children's clothing in a premises, I do not think that would require them to have to take that because clearly it would not be used for the benefit of the adults being charged. What I do say is that if it causes some concern, particularly in the area of having to take assets which clearly are not going to provide any productive financial refund on their sale to the fund, then they should not need to take it, and we agree with that. It is also to provide the DPP with discretion under the regulations to decide if it is uneconomic or impractical to seize those assets. That really covers the last issue. Used wisely in the regulatory power, they will not have any problem from the opposition.

The other area really comes back to the Controlled Substances Act and this question of allowing the police to search a person or their vehicle if that person is seen entering or leaving premises which the police may, in respect of the premises, reasonably suspect are being used for the manufacture, distribution or storage of illicit substances or chemicals. That is where we say the government have gone too far.

Our position on this matter is one that is consistent in other recent bills presented to the parliament where we see the police having quite appropriate and adequate powers in other legislation, such as the Summary Offences Act, the Road Traffic Act and the like, where, largely, they have to have reasonable suspicion and they have to justify certain circumstances to obtain warrants. They do have some very, very broad powers, particularly in criminal conduct, and we think that they are adequate and set an appropriate balance.

The government's ask in this part of the bill is without precedent. There is nowhere else in Australia—nowhere—where the police have this power to search anybody or any vehicle going in and out of a suspected property. There is no justification, I suggest, for bringing it and, even on inquiry from some of the wise advisers to government on this, apparently it does not even have any precedents in England. The question is: why are we doing it here in South Australia? Other than SAPOL asking for it, and of course they have a long list (I am sure Mr Speaker would remember his dim, dark time a long time ago as the attorney), and there was always an extensive list.

That is fine; that is part of their advocacy role—to get the best they can for their members because they have an important job to do—but sometimes it is over the fence and a bit out there. Sometimes it is so novel that it is an excellent idea and it is worth pursuing. In this case, it has to have merit to justify it as necessary. I appreciate Mr Illingworth from the DPP coming along to the briefings to outline a number of cases, which he indicated, at first blush, had caused the failing of the successful admissibility of evidence because of police protocol ostensibly not reaching an adequate threshold, which this amendment is attempting to remedy.

One of those cases was actually during the briefing ultimately withdrawn from being relied upon because, clearly, it was not a judgement that had any relevance to what is being asked here. Be that as it may, it was put on the table, disposed of and we went back to some other core cases; in two of those, it would have been easier for the police just to be able to arrest people on the way in or out. We say that even those judgements do not require a threshold change and certainly not a carte blanche in respect of the search of persons or vehicles.

In response to anyone, including the government because it is their usual wont, who wants to say, 'If you haven't done anything wrong, you shouldn't be worried about us stopping you anywhere, anytime, and searching you, asking questions and requiring you to cooperate with the police,' all that sounds great on FIVEaa, but let's understand here, in this place, about making laws that are important for the protection of people to go along in their ordinary course of their daily work. These are good, decent citizens, including the poor old bloke who might enter a property, unbeknownst to the fact that there is a methamphetamine lab at the back of the house, and goes in to read the water meter.

In our view, it is just not acceptable that it should be a case of, 'Capture everybody. Let's leave it to the discretion of those who are in this space.' I say in this instance that whilst we thank the police of the work they do, and they do a great job in both the investigation and prosecution of cases where people are involved in the storage, distribution, selling or manufacturing of these despicable drugs, please do not ask us to do something that potentially, in the hands of a minority, might be abused—that is, to make laws in those circumstances—because we are not prepared to do it.

Can I also say that this initiative, by legislation, comes to us as part of a suite of recommendations from a ministerial methamphetamine task force summary report, 'Stop the Hurt'. The document is around four pages of text, another four pages of pictures of people's fingernails, and some blank pages. It covers four different areas in which the government proposed to act to assist in dealing with this curse: reducing supply, increasing treatment, increased family support, and community education and capacity building.

First of all, when we asked for the report earlier this year, all we received was this summary—this little picture book of a few pages—as to what was being done. I am appalled at that because

apparently ministers Malinauskas and Vlahos went around the state, consulting the world to try to identify how they could best deal with this problem, and this is what they have come up with. We are not allowed to know what anyone else has presented or what the findings were; we just received information on what will happen next from the government in cryptic language. Let me give you an example.

They say: 'Becoming a national leader in regulating the chemicals used to manufacture methamphetamine.' Any South Australian reading that will think, 'Good on the government for doing that. Isn't that a good thing for them to do?' On inquiry, we find that is a complete myth. They are not actually 'becoming a national leader in regulating the chemicals'. They are going along to a national meeting run by a national body that is dealing with that issue. South Australia, along with the states and territories, is attending the meeting, which is being driven by national bodies and national administration.

It is important that we are part of those discussions, particularly where there needs to be some harmonisation of what goes on the list and those sorts of things, so that we can deal with that type of issue, including the storage and distribution of chemicals to build this stuff. That is part of the deal, but do not try to pretend, in this flimsy document, that you are doing something that you are not. That is not acceptable.

The second thing I will say is this: if Mr Malinauskas and Ms Vlahos had one nit of capacity in this area, they would have gone back to the November 2002 report prepared and provided to premier Rann after a comprehensive drug strategy summit. This was one of the first, and I think most commendable, things done by the prior Labor government when it took office in 2002. All the players were there by invitation. I was asked by the then premier to attend and represent the opposition. I had shadow education responsibilities at that stage.

Clearly, whatever we were going to action in relation to dealing with illicit drugs included police, education services and a multitude of other areas, including the then minister Weatherill's responsibility in relation to welfare. There is a surprising similarity between that much thicker report, including its recommendations and outcomes it ultimately presented, and the government's response to the drugs framework tabled on 11 November 2002.

Members should read it. It is a bit of *deja vu*. You would think that you had woken up tomorrow. Probably the only thing in here that is different is the government's initiative to establish the appointment of Monsignor Cappelletti's social inclusion unit, which has since bitten the dust. It cost \$1 million a year. We received some quite good reports on mental health and other things out of it, but that has been and gone.

The same information is there. The same problem is there. The tragedy is that 15 years later we now have an abbreviated version, which I call an insult, presented to us as what needs to be done. Now the government are starting to get organised. I say 'starting', as it is a glacial pace. They say that they will increase the number of drug dogs and their handlers. I think that the next two we are to get have not been born yet, but, if they have, they have not yet even been trained. Goodness knows when we are going to get them. I saw a very interesting story on television the other night about the retirement of one of the SAPOL dogs who had apparently given many years of service. It was a wonderful story.

You have to wonder. They publish all these wonderful words about what they are going to do, and then you examine it against what is delivered and, sadly, it is incredibly disappointing. That is our position. Aspects of this bill are meritorious and we will support them. Extra search powers are novel, but they will not have our support.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:16):** I rise to support the words of the member for Bragg in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Drug Offenders) Bill 2017. I note that this is one in a series where the government is seeking to undermine the test of reasonable suspicion when it comes to where people should be searched. It is a debate that we have been having in this chamber and in the public over quite a length of time. This is just one in a series of opportunities that the government is seeking to take to try to undermine that principle.

The bill seeks to do the following things. It seeks to allow the court, when sentencing, to consider an aggravated offence to be aggravated if a child was present at any stage when the offence occurred. It seeks to allow police to search a vehicle or a person if the person is seen entering or leaving a premises reasonably suspected of being used for the manufacture, distribution or storage of illicit substances or chemicals. This is the part we have a problem with. I will go into more detail later. It allows funds to be paid to the authorities administering the seizure, storage, selling and disposal of assets under the criminal assets confiscation laws before the net funds are paid to the Victims of Crime Fund. It provides the DPP discretion under regulations to decide if it is uneconomical or impractical to seize certain assets from prescribed drug offenders.

I have provided quite a bit of commentary in recent debates on the scourge of drugs in our society. If I look at the rate of crime in South Australia, thankfully in a lot of cases the rate of crime is coming down. Whether it be offences against a person or offences against property, we have seen broad reductions. Obviously, there are always some outliers to that, but we have seen broad reductions in crime over a long period of time. However, the Report on Government Services that came out earlier this year showed that we have seen a massive increase in the rate of illicit drug offences in South Australia, that we have the highest rate of illicit drug offending in the country and that we sit at around 1,100 offences per 100,000 people or thereabouts.

More than that, what we have seen is a steady and consistent increase in the rate of those offences. It is an area we need to tackle. We have seen the work the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission has done in relation to seizures, what types of drugs are more prevalent in which states and whether those drugs are more prevalent in metropolitan Adelaide or whether they have more of a regional focus. It very clearly states that in South Australia we have a problem with methamphetamine. All other states had a greater seizure rate for cannabis, but South Australia was the outlier in the fact that ice took precedence. That is really where our issue lies in the specific set of circumstances in South Australia.

I then look at the government's process in trying to deal with that and the member for Bragg talked quite appropriately about the 'Stop the Hurt' campaign and about their rushed process to put together something to make it look like they were doing something. It was something that minister Malinauskas announced with great fanfare, with the member for Taylor standing by his side. Interestingly, the member for Taylor had very little involvement in that process, beyond that initial press conference. I think she was too busy trying to save her own skin in relation to the awful issues that occurred at Oakden. Minister Malinauskas said, 'We are going to put together a task force. That task force has a very strict deadline of 60 days to come back and to respond and from there we will be putting our plan into action.'

The government was a little bit later than that in putting the plan out there. In about the middle of the year, June or so, they put their final plan out into the public. Lo and behold, when we tried to get information on this, understanding that it is in law enforcement, in crime prevention and in tackling issues within our society to keep people safe, what we got was a very skinny piece of paper that looked very much like something designed to look like the government was doing something, but without any real critical evidence based underneath it.

Some of the measures in there have been enacted and some of the measures in there we support, especially in relation to the increased use of sniffer dogs. We have announced a policy, potentially somewhat controversially, that we want to extend the use of sniffer dogs as well as increase resources to tackle prevention in a much more serious way. We believe that, if we are going to tackle this problem, it is one thing to try to deal with the problem as it currently exists and deal with the attitude and the behaviours of existing drug users, but we must not let the urgent crowd out the important, and that is to try to reduce the uptake of drugs and the use of drugs by young people.

We know from studies done by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare that many young people in their early to mid to late teenage years are having their first interaction with illicit drugs. That is the time we need to change the behaviour and that is the time we need to help educate and divert people from going on to more heavy and more risky illicit drug use that comes with all the associated issues that roll on from that, whether that be drug-related crime, drug-related theft in order to support a drug habit, deteriorating personal health and circumstance or family and relationship

breakdown. All those things can be prevented if we can prevent the initial drug-taking behaviour. That is why we have put a lot of emphasis and focus on trying to tackle this at its heart.

You cannot talk about early intervention for teenagers without getting into schools. It is the place where they are very likely to be exposed to drugs for the first time, whether that be from classmates and peers who have started to use drugs and who may have availability of drugs that helps to give opportunity to that experimental behaviour, especially in high school years. It is why we have been unapologetic about seeking to go into schools to try to change that behaviour, whether that be through increased detection methods or increased enforcement around encouraging SAPOL to go into schools, so that they can help to find and identify problems.

It is not necessarily about trying to prosecute young people, but through the deterrence effect and an enforcement capability to make young people realise that police are on the case—that they are going to get involved, that they are watching—and, before the addictive effects of drugs can take hold, that this is not a path that they should take. Any effort to reduce drug use and increased levels through increased enforcement needs to have balanced with it increased access to education. Young people are not stupid. We need to educate them as to why this is risky and difficult behaviour, and that is why we have also announced policy to increase resources for schools to be able to educate young people as to the dangers of drug use.

We should, we can and we must also look at the drivers behind why young people take drugs. Certainly, we can deal with the experimental element. We can help to give young people the information they need to make better choices for themselves, but there would also be other underlying factors—difficulty with their living situation and difficulty with family situations—that may drive people to drug-taking behaviour and we also need to tackle those inherent causes as well.

That is a broader and much bigger problem, but one that we cannot shy away from. It potentially falls outside of the purview of my shadow portfolio areas. It goes into broader education and broader child protection measures where we need to essentially tackle the root causes of why young people choose to take drugs. It is why we have had an extensive focus on this, because we want to stop the next generation from undertaking this behaviour in the first place.

The government has come out with this very skinny document, and straightaway we say, 'Hang on, there has to be some research behind it. There have to be submissions behind this. There has to be some science behind this.' We put in a series of FOIs and questions, particularly in the other place, and the answer that came back to us was, 'Yes, sure, if there is more information out there, we will give it to you.' Lo and behold, a few weeks later, the very quiet and very sheepish answer came back, 'Well, no, this is actually all the information we have. This is the entire report.'

We have often said in this place that we need to undertake evidence-based policy and that we need to have a more systematic and scientific way that we go about making these decisions, but we have not seen that. Who was consulted during the 60-day process? Who put in submissions? What were those submissions? Did they line up with what the government in the end decided to do? If they did, great, but if they did not, why not? Instead of having a full, frank and open debate on this very difficult topic, what we get is a glossy brochure. This issue deserves more than that. This issue deserves us having a more full and frank debate.

I will now turn to the search powers. I know that we are not allowed to reflect on other votes of the house or other bills still before the house, but this is one in a series of measures where the government is seeking to erode the principle of reasonable suspicion when it comes to police being allowed to search someone and every time it gets dressed up as something quite innocent and something quite common sense. Why should police not be able to search drug users as they go to their drug dealer's house to buy drugs, which is essentially what we have been asked to suggest is this proposition before us?

People on the street would say, 'It is pretty reasonable for you to be able to pinch a drug user just after they have bought drugs from their drug dealer at their drug dealer's house,' but that is not the power that we are giving to police. What we are giving to them is the ability when we do not know that it is a drug dealer's house. We do not even have to know that they are a drug dealer or, indeed, that the people who are coming and going are drug users. It essentially gives them the carte blanche power to be able to search anybody in and around a house that they reasonably suspect may be

being used for drugs. Always, in these cases, the purpose of the power that is being sought seems noble, but it is the unintended consequence that we need to focus on.

We need to bring some balance to where this extension of power lies. On one hand, we have the desire for the police to go about and very easily do their job, but on the other hand we also have the rights of private citizens to be able to go about their daily lives uninterrupted and free from interference by anybody, including law enforcement. There is a balance that needs to be found, and I think that in South Australia, and in jurisdictions all over the country and the world, we have tried to find that balance.

In South Australia, it has come down to the principle of reasonable suspicion, this idea that police have to have some basis to expect that you are undertaking or committing an offence. In those circumstances, where there is reasonable suspicion that you are committing an offence, police can step in and they have the power to search you. It is something that has existed for a long period of time; it is something that has been tried and it has been tested. It has been the way that we in this parliament over long years have found that balance, but now the government is seeking to undermine that balance.

You would ask, in the circumstance where the government is asking for that increased power: where is the evidence that the current system is not working? That is what has not been forthcoming. It was not forthcoming in relation to drink and drug driving. I understand that the shadow attorney-general has asked for SAPOL and the DPP to provide data to support this assertion. Of all the information that is in front of me, that has not been provided. There has to be a reason that this law change is being sought by this parliament.

Without any evidence to show why or where there was a clear link between the inability to search somebody they did not reasonably suspect but they just wanted to search, and potentially had reason to, where is that deficiency? We need to get to the heart of that matter and understand very clearly that the absence of this power, which is currently being sought, is the remedy for the problem the government says exists. We need to think, though, about where this power may be used in unintended ways.

The member for Bragg gave the example of the bloke who has come to read the meter at the back of the house and whether or not he would then end up being searched. The poor guy is just trying to go about his job and gets caught up in this. Another example is children or young adults who live at home with their parents and those parents may be doing something that the kid may be unaware of or vice versa and whether or not in those circumstances people are going to get caught up in this. Does this give police the ability to stop Jehovah's Witnesses who come knocking on your door? 'Hang on, do we know that these people are legit? Well, let's stop and find out.'

We need to think about these unintended consequences because that is what is going to come back to this parliament. What will come back, for example, is a story in *The Advertiser* that says, 'Well, the police pulled me over with absolutely no provocation. They said just because I'd visited my mate, who I haven't seen for a while, they could pull me over and search my car.' As I understand it from this, when police have the ability to search a vehicle, they also have the ability to interfere with a vehicle for the purposes of the search, and that can include damage to the vehicle.

Again, where police have this very serious power, it needs to be used properly. I am not suggesting that there is widespread breach of the power as it currently stands or even that we have had evidence that there are breaches, but when police have immense power to inflict damage upon a vehicle in relation to a search we have to make sure that it is used only for its most proper purpose. Whether it be drink or drug driving or child exploitation in encrypted material, until we are presented with some evidence from the government about why and where we need it we will continue to say that the balance as it currently exists is correct.

This is especially important when we know that police have increasing ability to use technology to find, prosecute and create reasonable suspicion—for instance, being able to use evidence collected through mobile phones to prove that somebody is drug dealing and using increased surveillance technologies to be able to create reasonable suspicion. Why is it that this power is being sought? It is a question we have not had a decent answer to, and until we get that we will continue to uphold the existing principle.

Further to that, in relation to the other measures contained in this bill, we think they are straightforward and reasonable, and that is why we will be supporting them. We look forward to a decent outcome in the other place, notwithstanding the very limited amount of time we have left and the propensity of the other house to take their time with most things. We look forward to there being a good resolution on this bill and a number of others that are going through the house at this same time.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:35):** I rise to make a contribution on the Statutes Amendment (Drug Offenders) Bill. I indicate that I will be supporting the government's bill, in particular the notion that if children are present in facilities where drugs are being manufactured that it will be deemed an aggravated offence and taken into consideration when sentencing occurs. I also rise to indicate that I will be supporting the measure for police to search persons or vehicles for illicit substances if that person or persons is seen entering or leaving a premises reasonably suspected of being used for the manufacture, distribution or storage of illicit substances or chemicals used for the manufacture of illicit substances.

Methamphetamine, commonly called ice, is having a devastating effect on our state, in particular regional communities. You just need to sit down—and as a local member, I have on numerous occasions—to speak to police officers who share a degree of frustration or to parents of their son or daughter who is addicted to ice or nurses or loved ones. They will talk about their frustration at this insidious drug. In particular, of a number of police officers I have spoken to one sticks out in my mind. He was a 30 or 40-year veteran of the police force who talked to me about his experience throughout his career of seeing many evolutions of drug taking, whether it is heroin, marijuana or cocaine. He said that he has seen it all before.

He pointed out that alcohol is still one of the most destructive substances in the community but he also pointed out that he has never seen the impact that ice has on people and, in his words, it is an epidemic. The cost to the community and the state is far greater than is ever reported. That is backed up by nurses who will talk about people they know who come into the emergency department under psychosis. They are violent, aggressive and irrational, and there is no comprehension of where they are or who they are lashing out at.

It is with this in mind that I want to support any measure that puts greater pressure on those who are manufacturing or acquiring the chemicals to manufacture this insidious drug to be searched, or those entering or exiting a property to be searched. I invited minister Malinauskas to Mount Gambier when he launched the Ice Taskforce or 'Stop the Hurt'. He was gracious enough to conduct a round table with representatives from my community. Sitting around that table, there was clear frustration at a lack of resources and a lack of state government focus on tackling this problem. This is not an emerging problem: it is here and now.

I commend the state government for the six rehabilitation beds that have been allocated to Mount Gambier. I am sure we will find in a very short period of time that those beds are fully occupied and that we will need to work as a community on how we continually address this issue of ice in the South-East. I think \$3.6 million to increase access to treatment could easily be \$36 million because, unfortunately, we are seeing an epidemic that needs to be stopped earlier. It is only when people get to a psychosis stage that intervention seems to be forthcoming. By then, the amount of money, time and effort required is far greater than if we addressed the problem at an earlier stage.

It is fine to say that we are going to put more and more into schools but, as a previous teacher, what you start to realise is that everybody looks at schools as the answer to society's problems. No longer are teachers concentrating on English and arithmetic, but they seem to be doing a whole plethora of societal interventions in that period of time. Most of it is doable, but you cannot just keep loading it on to schools to sort out society's problems.

In terms of the impact of ice on regional communities, I know a number of people whom I would call functioning ice users, but it seems as a drug to eventually catch up with all of them. People are losing their jobs, their families and their livelihoods because of this drug. With those thoughts in mind, I will be supporting this bill. If there is one message I can give, it is about the money allocated. It is okay to allocate \$20 million for a new road or \$160 million for a new piece of infrastructure, but if we start getting serious about tackling this issue earlier then that is the type of money that this will

need. This money needs to be spent wisely because at the moment there is nowhere near enough resources being put into this insidious drug.

There are not too many people I know who become regular users of this drug who are able to kick the habit. It is a dire warning and I am very confident that we have a ticking time bomb in this state and in this country, where regular ice users are addicted to this stuff and, while they think they might have it under control, their lives are slowly unravelling, and it gets to a point where they cannot stop taking it. Intervention is certainly needed.

I have had numerous parents of young people in my office. Unfortunately, in most cases their loved ones have died because of substance abuse, whether it culminates in suicide, a road crash or an overdose. Invariably, from the parents I have been speaking to, it has resulted in death. They always talk about the early stages when they still recognised their loved one, but they get to a stage where eventually they do not recognise them: they are stealing from them, they are turning into basically wild animals—those are the words they use; I do not necessarily use those words. Early intervention is the key. If this goes some way to deterring people from going to drug houses then I fully support this measure. With those comments, I will conclude.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:44):** I thank those members who have contributed. In particular, I thank the member for Mount Gambier, who has obviously thought about this issue quite a bit and has seen some of the misery that these substances have brought to families and to communities. I will be brief in relation to the objections that were raised, particularly about the powers to search and seize.

Put simply, if you read the provision we seek to include, which is in clause 5 of the bill, it requires that the police form a reasonable suspicion that the premises that is the subject of their investigations is, indeed, a drug house. They cannot park in front of any house in any street because they like the look of it and randomly stop people from going in and out of that house. They have to have a view that there is a drug house operating in a street or that it is a manufacturing place, or that there is somebody there who is dealing in drugs, or whatever. Of course, the reasonable suspicion that they have to form that view should be something that can be tested in the court.

If it turns out that they do not have a reasonable suspicion for believing those premises are in fact premises where drug deals are occurring, or drug activity is occurring, then all the evidence that follows thereafter based on that reasonable suspicion is excluded. The notion that your home or my home could be picked at random and that people coming to our place for a barbecue could be stopped and have their cars searched is, quite frankly, ludicrous. The police have better things to do than to park outside people's houses for the sake of it when there is no good reason to be there.

Let us be clear on what we are talking about. The police do not have this power unless they have a reasonable suspicion that the premises they are in front of is a drug premises. That is point number one. Point No. 2 is that what the opposition is saying is that not only should they have a reasonable suspicion about the premises being drug premises but that everybody going to and from that place, they should independently and additionally form the view that those individuals are somehow involved in drug activity.

What I am going to say may shock some people, but I am reasonably confident that people who are involved in this illegal activity are not foolish enough to come into drug houses dressed up like Cheech and Chong. That is not what they do. In fact, if our proposal is not accepted I can tell you that the costumes presently used by UberEATS, Telstra and hard hats with hi-vis jackets are going to be a premium amongst drug dealers because they would just put one of these things on, or would dress up like Ronald McDonald or something, and head into the place.

When the police stop them, they would say, 'Hang on, what's so suspicious about Ronald McDonald? I'm just here because I'm a burger guy, notwithstanding the obvious question of why is Ronald McDonald going into a house full of methamphetamine? We cannot ask that question because Ronald himself does not look suspicious. He does not have a bong in one hand and a large beard. Let's be real about this.



To get to the point, the police will not randomly park outside people's houses and molest their visitors. If they do, and if they obtain stuff through the search, they still have to prove that they had a bone fide reason for being in front of those premises and had a suspicion in particular about those premises. The other thing is that the people we are talking about here who are applying this trade are not law-abiding citizens.

They are not people who want to play by the explicit and implicit rules of civil society like the rest of us. These are people who do not care less. What they are on about is making money and exploiting people, and they do not care what damage they do along the way. If the police have formed a bona fide view that a particular premises is a drug premises and there are people coming and going in and out of those premises, it is not unreasonable to assume that those people coming and going outside those premises may have something to do with what is going on in there.

To put the additional burden on them, that they have to appear to be some sort of druggie or that it has to appear that there is something inherently suspicious about them before they can even be intercepted and their car checked for drugs or something, with respect, I think is unfairly hamstringing the police and it is also very helpful from the point of view of the drug pushers. Another example is why would you not use kids to be the people who come and go from your house, or why would you not use senior citizens?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Watch it!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Madam Deputy Speaker, you are not, with due respect, a senior citizen.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am an elder.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** You are in your prime. Madam Deputy Speaker, you might be comforted by the notion that 40 is the new 20.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I said that once, famously, and was overruled.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will go back to the more mundane substance of this conversation. The point is that it might actually encourage them to pick senior citizens to come and visit these properties, and what is inherently suspicious about a senior citizen? These people are not nice people. They do not play by the rules. They are inherently tricky. They are not nice. They are not trying to do the right thing; they are trying to do the wrong thing. All we are trying to do here is to give the police an opportunity to be able to say, 'If that house is full of drugs and these characters are going in and out of the house, that should be a good enough reason for us to have a look at their cars and see whether they are involved in some illicit trade.'

We disagree with the opposition's position. We do agree with the member for Mount Gambier. Otherwise, I think we all generally accept the fact that this is a very insidious and dangerous trade that is going on in our society and anything we can do to do something about it will be for the common good.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Clause 5 is the offending aspect of this reform from our perspective, which we say simply goes too far. Notwithstanding the contribution by the Attorney immediately preceding the committee stage, the fact is that it is not necessary for any other police or law enforcement agency around the country to require to have these powers to search anybody who is going in and out of a premises that the police reasonably suspect is undertaking some manufacture, storage or dealing of drugs, and his further contribution does not, in any way, discharge the views held by the opposition in that regard. I do not think it is necessary for us to go through any other data.

I will say that in respect of reasonable suspicion with regard to the premises, members should be reminded that police officers have the capacity to act in those circumstances and to deal with

those who are either at the premises or are ultimately traced back to some responsibility for the manufacture or distribution of its product. They ought to be doing that. In the course of these briefings, we are provided with various information which, for obvious reasons, we will not repeat in the parliament. That is all part of the material accumulated by units to deal with detection and prosecution in these cases, so we will not do that.

I mentioned in a preceding debate the 2002 strategy outcomes from a drug summit held in South Australia. It would behove the Attorney to refresh his memory, if he ever read it—he was a humble backbencher at the time of that exercise and when the summit was held. All relevant stakeholders and agencies were represented and hundreds of people attended that summit. There were some good outcomes, including law enforcement, including dealing with insidious manufacture, and including the rising incidence of methamphetamines, etc., which were utilised. One of the outcomes—which is why I said in the preceding debate was a bit of *deja vu*—was the reinforcement of reducing the supply and availability of illicit drugs. Just to quote one sentence of the report:

Seizures of amphetamine-type drugs and clandestine laboratories in South Australia, over the past three years, indicate that there is significant growth in the number of these laboratories and that the manufacturers have little or no pharmaceutical experience, leading to contaminated products entering the market place.

That is one sentence of a very lengthy report in respect of the initiatives to be taken by the government of the day. I think they failed comprehensively. They knew what the problem was then, in a very real way. They had commitments to extra data collection. I would say we have moved into an area of significant extra data that is out of date. I think we have utterly failed to have contemporaneous data on this matter. Nevertheless, there has been some effort made there, but there has otherwise been a comprehensive failure to do all the things that are aspirational in the current drug strategy from the most recent task force, which was all there in black and white.

For the government to have initially failed and then, when they come back to us, try to add in and pad out a list of categories of implementation of strategies to deal with a problem which they have known about for decades I think that is insincere. As such, the opposition will be opposing clause 5. The police will be left well armed with their current regime, like every other police officer in the country, to undertake this rather arduous task. They do not need these amendments to do it.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I listened very carefully, and it is difficult to discern exactly what that question was. I am reading it as a speech, and I am not sure that is strictly orderly—

**The CHAIR:** Maybe just sit down then and we will see if we can move on.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Is it the cartoon strip *Peanuts* where—

**The CHAIR:** No, let's just try to move on, shall we.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —people had their sticking plaster?

**The CHAIR:** Shall we try to move on? Any further questions on clause 5? No. In that case, I am putting clause 5 as printed.

The committee divided on the clause:

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| Ayes .....    | 23 |
| Noes .....    | 15 |
| Majority..... | 8  |

AYES

Atkinson, M.J.  
Bignell, L.W.K.  
Digance, A.F.C.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Rankine, J.M.  
Weatherill, J.W.

Bell, T.S.  
Caica, P.  
Gee, J.P.  
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)  
McFetridge, D.  
Piccolo, A.  
Rau, J.R.  
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.  
Key, S.W.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Snelling, J.J.

## NOES

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

## PAIRS

|              |                |              |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| Brock, G.G.  | Marshall, S.S. | Hughes, E.J. |
| Tarzia, V.A. | Vlahos, L.A.   | Speirs, D.   |

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 8) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:04):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**LINEAR PARKS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November 2017.)

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:05):** I rise to speak on the Linear Parks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017 and recognise that the shadow minister, the member for Bright, has given advice to the opposition on the bill, attended briefings and indicated the aspects for consideration. I place on the record the opposition's appreciation for his work in that regard and, indeed, his continued work as the shadow minister for the environment and the good initiatives he continues to undertake and work on with our leader for a future Marshall government.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are you the lead speaker?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** As it happens, he is currently unable to make a contribution to this debate and accordingly, whilst I am sure he is listening attentively somewhere, it falls to me to indicate that the opposition supports the bill.

Whilst 'linear parks', a bit like pocket parks, has become a rather significant new description of parks in the last 15 years or so, they are not completely unique. We of course have a very significant one along the Torrens creek (now river), which supports an excellent transport system developed by the Tonkin government. They are not completely new, but they are very important in certain areas.

I had a look at an area, which I think could be described as a linear park, along part of the river system out at Gawler when the significant housing area in Hewett was developed. I was up there for the opening of a primary school, and I think Trish White was the minister at the time. In any event, I remember looking at this aspect, and they were developing a park with a walking trail and room for cross-country biking, which they do with thicker tyres. It provided an important space for children's play and adult recreation and relaxation along a creek area.

People who have been to the Gawler area will know that there is a magnificent river system through there, and even the Gawler township, whilst it has a rather quirky central area immediately away from the main river, produces a great sanctuary for development. As this was a private development, and they were perfectly capable of developing a linear park and recreational area for the community and prospective residents, it was important that, in the public space area, it was advanced. Ultimately, how the amenity is going to be maintained requires a lot of work because there is unquestionably extra attention needed if you are dealing with a waterway that needs to be not only supervised but properly managed for the future of the park, whether it is the erosion of banks, the management of pest control or the incidence of weeds.

When the government come to us as a parliament with this bill and say, 'These are popular recreational facilities and they are to be encouraged,' that does not really mean much as we have had them before. But what we are attracted to is when they say it is to establish, maintain and preserve parks, promote the use and enjoyment of parks, and promote healthy, active lifestyle facilities. We do not disagree with those things, but frankly they are completely superficial to what this bill is about.

This bill is about ensuring that the minister—in this case, as I understand, it will be the Minister for Planning—will have the power to establish linear parks without the pesky interference of multiple regimes of local government in areas that might traverse a linear area. The government are well known for their exclusion of local government from the planning picture. We have had these debates in the past. They have taken to a level of excellence their capacity to exclude the public from planning, and they have used all sorts of novel ways to exclude them in respect of development in this state and the planning to facilitate it.

When the government say, 'We are going to give the minister the power to make decisions about the precincts along these linear parks and the power to say whether they are going to have toilets, barbecue facilities, extra walkways, fencing, support structures over the creek, rubbish traps, or whatever infrastructure they decide should be in these linear parks,' then ultimately the thing that has to be addressed by anyone who actually develops under this bill, any current or future government, is that somebody is going to have to look after this.

Whilst the government are producing a legislative framework where they are going to have a minister make these decisions and execute the implementation of these parks, it will exclude local government contribution in the decision-making power. Of course, governments always say, and we have heard this before, 'Of course, we would consult with them. We would have a talk to them. We would identify what else they have in their public works proposals, what other amenities they have in the area, whether they need electrical lighting along there or security, or whether we can tap into some other initiative they are going to do.'

I have heard all that stuff before. I do not trust this government to deliver any of it. It does not mean that the core legislation is without merit, and we will support it, but this government should be on clear notice that there will be a consequence of the minister making decisions about what infrastructure is to be there. Depending on whose land it ultimately ends up on, there will be a consequence and a cost to meet for people other than the government, and that is likely to be local government, so they ought to be prepared.

One of the most concerning aspects of the legislation, presented to us as this happy panacea of children running along a creek line, is that we are told that, when they introduced this bill in September, they had not even spoken to the Local Government Association. Mayor Lorraine Rosenberg is currently the President of the Local Government Association and, of course, we thank her, her team and her members for the work they do at that level of government. It is unconscionable that the government should introduce a bill in which they are going to exclude the powers of another level of government and with this bevy of agreements, understandings and obligations of consultation pushed out the window. They did not even ask them for a review.

To illustrate the level of disrespect this government has in respect of other levels of government, but particularly the most vulnerable in that exercise—local government—I picked up the paper the other day to find a suggestion by the chair of the Riverbank Authority, Mr McEvoy (I have quite a high regard for his credentials and, historically, his work in tourism and the like). He suggested

that, in respect of the development of the Riverbank area, the government really should be invited to bring in the responsibility rules and exclude the Adelaide city council.

I can think of half a dozen things that the government have proudly presented to South Australians as being consultative with council, including the Adelaide city council, which they are now utterly dismissing. Minister Mullighan came out on that day and said, 'Basically, if they don't do as they are told on this then, yes, we will consider taking away their powers. We have quite a good working relationship with the Lord Mayor, but we are on pretty unhappy terms with others,' whatever that means. That is the level of contempt the government have in the development.

Notwithstanding that, this minister brings this bill in here. I think he still chairs the Adelaide city committee, or whatever it is—I know because I read their annual report once a year. It is full of pictures, as usual, with not much substance. It has pictures of him, of course, sitting there happily with whoever else sits on it these days. I think there are two from the government, two from the Adelaide city council and I think it still chaired by the Attorney-General. In any event, it is a body which meets perhaps once or twice a year and, frankly, it does bugger all. Nevertheless, the government use this as their instrument of support to show that they are a consultative government and that they work with the Adelaide city council. The Adelaide Park Lands Authority is another one I can think of which is regularly ignored and which deals with the Riverbank Precinct.

I am very concerned about this government's use of powers that might be implemented through this. It does not mean that it is going to be a bad law, but it may in future need some protective measures to ensure that it is not exploited, abused or even circumvented by the planning administration of bad governments. Nevertheless, I indicate that we will support the bill and that this government are on the clear notice.

**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) (12:17):** I thank the deputy leader for her contribution. For those who were perhaps not paying quite as much attention, that may have seemed like a stinging rebuke of me and the government, but the good news is that it was actually an endorsement, as it turns out, of this legislation. For the one or two phrases of endorsement slipped in near the end, I think, I say thank you. For the rest of it, it was a rather familiar litany of hyperbole.

I do actually have a bit of concern. As we are getting near the festive season, I am concerned about the deputy leader's welfare because she has been quite angry and upset for most of the last four years. My hope is that, as we are into the week where the spirit of fellowship overtakes other less charitable thoughts, the anger that has been overcoming her in the chamber leaves her and lifts from her shoulders and she becomes a happier person, who will, after her break over Christmas, be able to say, when she agrees with something we are doing, 'That's terrific. Thanks very much. We agree with you,' and we do not have to have all the fill. There are words that are quite frequently used: despicable, disgusting—actually, there are quite a lot of Ds for some reason; I do not know why.

**Ms Chapman:** Not 'dead' yet.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No. As I said, you have to take the crunchy with the smooth in this place. It is just that in this particular instance, it was 99.9 per cent crunchy and then one tiny little bit of a per cent of smooth at the end where she said, 'We agree with the bill.' For that last little bit of smooth, I am most grateful and I say thank you.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:20):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

**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) (12:26):** 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. 16, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Thursday 30 November, to take precedence over Government Business forthwith.

Motion carried.

*Bills*

### GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS (POSTPONEMENT OF EXPIRY) BILL

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (12:26):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Overview

- South Australia is one of the few jurisdictions in the world to be phylloxera free, fruit fly free and have a moratorium on growing genetically-modified (GM) food crops.
- These credentials give the State's primary producers and food and beverage manufacturers a competitive marketing advantage in the global marketplace.
- South Australia is the only remaining mainland state in Australia to prohibit the commercial cultivation of GM food crops.
- Our non-GM status is one of the elements underpinning our global reputation as a supplier of premium products, and supporting the Government's *Premium Food and Wine Produced in our Clean Environment and Exported to the World* economic priority.
- Through the *Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004* and Regulations, a moratorium on the commercial cultivation of genetically-modified food crops is in place until 1 September 2019.
- On 18 October 2017, my colleague in the other place, Greens State Parliamentary Leader, introduced a Bill which would extend these Regulations until 2025.
- He has stated the intent of the Bill is to ensure there is parliamentary debate before the Regulations expire in 2019.
- I congratulate the Member in the other place for bringing this matter to the attention of the Parliament for early consideration before this expiry occurs.
- The Bill aligns with Government policy and brings forward consideration of whether the current legislation should be retained, extended or removed prior to 1 September 2019.
- Extending the prohibition on growing GM food crops would provide greater certainty to our trading partners and industry, enable South Australia to maintain its market position as a producer of premium, non-GM food, and respond to the expected increase in global demand.

#### Costs and benefits

- When it comes to the GM prohibition in South Australia, canola is really the only GM food we are talking about.
- But the benefits—now and into the future—of being able to market South Australia as non-GM, fruit fly free and phylloxera free apply across our whole state and to all our agribusiness industries.
- There is a clear premium for non-GM canola over GM canola.

Domestically, a review of prices for commodity non-GM and GM canola in March 2016 found price premiums of between 10% and 17% (\$45 to \$69 a tonne) for non-GM canola at Victorian, New South Wales and Western Australian grain receival sites.

- There will be seasonal variation but the premium remains, with the latest information for the upcoming season putting the premium at between \$20 and \$35 a tonne.
- On 22 November 2017, the price difference between non-GM and GM canola in Victoria was \$40 per tonne.
- South Australian non-GM canola gains an equivalent price. It is also effectively worth more to the producer as there are no costs for separating GM and non-GM grain through the supply chain and they are not paying the higher GM seed costs or GM variety royalties.
- The benefits of South Australia's non-GM status extend beyond a single crop and are available to the whole agricultural, food and beverage sector, which generated a record \$19.97 billion in revenue in 2016-17.

#### Report by the University of Adelaide

- A 2016 report by the University of Adelaide investigated global trends for packaged, non-GM, natural and organic food and beverages.
- The report, commissioned by the State Government, indicates the global market for non-GMO labelled foods and beverages will reach \$US 949 billion by 2018 from a base of \$US 521 billion in 2014, creating export market opportunities for South Australia.
- Findings indicate the United States is a complex market but one where there is strong demand growth for non-GM labelled food. China is also identified as a market willing to pay a price premium for foods they trust. These are our largest and fastest growing markets for SA food and wine.
- While not intended to address the South Australian legislative framework prohibiting commercial cultivation of GM food crops, the report does identify the State's GM moratorium as one of several current assets available to capitalise on non-GM food export market opportunities.
- Since the report's release:
  - A communications and engagement strategy has been developed
  - Four key market strategies (UK, US, Japan, China) are being developed based on the work of the report
  - French and EU non GM policy and opportunities have been investigated during the Great Wine Capitals meeting
  - Round 3 of the Credentials Program has completed, which targeted non-GM certification for businesses. Grant recipients were:
    - AJ and VJ McTaggart's, Bultarra Australian Certified Organic Saltbush Lamb and Yeltacowie Pastoral's application to become Non-GMO certified; and
    - Tucker's Natural's application to support non-GM and safe quality food certification.
- The pilot non-GM food sector Statement of Recognition Program has recently been offered to the South Australian food and beverage sector with three successful recipients, including Tucker's Natural, Greenwheat Freekeh and Kangaroo Island Pure Grain.
- I have approached US supermarket chain Wholefoods to explore how South Australia could capitalise on Wholefoods' GM-free commitment.
- PIRSA is also investigating opportunities to work with interested businesses to further capitalise on and market South Australia's non-GM status.
- South Australia's non-GM status has been, and continues to be, promoted in a food and wine industry toolkit video which is on the PIRSA website and is shown on inbound and outbound trade

missions including the most recent trade mission to North East Asia (Japan, South Korea and Taiwan).

- PIRSA continues work to further capitalise on SA's non-GM status, including:
- Analysing domestic and export market legislative requirements and certification processes
- Assessing the full advantages of not having to segregate crops
- Assessing the current impacts of SA's moratorium on the cultivation of GM food crops on primary producers and the field crops supply chain, and
- Consultation and participation in the Commonwealth's review of gene technology regulation.

#### Industry views

- I know industry opinions are mixed on this—and I received the industry petition from Grain Producers SA in August 2016 with 221 signatories (out of a total 5,800 grain growers) calling for the moratorium to be lifted but I am approached by farmers all around the state, including grain growers, who tell me they support the moratorium.
- A number of South Australian businesses are using their non-GM status and the state's GM food crop prohibition to access new markets and grow sales.
- Our non-GM status was critical in developing export markets for Kangaroo Island Pure Grain, attracting international investment and acting as a strong drawcard for Japan based Hirata Industries who have come to South Australia to import non-GM canola from Kangaroo Island.
- The University of Adelaide report highlights a number of other South Australian food exporters promoting their non-GM status including: Tuckers Natural, San Remo, Fleurieu Milk and Yoghurt Co and B-D Farms Paris Creek.
- Sam Densley from QualityWise Oats has told me he gets a premium price from access non-GM markets for his specially labelled oat products.
- I have spoken with Mark Harvey—Chairman, S&W Seed Company, who publicly supports our policy on behalf of his industry because it brings them many benefits and market access.
- The State Government is committed to realising the market opportunities for our agribusiness industries by maintaining the moratorium through an ongoing legislative prohibition.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:27):** I rise as the lead speaker in regard to the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations (Postponement of Expiry) Bill 2017. I note that the Liberal Party oppose the bill and I will explain why. The bill is for an act to postpone the expiry of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008. The bill seeks to further postpone the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008 until 1 December 2025. I also note that the government have filed amendments to extend that moratorium until—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** No, we are not doing that.

**Mr PEDERICK:** You are not doing that. It has been indicated that the government is not filing amendments to extend that moratorium until 2028, which would have resulted in a 20-year moratorium on genetically-modified crops in South Australia from when it was first introduced. Under the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004, no genetically-modified food crops can be cultivated in South Australia.

Before proceeding further with the debate, I would like to indicate that the state opposition has supported the current genetically-modified crops moratorium in South Australia. However, if elected in March 2018, we will commission and finalise an independent review within six months on the subject of genetically-modified crops. That review is about getting an expert panel in place to look at the science and economics of whether there is a premium for staying genetically modified free in this state.

The opposition do not think that it is acceptable for a government to impose a moratorium totalling 17 years with zero consultation with the industry. We believe that there needs to be expert advice provided to investigate and highlight the facts, which is why a high-level review has our full commitment. Australia has been cultivating genetically-modified cotton since 1996. CropLife Australia has noted that today 96 per cent of cotton grown is genetically modified, and its production has cut pesticide use down by up to 85 per cent in comparison to conventional cotton varieties. Some



of these are herbicides. In the main, these sprays are insect sprays, or insecticides, which are the most dangerous to use on farms. That figure of 85 per cent in reduced insecticide use in GM cotton production is a significant figure to acknowledge.

The manipulation of the genetic make-up of animals and plants has been happening for countless generations. Those techniques are often referred to as traditional crossbreeding, such as selecting plants and animals with the most desirable characteristics for breeding the next generation. We see this principle being considered for many creations of life, whether it be for animals or plants. We have seen it in the cattle industry and the sheep industry, just to name a couple, where people breed rams for size, for the wool growth they want, for the wool traits they want or so they can breed the stock they want. In regard to cattle, they do so to get that growth in the hindquarters, etc.

Driving deeper into the theory of generations of selective breeding can be heavily related to the breeding of companion animals, such as dogs. Genetically-modified foods are derived from genetically-modified organisms. All approved GM foods come from GM plants, such as corn plants with a gene that makes them resistant to insect attack, or soybeans with a modified fatty-acid content that makes the oil better suited to frying. Recent developments have seen the approval of a canola line that has been genetically modified to produce considerably high levels of omega 3, a long-chain fatty acid, docosahexaenoic acid (DHA). Other publications have stated that if you can achieve 12 per cent levels of DHA in canola oil, then one hectare of this crop can meet the same production levels produced by 10,000 ocean fish.

Some may not be aware, however, that insulin for diabetics is also derived from genetically-modified bacteria. Conventional methods of obtaining insulin is taken from the pancreas of a pig or a cow. However, modern practice now enables the development of insulin synthetically. There are advantages to creating insulin synthetically, including that it is easier to create high quantities, that it is less likely to result in an adverse reaction and that 'it overcomes ethical concerns from vegetarians and others'. Obviously, insulin is necessary for diabetics in the control of sugars.

Food Standards Australia New Zealand is also currently assessing genetically-modified rice, which would contain high levels of vitamin A, which again would result in health benefits for recipients. Genetic modification is also present in corn products, such as corn oil, cornflour or corn syrup used in snack foods, fried foods and confectionery. It is also used for cattle feed. Interestingly, I have located a list of percentages from the top seven genetically-modified crops grown in the United States, as follows:

- corn: corn is the number one crop grown in the US, and nearly all of it (88 per cent) is genetically modified;
- soy: 93 per cent of soy is genetically modified. Soy is a staple of processed foods under various names, including hydrogenated oils, lecithin, emulsifiers, tocopherol (a vitamin E supplement) and proteins;
- cottonseed: according to the United States Department of Agriculture, 94 per cent of cotton grown in the United States is genetically modified. Cottonseeds are culled from cotton and then used for vegetable oil, margarine or shortening production, or frying foods, such as potato chips;
- alfalfa or lucerne: farmers feed alfalfa to dairy cows, which are the source of milk, butter, yoghurt, meat and so much more. Alfalfa is the fourth largest crop grown in the United States behind corn, soybeans and wheat. There is no genetically-engineered wheat on the market;
- papaya: 75 per cent of the Hawaiian papaya crop is genetically modified to withstand the papaya ringspot virus;
- canola: about 90 per cent of the United States' canola crop is genetically modified. Canola oil is used in cooking, as well as biofuels; and
- sugar beets: more than half (54 per cent) of sugar sold in America comes from sugar beets. Genetically-modified sugar beets account for 90 per cent of the crop. However, that percentage is expected to increase after the United States Department of

Agriculture's decision last year gave the green light to sugar beet planting before an environmental impact statement was completed.

These percentages indicate the high uptake of GM crops within the United States. Certainly, locally, we have the investigative labs, including the Plant Accelerator at the Waite Research Institute, which is in the Adelaide Integrated Bioscience Laboratories. The Plant Accelerator is a cutting-edge plant phenotyping facility located at the University of Adelaide's Waite campus.

As a node of the Australian Plant Phenomics Facility, the Plant Accelerator offers modern plant growth environments and state-of-the-art, high throughput automated imaging and computing technologies to monitor the performance of plants under different environmental conditions—for example, which genotype performs best under drought stress. The facility offers professional consultation on plant phenomics and experimental design, backed by dedicated bioinformatic support with data management and analysis.

The AIB lab is also fitted with four fully-automated greenhouses (smart houses) tailored with conveyor systems and programmable watering stations with 34 modern high-quality greenhouses, including quarantine and genetic modification approved facilities. I understand that one side of the Plant Accelerator system is dedicated to genetic modification.

I also note that in around 2006 ministerial exemptions have been given for a limited controlled release of GM herbicide tolerant hybrid crops; this includes canola and mustard. The proposed sites in South Australia included Kingston, Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Lucindale, Grant, Robe, Tatiara, Wattle Range and Lacedpede. I understand that there has been seed grown out in the Mount Gambier district, under licence.

As stated previously, genetically-modified cotton has been grown commercially since 1996. GM cotton has been modified so that it is insect resistant, herbicide tolerant, or both. Residues of agricultural and veterinary chemicals can legally only be present on food if they are compliant with maximum residue limits (MRLs). MRLs provide the specifications of how much residue is allowed to remain on a harvested crop after the chemical has been sprayed and ensures that residue levels are kept as low as possible.

Cottonseed oil also has many uses and is heavily produced. In 2017, 134,000 metric tonnes of cottonseed oil was produced with a growth rate of 14.53 per cent. The following statement is an extract from a publication I have come across, entitled Uses of Cottonseed Oil:

This vegetable oil is frequently used for frying, deep-frying, and baking. Because of its neutral taste, cottonseed oil is said to enhance the natural taste of food, unlike other oils.

Cottonseed oil is a familiar feature of processed foods, which I absolutely recommend you avoid if you want to achieve true health. It's a popular ingredient in margarines, icings, and whipped toppings, because it helps form beta prime crystal, which promotes the ideal texture and creamy appearance of shortenings, spreads, and similar products. Cottonseed oil is also added to salads.

Other processed foods that use cottonseed oil as an ingredient include potato chips and French fries, baked goods, cereals, mayonnaise, [stir-fries] and oriental dishes, and spicy foods.

Certainly in restaurants and fast-food shops across South Australia, cottonseed oil is used to fry chips—

*Mr Treloar interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** —yes, absolutely—and 93 per cent of the cotton grown is genetically modified. The article continues:

Cottonseed oil is also used in personal care products such as soap and cosmetics. Soap produced with cottonseed oil was found to be adapted to washing wool. The oil from cottonseed is also added to laundry detergents. Other products where cottonseed oil is used range from rubber to insecticides and explosives.

Canola is also an approved genetically-modified, herbicide-tolerant crop and was approved for commercial production in 2003 on a worldwide basis. Canola oil is used on many dairy-type spreads and blends. Along with Australian-grown genetically-modified products, there are also imported GM foods. Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) allows manufacturers to utilise a range of GM food ingredients imported internationally. Such products can include GM varieties of soy beans, corn, rice, potatoes and sugar beet, and these products will be all over your supermarket shelves.

GM technologies are constantly developing, and other states are well advancing in that respect. For instance, if a farmer has a crop growing really well and then experiences a frost, they would lose an entire crop of barley, wheat or canola. However, there is potential to develop frost-tolerant, drought-tolerant and salinity-tolerant crops. I have also been advised that a lot of work is being done on potatoes and grapes becoming disease resistant and, even further, there is research being done on allergen-free nuts.

There are many other genetically-modified options advancing, and I am sure these will continue to develop well into the future. Other benefits of GM crops around the world have also included lowered farm level production costs and higher crop yields, increased farm profits, improvements in soil health, and reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from cropping. On a state-by-state basis, Western Australia is experiencing the biggest uptake of GM technology in Australia. When the 2010 permission was given for commercial planting of GM canola, 317 growers planted around 72,200 hectares. Since then, the proportion of commercial genetically-modified canola grown has been steadily increasing.

In 2015, Monsanto reported that Victorian farmers purchased 108 tonnes of the company's Roundup Ready Canola seed, up 15 per cent on the previous year. That level of planting accounts for about 13 per cent of Victoria's overall canola crop. Overall, states able to access GM technology have been able to adapt more efficiently to extreme climactic conditions, and require less pesticides, water and fertiliser than conventional crops. There is also GM technology which could address vitamin deficiency of the world's malnourished.

Whilst I have acknowledged some of the benefits genetic modification presents, safety requires paramount consideration also. Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) established a rigorous and transparent process for assessing the safety of GM foods. FSANZ undertakes a thorough safety assessment of all GM foods prior to them being allowed in the food supply. This safety assessment is distinguished through case-by-case consideration of GM foods, consideration of both the intended and unintended effects of the genetic modification, and a comparison with conventional foods having an acceptable standard of safety. The following statement is an extract from the FSANZ website:

Many of the food safety issues raised by GM foods are equally applicable to foods produced by conventional means. GM foods are however subjected to a safety assessment before they are permitted in the food supply. The safety assessment includes extensive analyses of the composition of the food, a full consideration of the safety of any new substances that have been introduced into the food...as well as a thorough characterisation of the genetic changes that have been introduced into the organism from which the food is derived. This ensures that any GM food that is approved is as safe as food already in the food supply, including in the long term.

To date, gene technology has not been shown to introduce any new or altered hazards into the food supply, therefore the potential for long term risks associated with GM foods is considered to be no different to that for conventional foods already in the food supply.

As well as the safety assessments previously described, the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR) is the federal government body responsible for the national scheme to regulate genetically-modified organisms (GMOs) in Australia. Under the Gene Technology Act 2000, the OGTR administers some of the toughest legislation regarding GMOs in the world. Breaches can result in potential fines of more than \$1 million per day.

Given that we are debating genetic modification, I must also refer to the comments made by the Minister for Agriculture. The minister claims that, by South Australia remaining GM free, all South Australian exports receive a premium in overseas markets, though to date the minister has provided no data or advice to quantify or substantiate his claims that all South Australian exports receive a premium as a result of South Australia's genetically-modified free status. The minister even commissioned a report by the University of Adelaide to investigate his assertions. Ultimately, the report does not address the claims that all exports receive a premium as a result of this state being GM free.

Furthermore, I would like to reflect on a contribution made by the Hon. Robert Brokenshire in the other place. The honourable member indicated that agricultural commodity prices between South Australia and other states do not show any evidence—any evidence—of a premium price for this state being GM free. The honourable member in the other place continued his remarks in this

regard, stating that he was required to sign a sustainable canola declaration to prove that South Australia has the cleanest, greenest and most sustainable canola in the world, yet there are no additional premiums for this status.

The opposition's policy of having a high-level expert investigation would consider all matters relating to genetically-modified canola, including the statements made by the minister in relation to this so-called added premium. During estimates this year, we questioned the minister about a GM breakout. I note from the comments made in the answer by Will Zacharin from the department that on 22 May 2017 Biosecurity SA became aware of a report from a Mid North farmer of a number of self-sown or volunteer canola plants that had survived a spray of glyphosate while others in the paddock had died.

It went through the investigative process, and these plants were determined to be genetically modified. Obviously, there had been an issue with the seed, and some genetically-modified seed had come in. From what I understand, it was not just one round of Roundup. A grower tried to kill these plants. He went over several times. Obviously, they were Roundup-resistant. The issue is that this was not over a small area: this was over 500 acres, or 200 hectares, a significant portion of land that now has had genetically-modified canola on it.

The Productivity Commission's draft report of July this year into the regulation of Australian agriculture unequivocally states that there are no economic, health or safety justifications for banning the cultivation of genetically-modified GM organisms. Draft recommendation 6.1 stated that all state and territory governments should also repeal the legislation that imposes or gives them powers to impose moratoria on the cultivation of genetically-modified organisms by 2018. It went on to say that some regulations lack a sound policy justification and should be removed, including state bans on cultivated genetically-modified crops and that there is little evidence of GMO-free marketing benefits at bulk trade level.

In my experience as a farmer before entering this place, and having an issue with wild radish on my property, I had no choice but to use a lot of chemicals on my canola crops and I had to use triazine-tolerant (TT) varieties. You take a bit of a yield hit using triazine-tolerant varieties because they have to have that built-in triazine tolerance. You go out with a fair lick of simazine and then follow up with atrazine later on, early in the crop growth. It does work and it is very effective.

I am going from memory now, but the recommendations were about 3½ litres of triazine per hectare. I think it was two litres first-up and probably six or so weeks later 1½ litres of atrazine. Because the regulators were concerned with the build-up of triazine in the soils, they reduced the label rates. I can tell you from experience that they are not effective. I understand why the label rates were reduced, but if it does not work it is not much chop going with a lower rate.

That is an issue because there is a lot of country in South Australia, as there is in Western Australia and through other states in this country. I am certainly well aware of how much wild radish there is in WA, but it would be right through Victoria, New South Wales and probably into Queensland. It is—I was going to swear but I will not because I am here—a darn weed; it is a beggar of a thing. It just keeps regrowing. There is hard seed in the ground and you have to use triazine-tolerant canola seed to grow a clean and profitable crop.

What has happened with the Western Australian experience—where they have been able to use Roundup-Ready canola for quite a while now—is they can go in with Roundup, which is a lot safer than triazines and a cheaper option. Certainly it is another option, another tool, in the kitbag for Western Australian farmers in their farming program.

Canola is not grown year in, year out. It could be a three-year rotation, a four-year rotation or a five-year rotation—so, every three, four or five years. Several years ago there was a drought in Western Australia and some of the only profitable crops on some farms were the genetically-modified canola. They sowed it with very little rain because they knew that they could take all the weeds out with Roundup once everything germinated and, in fact, a lot of it went in dry, as a management tool. Because people have so many acres or hectares to put in they need to get on with the job and in a lot of cases that was the only crop that made them any money at all.

As I said, with trials and the Plant Accelerator experience, whether it be in the genetically-modified zone or the normal crop-breeding zone, to get salinity and drought tolerance into any grains or canola would be a huge win—a huge win if it can be pulled off—for the agriculture industry.

Salinity and drought, certainly in Western Australia, are two of the biggest issues, but they are also issues here. We always have droughts around the place. I note that in Canada there has been some talk about premiums. Japan will not take canola unless it is non-genetically modified. Canada pretty well sells all their canola commingled and they sell a lot of it to Japan.

I have talked about the Productivity Commission report. In regard to the ban in South Australia and what it does as far as getting seed from the Eastern States through to Western Australia or whether it is grown under licence in Mount Gambier, I know that Webb transport in MacKillop and Tintinara cart a lot of this seed. They have to go right around South Australia and up through the Northern Territory to get this seed to Western Australia, which I find absolutely ridiculous. Getting this seed there puts a huge cost on the other end, for the Western Australian farmers.

I have opened plenty of canola seed bags. They are probably triple-strength material and stitched right up. They would be packed in plastic, tied up and put inside container trucks. Unless you had a devastating crash, nothing would happen. It just seems amazing that, because of the ban in this state, this seed has to go right around the state as if it is some big bogeyman out there in the field.

I am certainly keen to hear what the minister has to say about the recommended next steps in regard to the University of Adelaide's Centre for Global Food and Resources' Final Summary Report. Three of the recommendations include:

1. Invite South Australian businesses interviewed as part of the study to a presentation and discussion of the findings.
2. Liaise with Food SA to include the highlights of the findings in the industry workshops it will be conducting as part of developing their 'Growth through Innovation Strategy'.
3. Depending on sufficient industry support, provide a briefing to relevant Government Ministers and Executive staff on the findings and implications for Government programs.

I would certainly be interested to know whether any of these recommendations have been implemented and what the government's original thoughts were about extending this moratorium until 2028 because clearly we do not actually have a government policy that is unreviewed and not looked at for more than two decades. I am interested in the minister's response to that.

As I indicated, we oppose the bill. I have indicated what we will do if we come into government. I am a farmer and have declared that. I look at the tools that can be used elsewhere. I look at the uses of genetically-modified foods not just in the first but where they are used for add-ons to processed food, such as cottonseed oil which is used in many deep fryers across the state.

Certainly, there would be a huge array of foods with genetically-modified ingredients that people would buy every week off our store shelves in South Australia and they would have no idea that they were genetically modified. Obviously, they do not have any health effects. Looking at some of the health reports I commented on earlier in this contribution, I know that there are no reasons to have this moratorium. It just seems that emotion gets in the way of reality. On this side of the house, we would like to see science and economics come to the fore so that we can see the true reality. With those remarks, we oppose the bill.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:59):** I will be very quick in seeking leave to continue my remarks. If that contribution was meant to have us reconsider lifting the moratorium on genetically-modified crops in South Australia, it did not work. It is more a reason for us to do exactly what we are doing by this bill. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We welcome the West Lakes Rotary Club. We hope you are staying for question time and that the minister is looking after you during your tour through the house.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

*Bills***POLICE (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**LIQUOR LICENSING (LIQUOR REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (COURT FEES) BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT NO 2) BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**AUSTRALIAN ENERGY MARKET COMMISSION ESTABLISHMENT (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (SENTENCING) BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (VEHICLE INSPECTIONS AND SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***MODBURY HOSPITAL**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 300 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to restore vital emergency and surgical services to Modbury Hospital, expanding its role within the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and in particular, seek to reinstate the High Dependency Unit at Modbury Hospital and to fast-track the introduction of the Emergency Extended Care Unit.

**GLENELG POLICE STATION**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** Presented a petition signed by 151 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to maintain current levels of police numbers and operating hours at the Glenelg Police Station.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

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

*Parliamentary Committees***STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

**The SPEAKER (14:05):** I bring up the report of the Standing Orders Committee 2017. Report received and ordered to be published.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

- Adelaide Riverbank (Festival Plaza) Development Supplementary Report November 2017 [Ordered to be published]
- Disaster recovery planning Supplementary Report November 2017 [Ordered to be published]
- Grant to One Community SA Supplementary Report November 2017 [Ordered to be published]
- State finances and related matters Supplementary Report November 2017 [Ordered to be published]

Local Government Annual Reports—

- Campbelltown City Council Annual Report 2016-17
- Ceduna, District Council of Annual Report 2016-17
- Franklin Harbour, District Council of Annual Report 2016-17
- Lower Eyre Peninsula, District Council of Annual Report 2016-17
- Mid Murray Council Annual Report 2016-17
- Tatiara District Council Annual Report 2016-17
- Tumby Bay, District Council of Annual Report 2016-17
- West Torrens, City of Annual Report 2016-17

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

Remuneration Tribunal—

- 2017 Judicial Security Allowance Report No. 15 of 2017
- 2017 Review of Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and Officers and Members of Parliament Report No. 13 of 2017
- 2017 Review of Electorate Allowances for members of the Parliament of South Australia Report No. 11 of 2017
- 2017 Review of the Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Report No. 10 of 2017
- Accommodation and Meal Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers Report No. 14 of 2017
- Annual Review of Reimbursement of Expenses Applicable to the Electorate of Finnis—Travel by Ferry Report No. 12 of 2017

Remuneration Tribunal, Report and Determination of the—

- 2017 Judicial Security Allowance No. 15 of 2017
- Accommodation and Meal Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers No. 14 of 2017
- Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and Officers and members of Parliament No. 13 of 2017

Royal Commissions (Application of Act) Amendment Bill 2017—Draft

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

State Theatre Company of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Courts Administration Authority—Annual Report 2016-17

Electoral Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

Equal Opportunity Commission—Annual Report 2016-17

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012, Report of the Operation of the—  
Report 20 December 2012 to 24 November 2017

Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner—Annual Report 2016-17

Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Annual Report 2016-17

South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—Annual Report 2016-17

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse)—National Domestic Violence Orders

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Development Act 1993, Administration of the—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

South Australian Employment Tribunal—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Services (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Independent Gambling Authority—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Public Corporations—Supported Community Accommodation Services

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

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

SA Cattle Advisory Council—Annual Report 2016-17

SA Sheep Advisory Council—Annual Report 2016-17

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

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

South Australia, Getting on with Business, 2017 Annual Small Business Statement

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close) on behalf of the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Communities and Social Inclusion, Department for—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close) on behalf of the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Ageing, Office of the—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close) on behalf of the Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission—Annual Report 2016-17



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

Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority—Annual Report 2016-17  
Child Protection, Department for—Annual Report 2016-17  
Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board of  
South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17  
Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Department of—Annual Report 2016-17  
Riverbank Authority—Annual Report 2016-17  
Urban Renewal Authority (Renewal SA)—Annual Report 2016-17  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Harbors and Navigation—Lifejackets  
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—Amendment of Law No. 4

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

HomeStart Finance—Annual Report 2016-17  
Housing Trust, South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Police (Hon. C.J. Picton)—

Health Advisory Council—  
Balaklava Riverton Annual Report 2016-17  
Barossa and Districts Annual Report 2016-17  
Bordertown and Districts Annual Report 2016-17  
Ceduna District Health Services Annual Report 2016-17  
Eudunda Kapunda Annual Report 2016-17  
Far North Annual Report 2016-17  
Gawler District Annual Report 2016-17  
Hawker District Memorial Annual Report 2016-17  
Hills Area Annual Report 2016-17  
Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2016-17  
Kingston Robe Annual Report 2016-17  
Leigh Creek Health Services Annual Report 2016-17  
Lower Eyre Annual Report 2016-17  
Lower North Annual Report 2016-17  
Mid North Annual Report 2016-17  
Mid West Annual Report 2016-17  
Millicent Hospital Advisory Council Annual Report 2016-17  
Mount Gambier and Districts Annual Report 2016-17  
Northern and Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2016-17  
Port Broughton District Hospital and health Service Annual Report 2016-17  
Port Pirie Health Service Annual Report 2016-17  
Quorn Health Services Annual Report 2016-17  
South Coast Annual Report 2016-17  
Southern Flinders Annual Report 2016-17  
Whyalla Hospital and Health Service Annual Report 2016-17  
Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2016-17

*Ministerial Statement*

**MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:06):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** South Australians understand how critical the Murray-Darling Basin is for our state and our state's growing economy. It is also the lifeblood for our nation, with the basin areas producing around one-third of our national food supply and providing the critical drinking water needs for Adelaide. As far back as 1969, South Australia took the first actions and capped our water use from the Murray, recognising that we had to care for and manage this important resource for our future generations. In the 48 years since we took those first actions, South Australia has continued to be leaders in compliance and management of the river. I am pleased to say that the report released by the commonwealth government—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: can we get a copy of this as per the convention?

**The SPEAKER:** That is happening right now. It is just that the attendant has begun at the other end of the opposition benches.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I am pleased to say that the report released by the commonwealth government on the weekend recognises this, highlighting:

South Australia has had a long commitment to a compliance culture...of all the Basin States, South Australia's compliance framework is the most extensively codified by the way of guidelines for staff and transparent, with detailed annual reports on compliance activity and outcomes.

Unfortunately, the rest of the report made for very angry reading. It confirmed our long-held suspicions of a lack of commitment and integrity in delivering the basin plan on time and in full by those Eastern States. It found that upstream states and the commonwealth government under Barnaby Joyce and Malcolm Turnbull are ignoring widespread allegations of water theft and failing to enforce the commitments under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

This review, along with a litany of new allegations following the *Four Corners* report in July this year, is the strongest signal alerting us that the River Murray may not receive the water flows mandated under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan unless serious action is taken. That is why I have announced that South Australia will establish a royal commission to look into these serious allegations of water theft and corruption that are undermining and derailing the Murray-Darling Basin Plan that South Australians fought so hard to secure in the first place.

We cannot sit back and allow the Liberal Party and National Party to turn a blind eye to the evidence of this water theft and corruption that threatens the very water our state needs for its drinking supply and its farmers. We have reports now that have detailed a 'lack of leadership at the commonwealth level and a falling short in commitment by basin states'.

Now that we have that confirmation, we must act. We have to hold these governments and those irrigators who are alleged to be stealing billions of litres of water to account for their actions, and only a royal commission can do that. Only a royal commission will have the power to compel witnesses to give evidence and to get the basin plan on track to ensure it is delivered on time and in full.

I am tabling the Royal Commission (Application of Act) Amendment Bill 2017, which seeks to clarify the extraterritorial reach of the royal commission. This will address any doubt about the compellability of interstate witnesses. I invite feedback and comment on the bill from any interested parties. I will be raising these issues at the next COAG meeting and making clear that South Australia expects the commonwealth and all basin states to deliver on their commitments under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

We are establishing this royal commission because we are standing up for South Australia, but in protecting South Australia's interest we are also protecting the national interest.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the member for Hammond and the leader for interjecting during the Premier's ministerial statement.

### POWER PLANT PURCHASE

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:12):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As part of Our Energy Plan, the South Australian government, through an initial lease of nine hybrid turbines, now has a 276-megawatt power plant to provide power to South Australians in the event of a projected supply shortage. On 13 November 2017, we announced that the plant was fully operational and available two weeks ahead of schedule. Today, I can officially advise the house that we now have exercised the purchase option to secure the implementation of the permanent emergency power plant solution.

In a historic move, this will be the first power plant owned by South Australians since the privatisation of ETSA in 1999. The state government is currently evaluating a number of permanent site options that meet the requirements of being adjacent to both gas and electricity transmission networks. A community engagement process will be run alongside the engineering studies on a permanent site that meets technical requirements and addresses community expectations. The site must be identified and evaluated quickly to ensure the permanent emergency power plant can be fully operational by the summer of 2019-20.

Even when running on diesel, these turbines are significantly more carbon efficient than coal-fired power stations, including the former Northern power station, which members opposite privatised. When running on gas, they will be more carbon efficient than Torrens Island power station. The GE TM2500 turbines are cleaner and quieter than competitors in the market, such as diesel reciprocating engines, producing up to 94 per cent lower nitrous oxide emissions, significantly less particulate matter and 20 per cent less noise. Recent reports prepared by AEMO have reinforced the risk of electricity supply shortfalls in the National Electricity Market.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** After analysing your plan.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The power plant will continue to be tested monthly and only dispatched to the grid when required to prevent an electricity supply shortfall. The generation assets will transfer from APR Energy to the South Australian government at the conclusion of the 13-month lease in December 2018. The relocation to a permanent site will be undertaken incrementally during 2019 to ensure that approximately half the capacity remains available to the network at all times.

We always said that a power plant will not compete in the National Electricity Market but will be directed on by AEMO or the Minister for Energy. The state-owned power plant will fall under the purview of the new energy and water services department (E&WS). Our plan has always been about giving greater control of our energy system back to South Australians, and this is precisely what it delivers.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the member for Stuart for interjecting during that unprovocative ministerial statement.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the Rotary Club of West Lakes, who are guests of the member for Lee.

*Ministerial Statement*

### SMALL BUSINESS STATEMENT

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Health Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:16):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** This morning, around 400 innovative small business people attended the launch of the 2017 Small Business Statement at the Adelaide Convention Centre. The mood in the room reflected the growing confidence in the small business sector, especially among younger entrepreneurs and innovators.

As minister in a state government that is a proud supporter of small business, I announced the latest initiative to help build the underlying strength in our economy. The Excellence in Business Fund will provide capability building programs to small and medium-sized enterprises. The three-year funding program will consider proposals of between \$5,000 and \$50,000 on a matched funding basis for initiatives, programs or services that build capability within business. Successful proposals will be those that demonstrate the greatest potential impact on the participating businesses and on the broader state economy.

I thank the honourable member for Mitchell for attending today's breakfast and hope that he took note of observations made by economist and analyst Peter Switzer. As Mr Switzer noted, South Australia is batting above its average in jobs growth, economic growth and primary industries exports. I liked the message he delivered about the need to innovate and to lead, and I am sure that the member for Mitchell would have agreed with Mr Switzer's quote, which was this: 'One thing I like about Jay Weatherill—he's a great innovator; it's the type of leadership we need.' He talked about the battery and various other things that we are doing. It is interesting hearing that backing from third parties. I am sure that will be celebrated by those opposite.

I mentioned that the mood in the room was very positive. These are people who have been investing, innovating and taking a financial risk, and it is paying dividends. The 140,000 small businesses in South Australia should be applauded for their efforts. It is why the ANZ Stateometer rates the South Australian economy as 'growing above trend and accelerating'. It is why employment has grown for 23 successive months. It is why the Sensis Business Index for September shows the highest levels of confidence since 2013.

I congratulate the staff of the Department of State Development on their efforts in engaging with small business associations over the past year. In fact, we have done the work of going around to meet with every small business association in the state. We have asked them what their issues are, what their problems are, and we are attempting to address every one of those problems. It is the first, I think, that has been done by a state government, ever.

Today, we released a set of tailored action plans for each of those associations and they can be viewed on the new small business website [business.sa.gov.au](http://business.sa.gov.au). Today is another example of the gap between the pessimists and the optimists. If you set yourself a task, define who you are and commit to a course of action, you will get results. Life is not about being liked: it is about being effective. We do not talk about being strong in advertisements; we are actually out there as a state being strong rather than waffling about it.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Stick with the strength.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Agriculture is called to order, though one would not disagree with his sentiment.

#### **DISABILITY REFORM COUNCIL**

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:21):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** South Australia has always led on the National Disability Insurance Scheme and we will keep fighting alongside people with disability to make sure the NDIS changes people's lives for the better. It is absolutely vital that the federal government keeps its promises on the NDIS because the scheme must deliver for South Australians with disability, their families and their carers.

The NDIS is a truly massive reform. It gives us the opportunity to ensure that around 32,000 South Australians with disability have more choice and more control over the services and supports they receive. Pleasingly, around 9,000 new people will receive support for the very first time

in 2017-18. It is not easy and it is not simple, and I acknowledge that some South Australians have experienced issues with their transition to the new scheme and in particular with the planning process.

That is why at last week's Disability Reform Council meeting in Canberra I fought for significant improvements to the rollout processes from the federal government and the National Disability Insurance Agency. I am very pleased to report that, after listening to participants and hearing our views, the NDIA has agreed that better rollout processes are needed. The NDIA has committed to return to face-to-face planning and to implementing a new pathway into the scheme that will include a single contact person for each client. The move back to face-to-face planning is important because the NDIA's first concern must be quality and getting plans right for every individual.

I also took a proposal to last week's Disability Reform Council meeting to prevent gaps emerging for complex clients and people in country South Australia, and the NDIA has agreed to work urgently on this. The latest quarterly report shows that, whilst there have been some delays, rollout in South Australia is largely on track. Our government will continue to apply the necessary pressure federally and support Disability SA client transition to make sure as many people as possible get a quality NDIS plan as quickly as possible.

Our government wants to see the NDIS rolled out on time because people with disability have already waited long enough. That is why I am calling on the Turnbull government to focus on people rather than ideology and to remove the cap on the number of workers who can be employed directly by the NDIA. The Productivity Commission recently called for this change, which would go a long way to improving the speed and quality of the planning process, and make sure South Australians' first experience with the NDIS is a good one.

By April next year, the NDIS will be available statewide. This will mean an exciting, once-in-a-generation opportunity for improvement in services, in choice and in control, and it is only because of the hard work and dedication of staff in the South Australian government and in our disability sector, and through empowering the voice of people with disability and their families. There is a very simple message for the federal government: keep your promise on the NDIS; 32,000 South Australians are counting on you.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:26):** I bring up the 97<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'From the paddock to the plate: a fair return for producers'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

#### **NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:27):** I bring up the 128<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Natural Resource Committee fact finding visits to Barmera, Mannum and Goolwa, revisiting the basin plan: flooded with potential'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I bring up the 129<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Regional report, including material from the Gluepot Reserve fact finding visit'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I bring up the 130<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Natural Resources Committee handover report for the forthcoming Natural Resources Committee members to be appointed in mid 2018'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:29):** I bring up the 593<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Taillem Bend to Keith pipeline increased storage: Coomandook tank'.

Report received.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I bring up the 594<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled North Lefevre Peninsula Wastewater Diversion Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is called to order for—

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Being stupid.

**The SPEAKER:** No—for interjecting on an entirely unprovocative remark.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Being rude then, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** He is not being helpful, member for Finniss.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

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

**CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:30):** I bring up a report of the committee, entitled 'An inquiry into the Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth) Act 2009'.

Report received.

*Question Time***ONE COMMUNITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** My question is to the Premier. What responsibility does the Premier accept following the Auditor-General's finding that his department did not properly administer a \$750,000 grant to the One Community organisation?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:31):** I accept responsibility that that administrative process wasn't up to scratch, and we have put in place the measures to ensure that that will be improved. But let's be absolutely clear about what was found, it appears, from the Auditor-General, and that is that the particular grant was consistent with the guidelines, guidelines which have since been strengthened. It also found that the grant was applied to the purpose for which it was granted.

It also disposes of that nonsense that was running around that somehow the grant application was approved on the day it was received. All the misinformation about this so-called One Community grant has been dispelled here. We maintain our position that we were entitled to, and will continue to, campaign against the \$80 billion cut to health and education that was laid down in that Hockey-Abbott budget. To give you some idea of the success, we have secured an additional \$125 million as a consequence of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —the campaigning efforts we have made against the education cuts. There is still another \$210 million that has been cut from South Australian schools, and we are not going to abandon our campaign. We are going to continue to campaign against those cuts in education that are affecting South Australian schools, Catholic schools and public schools. This is a commonwealth government that has turned its back on a signed agreement with a state government. It is unacceptable, and we are going to continue to campaign against those cuts.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Heysen, Morialta and Colton, the deputy leader, the member for Davenport, the member for Adelaide—if it would not be bullying to do so—and the members for Stuart and Morialta.

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order: can I ask that you withdraw that comment?

**The SPEAKER:** An imputation was made by the Hon. Michelle Lensink. I have just responded to it. Leader.

### ONE COMMUNITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34):** To the Premier: as evidence was given to the Auditor-General that the drive for the One Community campaign came from the Premier's office rather than his department, will he admit that his office is responsible for the improper use of the \$750,000?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:34):** The impetus did come from our office. In fact, in this very building, in the Balcony Room, in front of all the assembled media, in the presence of a series of non-government organisations, we announced the establishment of the Federal Cuts Hurt task force after the 2014 Hockey-Abbott budget. We said to everybody, including the media, that we would be spending public money to campaign against these cuts because they were dramatic cuts to our health and education system and they struck at the heart of commonwealth-state relations, agreements reached between two levels of governments.

We were standing up for the integrity of agreement-making within the federation and also the wellbeing of our citizens. It's when you stand up and campaign, just like we did on Holdens, just like we did on submarines, just like we did on health cuts, just like we did on education cuts, that's the only language these people understand when you stand up and you fight for your state. I know you want to make excuses for your mates in Canberra, but we're going to hold them to account.

**Mr Pisoni:** Mugabe would be so proud.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I ask that the member for Unley withdraw that unreservedly.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley interjected that Mugabe would be so proud. Is he minded to withdraw that?

**Mr PISONI:** Certainly, sir. I would be happy to withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The deputy leader.

### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Energy. Is the full cost of leasing and commissioning the nine diesel generators for one year, then buying them and then relocating them to another site, in excess of \$400 million?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:36):** I know the deputy leader has taken over from the shadow energy minister on this matter. One sentence and a slight overreaction. A bit of advice? Pretend it doesn't hurt.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I don't know what's hurting for you, but that is unacceptable and I ask him to return to the substance of the question.

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

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Demanding that it doesn't hurt, to you, in this chamber, is not acceptable.

**Mr Marshall:** Unless you are not well, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm not.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I would ask him to return or actually start on the subject of the question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As much as I have tried to hurt you over the last 30 years, sir, I have been unable to.

**The SPEAKER:** Onwards and upwards.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As we said earlier today, the brand-new aeroderivative generators will be the proud property of the South Australian public once again, having our own capacity to generate our own electricity for our own South Australians in times of need. The procurement of those generators is within the budget we have announced. The operation of those generators is within the budget we have announced.

I have to say, given that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already flagged that if they are successful they will privatise these generators, the ink wasn't even dry on the contract and the deputy leader is reaching back into the 1990s.

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** After an inquiry.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** After holding an inquiry—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order: it's a very simple question. Has this cost more than \$400 million or not? That's the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, thank you. Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** They have already announced that after a judicial inquiry into buying a generator they are considering privatising—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker, again—

**The SPEAKER:** I have a point myself, but you go first.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I am graciously indebted to your allowing me to do that, Mr Speaker. The point of order is obviously relevance and debate. You have just asked him, on the same material, to bring him into order, so I ask—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** You are saying it's irrelevant material?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Both—and debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the members for Morialta and Stuart, and I warn the member for Morialta for the second time. If I am not mistaken, I heard the member for Morialta say that the Treasurer was lying to the house.

**Mr GARDNER:** I withdraw and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** Good, because in our house we are not allowed to say that one another are lying or liars.

**An honourable member:** Even if it's not true?

**The SPEAKER:** They can do that in the other place, owing to a proceeding there last year.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, the member for Chaffey, did you have a contribution?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I said that the Treasurer can call a member of parliament a racist, but we can't call him a liar.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** No, I distinctly remember naming five opposition members for calling another member a racist and then the member for Chaffey withdrew the allegation that she was a racist and said that she only did racist things, whereupon his naming was revoked, so I don't think he is quite right on that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir. It's obvious what is going on here: it's costing season and they are trying to work out how much they can sell these generators for. That's what they are trying to find out—how much can they sell them for? They are addicted to privatisation.



**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order: it's a very simple question.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, deputy leader. I was just trying to get the Treasurer to complete his gag and then we could rule it out of order.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Well, thank you, but—

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

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

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I simply ask that you ask the Treasurer to come to the actual question and—

**The SPEAKER:** Let's not have an impromptu speech. The point is that the Treasurer is not being relevant and that he is debating the question. Is the Treasurer finished?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Splendid. Deputy leader, supplementary.

### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** Is the Treasurer telling the house in response to that question that, having signed this agreement only an hour and a half ago, he can't tell the people of South Australia how much it will cost?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41):** Absolutely, I can. We announced in March, when we announced Our Energy Plan, that we were going to be spending \$550 million—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I know they want to sell the generators and they want to put it into their costings, but the \$550 million that we have allocated for Our Energy Plan was to have a renewable technology fund, which is doing exceptional work. We also have in there the procurement of temporary generators for this summer, and next, and then to buy a permanent generator.

**Ms Sanderson:** How much?

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** All of our announcements have met our budget parameters.

**Mr Marshall:** Why don't you want to tell us what is going on? What have you got to hide?

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** All of them meet within that framework. What we are seeing is that APR are in negotiations with other governments about buying generators, so we got a very good deal.

**Ms Chapman:** How do we know?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Because there has been no—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Unley to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Because they don't want to reveal it. I know members opposite—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Davenport.

**Mr Marshall:** That's what you said about the diesel generators and that turned out to be \$100 million.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the leader for the second and the last time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I know members opposite are planning to sell these generators and they want to put the costings in their election costings so they can spend it on something that they think would be favourable for their own electoral benefit. Well, I won't give them such satisfaction. We are meeting everything within our budget parameters. We allocated \$550 million for Our Energy Plan and we are meeting it within that money.

#### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43):** Can the Treasurer tell us how much the estimated cost is of maintaining the stand-by generator at a permanent location for the remainder of the 25-year operating life?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43):** I would hope it would last more than 25 years. Torrens Island lasted 50 years. In fact, when it was sold by members opposite, it had already done 30 years' operation, so 25 years is not an accurate reflection of the operating life of these generators because they are brand-new aeroderivative generators, which means that they are very, very efficient.

Given that we will be using them at a permanent location, operating on gas, which we will be announcing very, very soon, what you will be seeing is that these generators will last the state a very, very long time, unless of course we're not successful at the election and members opposite get their hands on them and sell them again.

**Mr Marshall:** What a joke you are, what an absolute joke.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is on a full set of warnings.

**Mr MARSHALL:** I didn't hear what the Treasurer said then, sir, when he was—

**The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith:** Well, listen.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Investment and Trade is called to order.

#### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** To the Minister for Energy: did the government seek any independent advice about exercising the purchase option now?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:44):** We sought advice from Frontier Economics on the design of Our Energy Plan. We announced in March that we were purchasing these generators. We announced in the budget we were purchasing these generators. We've made it public that we want a brand-new state-owned gas-fired power plant. Why? Because members opposite sold our generation. Sir Thomas Playford still looks down disapprovingly on all of them opposite for selling those assets. We are going to start rebuilding and undoing the mess members opposite have done to the state. They told us, by selling ETSA, power prices would go down. How has that worked out?

**The SPEAKER:** Is the Treasurer finished?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** That was debate, Treasurer.

#### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** Supplementary: is the Treasurer saying that the only advice that has been obtained is in relation to the energy plan and not the decision subsequently to proceed with the purchase now?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:45):** I am saying that in the development of Our Energy Plan we got energy experts to give us advice, yes.

### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** Supplementary to the minister: having got that advice on the decision to actually buy, did your advisers recommend that you buy it now and not at the end of the expiration of the lease period?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46):** When we exercised our right to purchase—

**Mr Marshall:** Just answer the question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am answering the question, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** If the leader interjects again—he was offered no provocation there—he will be departing. As the leader knows, I am reluctant ever to suspend the leader.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We announced in March that we were buying a brand-new gas-fired turbine. Like Torrens Island, which runs on two fuels, these generators can run on multiple fuel sources as well. We said that we would be purchasing these generators. What the opposition are quibbling about is when we exercised that right to purchase them. We always said we were going to buy them. This isn't a new revelation that we were going to buy the generators. We were always going to buy the generators.

What they are upset about is that obviously if they are elected they are not going to exercise the option. And now they are faced with the question: do they keep them or do they sell them? What it has done, what is causing all this aggravation between the shadow attorney-general and not the shadow energy minister (which is interesting in itself) is that they don't like owning public utilities. They don't like offering services where the public should have the government offering services, like last time they were in office, when they privatised the hospital and closed 47 schools and privatised ETSA. They don't like public ownership.

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Welcome back to the debate.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: the minister is debating the substance of the question. He is refusing to answer it.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, he is, but the member for Stuart and members opposite are also shouting at him out of order, so I'm just calling, 'Play on.'

### GENERATORS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** Supplementary: if the Treasurer in May this year announced the plan to lease and then have an option to purchase, what has changed since May this year until now to make the decision to buy it now, and on whose advice, if anybody's, other than yours in the cabinet?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:48):** Nothing has changed. We always said we were going to purchase these generators. We always said we were going to have a state-owned generator. The question is: why are members opposite so angry about it?

### BETTER SCHOOLS FUNDING

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How will the federal government's failure to honour the final two years of the Better Schools funding agreement, known as Gonski, impact Catholic schools in my electorate of Torrens?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:48):** Of course, the simple answer is that they are not going to get the money that they deserve and had agreed was necessary. To briefly revisit the circumstances of the Better Schools funding arrangement four years ago, a six-year arrangement, in

the final two years 75 per cent of the funding comes in, so most of the difference is made in those last two years. In comes the Abbott government, having won on a platform of, 'No difference between us and Labor, dollar for dollar,' and the Hockey budget just destroys those last two years. Minister Birmingham has, to his credit, pulled back a tiny bit of money under severe pressure from South Australia. We have always stood up for our schools, always argued alongside the other states that education needs to be funded appropriately.

For the Catholic and independent schools—and particularly the member has asked about Catholic schools in her electorate—those schools are not immune from these swingeing cuts from the federal government. In fact, over just the next two years the Catholic school system misses out on some \$35 million that they had expected that we had done a deal on, that we had agreed, that the federal government and the South Australian government had signed a deal that that amount of money was necessary for a high-quality education.

So what we have done is we have agreed to add to the funding for both independent and Catholic schools from the South Australian state budget. We have agreed to increase our contribution to them to, in part, offset some of the harm done by this federal government's position. This money, the \$110 million over the next four years, will benefit some 93,000 students in schools. For the member's electorate, I will give an example. St Pius X in Windsor Gardens next year will receive some \$106,000 additional for educating their kids. We tend to talk a lot about dollars because dollars translates—

**Mr Gardner:** How many millions will they lose if you don't sign that letter?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** We can talk about the way the federal government is refusing to spend any money on South Australian schools next year, and the South Australian schools are being threatened by the federal government that they will not spend any money on them next year. We have offered an alternative mechanism for them to provide that funding. We do not accept that we are required to sign off on a series of motherhood statements that will make absolutely no difference to the quality of education being provided. We don't accept that that is the case, but the federal government is being incredibly intransigent in refusing to use the net funding mechanisms that it knows it has at its disposal, and I have written a letter to minister Birmingham to that effect today.

**Mr Knoll:** You won't sign a piece of paper that it's their fault.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** What this will do is both—

**Mr Knoll:** Sign the piece of paper. Get the \$1.2 billion. Get our kids an education. It's fairly straightforward.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** What is occurring at present is that all of the funding for the non-government schools is being threatened—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is warned a first and a second time.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —but the reason we are having this argument is because the federal government has abandoned its position. We had a signed agreement for six years, and it doesn't just affect public schools. It affects non-government schools, both Catholic and independent, and we have had to step up and provide just some money in order to have them be able to be competitive with their interstate counterparts.

## GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Energy. As the government's option to purchase the stand-by diesel generators existed until after the 2018-19 summer, what is the benefit to the taxpayers of exercising that option early?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:52):** We can start planning for their permanent location now. Let's look at the alternative. Imagine we are spending money and time finding a permanent location when we haven't bought them yet—all the questions I would be getting then. What would they be saying then? Welcome back to the debate, by the way.

What would the opposition be saying to me now if I was spending money and time on generators that we didn't own, searching for a permanent solution? Perhaps then members opposite would be saying to me why am I wasting money on site surveys, why am I wasting money on consultations, why am I wasting time organising gas contracts, why am I wasting my time organising transmission connections, why am I wasting my time training up public servants to run these generators. But when we buy these generators, apparently that is a waste of money. The real question is: why is the opposition so upset that we have exercised these rights? What are they hiding?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: as soon as the minister says, 'The real question is,' he has entered into debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Not necessarily. Is the Treasurer finished?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order then, sir: please bring him back to the substance of the question which is: what is the benefit to the taxpayer?

**The SPEAKER:** That is just your opinion, rather than a point of order. You are allowed to have your opinion, of course. The member for Fisher.

### BETTER SCHOOLS FUNDING

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:54):** My question is for the Minister for Education and Child Development. How are South Australian schools already benefiting from the Better Schools Funding and how would they be affected by the proposed changes to funding from the federal government?

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: standing order 97 doesn't allow hypotheticals.

**The SPEAKER:** No, there are actually proposed changes by the federal government; they are not hypothetical.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:55):** Again, very briefly, the bottom line is that we missed out on \$210 million for all of our schools, but the good news for South Australian schools is that not only are we standing up for them and fighting for them but also, because we have stuck to our end of the bargain, we are able to spend money on our schools that is going to make a significant difference to the quality of education being provided.

In the last question, I explained that we were providing additional funding to non-government schools—to independent schools and to Catholic schools—but also we are of course spending a significant amount of money on our public schools because we have maintained our commitment to what is known as Gonski. Examples are 154 more special places for special options for students who have disabilities; 10 additional behaviour coaches to provide therapeutic interventions; 11 attendance and engagement social workers; 51 more wellbeing leaders, previously known as counsellors, in primary schools to make a difference to the quality of the education and the experience of our students; and the \$67.5 million that we are spending on literacy and numeracy interventions.

None of that would be possible without our commitment to Gonski, and imagine what we could do if we had the similar existing commitment from the federal government. If the commitment that we signed had been maintained, imagine what schools could spend. Imagine the number of teachers and SSOs that they could employ to assist students. But, no, they are going to be unfortunately significantly short of what had been agreed to be the amount required for a world-class education.

I will give an example at random. The electorate of Norwood, soon to be known as Dunstan, looks like it will be about \$3.5 million—

**An honourable member:** It already is Dunstan.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —excuse me, Dunstan—worse off, including East Adelaide School losing some \$647,000 that it was supposed to get, that it was agreed it would get and now will not be getting because of the federal government. The schools in the member for Morialta's electorate will be some \$1.5 million worse off, including around \$744,000 from Stradbroke, and these are just

some public schools in these electorates that are missing out. Bear in mind that so too are the independent and the Catholic schools missing out.

So we will stand up for our schools, not because it is a dollar figure that we have pulled out randomly as thinking would be nice to have but because some time ago we agreed what was required for a quality education for our students—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** —and we stuck to our side of that bargain and the federal government has abandoned us.

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

### GENERATORS

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:58):** My question is for the Minister for Energy. Why did the minister tell the house it was necessary to exercise the purchase option of the temporary diesel generators so that the government could start its planning process for a third permanent location when the government actually started and has spent taxpayers' money on developing that third permanent location well over six months ago?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:58):** It's all part of our plan. We said initially—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Fake laughter won't change any of it. What we did was we said we were going to purchase a brand-new state-owned generator. The reason we want a brand-new state-owned generator is because the privatisation of ETSA has been a failure—a miserable failure—and members opposite are guilty as charged for doing that to the people of South Australia. Our bills have not gone down since the privatisation of ETSA. We haven't seen increased competition in the market. We haven't had any of the benefits that privatisation promised—not one.

That is why I am proud to say that I was here in parliament when that bill was debated and I voted against it, even though the Leader of the Opposition said he was still in school when it happened but he is older than me.

**Mr Marshall:** You look a lot older.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That is true because I work harder.

**The SPEAKER:** Didn't we preselect you when you were still at Adelaide High School?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The reason we want to have a state-owned generator to call on ourselves is because the private sector has let down this state terribly. The privatisation has been such an appalling disaster for the people of South Australia that we need to have our own generation we can call on, otherwise we are completely reliant on the private operators and an interconnector. That is all we have: profiteers and a thin long cable. That is what they want us to rely on.

We want more generation here in South Australia. We want to be self-sufficient. We want more gas, more gas exploration, more gas-fired generators, more wind turbines, more solar thermal power plants, more batteries, more wind farms. We don't want more reliance on the east coast. We want less reliance and more self-sufficiency. That's why we are buying our own state-owned generator, and I do not understand why members opposite want to sell it already.

### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier consult with the opposition about the terms of reference for the River Murray royal commission and the appointment of a commissioner as his predecessor, John Bannon, did when establishing the State Bank royal commission?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (15:00):** Yes, I will be consulting about the terms of reference, and I am happy to consult also about our proposed choice for the royal commissioner. In fact, I will do better than that: we will be intending, once we have finalised the terms of reference after making a request for some public input into the shape of those terms of reference, to publish a draft set of terms of reference. The draft set of terms of reference will probably be made formal by letters patent in the new year so that the work of the royal commissioner can commence in earnest in the new year. There are a range of reviews and almost all of them I think have been completed now.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I am trying to answer a serious question in a serious fashion. I am getting interjected on by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, sir, so if I could perhaps have a bit of—

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the deputy leader.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It is our intention to provide input from the opposition, of course, but also from the broader community, and we will commence that process later this week. We are more than happy to share our thoughts with the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else in the parliament who may be interested.

We are wanting to choose an eminent jurist, who will have broad respect across the nation, to carry out an inquiry of this sort because it does need to have the gravitas necessary to have an impact on a national basis. This is a national river. South Australia has been held up as a moral exemplar in relation to its treatment of the river, and so it has to conduct itself in an exemplary fashion if it is to have that influence across the nation. That includes how we construct the terms of reference, who we appoint and the processes we adopt.

#### **MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02):** Supplementary: has the Premier already approached the eminent jurist and ascertained whether he or she is prepared to undertake that work?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (15:02):** We are in the process of doing that as we speak.

#### **MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:02):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, will you ensure that the commissioner appointed to the South Australian royal commission has the expertise and understanding of the unique challenges faced by Riverland irrigators with the implementation of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (15:03):** I appreciate the question the honourable member is asking, and I have some sympathy with his sentiment. He might just want to reflect for a moment on that if we chose somebody who was manifestly a South Australian partisan, and somebody who had a preconceived view about this matter, it may not achieve the benefit that we are seeking to achieve here. This is necessarily trying to achieve something from a minority position, something that I have a lot of experience in. What we need to do here is to bring the nation with us.

*Ms Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I notice the former leader of the opposition laughs as though that's a matter of some bemusement.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: the Premier addressed the member for Heysen by calling her 'the former leader of the opposition'. You have been very much a stickler about members addressing members in this chamber by their—

**The SPEAKER:** No, it's quite okay. As long as it is made clear that they are a former member, or as he or she then was, that is entirely in order. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Obviously, the choice of the person should be a high-status jurist, somebody who could be regarded as, hopefully, a national figure that will have some influence, somebody that I think has a great forensic capacity to be able to undertake the detailed work that is necessary to get to the bottom of the water thefts that we have seen alleged concerning the upstream states.

With all due respect to my former profession, the high-level jurists that exist in the profession do have the capacity to assimilate complex information from areas of expertise that might be well outside their usual experience. So, of course, it is appropriate, I believe, that we choose somebody who is capable—

**Mr Gardner:** So it has to be a lawyer.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, it's best to be somebody that—

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It has to be somebody that complies with the Royal Commissions Act, of course, by definition, and somebody that can command the respect of the nation as they carry out this most important inquiry. I can see what the member is getting at there. His anxieties will be to make sure that we have somebody that isn't going to reach conclusions that are disadvantageous to South Australia, but I think we have to have confidence in the fact that the facts are on our side. Just as we saw with the Murray-Darling Basin advisory panel review of the operation of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, where they concluded that our enforcement processes and compliance processes were nation leading, I think we must have confidence that we also will be found to have behaved appropriately in relation to the river.

Having said that, there may be—I doubt it—limited instances of misbehaviour on the South Australian side of the border. If that happens, the cards have to lie where they fall. It is something that we will have to grapple with, but I am quite confident that our irrigators have done the right thing—they always have. They have always understood the precarious position that they occupy at the end of the river, and so I have quite a lot of confidence in the South Australian irrigators.

### STEM EDUCATION

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (15:07):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How is the rollout of the government science and technology labs across 139 public schools around South Australia progressing?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:07):** It's progressing extremely well. To remind the members of this incredible project, we have committed \$250 million over the next four years (we are in the second year now) to have 139 public schools have science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities. For those schools that have primary school students only, it is \$1 million, \$2.5 million for high schools and then \$3.5 million for—

**Mr Gardner:** \$650,000 without the admin and project management.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Well, nothing comes for free. The projects are now starting to be active on the ground, and I have already attended the first of the openings with Brompton Primary School, which is a fantastic space created for young students to be able to experience what science and technology mean and how maths is actually practical and important and useful, rather than simply being about memorising our times tables.

I have also now had the honour of attending Keller Road Primary School in Salisbury East, along with the member for Wright, to see their new STEM opening. It was a magnificent opening, in part because the facility itself is important, but it's what occurs inside the facility that matters so much—having an organisation come and do scientific experiments with the young students there and the excitement that those young students were showing in the idea of science, in the idea of technology, and the fact that they can not only understand the questions that are being asked but can ask them themselves and explore and discover.

Recently, as I have gone around visiting schools, as is my wont, I keep coming across building sites that are these STEM facilities in the making. I was at Waikerie High School not long



ago, and they are going to do a magnificent new area for science, technology, engineering and maths. Just yesterday, I was at both Plympton Primary and Forbes Primary looking at the sites that they are now upgrading in order to have these technologies.

One of the things that is very important about these spaces, particularly for the primary school students, is the access to the outdoors. It is so essential that students experience science not just as being something that occurs inside but also the external environment where students are able to experience nature and understand the natural sciences. In fact, when the Premier and I visited Woodville High School recently, we saw that they have put their STEM facility (which is currently being built) on the first floor of a building, but they have the outdoor area outside on the verandah, which will also enable nature and the natural sciences to be part of this STEM experience.

In that particular facility, what they are doing is ensuring that there is a space that is allocated for teachers to teach and other spaces where students are really creating their own learning, being guided by teachers but not instructed by teachers. Of course, they have brought in a huge element of digital technology, which is so important for the future economy. In all these spaces, what we have seen is a combination of fantastic architects going out and designing these spaces and the involvement of the school community—the governing council, the principal, the teachers and the students—in what they want to see.

When you bring all those together, which does require complex project management, you can have a space that is useful now and into the future and really does demonstrate the kind of investment that we ought to be making in our schools so that our students are prepared for the jobs of tomorrow.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:11):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the resignation of Sinead O'Brien as the ICT transformation executive in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was directly linked to the outcome of a review on the selection process for the former chief information officer, Veronica Theriault?

**The SPEAKER:** That would be 'Sinead' in the Irish.

**Ms Chapman:** It would be, yes.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:11):** In relation to this matter, what I can tell the parliament—and I know it is a matter that is of continuing interest to the deputy leader, and I hope some of the materials have already been published in relation to that, but I thought she may get onto this topic today so I do have some further information.

Just a little bit of a recap, Mr Speaker, because I know you're interested in the background to this matter. As you know, there was a situation where there was an advertisement for a position in May of this year. There was an appointment—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: you have previously ruled on this issue, on one of the many other questions I have asked, that the historical snapshot continuing to be repeated was to be moved on and to get to the actual answer to the question, that is, whether in fact the resignation—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, we do, I think, have the history, and we have 3½ minutes to go.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Very good, Mr Speaker. I know the one thing that you are always very attentive to is the history of a matter so the context of any future interruptions can be properly understood. Anyway, as I was saying, the situation was—and this is very important—

**Mr Gardner:** He's ignoring you, sir. He doesn't respect your authority.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I can hear a noise, Mr Speaker. It's sort of a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier has awakened the member for Chaffey. Answer the question, please.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Not the member for Kavel, sir, but the member for Chaffey?

**The SPEAKER:** No, the member for Chaffey.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I see. As I was saying, what I can tell the parliament is this: there was an investigation by Dr Russell. Dr Russell terminated the employment of the individual who was appointed, effective from 19 September. Further to that, a contractor engaged by the former chief information officer also had a contract of employment terminated, effective on 18 September. In addition to that, those matters are now before the court and I don't wish to canvass any further detail about those.

**The SPEAKER:** With 10 minutes to go, could we approach the contemporary era?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** We are zeroing in on the target now, Mr Speaker. Dr Russell had a review, and I have explained to people already what the outcome of that review was, so I am not going to repeat it again because I know people have heard it previously. Since that time—and this is important—the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, has indicated publicly that he is in the process of undertaking a maladministration investigation into the recruitment process. Indeed, as members would be aware, that means that he is utilising the powers that otherwise would be available to the Ombudsman to do so.

My advice is, in that context and in that light, that no disciplinary proceedings have been instigated against the selection panel members at this time. However, I do understand that Ms O'Brien was a member of the panel, and the service of an ICT contractor, who assisted in the panel's deliberations, was concluded, effective from 22 September this year. Otherwise, the question of the recruitment process remains the subject of an ongoing investigation by Mr Lander, and I therefore let him deal with that matter and provide such a report as he sees fit.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:16):** Supplementary: would Ms O'Brien be entitled to any payout in respect of her resignation and, if so, how much?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:16):** I will have to seek information about that. I can say in general terms, though, that the contracts of employment of senior executives generally have provisions in them relating to notice and termination payments and suchlike. The particulars of her circumstances are not known to me, but I will seek the information.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Florey.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** No. Member for Florey. It is the member for Florey's turn.

#### **ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL PEDESTRIAN SAFETY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:16):** Thank you, sir, for that protection. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house what planning was undertaken and what remedial work is being done now to improve safety and access for pedestrians using and/or visiting the new RAH, both in the immediate vicinity and on approach from all directions?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:17):** I thank the member for Florey for that question. The issue of pedestrian safety around the new Royal Adelaide Hospital has been a concern since it opened because the facilities that have been provided for the hospital, as well as for some of the other facilities that have emerged over the past 18 months, in particular the new investments off the back of the hospital in the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute and the investments by both the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia, are attracting more people to that precinct.

There has been a noticeable trend as those buildings have become functional, both the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and those university buildings, that people are often crossing the road at locations other than the pedestrian facilities that have been installed with them. Certainly, the Adelaide city council, which technically is responsible for this, has engaged the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to work out how we can provide and improve the pedestrian facilities down there.

If members cast their minds to the layout of that particular precinct, there is the intersection that was built and created for the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, which is George Street. Farther to the west of that, heading towards the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, there is the tram stop. There is also a street between North Terrace and Hindley Street called Gray Street, which does not have a pedestrian crossing or a signalised intersection and is receiving a lot of foot traffic from the Hindley Street west precinct.

It has certainly been observed, as far as I am advised, that there are a large number of people throughout the course of the day who, either at Gray Street or in the relative proximity to Gray Street, are crossing North Terrace. That is in between the pedestrian crossings that are provided for both the tram stop outside the new Royal Adelaide Hospital as well as the crossing facilities at the intersection that has been created at George Street.

In light of that explanation about the current layout, what both the transport department and the Adelaide city council are working towards is improving the pedestrian crossing facilities, preferably signalised without necessarily installing a new set of traffic lights in a half of North Terrace that already has a large number of signalised intersections, whether it's for traffic movements or whether it's for pedestrian movements. In fact, I think, off the top of my head, there is something in the order of seven signalised intersections between West Terrace and King William Street.

I think both the transport department and also the officers within the Adelaide city council are loath to put in an eighth set of traffic lights which would further impede traffic flow in the western half of North Terrace. They are working on a solution. My most recent advice, which I must admit goes back two or three weeks now, was looking at trying to augment that intersection at George Street to see if that would provide enough of an attraction for those pedestrians to cross safely with the aid of lights.

You can install new pedestrian facilities of course, but if people aren't incentivised to use them, because they feel it takes them too far out of their direct path to get where they are going, then you have just left the site as unsafe as it was before those new facilities were put in. Although it is not quite resolved, the work is being done between the transport department and the Adelaide city council and that is the direction it's heading in.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:21):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm whether the Sinead O'Brien, Government Printer, South Australia—being the authority for publication of today's Auditor-General Report and conveyed to the Speaker and President by letter of 27 November and tabled here today—is the same Sinead O'Brien who has resigned from the DPC and, if she has that position, what are the terms and conditions of her employment?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:21):** I congratulate the deputy leader on her forensic reading of the report.

**An honourable member:** Page 1, buddy.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It's on page 1, I know. It's tremendous to get a start on the report during question time. I am impressed by that. I know from my own personal experience, and this is not official but it's anecdotal, that this is a reasonably uncommon name, but beyond that I don't know whether—

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** The President of Germany was John Rau.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, indeed, the President of the Federal Republic had that name at one stage. Anyway, let's not go down that path. There does appear to be a likelihood of some correspondence—

**Ms Chapman:** A coincidence?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —a coincidence, but I will check just to make absolutely certain because I wouldn't want to in any way jump to a conclusion, albeit one which does appear to have some logic attached to it.

#### PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:23):** My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. Does the minister have any concerns that the Principal Community Visitor annual report has been truncated into a 17-page document for 2016-17 when the 2015-16 report was 80 pages?

**Ms Redmond:** They directed it to be shorter. They demanded it be shorter.

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

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:23):** Thank you very much to the member for his question. I am really pleased to be able to remind the house that our Labor government expanded the Community Visitor Scheme in 2012 to establish a disability community visitors scheme. It was established to protect the rights of people with disability who are living in disability accommodation services, in supported residential facilities—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —or attending and participating in day options programs.

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

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** The Community Visitor Scheme, as the member would know, conducts regular visits and inspections to audit and to report on services to identify gaps in supports that are available and also, very importantly—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —to report back to our community with the very important goal of improving the quality of services for people with disability. The Community Visitor Scheme also advocates for people with disability to assist them in resolving issues relating to their care and to their service provision—

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —and the scheme rightly has a—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr DULUK:** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** No, I'm sure I have warned the member for Goyder before.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** I'm still going with my answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Not very much, but I have done it.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** I haven't finished my answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Davenport.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** I haven't finished my answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** The scheme has a really close and ongoing relationship with the department in this regard. The scheme is incredibly important for people with disability. It leads to improvements in care and the services provided, and where this improvement doesn't occur the community visitor really importantly advocates for people with disability to get any of those issues identified resolved.

The Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and I are in regular contact with the Community Visitor Scheme and with the Principal Community Visitor, and this report I think provides a really useful overview. The annual report does give an overview of what support the Community Visitor Scheme has provided, where improvements have been made in the system and where improvements can be made.

As the member would know, the report includes quite detailed information on volunteer recruitment and training, communication between staff and residents, the suitability of facilities, the maintenance of environment—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for MacKillop to order.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —and food provision. It includes information and reports on care plans, restrictive practices, the personal safety of both residents and staff, and it also provides detailed information about advocacy assistance that has been provided. I was really pleased to note in the report that during the last financial year the community visitor undertook 583 visits—453 of those visits to disability supported accommodation sites, 41 to supported residential facilities and 89 visits to disability day options programs. I understand that the community visitor will be providing a further report, which I very much look forward to discussing with him in detail when I meet with him in the coming days and weeks.

#### PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:27):** Supplementary: did the Principal Community Visitor raise his concerns on the new reporting template and requirements at your meeting on 23 October during which the report was discussed, or at any time since then when the new requirements were introduced?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:27):** Thank you very much to the member for their question. I think that I have answered in detail about the content of the report. I really look forward to meeting with the community visitor, as I mentioned in our last sitting and also will mention again today. I very much look forward to meeting again with the community visitor to further discuss this particular report and also to discuss the additional report that he will be providing. The last conversation we had was a great conversation. I look forward to our next conversation to further explore these issues during that conversation.

#### PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:28):** Supplementary: minister, were you surprised that the Principal Community Visitor report included an apology on page 9 of his 2016-17 annual report about the new reporting structure?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:28):** Thank you to the member for his question. I think I have already covered those issues. I have covered at length the content of the report. I think it's a very good report, in terms of all of the issues that it covers.

I want to again, as I did last time, place on record my thanks to the volunteers who work as community visitors. The work they do is incredibly valuable and there is evidence in this report that their work makes a real difference to the lives of people with disability. It was really pleasing in the report also to see that there are a number of new volunteers who have come on board with the

Community Visitor Scheme and I look forward to talking about that particular issue with the community visitor when I meet with him again in the coming weeks.

#### **PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:29):** My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. Minister, will you release in public the full documented report as outlined on page 9 of the current report that is tabled before the house?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:29):** Thank you to the member for his question. I understand, as I think I have said a number of times now, that there will be an additional report provided to myself and released publicly, which of course I will table in due course.

#### **PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:30):** What assurance have you received from the Principal Community Visitor and what date will he be releasing that full report to you?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:30):** Thank you to the member for his question. As I have said on a number of occasions now, both during last sitting week of parliament and also in my answers to these questions now, I will be meeting with the community visitor again in the coming days and weeks, and I can certainly talk with him about his intentions in terms of the date on which he will release that report publicly.

#### **PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:30):** Supplementary: what is your next scheduled date to meet the Principal Community Visitor?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:30):** Thank you to the member for his question. I know that that meeting is imminent. I can absolutely check the date in a moment and give the information to the member for Davenport. I do know that it's in my diary in the coming days, coming weeks, so I can certainly let the member for Davenport know about the exact time and exact date of that meeting. It's a meeting that I very much look forward to.

I have enjoyed my conversations with the Principal Community Visitor. I enjoyed our conversation at our last meeting, and I certainly absolutely look forward to our next meeting which, as I said, is in the coming days and weeks. I will certainly provide the information about the exact time to the member for Davenport.

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

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

*Grievance Debate*

#### **PUBLIC POLICY**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:31):** I rise today to talk about policy, to talk about ideas and to talk about the battle of ideas. In this place, the Liberal Party and the Labor Party have been fighting each other for generations. We have tested our ideas and we have tested our policies, and we have received the expected scrutiny from our opponents. We have undertaken the same function on behalf of the Labor Party. When they put up their ideas, we scrutinise them, we find the holes, with the idea that through this debate we get better public policy. We have used the political debate to affirm what we believe in, and what we believe is the best way forward for our beautiful state. This process is not perfect. We as political parties are not perfect, but the degree of scrutiny that we apply to each other is high and, by and large, it works in the South Australian context.

In this election, though, there is a third party that is seeking to hold power and has talked about their desire to hold the balance of power. This statement, 'the desire to hold power', brings with it a greater level of obligation for scrutiny. Of course, I am talking about former Senator, current electoral part-time officer, Nick Xenophon, and his SA-Best team. The question that people should

be asking, as we get towards the polls in March next year, is: what does Nick Xenophon stand for? And the answer is: nobody knows.

At the 2014 state election, the first and most important policy that the X-Team took to the state election was to support rate capping in South Australia to ease the burden of the cost of living. The flyer states:

...the Essential Services Commission needs more power to rein in the cost of utilities and be given power to make councils accountable for their rates and charges. Proposed increases must be limited to no more than CPI.

A couple of weeks ago, though, Nick Xenophon said that he no longer believes in lowering the cost of living. What he does believe in is the lobbying power of the Local Government Association. He stuck his finger up in the air, sniffed the political wind and changed direction. John Darley has revealed that, on discussions about the bank tax, initially Nick Xenophon was in favour of it. But having been convinced by John Darley to go the other way, what does he do? He sticks his finger in the political air and backflips.

There is no consistency there either, but the one thing that South Australians should be able to know about Nick Xenophon is that he is against pokies. When he first ran in 1997, his platform was as the No Pokies MLC, but six weeks ago on ABC radio when questioned by David Bevan, Nick Xenophon backflipped on that, too. He refused to say that he would even get rid of one poker machine if he held the balance of power post the next election, not one poker machine. If Nick Xenophon is no longer the No Pokies MLC, who is he? There is no way for South Australians to know what Nick Xenophon believes in because he refuses to stick to what he actually says.

He will go in one direction if he believes it is politically advantageous, he will honk on the brakes and he will turn around and go the other way. The only thing that South Australians can be confident of is that Nick Xenophon wants power. He wants to control South Australia. He cannot tell you why he wants power. He cannot tell you who he will support if he gets power. He cannot tell you what he would do if he gets power. What he can do is tell you that he wants it. He wants to supplant the rights of South Australian voters to make a decision on whom will form government at the next election and he wants everybody to leave it up to him. Well, that is simply not good enough. That is a recipe for chaos.

If South Australians want somebody who has a clear focus on the cost of living, they need to vote for their Liberal candidate. If they are voting in the seat of Hartley, they need to vote for Vincent Tarzia. That is the only way they are going to get relief on cost-of-living issues. If voters want somebody who is going to reduce their emergency services levy bill, they have to vote for their local Liberal candidate because, as Nick Xenophon said cryptically in a press conference, 'Our policy is a game of Whac-A-Mole.' I am not 100 per cent sure what that means, but I am fairly sure that Xenophon has just driven the analogy bus off the cliff.

The only way householders are going to get ESL relief is to vote for their local Liberal candidate. If people want somebody who is going to stay consistent and true to what they believe in, who is going to put policies up for scrutiny by their political opponents, who is going to deliver in government what they say they are going to do, then they have to vote Liberal in the next election, and that is what I urge all South Australians to do come March next year.

#### DIGITAL DIVIDE

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:36):** Equity and inequity are issues that have received a little more recognition and focus lately. During the lunch break, I was listening to the Senate, and the marriage equality bill got up on the second reading on the voices, so I think that is a really good start. I think now they are bogged down in the amendments, but I will not go there. As I said, the issue of equality and inequity is something we all have at the forefront of our mind. We look at funding for education and the issues surrounding Gonski, water and the River Murray, homelessness and affordable housing, just to name a few.

Also, discussion and debate centre around analyses about inequitable outcomes of globalisation where the rich have definitely got richer but a lot of the population have not done so well. Interestingly and perversely, many equity-type debates and campaigns these days are conducted online through Facebook, Twitter, email, Instagram and all the other platforms and

technologies that connect us and let us talk about these things to each other and, in many cases, influence each other. Sadly, not everyone can participate, or wants to, in these campaigns and social movements, and I would argue that this is another form of inequity, labelled the Digital Divide.

I have been interested to follow up on this issue and have noticed that documents have been published fairly recently looking at Australia and South Australia, for example, the Roy Morgan research publication—and this is through their Centre for Social Impact—entitled Measuring Australia's Digital Divide. The measurement used to determine this was the Australian Digital Inclusion Index (ADII). In March 2016, Australia had an ADII reading of 54.5 per cent, whereas in South Australia we were rated at 51.6 per cent, the second lowest in Australia. Tasmania sits at 48.2 per cent.

The factors they considered in their study, which was over three years, were region (urban, country, remote areas), demographics, income, paid employment, age, disability, ability, education level (one of the factors there was less than secondary level) and the level of expenditure on technology. That, along with the ABS statistics of 2016, says that 86 per cent of Australian households have access to the internet, and those who do not have access are increasingly being left out of the world and missing out on a whole lot of services, information and participating in some of the debates that are happening.

One good thing about not being on the internet or not participating in that world is the number of scams that have been reported in Australia. An organisation called Scamwatch says that 42.7 per cent of scams were either delivered by email or on the internet in 2016. I guess there are reasons to be cheerful, and that may be one of the few benefits of not being able to access or not wanting to access digital communication. Again on the positive side, it would also mean that one would have more time to actually get on with living rather than looking at a screen all day and participating in Facebook and all the other forums that do include some conversations with people but certainly do not go to the whole population.

Many people who come into the electorate office are unhappy at having to pay a premium for having paper bills, whether they be telephone bills or power bills. I think that we should get behind the Keep Me Posted campaign because it is determined to argue that people should be able to get financial information in any form they request.

### **FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:42):** I rise today to speak to the recent Fund My Neighbourhood grants that saw a local project in Hartley successfully funded, namely, the Morialta netball and tennis club court and facilities upgrade. I congratulate the Morialta Netball Club, a fantastic organisation that over the past 10 years has seen tremendous growth, with over 120 families from the community actively involved in the netball club, which is run by many dedicated volunteers. The last resurfacing of these courts was over 20 years ago and they now have much cracking and lifting in many areas.

The benefits to the club, the Morialta Uniting Church and the associated community include the ability to continue to grow the club base and provide opportunities for the community to get involved and play affordable and fun netball. My thanks and congratulations go to all those who supported this important project at the club.

I also wish to speak to a number of projects that I hope will be funded in the future for the benefit of our local community; first is the irrigation infrastructure for state heritage area around Lochend House and environs. This project is looking to provide essential irrigation for Lochend House heritage and permaculture gardens. Another great project is the River Torrens Fifth Creek pedestrian bridge that looks to improve the walking trails of Linear Park in the area. This is a very enjoyable spot, especially over the summer months.

The aged-care community garden project narrowly missed out on funding but received over 100 votes. This project included a proposed community garden, with the aim of providing residents of the North Eastern Community Hospital aged-care facility with an opportunity to work with local community volunteers to cultivate and grow produce in a secure setting. There was also the Ripples Community Arts shed. They were looking to add a pottery kiln to enhance their work with pottery and also to provide workshops in pottery to the community.



There was also Foodprint farms in Hectorville, which is another project that received almost 100 votes. Footprint farms look to provide the skills and knowledge to transform what was otherwise unproductive household lawn into community-driven urban farms. St Georges Magill playground for children is a project that seeks to excavate and rebuild a playground for a variety of children and families who already use the area.

Other projects that I continue to speak on and advocate for in the future include the fence at Thorndon Park playground; Magill Kindergarten outdoor play space; safety at the major intersection of Glynde Corner; redevelopment of the il nido Children's Centre outdoor community space; the playground for Athelstone Football Club; a basketball area near Koongarra Avenue, Magill; a suburban outdoor grass volleyball court in Botanic Grove, Campbelltown; upgrading pathways at Paradise Primary School and extension of the school garden; installation of road humps and a bus stop at the corner of Giles Road and Penfold Road; an upgrade to the basketball court on Park Street, Campbelltown; and an electronic scoreboard for the Raggies, Athelstone Football Club.

### FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:45):** I rise today to speak about the Fund My Neighbourhood grant program.

**Mr Whetstone:** Who's funding that moustache?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Well, hopefully, you are as well. I am very proud to say that my community did very well in the Fund My Neighbourhood program and that I am very proud of the community. We did all the hard work in our community and 15 projects won funding—

**Mr Whetstone:** Fifteen? That's pork-barrelling if I have ever seen it.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** —for a total of \$1 million. The member for Chaffey talks about pork-barrelling, but this was voted by the people themselves. The people voted. So when people vote for a project that is pork-barrelling?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Back to the nub of your—

**Mr Whetstone:** How many projects?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members on my left!

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** My community—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, member on my left, you have been called to order and warned for the first time.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am warning you for the second time now. The member for Light has the floor, and he is entitled to be heard in silence.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** My community actually nominated 52 projects and worked very hard. Fifteen of those projects were successful, and I am very proud of that. I am very proud of my community, that they were able to lift their game and get the results.

The fact that we were able to do that is a great result for our community. It also shows that democracy and people power can work at the local level—and that is what this is about. The overwhelming response to the Fund My Neighbourhood program proves that people who know their communities best are those people who live there. They are the ones who decided which projects should be funded in our community, so I am very proud of all the 15 projects that got up. I am also proud of those other projects that were not successful this time.

I will be more than happy to work with those community organisations to make sure that their projects get a better opportunity to win the money next time. Giving local people the power to decide where government funding should be allocated demonstrates that this government is prepared to listen to what people want in the community—at the street level, at the neighbourhood level, at the community level. The fact that my community in its region was able to succeed very well shows that it was prepared to do the work required to receive that funding.

I am very honoured to be able to work with these community organisations and honoured to work with a number of highly motivated local people. I was also honoured to be able to support them through the process, including making my electoral office a polling booth. I am sure that many other members also opened up their electoral offices and people came in and they were used as a polling booth.

The member for Chaffey and those on that side do not know how to win. We know that. For the last 16 years they have not shown us how to win, and it is unfortunate they still do not know how to win because in my community there are winners. We had 15 organisations that were winners and able to share \$1 million in funding. The projects were quite widespread right across the community, and I would like to name some. For example, the local Salvation Army won some money to establish a community bus service in our town—a very important project. The local Apex group won money to upgrade Apex Park to make it a much more accessible and disability friendly park for our community.

The Gawler BMX Club won money to actually establish a pump track at Willaston. One of the local residents won money to establish a dog and recreation park for dogs and owners. The Salt Care church group won money to set up the Gawler Community Care Hub. The Gawler Central Football Club won money to establish a grandstand shelter, not only for the football but the cricket and the show society. A whole range of people will benefit from that project, so I applaud the Gawler Central Footy Club.

The Gawler Primary School won money to establish a science and outdoor classroom area. The Gawler Road Safety Group won money to establish a speed trailer for the community to improve road safety. The Gawler Community House won money for a kitchen and dining area upgrade. The Hope Church won money to establish a mobile food trailer to help service the local community. The Uniting Church won money to establish an open access community playground and for a garden upgrade in the community.

The Salvation Army also won some money for a riverside project, a special needs indoor play area. The Gawler Light Rotary club won money to establish a program to teach young people driving skills, etc. The Willo's Men's Shed won money to establish a new workshop. I am very proud to be the local member for Light. I am very proud of these community organisations and I am very proud of the fact that we got up, did the work and won the money.

#### DAVENPORT ELECTORATE

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:51):** It is hard to believe that there are only 27 sleeps until Christmas and 34 sleeps until the new year. The days, the weeks and the months—and even the years—pass so quickly. It is almost three years since I was elected to parliament and had the privilege and pleasure of joining you, Deputy Speaker, and other colleagues in this place. Like many people, I find myself at this time of the year reflecting on the year that has passed and looking forward into the future for what may come. The end of 2017 also brings the end of this term of parliament and it is an opportunity for me to reflect not just on the year but on my time as a member of the 53<sup>rd</sup> parliament.

Being a member of parliament is a unique job. Just like any other role, there are good days, there are bad days, but every day is, without question, a privilege. It is a privilege to represent the Mitcham Hills community and help bring attention to the needs of our area, such as the need to invest in and upgrade the local road network, or the immense value in adding a nature play space to Wittunga Botanic Garden. It is a project that will bring many benefits to the area and one I am very pleased to see is now being funded. Congratulations to Nature Play SA and the Botanic Gardens of South Australia on their hard work and support for this project.

It is a privilege to advocate on behalf of the interests of my community, such as the families affected by the government's decision to close the Autism Intervention Program at Blackwood Primary School and Blackwood High School, or those who have been affected by the closure of the Repat, including the hydrotherapy pool. I am very proud of the Liberal team's commitment to retain the Repat site as a health precinct for our community. It is a privilege to support grassroots campaigns such as Totally Locally, a community-led initiative to encourage people to support local businesses and locally produced goods and services.

It has also been a privilege to help pensioners secure their concession entitlements, a young family with their Housing SA application, a mother gain access to disability services for their child, a visually impaired school student to secure DECD funding assistance while completing an international exchange program, local residents who had their street mail Australia Post box reinstated, a student have his invoice waived after TAFE repeatedly ignored his request for assistance over a bungled invoice, and residents lost in the bureaucratic tug-of-war between Onkaparinga council and the environment department.

Life as an MP is certainly never dull. We are an important interface between the public and the government and the operations and machinations of government. We often play a critical role in helping people navigate their way through bureaucratic red tape. The opportunities I have had, the people I have met and the insight I have gained into the day-to-day issues and challenges that people experience have provided me with a deep appreciation of the policy settings South Australia desperately needs to improve the daily lives of my constituents and indeed of all South Australians; the need to remove red tape and to simplify processes; the need to invest in a health system that cares about people, not just buildings, one where we do not wait until people fall off the cliff but, rather, provide a helping hand so they can avoid the edge in the first place; the need to provide an education system where every child has an opportunity to excel; and the need to protect our most vulnerable members and treat them with the respect and care they deserve.

There are now only 109 sleeps until the next state election. There are 109 sleeps until every South Australian aged 18 years and over has an opportunity to have their say on the future of the state and on the future of their children and grandchildren. There are 109 sleeps until the people of South Australia have the opportunity to pass judgement and deliver a verdict to this incompetent Labor government.

They say that we get the government we deserve. Personally, I think that South Australia deserves the best, and that is why we need a Liberal government come 17 March. That is why I will be fighting every day for my community and to be their voice in the 54<sup>th</sup> parliament.

#### **WESTFIELD WEST LAKES**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:55):** It gives me great pleasure to rise on a couple of matters which are of great concern to the constituents I represent in the electorate of Lee. The first is something that has been frustrating residents as far back as 2013: the parking arrangements at the Westfield West Lakes centre. The boom gates were originally installed in 2013 and, to give credit where it is due, City of Charles Sturt appealed the approval provided for the boom gates to be installed.

The council challenged Westfield's ability to install these boom gates and went right through to the Environment, Resources and Development Court, under jurisdiction of the District Court, but unfortunately lost that case. Westfield went ahead and installed the boom gates and since then has making it extremely difficult for many constituents to access what was previously freely accessed: a large, fully air-conditioned, comfortable shopping centre. I raise the issue of air conditioning for an important reason: a lot of elderly people would spend an amount of time on a day like today, when the temperature is well above 30°, to escape the heat and try to look after themselves.

In recent times, it has become an important issue for another reason: the safety and security of staff members working at Westfield. Ever since the installation of those boom gates, a temporary parking solution has been provided on the other side of Turner Drive, adjacent to the old Football Park stadium. This is inconvenient at best for workers, who have to walk several hundred metres from their parked cars, and it is outside of a secure, well-lit and monitored parking facility like the remainder of the car park around West Lakes.

Some months ago, there was a series of break-ins, where people were breaking into cars and stealing what they could from these poor staff members, some of whom were stuck working in the centre for longer than eight to 10 hours at a time. Particularly concerning, this happened to a young woman who took her complaint to Facebook and publicised the manifest insecurity of these arrangements on behalf of staff members. I met with a number of workers at Westfield, and I met

with the Westfield centre management. I was given, to put it kindly, short shrift from Westfield management about the concerns of staff.

I urged them to place themselves in the shoes of these staff members, many of whom are young women who work in retail outlets, and think about how they would feel when they have to walk back to their cars either in the middle of winter, at the end of a shift on a Thursday night, or even on a Saturday afternoon, feeling unsafe and insecure—particularly if they walk back to a car which has been broken into or violated in some other way.

I asked Westfield what they would do in the future, given that the land around Football Park is to be developed over the coming years and this temporary parking facility for staff is going to be removed. While they admitted that they would look at what they called a 'parking nest' somewhere on their footprint, on the bitumenised car park within the boom gates, they were not in any hurry to announce those plans, let alone get on with them and get ahead of this problem, or let staff know so that they can be offered some hope that they can park securely and safely around Westfield.

Unfortunately, this is the approach taken by this company at West Lakes time and time again. We know that 97 per cent of people who park within the boom gates at Westfield are out within the three-hour free period, so why on earth do they keep these boom gates? They are certainly not suffering overflow car parking from major events at Football Park anymore. It is not like football or concerts are still being played there. It seems that they are maintaining these boom gates out of nothing more than stubbornness, and the refusal to remove these boom gates is doing those staff at Westfield a major disservice.

Once again, like other members of council, like former members of parliament and like current members of council, I beseech Westfield West Lakes to do the right thing by the community, to do the right thing by people who want to go and shop at their facilities and to do the right thing by young people who increasingly work in retail jobs and get rid of these boom gates. Let people park safely and let people have peace of mind that they or their cars are not going to be accosted in the future.

#### *Condolence*

#### **ROLTON, MRS GILLIAN**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (16:01):** By leave, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Gillian Rolton OAM and places on record its appreciation of her long and meritorious service to the sport of equestrian as a dual Olympic champion, Sport Australia Hall of Fame member and director of the Australian International 3 Day Event.

South Australia lost one of its most inspiring sportswomen, one of its finest citizens, with the passing earlier this month of Mrs Gillian Rolton OAM. She was admired across the country and the world for her achievements, especially at the Olympic Games in Barcelona and Atlanta in the 1990s. In more recent times, she was known to many of us in this place for her outstanding leadership with the Adelaide-based Australian International 3 Day Event.

Most significantly, Gillian was loved by so many people for her fundamental decency and goodness of heart. In the past week or so, and at the moving state funeral I had the honour of attending yesterday in Victoria Park, we have heard stories and tributes that speak to her remarkable personal qualities. There was her courage and determination, traits she demonstrated when riding for a gold medal with broken bones at Atlanta and in fighting a battle against the cancer that eventually claimed her life. There was her desire, stemming in part from her background as a school teacher, to enrich the lives of young people and to help them fulfil their potential.

Gillian was also respected for her total commitment to equestrian. At the conclusion of her stellar riding career, she remained dedicated to the sport she loved through her work as a coach, a teacher, an assessor, a selector, a judge and a commentator. I must say that, from the perspective of the state government, her directorship of the Australian International 3 Day Event was a model of sound organisation and entrepreneurialism. With vision and professionalism, she made it extremely popular among competitors, spectators and sponsors across the world. It now has the distinction of being the only four-star equestrian event in the Southern Hemisphere.

It is no surprise that Gillian Rolton received many honours and accolades in her life. She was awarded a Medal of the Order of Australia in 1993. She was one of eight flag bearers at the opening ceremony of the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000. She received an Australian Sports Medal in the same year. In 2016, Gillian was elevated to the status of legend alongside Don Bradman, Barrie Robran, Bart Cummings and Victor Richardson in the South Australian Sport Hall of Fame.

Yesterday's funeral service, held in the Parklands Gillian so adored, was a beautiful, evocative and perfectly Australian farewell. Gillian's coffin was draped in the Olympic flag. Magpies warbled in the background, and her lovely golden retriever, Josie, wearing green and gold ribbons, said her own goodbye by briefly lying down next to the casket. We also heard so many touching stories. There were recollections about how, as a girl, she stole books about horses from the library, about how she ignored advice that horses would not get her anywhere in life and about how she sometimes mislaid her gold medals when showing them to people while talking at events or doing school visits and how they would somehow always make their way back to Gillian.

The revered sporting commentator Bruce McAvaney nicely summed up Gillian by saying that her passion was horses but her talent was perseverance. With her graciousness and determination, with her charisma and winning smile, I suspect that we are unlikely to see anyone quite like Gillian Rolton for a very long time. On behalf of members on this side, I extend my condolences to Gillian's husband, Greg, and to her family and friends.

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:04):** On indulgence, I rise to speak about the recent passing of Gillian Rolton OAM. Sir Donald Bradman, Bart Cummings, Barrie Robran and Victor Richardson are all legends in the South Australian Sport Hall of Fame. Last year, they were joined by Gillian Rolton. Haven't we been blessed, as a state, with such outstanding sports men and women?

Gillian Rolton's story is nothing short of extraordinary. In her 20s, she was injured in a motorcycle accident, and in her 30s she dislocated an elbow before the final selection trial and missed out on the 1988 Olympics. But nothing could defeat or deter Gillian Rolton. At the 1992 Olympics, she won gold in Barcelona in team eventing and did it again in 1996 in Atlanta. On both occasions, it was on her beloved Peppermint Grove. But it was in Atlanta that horse and rider showed supreme courage and determination—anyone who saw it on television will never forget their performance—after Peppermint Grove skidded during the endurance phase of the event.

With a broken collarbone, broken ribs and a punctured lung, Gillian guided Peppermint Grove over another 15 jumps covering three kilometres. On her way to hospital afterwards, she refused painkillers, concerned that she might have to ride again, representing Australia, the next day. The performance of Gillian and Peppermint Grove inspired a nation and it still does to this day. As Gillian later said, 'You don't go to the games to be a wuss. You don't go to the games to be a wimp. You go to the games because you've got to get through those finish flags no matter what.'

Unlike most of our top riders, Gillian chose to live here in Australia, not overseas. On her retirement, after 16 years as a top international competitor, she continued to give back to the sport that had given her so much. She opened a riding school to help young eventing riders. She helped establish the national interschools program. She was a national selector and, later, an international equestrian judge officiating at the 2012 London Olympics.

In 1997, she established the Australian international horse trials. Within a decade, it became the only four-star event in the Southern Hemisphere and is now the Australian International 3 Day Event. In her final days, Gillian was still involved with its administration: just like in Atlanta, she could not be kept down. Just like another of South Australia's dual gold medal Olympians, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, Gillian did her state and our nation proud in the arena and long afterwards.

The last time I saw Gillian Rolton was at this year's Premier's appeal gala dinner. Despite the advanced stage of her illness, she seemed to be enjoying the evening, engaging with many people and for most of the evening was surrounded by fans, people who wanted to come up and remember her heroic feats representing Australia. At one stage, she was in a group comprising Glynis Nunn, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson and Raelene Boyle and herself. It was a great group of girls. I pulled out my phone and asked, 'Would you mind if I took a photograph? You all look so lovely.' I am so glad that I did. I took that photograph and sent it to all four of them, and Greg called me

afterwards to say that he had sent it to her in hospital. She really enjoyed remembering that evening. It was a very special night.

In expressing our deep sympathy to her husband, Greg, we trust that he will be sustained by the memory of Gillian's outstanding courage, determination and success both as a competitor and an administrator. She will be missed by so many South Australians, Australians and horse lovers worldwide. Vale, Gillian Rolton.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:09):** I rise to thank Gillian Rolton for her service to sport, her service to the community and, in particular, to the southern community as a resident of Clarendon. Gillian was a long-term resident of the seat of Fisher. I believe that Eden Hills, where she grew up as a child, probably sat within that or close to that.

I also would like to mention that many people have mentioned to me how wonderful Gillian Rolton was as a teacher at Reynella Primary School, which is also in my electorate. Having witnessed her husband, Greg, as the deputy principal at Aberfoyle Park High School, I know how terrific he is as well with young people, so I can only imagine the benefits for all the young people who have come into contact with Gillian as a riding teacher in her riding school. I wish to place on record my thanks as the local member for their service to the community. Vale, Gillian Rolton.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:10):** I first met Gillian England in 1984. As members would know, before I came into this place I had a veterinary practice at Happy Valley/Chandler's Hill. It was a mixed practice, where I did a lot of cattle work and small animal work, but particularly a lot of horse work, and one of my clients was Gillian England, later to become Gill Rolton.

Gill was a very good friend of mine and we spent many hours together—very early mornings and very late nights sometimes with horses that were unwell. Not many people get to stick a hose up the nose of a gold medal-winning Olympic horse. I had the pleasure of doing that, so to speak, and rasping Fred's teeth—all the sorts of things that you have to do to horses—always under the watchful eye of Gill Rolton.

Gill was a very passionate horse owner, as well as a very passionate competitor, and I was pleased to be a small part of her progress up the ladder of achievements. When Greg came on the scene, I was lucky enough to be part of their celebrations when they were engaged and then married and to go to their home and have meals, but all the time the talk was all about horses—what we could do, where we could go and how we could improve the performance of the horses. Gill was always looking for different ways to improve not only her own performance but more particularly the performance of her horses.

As a vet, you get to become very close to your patients. You know how your patients behave, you know their temperaments and you know how they will behave when you are doing things they do not always appreciate, but you also get to be very close to the families of your patients because those patients are, in many cases, part of the human family.

In Gill's case, in many ways the horses were her surrogate children and very close to her. I know the sacrifices that Gill made to be able to be on the world stage in the end. That ladder she climbed was built on hours and hours of fundraising and hours and hours of dedicated hard work looking after her horses and looking after all the equestrian groups in South Australia. She will always be remembered by the thousands of people who knew her.

Yesterday, there were over 1,000 people at her funeral. I know that there were kids in their jodhpurs and she would have been very proud that those kids were there hoping one day to emulate her performance. There were many people whom I knew as clients in my vet practice and who had benefited from Gill's expertise and knowledge in becoming better horse owners and horse riders themselves. It gives me great pleasure to be a very small part of that whole picture, but 99.999 per cent of that was due to Gill's perseverance, persistence and dedication not just to her horses but to the whole sport.

Greg is a wonderful guy. Not long ago, he asked me to be on stand-by when their golden retriever was due to whelp and have pups. Fortunately, she whelped seven healthy pups. They are now going on to give other people's lives as much pleasure as they gave Gill. I was with Gill in the hospice's palliative care when the pups were born and we watched a video that Greg had sent us

about the pups. I know that gave Gill a lot of pleasure because, again, like her horses, her dog was a big part of her life.

To see her go the way she did and as early as she did was a tragedy not only personally for Gill but also for the entire South Australian horse fraternity. Her husband, Greg, has certainly shown a lot of courage to continue the way he has. I will catch up with him in the next few weeks to make sure that he is able to continue to be the person he is—that is, a great South Australian. To have been part of Gill's life for many years, to be able to contribute in the way we have and to now appreciate what she has done for South Australia I think is a great thing for all of us.

She was very passionate about the 3 Day Event. I remember back in the early days, when there were issues with funding, I was getting lots of phone calls, knocks on the door and emails about what was happening and where we were going. Her perseverance and that of many others has now made the event one of the highest classed events in the world and the only four-star event in the Southern Hemisphere. I hope that it continues not only to be part of Gill's legacy but also part of the legacy we have for the development of sport, the experience industry, in South Australia.

To Greg and all those who knew Gill, I am feeling your hurt, feeling your pain and feeling your loss. Certainly, South Australia has lost a great South Australian.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (16:16):** I also rise to add my thoughts to this condolence motion for Gillian Rolton. I first met Gill back in the 1990s. One thing about Gill was that, for everything people saw of her at the Olympics, she had bravery, courage and strength off the horse as much as she had it on the horse. She was a great person to break down some of the barriers.

People involved in the equestrian world are a little bit different. I know as a journalist that they were not always that easy to get to and deal with because a lot of times there are factions within the horse and equestrian industry. Gill broke those down and was determined to make sure that she reached out from the equestrian world to engage with the media, members of parliament and sponsors to ensure that there was a really high level of credibility about the entire sport, in particular the Australian International 3 Day Event held in the Adelaide Parklands each year.

When Gill took over the running of the event 10 years ago, it really stepped up and turned into a four-star event. The communication between government and the event improved as well. Instead of having five or six people with 10 different views coming to see us, Gillian channelled everything and brought it to us in a coherent and well thought-out way. The entire sport owes her a great deal of gratitude for the things that she did outside the arena as much as inside. No-one will ever forget her great achievements in 1992 and in 1996 in the Olympics, particularly in Atlanta, when she had a nasty fall and Peppermint Grove brought her home, and she was standing there with her arm in a sling receiving her very well-deserved gold medal.

I saw a different side of Gill as well. She would ring me when I was at the ABC to ask me to cover an event—and it might have been at Wirrina or her beloved Reynella horse trials—and film high-calibre state and national level competitors who were competing in Adelaide. It was always a pleasure to do that. We would go out there, and there was someone with two gold medals to her name cleaning up things, making sure the canteen was run properly, putting up jumps and doing all those things. No job was too small for Gill Rolton despite the great acclaim that she had right around the world.

Something that is probably not appreciated by people in South Australia is the huge respect people still have for Gill and have had in the past decade or so because she was one of the top judges in the world. She attended all the major events right around the world and was involved as a judge. The FEI, the equestrian federation based in Lausanne in Switzerland, had their doors open for her at all time. From the president down, she was so highly regarded.

We have lost a great Olympian, a great administrator and a great international horse judge. We are all much less because Gill is no longer with us. I pass on my condolences to Greg and all Gill's family. She is an amazing woman, and I think it is up to everyone who has anything to do with

the three-day event to make sure that Gill's legacy lives on in a strong three-day event that just keeps getting better.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:20):** I rise to speak on Gillian Rolton OAM. She was a great South Australian of great distinction. Yesterday, I attended the state service at a fitting location, Victoria Park, the home of the three-day international equestrian event. Her love of the sport was only matched by the love of the horse. Gillian's competitive spirit was to deal with the next hurdle. It was textbook. It was clinical. It was a success story on and off the stadium course.

As a young man, I vividly remember watching Gillian and her team in Barcelona and then the infamous Atlanta Olympics. Gillian rode like she owned the world. She was fearless. She was determined. She rode through adversity. She rode to gold. Having met Gillian many times in my previous role as shadow minister for sport, Gillian showed how one person's determination could succeed in all elements of sport. Her legacy, as a deserving member of the Hall of Fame, and her driving force at the three-day international equestrian event will live on with her name attached. Gillian, our thoughts are with you. Our thoughts are with your husband, Greg, and your family.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (16:21):** Gillian Rolton was an inspiring and kind person and hearing yesterday how she lived her ambitions and dreams reminded me of my own horsey longings as a girl, reading every book I could but not ever getting a horse. I have actually broken a collarbone off a horse in far less salubrious circumstances, of course, so I know a little of the pain Gillian experienced on that amazing Olympic round.

I loved going to the old Gawler three-day event and the show and I attended the Adelaide three-day event for its very first time and subsequently to that. I even had the chance once to represent the minister at the opening cocktail evening and rub shoulders with all the international horsey people, which was almost as good as being with the horses if you think about it.

Gillian's kindness was also legendary and she unhesitatingly sent me one of Fred's shoes and a signed photo when I asked for it. Our condolences go to Greg, all his family and Gillian's family and to her friends, especially Felicity-ann Lewis (nee Cook), Juli Sharpe (nee Curtis) and Jackie Blyth (nee Stuart), the Marion girls, who truly were best friends forever and who must have lots of stories to tell. They spent hours together in the school library, and we know what they were doing now. I am told that it was Juli who was horsey, too, while Jackie and Felicity were not. What drew them all together, though, was the love of the great outdoors and surfing—halcyon teenage days that bound them together forever.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (DRINK AND DRUG DRIVING) BILL**

#### *Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (16:24):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me move a motion without notice forthwith for the rescission of the vote on the amendments of the House of Assembly in the Statutes Amendment (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There not being an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (16:26):** I move:



That the vote on the amendments of the House of Assembly in the Statutes Amendment (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill taken in the committee of the whole on 16 November be rescinded.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (16:27):** I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the chair and the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole for the consideration of the amendments of the House of Assembly in the Statutes Amendment (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill.

Motion carried.

#### *Final Stages*

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I will give a couple of minutes of summary of where we are up to with this bill. As members will recall, the bill is about to increase a range of the penalties when it comes to drink driving and, predominantly, drug driving. It is also to enable SAPOL to use new technology, replacing redundant technology, when it comes to drug-driving detection and offences. The bill has been back and forth between the houses a few times. Essentially, there have been three issues of contention which, to the best extent possible, we have reached agreement with the opposition on because these were facing stumbling blocks in the Legislative Council.

The first of those issues was around an amendment from the Legislative Council in regard to drug treatment programs as opposed to assessments of whether somebody is still addicted or has an addiction problem in regard to drugs or alcohol. The second issue was about the use of medicinal marijuana and whether or not you would be able to get a doctor to give a defence in court to say that, even though you were detected with THC in your system, you should get off the charges for doing that because it was for a medicinal purpose.

The third issue came about originally from an amendment from the Australian Conservatives, which was supported by the government, and then in an amended form by the government—and it was also from the Ice Taskforce—to allow police to use the detection on a roadside test for drugs to be able to search the vehicle to determine whether there may be other drugs in the vehicle. They are the three issues of contention.

Between the government and the opposition, we have now resolved to accept the amendments from the Legislative Council in regard to the treatment in a slightly altered form and also to keep the status quo in regard to what was the medicinal cannabis provisions, so we do not proceed with that change to the law that the Legislative Council recommended.

In relation to the third issue, we have agreed to disagree at this stage. I will be making clear that it is still the government's intention to proceed and that the police should be able to conduct a search in that scenario, and that is something that we certainly will be taking to the election and hopefully reintroducing in the next parliament. However, given that we have not been able to reach agreement with the Legislative Council and the opposition on that last measure, we will take it out of the bill at this stage. But, as I said, we will look to reintroduce that next year.

#### *Amendment No. 1:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I therefore move:

That the House of Assembly no longer insist on its amendment but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 10, page 8, lines 10 and 11 [clause 10(1), inserted subsection (1)]—

Delete 'to attend an assessment clinic for the purpose of submitting to an examination' and insert:

to submit to an examination by an approved assessment provider

Clause 10, page 8, lines 14 to 17 [clause 10(1), inserted subsection(1)]—

Delete 'the applicant has successfully completed a prescribed alcohol dependency treatment program not more than 60 days before the date of application for the licence.' and substitute:

—

- (a) the applicant has successfully completed an alcohol dependency treatment program not more than 60 days before the date of application for the licence; and
- (b) the applicant is not dependent on alcohol.

**Mr KNOLL:** To concur with what the minister is saying, we have reached a form of agreement and, understanding how pesky the upper house can be in relation to a number of these things, we have realised that to give them a bill that they will accept in its entirety is the way to go.

What the government has agreed to in relation to this amendment is that there should be greater access to rehabilitation. The amendment as it stood that the Legislative Council gave to us was one that gave an alternative method for seeking drug treatment as an alternative to the drug dependency test. Essentially, that program was going to be prescribed by the regulation. The government had some concerns around that, forcing it to set up a separate rehabilitation program and there are questions then around how that is done. They have offered an alternative whereby we have a hybrid model.

What we have been arguing is that there is a drug dependency test, and we would contend that that does not work. There were over 600 people last year who passed the drug dependency test who went on to commit further offending. We think that greater access to rehabilitation is the best way to get people to change their behaviour.

As I understand it—and I am asking for confirmation from the minister—what we have agreed to is that, instead of having a drug dependency test and a prescribed rehabilitation program over here, we have merged it into one that we are essentially calling an alcohol or a drug dependency treatment program, the prescribed program. What is interesting is that the drug dependency test is prescribed to the extent that the government authorises approved providers to undertake that test. At the moment there is only one, namely, the Corporate Health Group, and the drug dependency test is essentially a couple of hours worth of testing, whether that be physiological, whether that be taking samples, or whether that be psychological.

As I read this new clause, we are essentially now going to have a situation where we can broaden the scope so that it is not just somebody who provides a drug dependency test; it could be somebody who provides a form of rehabilitation treatment at the end of which is a level of assessment which makes a determination on whether that rehabilitation program has been successful. Really, this gives opportunity to the government of the day to be able to design this alcohol or drug dependency treatment program to suit its purposes.

On that basis, we are comfortable because in fact, if done in the right format, this will actually force people to seek drug treatment, that as part of getting your licence back not only do you have to complete this test but you also have to complete a treatment regime and a treatment program that will help you to change your behaviour. Again, it is incumbent upon the government to approve a program that meets the words as they are put in these amendments, but I think this is a fantastic step forward.

However, in turning this into a question, am I correct in saying we are going to have two processes and that there is not going to be an approved drug treatment program and a drug dependency test? We are essentially going to have one process. At the moment there is a drug dependency test. Under this amendment, is the government required to change any of the processes the Corporate Health Group or another provider undertakes because we have changed the name from 'drug dependency test' to 'drug dependency treatment program'?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I think, essentially, what the member is saying is correct. I would say that obviously this was not our preference originally, and we have come to a compromise here. I think it is clear from the government perspective that there is quite a bit of work to go through in how this actually gets implemented. This was not part of the original plan but, essentially, as I understand it, it becomes broader to a treatment program. There is a lot of work that will need to be gone through in terms of the design of that, but the changes we were very keen to make in this

amendment were that we are not losing what was in there originally, which is that the person is not dependent upon alcohol or, in the second amendment to follow, that the person is not dependent upon drugs. That needs to be a feature of it.

Certainly, we do not accept the characterisations that have been made just then, and also previously about the assessment that is currently in place, but by the by I think we have reached the best compromise we can on this and will now work to implement this in the spirit that it has been put.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 2:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I move:

That the House of Assembly no longer insist on its amendment but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 10, page 9, lines 2 and 3 [clause 10(1), inserted subsection (2)]—

Delete 'to attend an assessment clinic for the purpose of submitting to an examination' and substitute:

to submit to an examination by an approved assessment provider

Clause 10, page 9, lines 6 to 9 [clause 10(1), inserted subsection(2)]—

Delete 'the applicant has successfully completed a prescribed drug dependency treatment program not more than 60 days before the date of application for the licence.' and substitute:

—

- (a) the applicant has successfully completed a drug dependency treatment program not more than 60 days before the date of application for the licence; and
- (b) the applicant is not dependent on drugs.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos 3 to 6:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its amendments.

**Mr KNOLL:** Amendments Nos 3 and 4 were essentially further amendments trying to insert rehabilitation into the bill. We accept that amendment Nos 1 and 2 do what it is that we are seeking to achieve, so we are happy for those two to be pulled out. Amendment No. 5 also is actually in relation to rehabilitation and is essentially where we were looking at a process whereby a sufficient amount of treatment needed to be undertaken.

Again, we accept the compromise that we have come to probably provides the best form of what needs to happen going forward, but amendment No. 6 is the medical cannabis clause and, as such, on that we accept that we keep pace with what is happening with prescription drugs, but we accept, again, to move this bill forward and to come to resolution that this was going to happen this time, but also that potentially more work needs to be done to perhaps more greatly refine where there is an issue and where there is not an issue.

To give you an example, where medical cannabis does not contain THC (where the active ingredient is CBD), those people will not be affected by the current drug-testing regime. They will not have any THC present in their system and they will go forward and do what they are doing. There is a second lot of medical cannabis that would have a psychoactive element. We accept that there could potentially be some issues with that. We believe that the medical fraternity were mature enough to be able to make the decision on that, but we accept that there is a group of people on medical cannabis that should not be allowed to drive. Again, that is not something that is inconsistent with the amendment.

I think what we are trying to achieve here is in relation to that group of people for which there is a presence of THC that is not psychoactive, because its processing has not activated that THC, but it is there. There may be other ways to corner that group of medical cannabis products and deal

with it in a different manner. Having said that, I think that more work needs to be done on and more that needs to be understood. Another point that I would make in relation to this is that, going by questions and answers during the last time we dealt with this bill, the lower limit threshold for a positive test of THC is actually 50 microns, which is not insignificant.

Again, there is a group of people who potentially have trace elements of THC which are not psychoactive as part of the product as it enters into the bloodstream. More work needs to be done to understand whether the THC will be detected in a drug test when people consume that product, or whether it stays below the 50-micron limit that shows up as a positive result. We still think there is more work that needs to be done in this space.

We do not think that this issue is going away, but the use of medicinal cannabis is quite new in South Australia. As that use matures and we gain broader acceptance of how it operates and how it affects people, and how it should work in relation to people being allowed to drive, we will deal with it at some point in the future. I will put on record that it is interesting that we are discussing risk in relation to THC levels in people's bloodstreams, yet people are still able to abuse opioid prescription drugs and other mind-altering prescription drugs that are not detected. This is part of the roadside drug-testing regime that goes unaccounted.

There are already risks on our roads that we choose to ignore because they do not fit within the current drug-testing regime. I find it incongruous to suggest that there is not already a risk out there—because of inaction from the government, they have deemed it to be an acceptable risk—and that somehow this is a different set of risks. But I accept that in moving this bill forward we will have to deal with this issue in a future parliament and so we will be supporting the amendments as they are put down.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 7:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I move:

That the House of Assembly no longer insist on its amendment.

I just note what I said originally: it pains me to move this amendment. In seeking something that will get through the parliament, and particularly through the Legislative Council this week, we have been forced to remove this thoroughly sensible measure. I think the community would expect that if the police finds somebody who tests positive to the drugs that we test for, whether it is ice or some other drug, the police should be able to search that vehicle.

I think that is a perfectly sensible thing to do, and we hope to return to the next parliament and reintroduce this measure, which will give our police the powers that they need and helps implement one of the recommendations from the Ice Taskforce.

**Mr KNOLL:** We welcome the government backing down on this, although I do not want to characterise it in that way in the spirit of bipartisanship here, notwithstanding the minister's comments. Still, to date we have not received one piece of evidence where there is a deficiency in the current law. Also, I agree with the minister that it is better for us to send a clean bill to the Legislative Council that they will agree to without amendment so as to speed this process through rather than having to deal with the vagaries of that chamber.

I think that the minister is being quite mature in realising that it is better for us to deal with it here rather than let it go through the upper house. We accept that this is a fundamental difference between the government and the opposition, and we believe that the balance is right where it currently exists and that the test of reasonable suspicion should remain in relation to police powers. We will continue to prosecute that argument.

Motion carried.

## **GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS (POSTPONEMENT OF EXPIRY) BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Colton, you are continuing your remarks.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:46):** I am, and I almost forget where I was at, but I do remember.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Shall we call for *Hansard*?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** No. They will correct the record if I am wrong because they are magnificent, but I think where I was at was suggesting that, if there was any reason to support this particular bill, it was a contribution made by the member for Hammond. I will explain that in more detail as we go along. I would also note that you were very lucky today, member for Hammond, because this was a private member's bill and, of course, you should have been restricted entirely to private members' business. There is no extended period. I think that the officers at the front there were very generous to you, and I guess we were as well because we should have shut you down.

**Mr Pederick:** Go for it.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** He is an angry man. Getting back to this bill, the national regulatory scheme for gene technology allows states to regulate genetically-modified (GM) crops where there are risks to markets and trade, as the national scheme deals only with risks to human health and environment. Deputy Speaker, you would be aware that in South Australia the cultivation of GM food crops is prohibited by regulations made under the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004. These very good regulations are due to expire, under the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978, on 1 September 2019.

The bill, introduced by my colleague in the other place, brings forward consideration of whether the current prohibition on growing GM food crops in South Australia should be retained, extended or removed before this time. What this bill effectively does is extend the state's non-GM status until 2025, something that I certainly support. I know that the minister and the government side support this because this makes South Australia the only mainland state in Australia to prohibit the commercial cultivation of GM crops. It is certainly my view, and that of people on this side of the house, that this non-GM status provides our state with a market advantage and is one of the elements that underpin our global reputation as a supplier of premium food and wine from our clean environment.

We heard the member for Hammond, in his very long contribution, talk about why we should be doing it. Essentially, what he was saying, if I got the thrust of it right, was that we should become the same as everyone else, that just because the rest of the world and the rest of the states are doing it we should do exactly the same as they are doing in other states and across Australia. I am bad at analogies, and you know that, but I am going to try one anyway. I often hear people say, 'They do this in Sydney. Why don't we do this?' 'They do this in Melbourne. Why don't we do this?' Well, we are Adelaide and we distinguish ourselves from Melbourne and Sydney—and that is what makes Adelaide and South Australia such a fantastic place to live.

The point I am making, I hope in a not too long-winded way, is: why should we follow the suit of other states and the rest of the world when it comes to genetically-modified food? We should distinguish ourselves from those states and those nations because we know that around the world there are more discerning marketplaces, those that are more interested in where the food they are going to eat comes from—paddock to plate, all those types of things—and also the nature of the product itself.

I believe that it is a great advantage to South Australia. It is probably arguable as to whether we are able to effectively measure it now as much as we would like, but certainly I do not believe it is worth the risk of lifting this moratorium because I believe that, in the medium to long term, and I hope the shorter term, the discerning markets around the world, of which I speak, will come to realise that South Australia is a place where you can source clean, green, GM free, non-GM food from our clean and healthy environment. It distinguishes us. That is what we have to do.

Whilst the member for Hammond talked about various areas of primary production, the reality is that what will happen over a period of time is that all aspects of our primary production will be regarded as coming from South Australia, renowned and regarded as a place to source your foodstuff. Extending the food crops moratorium would provide assurance of our food export status to

our trading partners and certainly to industry to facilitate planning and investment in non-GM market development beyond 2019. That is why this government supports the bill, as it aligns with government policy and demonstrates the government's commitment to the state market position in the long term. It would also ensure that South Australia is able to maximise current and future shifts in consumer sentiment and respond to the expected increase in global market demand for non-GM food products.

As the member for Hammond mouthed off all those things on the shelves in various shops that come from areas that are genetically-modified produce, just is the case around the world in those discerning markets—people are going to see South Australian products that come from a non-genetically modified primary industry environment. It would allow South Australia to protect and promote its market position as a producer of premium non-GM food and beverages.

I look forward, Deputy Speaker, as I know you do—you will probably be much closer to looking forward to it because you will be here after the next election and I will not—to seeing the state government continue working with our food and beverage industry to capitalise on our non-GM position. I believe that it is a position that we can capitalise on for South Australia, for the benefit of our economy, and also by ensuring that those discerning marketplaces around the world are actively seeking out our products from South Australia.

Opposition from some primary producers seeking access to GM canola as part of their crop rotation needs to be considered in the context of the benefits to the broader food and beverage industry, which generated a record \$19.97 billion in revenue in 2016-17. In considering the statewide impact of the GM moratorium, we need to consider the direct and indirect implications that introducing GM food crops would have on the state's entire food production.

The member for Hammond talked about the fact that those trucks travelling to Western Australia with GM seed have to go through Alice Springs. I say that it is good that that happens. It is good for them and good that it happens, because I know that we would only need one major disaster and those plastic bags, or whatever they are wrapped in, would split and all of a sudden our reputation would be diminished. I say that our reputation is being enhanced by making sure that those seeds travel the route that they do.

We need to consider all aspects, as I have said, the direct and indirect implications of introducing GM food crops on the state's entire food production system. I say: let's not be the same as every other state in Australia. Let's not be the same as the majority of states or nations around the world. Let's be different. Let's distinguish ourselves and let's ensure that this state continues to be a state that can be proud of—and the rest of the world can source—our fantastic produce that is grown in a clean and green environment and is GM free. It is important that we keep this in mind when we consider South Australia's premium clean brand and marketing position as a whole. I congratulate my colleague from another place on the introduction of this bill. I am proud to stand here and say that I support this bill.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:54):** I rise to speak to this bill, the genetically-modified crops extension of moratorium bill, which was introduced by Mark Parnell in the other place. Certainly it seems that, given the support of the government, this bill will actually go through. I think it is unfortunate that that is happening. I am going to declare an interest here. For more than 30 years, I was a grain grower and I still have an interest in a property on Eyre Peninsula. As most people know, I do not have an active role in the day-to-day running of the operation, but certainly I am still registered as a grain grower.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** And you worry about the rain—

**Mr TRELOAR:** I do worry about the rain and the rain that is coming—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** —this week.

**Mr TRELOAR:** —at the end of this week. We have already had one big splash, so fingers crossed that it does not come as forecast because, if it does, it will do some damage to this year's crop. Deputy Speaker, you are quite right.

The effect of this bill would be to extend the current GM moratorium from September 2019 to September 2025. I need to make it clear here and now that the Liberal opposition did actually support and do support the moratorium to be in place until September 2019, but we believe that it

needs to be reviewed appropriately and comprehensively at that time before a decision is made as to what is done with the moratorium.

In 2004, South Australia, along with other states, introduced a moratorium on genetically-modified crops. Since then, other states have gradually lifted their restrictions. In Victoria, for example, commercial cultivation of GM canola has been permitted since 2008. The member for Hammond talked about other crops, particularly GM cotton (or Bt cotton), which is grown in New South Wales and Queensland where the advantage really is a much reduced amount of pesticide and herbicide that is used on those crops—a great benefit to the environment.

South Australia is the only mainland state to maintain a GM-free zone throughout the country. The government claims this is necessary to maintain South Australia's clean, green marketing advantage; however, in our opinion, it has failed to produce evidence to support this position. In fact, I sourced some research that had been done by Mercado and they have come up with some figures that show the exact opposite. They show that the South Australian grain trade and other goods trade at a discount to other states. This is done over a period of time and indicates a long-term average.

For example, in wheat, Port Adelaide trades at a 3 per cent discount to Geelong. Port Adelaide trades at a 6 per cent discount to Kwinana in Western Australia. For feed barley, Adelaide trades at a 5 per cent discount to Geelong and Port Adelaide trades at a 7 per cent discount to Kwinana. For non-GM canola, Adelaide trades at a 2 per cent discount to Geelong. Adelaide trades at a 3 per cent discount to Kwinana.

For cattle, trade steers traded at a 8.3 per cent discount in South Australia versus Victoria, and mutton and lamb are the same. Regarding wine grapes, the discount in 2017 for South Australian grapes was \$240 a tonne against Western Australia. Both states have GM crops growing in close proximity, so the evidence is contrary to what the government is claiming. We certainly stick by our position that we would look to review the policy in 2019.

I am going to quote a good friend of mine who farms in Essex in East Anglia. I stayed with this gentleman back in 2002 and have remained in contact with him. His name is Guy Smith. He officially farms the driest farm in the UK. In 19-inch rainfall, he grows wheat, barley, canola and—

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** He probably has three times your rainfall, has he?

**Mr TRELOAR:** No, 19 inches, so very similar actually, Tom, to where we farm. Incredibly, funnily enough, he grows exactly the same crops: wheat, barley, canola and beans. He grows to the acre about what we do to the hectare, as a rough rule of thumb, so it is highly productive. Guy is currently a vice president of the National Farmers Union (NFU) in the UK. At the moment, they are debating the reauthorisation of glyphosate. To Australian farmers, that seems an extraordinary discussion to even be contemplating. In my humble opinion, glyphosate has had the single biggest impact on Australian and world agriculture since the introduction of the traction engine, the tractor. There is no doubt in my mind that that is true. Guy Smith says:

When politicians and administrators stop listening to the authorities charged with scientific evaluation, you get bad regulation.

And that is exactly what is going to happen. I am also going to give another quote, and I have been thinking about this for some time. Charles Darwin said: 'In the long history of humankind...those who learned to...improvise most effectively have prevailed.' And agriculture throughout its history has improvised.

Turnip Townshend and Jethro Tull oversaw the agricultural revolution in the UK in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. Turnip Townshend, of course, introduced crop rotation and Jethro Tull developed a seed drill in 1700. He developed a horse-drawn hoe. He developed a mechanical winnowing machine and was roundly ostracised by going against the will of God, and there is a sense of this in this debate, I believe. In South Australia, the Ridley stripper was invented in 1842. Superphosphate was applied to soils. The Correll brothers on Yorke Peninsula developed a seed drill that can sow grain and superphosphate, phosphorous, at the same time.

There has been motorised mechanisation and the introduction of the tractor. In South Australia we were the world leaders in the development of ley farming. In fact, much of that technology was exported. I remember our own department of agriculture sending scientists overseas

in the 1970s, particularly to the Middle East to places like Libya and Iraq, to take the technology that had been developed here in South Australia to the rest of the world. It was very successful.

In my time, we saw the introduction of agricultural chemicals, including glyphosate, which I have already mentioned, which allowed farmers to establish their crop with much less work and effort with incredible benefits to soil health. We have seen high analysis fertilisers. Of late, we have seen GPS technology and variable rate technology impact on our machines and the way we farm. They are extraordinary developments. My own father talks about hydraulics, cabs on tractors, the bulk handling of grain. My maternal grandfather said, 'There is no way I am going to go to bulk handling of grain.' Well, of course, he did because it was easier.

My point is that the rate of the uptake of new technology by South Australian and Australian farmers generally has been extraordinary because they see the advantage—until now. Now what we are seeing in this state is the adoption of groundbreaking technology grind to a halt. I believe that the government has overstepped the mark on this one. It is not for government to dictate to farmers what they can and cannot grow. They are dictating to private businesses economic decisions. It smacks of the Eastern Bloc and old Soviet Russia, governments dictating to farmers what they can and cannot grow.

The government says the premiums are real but, as I pointed out, they are not. It is about being competitive and growers producing commodities that are traded on the world market. Our products are commodities—10 million tonnes last year. That is a lot of grain. If we are not competitive, the risk is that we will become irrelevant and may even disappear. Ain't that the truth? It seems to be habit forming in the state. Engineering is not a silver bullet. It would only ever be another tool in the toolbox. It is not as though all would embrace it. No farming system is perfect, but it would give our growers an opportunity they currently do not have. Shame on the government for not allowing it.

Mark Parnell in the other place talks about letting the genie out of the bottle. There is nothing magical about this. This is not magic; this is actually science. It is based on science. Do not be fearful of the future or the science itself: embrace it. The member for Hammond talked a lot about the rest of the world embracing it, and the member for Colton also talked about the rest of the world embracing gene technology, asking why we should follow suit. My real fear is that if we do not, we will become uncompetitive.

Gene editing is just around the corner. Work has been done and much has been said about it. Gene editing is where DNA is inserted, deleted or replaced in the genome. It is incredibly exciting technology. Are we going to be precluded from that technology? Is the government going to allow access to that, or are we simply going to continue cycling about with a stick of bread and a bottle of pinot in a basket? There has been a lack of consultation, a lack of formal data and, unfortunately, it removes choice from growers and caps our potential.

Particularly, I would look to Grain Producers SA. They are the peak representational body in this industry and the government needs to look at the lobbying and the input they are having into this debate. I think it is a big mistake to extend this moratorium without any due diligence, and I think that is the key. We really need to investigate the benefits, or otherwise, that this is giving to marketing and also our farming and production systems. It appears to me to be anti-science, anti-competition and anti-choice.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (17:05):** I will pick up on the point that the member for Flinders made that you take away the right of people to have their choice. If you bring in GM crops, you take away the choice of all these wonderful producers and food manufacturers that we have. You take away the choice for those people, you take away the choice for those people to market—

*Mr Treloar interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** —their food as GM free. Let's have a look at some of the globally recognised—

*Mr Treloar interjecting:*



**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Excuse me. I sat here in silence.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left! The member is entitled to be heard in silence.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Let's take a look at some of our globally recognised food producers and food manufacturers here, like San Remo, Tucker's and Coopers, and the list goes on, who use South Australia's GM-free status to help market their goods. I spoke to Sam Tucker two weeks ago. He is just back from the US and he said that when they talk there, it is hard enough to get on as 'organic' onto the shelves of the US at the moment.

The University of Adelaide study has shown that in the four or five years to 2019 the market for non-GM crops is going to double, and the growth is unbelievable over there. It is the same in China and Japan. We know from Kangaroo Island Pure Grain that they are getting a premium of \$60 a tonne for their canola. A lot of facts and figures are thrown around by people on the other side. They are not necessarily correct. They are put up as facts.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I did sit here in silence. I did not say a word while either of you spoke.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** But they are put up by you as facts. The member for Hammond spent a lot of his address talking about cotton. We are never going to grow cotton in South Australia. Whether it is GM cotton or non-GM cotton, we are not going to grow it here, so there is absolutely no point in having that discussion in this place.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We do not grow GM crops in South Australia; that is what we are proud of. We do not have phylloxera in South Australia, and we should all give thanks to those legislators who went before us in the late 1800s who brought in the phylloxera act to keep out that bug that destroyed vineyards throughout Europe. It is prevalent across all mainland states of Australia where they grow grapes. That was kept out by an act of parliament. We have a duty here as politicians to make sure that we look after the reputation of the state.

When I go to the US or to Europe or to Asia, and I talk to people over there who are looking to buy premium food and wine, I tell them about our great heritage. I tell them that we are the only mainland state in Australia, and one of the few jurisdictions in the world, where it is illegal to grow GM crops, where we do not have phylloxera and where we do not have fruit fly. They are amazing selling points. The Liberal Party want to give all that away to allow canola growers—and not all canola growers either. Many of the people who grow crops here in South Australia want this GM moratorium to be left in place, but the Liberals are happy for it to be lifted so that canola growers can have some advantage, as the Liberals say they will have. They will not have an advantage. They will not have an advantage in terms of the money that they get.

When we look at the price of GM canola compared with non-GM canola in Victoria where they grow both, it is about a \$40 difference per tonne, and the non-GM canola gets more than the GM canola. There is no silver bullet for the canola industry here by allowing the growing of GM canola. If we look back at 2007 at a report that was done in Victoria, there was a prediction that, by 2012, 80 per cent of the canola grain in Victoria would be GM canola. The reality is that it is 13 per cent, so farmers have not taken this up as some silver bullet in Victoria and other states where the moratorium has been lifted.

So the Liberal Party wants to trade away the ability for 10 to 15 per cent of canola growers in South Australia to have the right to grow GM at the expense of every other food producer and food manufacturer in this state. We are not going to accept that as the Labor Party. On 17 March, people

have a choice: if they want GM crops grown in South Australia, vote Liberal; if they do not want GM crops grown in South Australia, vote Labor. It is a very, very clear message that we need to get out to the voters of South Australia— that the Liberal Party supports GM crops being grown in South Australia and the Labor Party opposes the growing of GM crops in South Australia.

Grain Producers South Australia did a petition, which they launched at the Paskeville Field Days two years ago. They presented it to me a year later. There are 5,800 registered growers of crops in South Australia and 221 people, including the Hon. Terry Stephens in another place, signed that petition. I have gone through the addresses and they are from right around the state, but that is only 221 people out of a state of 1.7 million people, which includes 5,800 registered growers of crops.

Where is this tidal wave of support to allow the growing of GM crops to come into South Australia? I do not see it. I do not hear it. I get around the state quite a lot. I talk to farmers who would like GM crops. I speak to farmers who are totally opposed to the introduction of GM crops. I talk to food manufacturers. I do not think I have ever spoken to a food manufacturer who wants GM crops introduced into South Australia.

Once you let the genie out of the bottle you cannot put it back in. I agree with Mark Parnell, the leader of the Australian Greens in the upper house, and I thank him for bringing this bill into parliament. I think it is a very important piece of legislation. I think it is great that Mark Parnell brought it in and I commend him for doing so. The bill has the total support of our cabinet, our caucus and the Labor Party.

For those canola growers and other crop growers out there who want to make more money, they should copy what Duncan MacGillivray did with his model on Kangaroo Island, and that is to take a marketing point of view instead of considering yourself as a grower a long way away from the market, which I know is a reality. There are a lot of steps, a lot of people and a lot of businesses between you and the person who eats your fantastic GM-free and wonderfully produced crops grown in a clean environment. We need to help the growers market their crops, and we are happy to do that as a government. We will work with Grain Producers SA and we will work with farmers to do that.

I have worked with Grain Producers SA and we agree to disagree on this, but I think many of their members agreed to disagree with the hierarchy of Grain Producers SA as well. I want to keep having a good relationship with them and I want to thank Darren Arney, who I know has just announced that he is moving on to another role. I want to pay tribute to Darren, even though we do have completely different views on the growing of GM crops. I want to thank Darren for the good humour, I suppose, with which he has gone about his job. We have always been able to have a beer and discuss things, and I think we are all as one in trying to help South Australian farmers any way we can.

I want to commend South Australia's grain farmers as well. If we look back at the past eight seasons, we have had eight seasons in a row above the 10-year average. That is incredible. Did we have great weather in all those eight years? No. We got bigger crops because the farmers did a great job in the way they managed their farms. They are resilient people. They are people who embrace technology. I also want to thank the people up at Waite who have worked on new strains through crossbreeding to make sure that the seeds that our farmers plant are the most suitable seeds for our environment here in South Australia.

This is not a war against farmers. This is people, even within the farming community, having different points of view. However, as a government, we have to stand on the side that protects the majority of people. We are talking not just about canola farmers here; we are talking about all farmers and all food manufacturers. We are talking about everyone who wants to go to market to be proud of what it is that they produce and to tell the world that it comes from a place where it is illegal to grow GM crops. We stand proud and tall when we go into overseas markets and talk about our credentials here: GM free, phylloxera free and fruit fly free. I think every South Australian should be very proud of that. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I wonder if the minister agrees with the Premier on his thoughts about genetically-modified crops when the Premier said that there are not many votes in regional areas, so it does not matter?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I think the Liberal Party is guilty of taking the Premier's quotes out of context.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** No, we have heard this time and time again when someone takes a full quote and they come in here and try to purport that that is the full quote. This has happened not just in this place but elsewhere. The Premier said:

The truth is, you know, there are not a lot of votes out there in country South Australia for us. We don't, so we're—in some ways we're sort of free of the electoral—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** That's where you cut it off. I will start again so that we get the full quote:

The truth is, you know, there are not a lot of votes out there in country South Australia for us. We don't—in some ways we're sort of free of the electoral imperatives about this. We're trying to do what's right rather than what's popular.

What the Premier was saying was that we are going to put South Australia first so that we do not have to have the pressure of some farmers in lobby groups coming to us all the time and saying, 'We need to bring in GM crops because my farm is down the road from your farm, as the local member, and we need this to happen.' That is what he was saying.

The Premier is out there all the time in regional South Australia. He introduced the country cabinets, where we go out and spend time in country communities right around this state, and he is a big backer of regional South Australia and, indeed, the agricultural sector.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** No, it does not contradict what I just said. What the Premier said is that we can do the right thing by South Australia. We will not be listening to a small group of farmers who live around where you might live, member for Hammond. We can take a holistic point of view.

We talk to farmers right across the whole state, we talk to food manufacturers right around the whole state, and we take a very strong view. It was the Premier and this cabinet who came up with South Australia's key economic priorities. One of those top key economic priorities was premium food and wine produced in our clean environment and exported to the world, so we are going to stick the distance on that.

We are absolutely going to stick the distance on premium food and wine produced in our clean environment and exported to the world because it is a very important economic priority. If we look at the carpet in this place, it has wheat and grapes. There is no other industry represented there. It is all about the agriculture, and we need to do what the politicians did here in the late 1800s with the phylloxera act, and we need to stick up for all South Australians.

**Mr PEDERICK:** In regard to the GM canola trials and seed bulking out that have been conducted in South Australia of genetically-modified canola, how many ministerial exemptions has the minister, and other Labor ministers, presided over for this since 2002, and how many hectares of genetically-modified canola have been sown in South Australia under these exemptions?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** As far as we can tell, there have been 14 exemptions allowed and eight of those are still current.

**Mr PEDERICK:** The rest of the question was: how many hectares have been sown to genetically-modified canola in that time in South Australia?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We do not have that information on us, but the information about where these exemptions are made is available on the PIRSA website. We are not trying to hide anything here. You talk about the science; we allow the researchers up at Waite to do research into genetically-modified crops.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Can you confirm, minister, that companies have bulked out genetically-modified canola like grown seed crops in South Australia?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, there have been some on small allotments. The seed can be grown here but the crop has to be destroyed. That is all under the auspices of the Gene Technology Regulator, so it is controlled.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I have a question on clause 1 as well. It relates to something I touched on in my second reading contribution around gene editing. Gene editing is when DNA is inserted, deleted or replaced in the genome. It is the next tranche of technology, if you like. Will plants that have been developed under a gene-editing regime be allowed to be grown under the extended moratorium?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The definition will be picked up from the commonwealth legislation, so that is where that will be decided.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I have a few more questions regarding the genetic modification of canola. Has the minister ever visited the Waite campus?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, I have, several times.

**Mr PEDERICK:** In regard to that, minister, have you visited the Plant Accelerator and the genetically modified side of the Plant Accelerator program?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, I have.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Regarding the final summary report from the University of Adelaide, entitled 'Identification and assessment of added-value export market opportunities for non-GMO labelled food products from South Australia' and the recommended next steps in the process, the first one is to:

Invite SA businesses interviewed as part of the study to a presentation and discussion of the findings.

Has that next step been taken?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Most of the businesses interviewed by the University of Adelaide did so on a confidential basis, so trying to get them all together has proved a bit more difficult than we would have liked. We did have an attempt at that in September but they are sort of spread out across the state and they travel quite frequently. We are still working on bringing them together, but PIRSA is working with a number of different businesses individually. We just have not had the opportunity to get them all together as a group.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I refer you to recommended next steps No. 2:

Liaise with Food SA to include the findings in industry workshops it will be conducting as part of developing their 'Growth through Innovation Strategy'.

Has that liaising been done with Food SA?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, it has. PIRSA works very closely with Food SA. I know you were at the food awards the other night and when I mentioned that I would be bringing this bill into the lower house there was a round of applause, too.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I refer to recommended next steps No. 3, which is:

Depending on sufficient industry support, provide a briefing to relevant Government Ministers on the findings and implications for Government policies and programs.

Has recommendation No. 3 been taken forward?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Yes, absolutely. All ministers were briefed on the findings of this report in September last year.

**The CHAIR:** Nearly finished, member for Hammond?

**Mr PEDERICK:** We are getting there.

**The CHAIR:** It is just that we are very broadly ranging around—

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, it is all very important.

**The CHAIR:** I am not doubting its importance.

**Mr PEDERICK:** This is all part of the report. Can you explain to the house where in the report it states that there is a benefit to all our crops and produce in South Australia being genetically-modified free?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The report looked at the global market and global trends, and it backed up what I had heard during trips to the Netherlands and the US, which was that the growth in the non-GM market at the retail end is growing much quicker than any other food sector. That is what the report was all about. I must admit that PIRSA went to the University of Adelaide and asked them to do this research. I think when they were asked to do it, the researchers involved were a little sceptical that there was going to be a big advantage in South Australia remaining non-GM. But, as the report bears out, there are great opportunities for South Australia to continue its GM-free status on behalf of all food producers in the state.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (2) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

#### *Third Reading*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (17:27):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (17:28):** I move:

That the report of the committee be adopted.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:29):** The opposition has considered a number of the matters put forward by the Standing Orders Committee. I believe that the committee gave relevant consideration to a number of issues that have been in the sessional orders for some time. It is apparent from the report, and as advised by the Speaker, that the committee took the view that it was appropriate to incorporate. This is problematic. The Speaker has written:

The Standing Orders Committee is of the view that it is now appropriate to incorporate the well-practiced Sessional Orders into Standing Orders together with an amendment to correct or clarify—

He goes on. The Speaker has made a grave grammatical error in the production of this report, which I am sure he is deeply ashamed of. I hope that he will come in to make a personal explanation as to why he has made this error that he never would have accepted from anyone else; nevertheless, the remainder of the summary is sound.

Fundamentally, the sessional orders that we have been operating under for some time are the way the parliament operates. Consideration was given to whether those things can be incorporated into the standing orders so that they are the practice of the parliament rather than the practice of the session. The opposition will be supporting these measures, but I think that it is important for the record to identify what those measures are.

The first deals with the days and times of meetings, the idea that we start the parliamentary day at 11 rather than 2pm. I believe that it is entirely appropriate. I think that the possibility of members of parliament being able to conduct business in their electorates or even, dare I say, occasionally spend time with their families in the evening is assisted by starting debates at 11 and enabling four hours of government business to take place prior to question time each week. That is sensible.

There is a change to practice in standing order 49 in that the movement of the adjournment later will see the traditional adjournment debate that would take place if the house were adjourned between 7.30 and 9.30. Previously, an adjournment debate was to take place. Now that will not take place, and that is fine. There can be an adjournment debate if the government runs out of business before 5.30. That is not unreasonable, and the opposition will support that.

The extension of the sitting of the house beyond 6pm enables the government to complete some business if it is not going to take very long past 6pm, but of course with the corollary that the house will automatically rise at 7pm. This would be playing on past the advertised stumps break that anyone who follows cricket would be familiar with. That standing order has been a sessional order for some time now and works just fine.

There are some changes to the way that private members' business is dealt with, which again puts into standing orders what has been in the sessional orders. The question arises as to the hour and a half that used to be allocated for private members' bills and the one hour for private members' motions, which I wanted in the standing orders. The sessional orders have switched that around to give extra time to private members' motions rather than private members' bills.

I should say that there was some discussion when opposition members considered this matter. The question was raised whether we should in fact be providing extra time for bills rather than for motions. The fact is that we get an enormous number of motions in this place. Sometimes they are debated at very great length indeed. Sometimes they can be passed fairly quickly, and the parliament can make a position clear on something fairly quickly. There is probably an opportunity on Thursday in private members' motions to reflect on how many we could get through in a day if we were to be concise in our comments and brief in our considerations.

The fact is, of course, we have often run out of private members' bills in the hour that is currently allocated, whereas private members' motions, from the very first day of private members' business in a parliamentary session to the end, tend to accumulate and accumulate. It is not unreasonable to have a greater amount of time for those private members' motions; therefore, the opposition will support the current practice, but hopefully we can all improve the way we make our contributions to those motions so that we can perhaps get through more.

I will move to rules applying to answers. This is the four-minute rule that, when it was introduced, was seen as something of a novel concept. This is not the only alternative time limit operational in parliaments around the world. What best practice is in relation to question time is a matter for debate in itself. The application of standing orders, the way that the debate is chaired, is as much a function of how the Speaker conducts their business as it is, indeed, the standing orders.

Speaker Atkinson, as is now, and Speaker Breuer, as I came into the parliament getting to know, have entirely different ways in the way that they conduct the house. Speaker Atkinson, occasionally warns you, sir, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, and indeed the member for Wright. I do not know why you and the member for Wright are the ones he picks on when there are so many government members who could be warned or ejected from the parliament, but the two of you seem to be the focus of his wrath.

The opposition, of course, has many people whom the Speaker would identify for chastisement during the course of debate, and that is the way that a Speaker can do it. Lyn Breuer, the member for Giles as she was, had a different approach and other Speakers have a different

approach. Other parliaments have a different approach. In Westminster, the Prime Minister will stand up and answer 100 questions in an hour, providing short, succinct, occasionally even answers, which is of course something we would like to see.

That said, in my personal view, the four-minute rule has in and of itself not been a bad thing. Sometimes it provides an end to the Dorothy Dix question that would otherwise, potentially, interminably drag on for significantly longer. It does not, of course, require that ministers provide a genuine answer, and that is something that we will do differently if the Liberal Party is elected to government.

The next standing order is in relation to what is known as the 'sin bin' and flows on from my previous comments. This standing order has been in operation for a number of years now, that somebody can be removed for up to an hour. It is really important that a Speaker of the parliament uses this standing order modestly and to assist the debate of the parliament. That said, it is an alternative to naming, which is a more severe punishment, where somebody could be out for the rest of the day.

Whether it improves behaviour or not, it has been with us and I think we are used to it, and so having it in the standing orders, rather than in the sessional orders, is not a bad thing. On balance, I think it is a modest improvement to the way the house works. But I put on notice that it is important that the house remembers the Speaker has to apply it modestly and appropriately, otherwise it could be a tool for inappropriate use by a government that was too arrogant.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to talk about the next standing order, that is, standing order 139, the suspension of a member. There have been a number of occasions when a Speaker in this house in the 7½ years that I have been here has taken the opportunity to name a member, and a range of different practices have followed. The member for MacKillop, Mitch Williams—as I will soon be able to call him in the chamber—has argued on every occasion that he has still been in the chamber to be able to do so that there should be a debate over a member's naming and the consequences that follow.

I am very pleased that this standing order clarifies what we believe has always been the case, that you can have the debate. In fact, there is some record in *Hansard* of such debates going on for hours. I am not convinced that such a debate going on for hours is necessarily to the benefit of the house in the future. I think that the people of South Australia need us to be talking more about what is in their interests and less about the value or not of a decision to remove somebody from the house. But a debate needs to be held because while that member is removed from the house their opportunity to vote on legislation and their opportunity to present the needs of their electorate is taken away from them, so it is worthy of a debate.

The Standing Orders Committee has suggested, I believe, a debate of 10 minutes on each side for that potential debate. One would hope, again going back to my earlier comments about speaking succinctly and to the point, that the points relevant could be made in that 10 minutes from either side and a decision could then be taken by the house. We will call this the 'Mitch Williams standing order', as it has been nominated very much by his arguments. I thank the Speaker for his acknowledgment that this is potentially something that could be of value to the house and to future Speakers to clarify the nature of a debate that could take place.

Proposed standing orders 216 and 217 are very much of a technical nature in relation to the delivery of messages between houses and, frankly, seem good practice. It is probably here that I would like to suggest to the future parliament that the Standing Orders Committee, under whoever the Speaker is—one way or another, it is not going to be Speaker Atkinson after the election—gives some thought to the way that this house occasionally delves not just into tradition, which is often valuable and an institution that protects us, but into anachronism.

For example, the ritual we just saw a few minutes ago and see regularly—the chairman of committees sitting down there and then standing up and saying, 'I report to the Speaker that the committee has considered the matter, etc.' and then sitting down in the chair and reports having heard himself talking to himself—is ridiculous. I do not think it actually adds dignity to the place, and I think that the Standing Orders Committee could do well to remove some of those anachronisms. There are one or two that are being done in this package, so bravo to the members of the committee.

The citizen's right of reply has been in the sessional orders for a decade. If it had caused any significant problems, we would have noticed by now, and so having it in the standing orders is not necessarily a problem. The next few are in relation to the broadcasting of proceedings. The last time we discussed the broadcasting of proceedings was when the cameras were turned on. I am sure that David Bevan is still watching, as he promised to do, every day and every minute.

**The SPEAKER:** On vacation.

**Mr GARDNER:** He is on vacation, but you can watch it on your phone, sir. You can watch it wherever you are. They do not have any excuse, and Mr Bevan does not have any excuse not to be watching.

We need some rules around the application of cameras. I am not certain that these current rules are absolutely perfect, but they work fine enough. Putting them in the standing orders for the new parliament to have ready to go from day one will present the potentially preposterous situation where we could start the parliament and not be able to turn on the cameras for the first bit until we had passed a new sessional order or a new motion to deal with how the cameras could be dealt with, so having them in the standing orders just seems sensible before the beginning of a new parliament. While I am saying that they are not necessarily perfect, I am not identifying any problem with them, just that further iterations may be developed in the years ahead.

In relation to the new chapter 31, the government has had a practice for the last couple of years of allowing parliamentary secretaries to act in some ways as ministers. That seems to have made the flow of business in the house occasionally easier when a minister has been unavailable. I do not identify any particular problems that have arisen as a result of this practice, so putting those sessional orders into the standing orders does not present any particular problem. Finally, the last set of changes is just renumbering to reflect the practice of earlier.

Sir, can I congratulate you and your Standing Orders Committee on doing some work. Once again, I draw attention to the fairly substantial grammatical error, I am afraid, that you put in your letter on the fourth paragraph—

**The SPEAKER:** Shame, shame, shame.

**Mr GARDNER:** —but I am sure that you will chastise yourself in due course. With that, the opposition supports the motion to accept the new standing orders.

**The SPEAKER (17:43):** I am most grateful for the opposition's support for putting these sessional orders into standing orders. Some of them have been there for many years, and it would seem a pity for me to leave parliament and just leave them as sessional orders since I think by long practice they had been accepted by both sides of the house.

The sin bin, the suspension for up to an hour, I think has worked well and the trade-off is the four-minute limit on ministers' answers. For most of my time here, ministers would answer at dreadful length. When I was a minister, I would sometimes take 10 minutes to answer and beat the opposition spokesman over the head for the entire time. That was an abuse because it reduced the number of questions the opposition could ask. It just wound down the clock, and that was a bad thing, so the four-minute limit and the sin bin seemed to me to be a trade-off.

The key thing is that, because the Speaker can at his or her discretion suspend someone under the sin bin, the temptation is that opposition members will be disproportionately suspended, so it is very important, at least for the appearance of balance, that members of the government be suspended from time to time, and I have found that increasingly difficult. I do not know whether the member for Morialta would agree with me, but I think about 95 per cent of the disruption in question time comes from the opposition.

**Mr Gardner:** What about the Treasurer?

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is normally on his feet in order when he is doing his disruption. I have thrown him out. He has been challenging at times, but I am not frightened of him; I am only frightened of his mother. My thinking is that most of the disruption comes from the opposition side—that is natural—and it is hard to catch many government members, especially when they are cunning, like the member for Wright, and stop on two warnings.



On the question of naming, I think that Mitch Williams was right—the member for MacKillop, I am sorry—was right and I was wrong.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn myself for using his Christian name and surname. I think it is implicit in the current standing orders that there be a debate, but sometimes, just to move things along and to stop disruption, I would rule against a debate that the apology and explanation be accepted. I recall, when in opposition, how Ralph Clarke, Frank Blevins and I would make a complete mess of the house by debating the question that an apology, an explanation, be accepted. When we had only 10 or 11 members of this house, our attitude to that procedure was, 'If you can't run it, wreck it,' and that is what we did. I am glad that it is now limited to 10 minutes on either side.

On the broadcasting rules, I wanted them in the standing orders because if disreputable parts of the media try to bring pressure on a Speaker to amend the good broadcasting rules we have, I think it is important that the house itself decide whether those measures are to be dispensed with. I thank the Liberal Party for its support and I look forward to these being entrenched in standing orders for a future generation of members.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (17:48):** I move:

That the alterations to the standing orders as adopted by this house be laid before the Governor by the Speaker for approval pursuant to section 55 of the Constitution Act 1974 with the request that His Excellency approve the alterations to take effect from the commencement of the next parliament.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (REMOTE AREA ATTENDANCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

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

No. 1. Clause 4, page 9, after line 33—Insert:

#### 77M—Review of Part

- (1) The Minister must cause a review of the operation of this Part to be conducted and a report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister.
- (2) The review and the report must be completed after the second, but before the third, anniversary of the commencement of this Part.
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of the report submitted under subsection (1) to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

## **STAMP DUTIES (FOREIGN OWNERSHIP SURCHARGE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (SUITABILITY TO HOLD LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November 2017.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:51):** I rise to speak to the Motor Vehicles (Suitability to Hold Licence) Amendment Bill and note that we are supporting this bill. I appreciate the minister and the house holding this over, as I had to have leave the other night when this was on, so I appreciate the adjournment. This bill amends the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has a longstanding discretionary power to refuse the issue or renewal of driver's licences or learner's permits or to suspend the same or to put probationary conditions on these in order to minimise risk of accident, injury or repetition of offences by a driver.

This section can apply regardless of the driver having undergone a period of disqualification in relation to offences. Ordinarily, these powers are used in exceptional circumstances to keep dangerous drivers off the road. The bill aims to enhance the registrar's powers to take action against dangerous drivers, whereas in the past these powers could only be used in relation to individuals on previously convicted or expiated offences. The criteria will be broadened to include past behaviour, indicating to the registrar that action should be taken to minimise the risk of injury or offences occurring rather than being required to consider whether the action would prevent the risk eventuating.

The bill clarifies that when the registrar determines to take action under this new provision, the overriding and pre-eminent consideration is the protection of the public, and new clause 1A is a clarification rather than a change of operation in the act that, when making decisions outside the ordinary licensing regime, the registrar should take the reasonable and responsible position of placing the greatest weight of their decision on the public's protection. The bill makes clear that the registrar should take into account any possible hardship eventuating from a decision in relation to a licence or learner's permit and that individuals affected continue to have rights of internal and external review under the act.

I appreciate the minister's office sending me through some information. I have had some offline communication with the minister about this because I saw the story in *The Advertiser*. I will declare my interest. This is about Michelle Thiele, a constituent of mine. Just to make sure I put the interest right on the board, I attended her wedding and I also worked with her on the broomrape committee. I certainly still have a bit to do with her to this day. I wanted to put that on the record. I want to make the point that Michelle contacted me in relation to this bill, and the short version of that conversation is that she is basically prepared to accept her fate. I really appreciated her making the call because what this means—and it is probably the correct decision—is that she will probably never drive again, at least not on the road anyway.

Holding a South Australian driver's licence is a privilege not a right. It is important that we all do what we can to ensure safety on our roads and take dangerous drivers off the road when necessary. These changes will ensure that road safety and the protection of the public are the paramount consideration for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles when deciding to remove someone's driver's licence. While these laws will be used only in exceptional circumstances, they will ensure that the registrar has the power to keep dangerous drivers off our roads, because dangerous drivers do ruin lives and their actions cause extraordinary pain and suffering to families and loved ones and impacts the broader community as well.

To provide a history of this, on 6 February 2001 Mrs Michelle Thiele was convicted of driving without due care following a motor vehicle crash on 26 April 2000 at the intersection of Thiele Road and Burdett Road, Pompoota, which caused the death of Mr John Mitchell. It is a road I travel quite a lot and I know the intersection well. On 10 February 2009, Mrs Thiele was convicted of a second driving without due care offence following another crash at the same intersection on 23 June 2007, which resulted in the death of Mr Graham Bryant. He was on a motorbike, and I understand that family members were following.

Mrs Thiele was disqualified from driving by the court for 18 months, from 10 February 2009 to 9 August 2010, and her licence was suspended for that period. On 27 October 2009, the Deputy Coroner released his findings following an inquest into the deaths of Mr Mitchell and Mr Bryant. In his findings, the Deputy Coroner specifically reminded the Registrar of Motor Vehicles of powers contained in section 82 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to cancel, suspend, refuse to issue or issue a licence subject to probationary or provisional conditions in order to prevent accident or injury.

On 14 July 2010, the registrar wrote to Mrs Thiele advising of the decision to cancel her driver's licence effective immediately, thus preventing Mrs Thiele from recommencing driving after the court-imposed disqualification. On 4 August 2010, Mrs Thiele lodged an application for review of the decision from the registrar, as provided under section 98Z of the Motor Vehicles Act. The review committee met on 8 December 2010 and confirmed the registrar's decision to cancel Mrs Thiele's driver's licence.

Mrs Thiele appealed the registrar's decision to the District Court. Judge Costello of the District Court upheld the appeal and substituted an order that the registrar issue Mrs Thiele a driving permit and, subsequently, a licence subject to specified conditions. The registrar appealed the decision of the District Court to the Full Supreme Court. The matter was heard on 10 April 2012 and on 4 May 2012 the judgement was handed down. The registrar's appeal was allowed and the cancellation of Mrs Thiele's driver's licence remained in place.

Although the decision to cancel Mrs Thiele's licence was upheld, Mrs Thiele was entitled to apply for a licence at any time, so on 7 January 2013 Mrs Thiele applied for a learner's permit; however, the registrar refused her application. Mrs Thiele again applied for a review of the decision, which was referred to the review committee. The review committee upheld the decision and on 25 November 2013 Mrs Thiele again lodged an appeal with the District Court.

On 30 November 2016, Judge Davison of the District Court ordered the following: the decisions of the deputy registrar and review committee be set aside, a learner's permit be issued to Mrs Thiele, Mrs Thiele successfully complete programs outlined by a motor driving instructor, Mrs Thiele be subject to such conditions as the registrar considers appropriate under the Motor Vehicles Act.

In the registrar's opinion, Mrs Thiele's ability to drive a motor vehicle was not in question, it was her lapses of concentration, inattention and complacency that presented a risk of a repeat of the offences that resulted in the other drivers' deaths. Prior to the first District Court appeal, the registrar researched the possibilities of retraining Mrs Thiele but was unable to find a program considered suitable to address Mrs Thiele's issues, that being her lack of concentration and attention to the task at hand.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.*

**Mr PEDERICK:** I thank the house for the extension. As I said, I have driven past this intersection many times and I have looked at where both these accidents happened—it is the road that leads down to the Thiele farm—and, for the life of me, it is for a simple reason that Michelle did not give way to the left. I do not know what she did. She obviously did not look, but something happened there. To have it happen once and for someone to be killed is bad enough, but to have virtually the identical accident on the same section of road and for someone else to lose their life is almost too painful to think about. I would hate to be a member of one of the families involved who lost their loved ones.

I know that Michelle would like to drive again but, after having a conversation with her a couple of weeks ago when this was tabled, and it did get opened up as a bill, she was quite prepared to take her medicine. I said, 'Two people have been killed in the same place, and it's hard to comprehend because it is one of those road rules where you just have to give way.' It is on the Karoonda side of the river on the Murray Bridge-Mannum road. If only she had taken due care there would not have been the deaths of these two gentlemen.

Michelle acknowledges the terrible tragedy that she has put on these two families who will never have their loved ones back. As I said, she is at peace with this. I was a bit intrigued when I saw it in *The Advertiser* but, as the local member and as someone who knows Michelle quite well, I

fully support the legislation and understand the intent. She is prepared to accept her medicine. With that, I close my remarks.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (18:01):** I thank the member for Hammond for his remarks. This bill is born out of the worst of circumstances, in particular, not just one fatal accident but two. It is regrettable for any government to find it necessary to take the action that we seek to take in this bill, that is, to broaden the powers of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to consider public safety in the withholding or cancellation or suspension of a driver's licence. I will not go any further into the details of what the bill seeks to do and why, because I think the member for Hammond has done quite well in outlining that.

I would like to make a couple of comments about the member for Hammond's contribution. Given that the member for Hammond has declared that this involves one of his constituents, and indeed he knows the individual who has given rise to this bill, it says a lot about the member for Hammond that he would choose to put the public interest at large across the state ahead of, in this case, what would be the interests of one of his constituents.

I thank him for navigating that very difficult situation that he finds himself in and for offering his support to the government's bill. In this circumstance, I certainly do not envy the position that the member for Hammond is in. With that comment, I thank both the member for Hammond and the opposition for their support of this bill and I commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (18:03):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:04 the house adjourned until Wednesday 29 November 2017 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***CHESSER HOUSE**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

- The refurbishment of levels 1-4 of the CBS tenancy in Chesser House proposes to improve the accommodation fit-out including public interface areas for CBS staff and visitors.
- All CBS floors will benefit from proposed new work areas that will create spaces that can be used by staff as a break out space or for collaboration.
- Whilst the majority of the loose furniture has been reused, revised planning will consolidate CBS branches and maximise access to natural light by opening up existing spaces.
- Support spaces such as open meeting areas, enclosed meeting rooms and quiet rooms are also proposed.
- New reception points are proposed for floors with external visitor access on levels 2 and 4, together with a refurbished marriage room and a suite of new mediation rooms.

**CROWN SOLICITOR**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

No payments were made to the Crown Solicitor upon her appointment to the judiciary other than for leave entitlements which had not been taken.

**CROWN SOLICITOR**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The current Crown Solicitor, Mr Mike Wait SC, was appointed for a term which will conclude on 6 November 2021. This end date is consistent with his previous employment contract.

**DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

In 2017-18, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions ('the Office') will continue to work on a number of projects that support the recommendations made in the ODPF Review.

Those projects will include:

1. The implementation of additional specialist legal teams including, but not limited to, a Pre-brief Assessment Team, with appropriate key performance indicators to measure success.
2. A pilot program for the early allocation of prosecution matters to trial counsel to determine feasibility for future implementation. In addition, predictive models using historical data will be integrated into business systems to help with resource allocation and decision making.
3. Finalisation of the management structure of the Office, including recruitment of a senior legal operational role with a particular focus upon the Solicitor's Section.

4. Feasibility study for possible use of paralegal staff in place of law clerks.
5. Implementation of a resourcing model to optimise the use of external counsel and integration with business systems to help provide real time analysis and reporting of costs.
6. Development and implementation a key legal training program 'Trial Counsel Skills'.
7. The development and implementation of key performance indicators and inclusion of real time reporting into business systems.
8. Development and documentation of processes to manage content of the 'ODPP Online Guide'.

#### FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

Based on classification and function, the current FTE cap for Forensic Science SA is broken down as follows:

| Class | Admin | Chemistry | Mortuary | Biology | Pathology | Toxicology | Total |
|-------|-------|-----------|----------|---------|-----------|------------|-------|
| ASO1  | 1.3   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 1.3   |
| ASO2  | 8.4   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 8.4   |
| ASO3  | 2.8   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 2.8   |
| ASO4  | 1.0   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 1.0   |
| ASO5  | 4.0   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 4.0   |
| ASO6  | 0.7   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 0.7   |
| ASO7  | 1.0   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 1.0   |
| MAS3  | 1.0   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 1.0   |
| SAES1 | 3.0   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 3.0   |
| TGO1  | 2.8   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 2.8   |
| TGO2  | 1.0   | 1.0       | 4.9      | 3.4     | 3.0       | 0.2        | 13.5  |
| TGO3  | 1.0   | 1.6       | -        | 7.4     | -         | 2.0        | 12.0  |
| TGO5  | 1.0   | -         | -        | -       | -         | -          | 1.0   |
| PO1   | -     | 4.8       | -        | 6.6     | -         | 2.0        | 13.4  |
| PO2   | -     | 3.0       | 1.0      | 13.1    | 1.0       | 7.0        | 25.1  |
| PO3   | -     | 5.9       | -        | 8.5     | 0.9       | 4.6        | 19.9  |
| PO4   | -     | 1.0       | -        | 4.4     | -         | 2.9        | 8.3   |
| PO5   | -     | 2.0       | -        | 1.0     | 1.0       | 1.0        | 5.0   |
| SCONF | -     | -         | -        | -       | 5.3       | -          | 5.3   |
| Total | 29.0  | 19.3      | 5.9      | 44.4    | 11.2      | 19.7       | 129.5 |

#### REBOOT PROGRAM

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The trial Reboot program was scheduled to finish in June 2017, but I have since extended it until December 2017. As at 21 August 2017, 77 young people have gone through the program and there are 14 currently engaged in the program.

#### CRIME PREVENTION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The projects listed below were awarded funding in the 2017 Crime Prevention and Community Safety and the 2017 CCTV Grants programs. Funding was provided in the 2016-17 year, with the exception of the District Council of Copper Coast CCTV grant. The council is expected to receive grant funding in the 2017-18 year.

No additional grants have been approved to date in 2017-18.

#### 2017 CRIME PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY SAFETY GRANTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| General stream   |           |
| Catalyst Foundation—The Toward A Safe Place: Raising awareness of Domestic Violence in LGBTIQ communities project                | \$90,000  |
| Davenport Community Council Inc—The Growing Strong project   | \$100,000 |
| Incompro Inc—The Youth Empowerment project   | \$96,800  |
| Plaza Youth Centre Inc—The Whyalla Aboriginal Community Early Intervention project   | \$20,000  |
| Helping Young People Achieve (HYPA) – The 'Lets Talk'—Healthy Relationships Workshops and Community Information Sessions project | \$99,308  |
| St John's Youth Services—The Nunga Café and Youth Hub project  | \$90,000  |
| YWCA Adelaide Inc—The Equipping Regional Communities to Prevent Violence Against Women project                                   | \$99,907  |
| Graffiti stream  |           |
| Alexandrina Council—Goolwa Skate Park—Graffiti Prevention through Street Art project   | \$40,000  |
| Employment Options Inc—Youth Urban Art Project   | \$49,529  |
| Keep South Australia Beautiful Inc—Stamp Out Graffiti Program  | \$50,000  |

#### 2017 CCTV GRANTS

|                                  |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|
| City of Salisbury                | \$45,000  |
| City of Tea Tree Gully           | \$25,470  |
| City of West Torrens             | \$50,000  |
| District Council of Copper Coast | \$75,730  |
| The Flinders Ranges Council      | \$51,843  |
| Town of Gawler                   | \$100,000 |

#### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

The cost of developing the FOI online form has been absorbed by the Attorney-General Department's (AGD) annual contribution to the Government's single online form platform, iApply, which is hosted by sa.gov.au.

Ongoing costs for supporting this form will be absorbed in the annual iApply licensing fees. Staff time in administering the system will be absorbed by State Records.

#### ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** Attraction, retention

and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors within Shared Services SA, Service SA and Office for the Public Sector:

a) 2015-16:

| Dept/Agency | Position Title                 | Classification | Allowance Type          | Allowance Amount | End Date   |
|-------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|
| DPC         | PROGRAM MANAGER                | ASO803         | Retention 15%           | \$16,539         | 11/12/2015 |
| DPC         | PROJECT MANAGER CHRIS21        | ASO803         | Attraction \$           | \$10,757         | 3/3/2016   |
| DPC         | SAGSSA PRINCIPAL CONTRACT MNGR | ASO803         | Retention 30%           | \$33,077         | 31/7/2017  |
| DPC         | MANAGER RETURN TO WORK SVCS    | MAS301         | Retention allowance 10% | \$11,226         |            |

Note: 2 retention allowances expired and were not renewed in 2015-16.

b) 2016-17:

| Dept/Agency | Position Title                    | Classification | Allowance Type           | Allowance Amount | End Date  |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------|
| DPC         | SAGSSA PRINCIPAL CONTRACT MANAGER | ASO803         | Attraction Allowance 30% | \$27,123         | 20/9/2017 |
| DPC         | MANAGER RETURN TO WORK SVCS       | MAS301         | Retention Allowance 10%  | \$11,507         |           |

Note: 2 retention allowances expired and were not renewed in 2016-17.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been provided the following advice:

a)

| Name of Grant Program or Fund | Balance of the Grant Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                               | 2016-17                              | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|                               | -                                    | -       | -       | -       | -       |

The Minister for the Public Sector does not administer any grant programs or funds. Details of discretionary grant payments are provided under section (e) below.

b)

| Name of Grant Program or Fund | Budgeted (or Actual) Expenditure from the Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                               | 2016-17   | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|                               | -   | -       | -       | -       | -       |

c)

| Name of Grant Program or Fund | Budgeted (or Actual) Payments from the Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                               | 2016-17  | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|                               | -  | -       | -       | -       | -       |

d)

| Name of Grant Program or Fund | Carryovers into or from the Program or Fund |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                               | 2016-17                                     | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|                               | -   | -       | -       | -       | -       |



e)

| Year    | Name of Grant Program or Fund | Value of Commitment | Beneficiary       |
|---------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 2016-17 | Discretionary Grant           | 120,000             | Connecting Up Inc |
| 2017-18 | Discretionary Grant           | 120,000             | Connecting Up Inc |
| 2018-19 | Discretionary Grant           | 120,000             | Connecting Up Inc |
| 2019-20 | Nil                           |                     |                   |
| 2020-21 | Nil                           |                     |                   |

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

Workforce data as at June 2017 is currently being compiled by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment and is not yet available for release.

Updated data will be published on the Office for the Public Sector website when it is finalised.

While the number of executives in the general government sector did increase slightly in 2015-16, the number (1,140) at June 2016 represents 1.15% of the total general government sector workforce and is lower than all years from June 2010 to June 2014.

#### JOBS4YOUTH PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

1. The total program cost, per trainee, including expenditure by the Office for the Public Sector and participating agencies is, on average, \$43,372.

This comprises:

- salary of \$31,852 (the average of the trainee wage scale)
- on-costs of \$6370
- program fee of \$5150 paid to the Office for the Public Sector which covers recruitment, training, support and mentoring.

2. The total program cost, per graduate, is higher due to the higher average salary of a graduate. The total cost per graduate is, on average, \$68,639.

This comprises:

- salary of \$52,908 (the average of the AS02 wage scale)
- on-costs of \$10,581
- program fee of \$5150 paid to the Office for the Public Sector which covers recruitment, training, support and mentoring.

I have been advised that these Jobs4Youth Program costs are accurate at 25 August 2017.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

Since 1 January 2017, there have been two chief executives employed under part 6 of the *Public Sector Act 2009* (SA) that have had their contracts of employment renewed. Both contracts of employment were renewed for a three year period.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

1. In 2016-17 Service SA Customer Service Centres served 956,028 customers, with an average wait time of 8 minutes and 45 seconds.

The Service SA (telephone) contact centre received 810,756 calls, with an average wait time of 4 minutes and 7 seconds and an average call handling time of 5 minutes and 21 seconds.

2. In 2016-17 there were a total of 5,029,057 transactions conducted online. Of these 3,722,384 were payments transactions, accounting for 61.8% of the total payment transactions.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

The 2017 financial year actual operating costs for Service SA Customer Service Centres was \$23.357 million. This figure includes staff salaries, all accommodation costs, security costs and general administration expenditure.

The average operating cost is \$1,167,850 per Service SA Customer Service Centre.

The average full-time equivalent (FTE) staff in each Service SA Customer Service Centre is 8.7.

During 2016-17 estimates briefings Service SA reported 324.6 FTE, which includes corporate overheads. During this period Service SA acquired an additional 16.3 staff from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) with service delivery functions, and an additional 2 FTE related to the 'Rip it Up' online forms initiative. The Service SA FTE budget for 2017-18, including corporate overheads, is 338.6 FTE.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

The mySA GOV account is a rebrand of the existing EzyReg Account, with some authentication components added to support the mySA GOV app. These components have no additional licence charges.

Implementation costs were limited to the development work to add these components, which was undertaken by internal Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure resources. The operating expenses, which are managed from within existing budget, are estimated at \$20,000 per annum. Both the implementation and operating expenses are managed by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

The costs associated with the redesign for sa.gov.au were:

- \$58,000 for design, analysis and specification
- \$87,890 for testing and implementation
- \$16,830 for project management.

This project was funded from within existing Department of the Premier and Cabinet resources.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

Service SA changed its customer service centre operating hours on Wednesdays to 9.30am to 5pm, from Wednesday, 4 June 2014 to provide a dedicated time for staff to undergo regular training and become acquainted with changes to systems, policies, processes and services.

Customers received three months' notice of the change through notices in service centres and a website update.

In May 2017, Service SA commenced a trial to extend the operating hours of two metropolitan centres (Elizabeth and Marion) to 6pm, Monday to Friday.

The aim was primarily to assist school students wishing to sit driver's licence learner theory tests after school hours. It also enables increased access for customers wishing to complete their transactions after 5pm. The change was made in response to customer feedback.

This change was accommodated through voluntary staff movements and neutral impact on budget. Customer demand has been moderate.

Service SA will conduct an evaluation of the trial in early 2018, following six months of operation. This will inform decisions about the future of extended hours of operation, and whether this should be introduced in other locations.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

System controls are in place for the mySA GOV account and app to identify security breaches. These controls have been informed by third-party security audits.

There have been no known breaches of mySA GOV.

#### SERVICE SA

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**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):** I have been advised:

170 staff within Shared Services SA will relocate to Port Adelaide in the first instance, from the Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable and Financial Operations and Reform business units. The total number for staff in these business units is 240. It is planned that the remaining 70 staff will relocate at an appropriate time in the future.

The balance of Shared Services SA staff remaining in the Adelaide CBD is 523. This is comprised of the 70 staff referred to above, Payroll Services and the Business Systems and Performance business units.

#### METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse):** I am advised:

In 2016-17, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service (MFS) had a revised expenditure budget of \$137.4 million. As published in the 2016-17 audited financial statements, the MFS's total expenses were \$135.5 million. This is a favourable variance of \$1.8 million and includes revaluations for annual leave, long service leave and workers compensation (\$5.7 million net favourable).

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**

Note: the response below covers the whole of the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, including portfolios of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Forests and Regional Development.

a) Primary Industries and Regions

| Year    | No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities | Employment Expense |
|---------|---|--------------------|
| 2016-17 | 15.4  | \$1.583 million    |

## b) Primary Industry and Regions

| Year    | No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities | Estimated Employment Expense |
|---------|---|------------------------------|
| 2017-18 | 15.4  | \$1.620 million              |
| 2018-19 | 14.4  | \$1.518 million              |
| 2019-20 | 14.4  | \$1.541 million              |
| 2020-21 | 14.4  | \$1.564 million              |

## c)

## i. (Response to be provided by Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Comms)

|  |
|--|
| Total Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2016-17 |
|  |

## ii. Primary Industries and Regions SA

|   |
|---|
| Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18 |
| \$299,000   |

**BUDGET EXPENDITURE**

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government):**

I have been advised:

\$110,000 of the \$590,000 2015-16 supplies and services expense relates to:

- \$38,000 employment agency contractors and service contractors
- \$25,000 records management costs
- \$16,000 communications and sponsorship
- \$13,000 Crown Solicitor Office's expenses
- \$7,000 services provided by PIRSA
- \$6,000 travel and motor vehicle expenses, and
- \$5,000 other office supplies and minor office management costs.