

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 29 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

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: FROM THE PADDOCK TO THE PLATE: A FAIR RETURN FOR PRODUCERS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:02): I move:

That the 97th report of the committee, entitled 'From the paddock to the plate: a fair return for producers', be noted.

In November 2016, the Economic and Finance Committee resolved to investigate whether our primary producers were supplying competitively to retailers. Through this inquiry, the committee received 17 submissions and heard evidence from 36 witnesses across seven hearings. One of these hearings was also held in the Barossa Council chambers—indeed, I am surprised you were not there, Mr Speaker.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: A rare day off. In addition to this, representatives from the committee attended two conferences pertinent to the inquiry. The first was the 2017 Farming Together National Forum, and the second was the Supermarket Power Symposium organised by the University of Melbourne Law School. The aim of this inquiry was to consider and report on the economic development of our producers across South Australia's agriculture, horticulture and viticulture sectors.

Because of the vital role these sectors play in the state's economic and social development, the committee used a unique two-limbed approach to carry out its investigations. This approach gave stakeholders the chance to steer the committee towards inquiring into specific and topical areas of interest. The committee then tabled an issues paper which identified five key issues for the inquiry. The second stage of this inquiry involved gathering evidence from those directly involved from those directly affected in the associated industries.

Some key themes explored included barriers to preventing producers from entering large supply chains, inequitable bargaining power, production costs, and relevant federal codes of conduct and current grain supply chain issues. In considering these key issues, the committee has made a total of 13 recommendations. Some of these recommendations relate to government departments increasing and strengthening the promotion of services they currently offer to primary producers so that those producers are directly aware of the tools and resources available to them.

The committee also recommends that the functions of the Small Business Commissioner be expanded to include an advice unit. This unit is to offer primary producers the ability to seek confidential advice on offers of agreement as to whether the terms of agreement are fair. During the inquiry, the committee also heard about the important role the cooperative business model can have in addressing the imbalance of power that affects some primary producers and how it can help producers enter larger supply chains.

That said, the committee received evidence indicating that this important business model is underpromoted. The committee recommends that this issue be addressed by adding information to the 'Starting a business' section of the South Australian government website about the benefits of agricultural cooperatives. Furthermore, the committee also recommended that relevant government departments ensure that funding grants do not prejudice the cooperative business model.

This inquiry and its two-limbed approach provided a valuable opportunity for stakeholders to highlight their issues and concerns about the current structure and operation of our state's agricultural, horticultural and viticultural supply chains. It therefore facilitated an important dialogue amongst interested stakeholders, aggrieved parties and the committee. On behalf of the committee, I express my appreciation to all those interested parties who provided submissions and oral evidence. I particularly thank those stakeholders who travelled considerable distances to appear before the committee.

I would like first of all to thank the members of the Economic and Finance Committee, of course—the member for Wright, the member for Colton, the member for Davenport and the member for Hartley—and I want to make special mention of the members for Light and Schubert. The member for Light instigated this inquiry. It is an area of great passion for him and many of his constituents. In a sense, he drove this inquiry. He certainly instigated it. I make special mention of the member for Schubert, too, who ensured that this inquiry, unlike some others, was largely bipartisan and very well facilitated. It was a model inquiry in that sense.

The member for Schubert ensured that it was a very bipartisan approach. He also facilitated some of the site visits, and he and the member for Light both facilitated many of the stakeholders who appeared before us, making it an altogether valuable inquiry. I particularly want to thank the staff, since this is the last report of this committee, perhaps forever—who knows? Certainly, it is for this parliament. I want to thank the staff, particularly Lisa Baxter, the executive officer, for her tireless work, her excellent advice, her procedural advice, her advice in terms of organising inquiries, her advice and support generally and her support of the various research officers who come and go.

In this instance, I also want to thank the research officer, Peta Spyrou, who has gone on to bigger and better things, thankfully. As I have said in this place before, she contributed such an excellent report. She translated exactly what the committee wanted, under the guidance of Lisa Baxter, and provided us with what I have said in this place, and I will say it again, is probably the best report I have seen as a chair of any committee.

While I have plenty of time, I want to reflect briefly on the work of the committee, particularly on an inquiry I was particularly proud of, the labour hire inquiry. I am yet to check the *Hansard*, but I am led to believe that the other place passed some important legislation yesterday.

The Hon. S.W. Key: Yes, they did.

Mr ODENWALDER: They did—excellent. Two years ago, the Economic and Finance Committee embarked on an inquiry into the labour hire industry. The report has been tabled, and I am really pleased to say that that report, with plenty of input from the union movement and other interested parties, has resulted in some good legislative change in this state. Certainly, those members of the committee who agreed with the primary report hope that it eventually translates into a federal system that can finally put an end to some of the inequities in the labour hire industry. I want to make quick mention of that. With those few words, I commend the report to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:08): I rise to support the 97th report of the Economic and Finance Committee, entitled 'From the paddock to the plate: a fair return for producers'. As a primary producer, even though I have had my property leased out for 13 years, I am very keen to see fair returns for primary producers like myself, who basically want a fair return for their toil, their sweat, sometimes their blood and sometimes their tears out in the field in whatever primary production setting they are in. Whether it is dryland agriculture, irrigated agriculture, horticulture, intensive animal keeping or animal breeding of any sense, farmers do a fantastic job in our state and country in bringing many billions of dollars annually into our economy. These are old numbers, but it is said that one in five people works in agriculture and I think it is probably more than that in the broader scheme of things.

It gets interesting, as time goes on, when we talk about fairness and equity to primary producers because we get the effects of some of the major supermarket chains trying to put downward pressure on what the primary producers get. It is not just primary producers, it is their suppliers, who may be the middle-tier suppliers between the primary producers and the end sale, and so that trickles right down to those people at the primary production end.

There has been a bit of media lately in relation to Laucke Foods and their CWA scone mix, which goes a long way in supporting the CWA and associated charities and an ongoing debate that Lauckes are having with the Woolworths supermarket chain in regard to getting a fair price for their product. Laucke's are a value-add company, and they have said, quite rightly, that the cost of production is far too high and one of the main costs is the high power prices. From what I understand, they were asking for just a 7 per cent change in the price they were getting, but Woolworths were denying this. The simple fact is, as Laucke's know, there is not much sense producing something at a loss. Mind you, that can happen quite often in the primary production sense. I note the reaction from the member for MacKillop.

Notwithstanding natural impacts like frost, drought, salinity issues and a whole range of issues that can impact primary producers and force them to run at a loss—and obviously that is not sustainable in the longer term—the resilience of primary producers and farmers shine through. If you are not resilient, you will not make it. Sure, occasionally you get a nice profit year, but too many times there can be those really tough years when you are not making money or not making much at all.

These days, there is the huge cost of inputs; for example, machinery on a dryland farming enterprise. You would be up for several million dollars if you wanted to buy all new machinery for your operation, with a harvester's list price heading towards \$1 million, large tractors around \$300,000 or so and large sprayers up to \$400,000. Equipment is getting more and more expensive.

Even in the animal industries, getting in stock right now is not simple and that is because there has been a bit of a resurgence in the price for sheep and cattle producers. That has been a good thing. Certainly with sheep, wool prices are at pretty good levels at the moment. From what producers are telling me, certainly with some of the input costs, including power and water to name a couple, were it not for the high prices they would not make it.

It is interesting when some of the people who run our abattoirs say that it is pretty tight. That is where you get this paddock-to-plate conundrum to a degree because abattoirs like Thomas Foods and JBS in MacKillop would be getting squeezed by people putting their produce on their supermarket shelves saying, 'No, we are only going to pay you so much.'

I can understand why the margin for the middle men, as far as abattoir owners are concerned, is not where they would like it to be. In fact, they have said the farmers are having a win. I said, 'That is good, but, as they have said from that level, we would like to take the bumps out.' I think farmers would like to see that as well. Certainly, that is not something you can do in an open market. I appreciate that, but it does create those market fluctuations where on one side of the argument the producer might be doing well, but the value-adder might not be doing as well.

This is where it gets down to the simple fact that supermarket chains and others really need to appreciate the value of primary production because it gets to the stage where you have these people who are doing this excellent value-add being told, 'We're only going to pay you so much.' They say, 'If you want the quality, we have to do this, or we have to do that.' With everything they have to comply with—whether it is taking a River Murray allocation or obviously being compliant with EPA legislation and production matters—it can be pretty tough. It can be pretty tight.

I would like to commend all our primary producers. Stick to it. Certainly, most of the dryland farmers are having a reasonable harvest. It is nowhere near the big one last year at about 10 million tonnes. It was a bit of an up and down year for a lot of people, and we note that there has been some really heavy rain lately. I know that over at the member for Flinders' area there have been some really big rains. Some people who do not know say, 'You must like the rain.' Well, not at this time of the year.

It destroys value in crops and not just value; it knocks the weight out of the grain so that you do not get the same weight per hectare you would have had before a large rain. It can certainly knock the value down by \$70 a tonne easily at times. I have seen it myself when I was cropping. I know farmers at the moment are picking between the high moisture days and those warm days. They would have been going full tilt yesterday and also today getting as much harvest off as they can and into those receival areas. I commend the report and commend our state's primary producers.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:17): I stand to speak in support of the motion to note the report. At the outset, I would like to thank the members of the committee. I would also like to thank the staff of the committee, who did a wonderful job in bringing the report together. I would also like to acknowledge my Labor caucus members, who supported the inquiry when I put the suggestion to them. The Labor caucus members supported me in having the inquiry.

I would also like to thank the Labor caucus for supporting the farm machinery inquiry some years ago and also the franchise law reform inquiry. Why are they important? Because those two reports led to the Small Business Commissioner Act being introduced by the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, which a Labor caucus, a Labor Party and a Labor government brought into existence. It was the government that actually recognised that we need not only to support small business but to recognise that farming communities and farmers are small business and that they deserve support from independent people who can support them, and this report does that.

This report builds on those two earlier reports in the sense that it takes it to the next step and looks at the more macro issues and the issues around lack of competition in the industry at the retail level and the impact that it is having on small businesses, which are farmers and primary producers, whether they are in horticulture, agriculture or viticulture. In fact, I initiated the inquiry as a result of people in the wine industry, market gardeners, who came and spoke to me about the difficulties they were having with big retailers and getting contracts honoured and how often the retailers were able to unilaterally change contracts and they were powerless to act.

This report is no accident. The report is called 'From paddock to the plate: a fair return for producers'. The focus of this report is actually about making sure that, while we obviously want to keep prices down, we need to understand that, to have a viable primary production sector, they need to get a fair return on their investment to keep them sustainable. The report recommends a range of measures to correct the huge power imbalance that exists between producers and the big retailers in Australia. In fact that issue has come up in the media just recently, in the last couple of weeks. I will touch upon that in terms of Laucke foods, now one of the latest producers in the food processing area that has found the big retailers difficult to deal with.

The committee heard evidence from a range of producers and industry associations, and a common theme was that the producers often accepted breaches in contracts by retailers, fearing that their contracts would be terminated if they lodged a complaint. We heard evidence of that. The committee has recommended that the Small Business Commissioner receive additional funding and powers to provide an advice unit. This would allow primary producers to lodge offers of agreement with the unit on a confidential basis and to obtain advice on whether the terms of the agreement are fair. That is a constant theme of this report—to ensure that there is fairness in the sector.

The committee heard from a number of witnesses, some in confidence, who provided examples where terms and conditions of contracts were unilaterally changed by the big retailers. The problem currently experienced by local food producers like Laucke and others epitomises what is happening in the marketplace. I would have to acknowledge that the long-term answer to some of these issues is getting greater competition in the marketplace at the retail level.

We need more retailers. We need more exports so the producers have more options to sell their product to, but in the short term—because that will not happen quickly—I think there is an urgent need for government intervention to ensure that small businesses are going to survive. The power imbalance between producers and retailers is huge and real and exists today. It impacts on the viability of our producers every day.

Many witnesses were critical of the current federal regulation, the grocery code of conduct, which imposes greater restrictions on producers and wholesalers but not on all the retailers. There is an absence of federal government leadership, and this is another example where we as a state can show leadership. We did once before with our franchise law reform where there was action taken by this parliament and bills in this parliament that led the federal government to have fairer laws in the franchising area.

In the absence of federal government leadership, the committee recommends that the South Australian government should institute a state-based mandatory code or add to the regulations within the Small Business Commissioner's current jurisdiction. That proposal would fill the gap between the

horticulture code of conduct and the grocery code of conduct. We heard evidence from the markets, the market people who operate as wholesale market people who said, yes, they would support the state government acting to fill the gap between the existing codes in the absence of any federal intervention.

In the same vein, we have done that in the labour hire area. The committee recommended that, in the absence of federal leadership in that area to protect workers, the state government should act. I acknowledge that it is probably not the best thing to do, for the state government to act, but in the absence of appropriate action by the federal government I think states have a moral obligation to intervene and act accordingly.

The committee also recommends that the South Australian government website include information about how cooperatives can help producers operate in larger supply chains. We heard evidence as a committee that one way of dealing with the retailers is for producers to form cooperatives, like they used to do in the old days in the rural sector—to form cooperatives together. They actually would have more bargaining power through those cooperatives and reduce the huge power imbalance that exists.

This is not by government regulation. What we need to do is to ensure that the framework exists for cooperatives to exist and to make sure that cooperatives are treated no differently from companies and that there is a capacity for cooperatives to exist and to be supported, because they support fairness in the marketplace.

The committee also recommends that the relevant government departments conduct audits of the relevant legislative instruments and grant programs to determine whether cooperatives are considered equal candidates through the application process. Evidence was given to the committee that cooperatives were not seen as equal partners, as models for operating businesses. They certainly are equal partners. The committee recommends that any barriers to cooperatives in the grant application process be removed.

The report also cites evidence from primary producers in the Barossa region that some of the current planning and development laws, regulations and policies act as a barrier to the growth of artisan food and wine businesses in key tourism and primary production areas. In the same way that we changed the framework for small bars and venues in the city, which gave rise to a whole range of new businesses, job employment and growth, the same thing could happen in the Barossa, McLaren Vale and Clare Valley.

I know that one of the new ministers who worked on the simplified regulation heard evidence in Gawler some time ago from businesspeople who said that we need to remove some of the barriers to get the right development but get development that will create smaller scale industry and build jobs and activity in those regions. In my view, those small artisan businesses offer real opportunities for business growth and new jobs in key tourism areas without detracting from the character of those areas. I was also pleased to see that the committee recommended that the planning minister undertake a review of those regulations to ensure that takes place.

In the time I have remaining, I would like to say that it has been a privilege to sit on this committee and deal with issues that are important to our community, both in rural communities and the businesses in those areas. I would like to repeat and reaffirm that we often hear from people and we are often criticised on this side of the house by people who say that we do not understand regional South Australia, that we do not understand small business. But if you look at all the major reforms in the last 12 years I have been here, they have been initiated by a Labor government, by the Labor caucus.

In fact, the farm machinery inquiry was opposed by the Liberal Party. The Small Business Commissioner Act, which farmers now use to support them, was opposed by the Liberal Party. So, when it comes to creating fairness in the sector, fairness in society and fairness in business, it is this government, the Labor Party, the Labor caucus, which have acted to ensure everyone gets a fair go. I support the report.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:27): Unfortunately, I have not had an opportunity to read fully this report but—

The Hon. P. Caica: What are you going to talk about, then?

Mr WILLIAMS: I said I have not had the opportunity to read it fully, Paul, but I will—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just want to remind members of Speaker Bishop's ruling on audible laughter—no laughing. This is a serious place.

Mr WILLIAMS: This is a serious matter, Madam Deputy Speaker. I remind the member for Light that it was his government that closed down the barley board here in South Australia. It is one thing for this government to stand up now and talk about how wonderful cooperatives would be when to my mind—I vigorously opposed the matter at the time—one of the best cooperatives we had in South Australia was the barley board which managed the sale of barley on behalf of growers across the state. We saw at a national level the same demise of the wheat board.

Fortunately for our growers, we have not had a particularly bad time since the demise of those two boards, but I suspect that the day will come when farmers will be calling out for governments around the nation to re-establish those sorts of marketing organisations to support smaller farmers. Having been a farmer for the vast majority of my life, growing up on a farm and owning and operating a farming business, I think I probably have as much knowledge in this area as anybody in this place.

I am very well aware of the economics of the farmers and the very competitive position they find themselves in the marketplace, which means that the price elasticity on their side, on the supply side, is much greater than it is on the demand side. I am very well aware of the fundamentals of the economics of it, that there are many, many producers right across all the commodity ranges and relatively few buyers. That obviously gives an imbalance in the power between the buyers and the producers or sellers. Notwithstanding that, I suspect this committee has missed the mark.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I have read the recommendations, Paul, and I have read quite a bit of the report. I said I have not completely read it. Let me go through some of the recommendations. One is that there be more frequent funding grants at smaller values available to primary producers. You are not going to save the primary industry sector in South Australia by giving a few farmers a grant. In fact, all you are going to do is extend the pain in many cases. My experience—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my right!

Mr WILLIAMS: My experience is that most often when governments give monetary handouts, they miss the target. Most often those who least need it and least deserve it get the handouts, and those who possibly are much more deserving and in much more need battle on and fall by the wayside.

A case in point—and I raised this in the house a couple of years ago—is how this government gave \$2 million to Treasury Wine Estates supposedly because they were providing an extra 32 jobs in the Barossa Valley for a new facility they built. At the same time, they laid off 11 people in Coonawarra in my electorate, and I think it was 23 in McLaren Vale—a net loss of two jobs across the whole of South Australia. That is the sort of nonsense we get when we seek to bolster industries by handing out grants. We do not know the full picture and all we do is take money from viable producers, in this case in the agriculture sector, and hand it to those who either do not need it or in the worst case are going to remain unviable.

As Kevin Foley and Mike Rann argued before the 2002 election, let's get industry off the teat of government through government grants and handouts. This government has done a complete about-face on that particular issue over the past 16 years, a complete about-face. I agree with what Mike Rann and Kevin Foley argued way back then, 17 years ago. I agree with that and I think they were on the right track.

Of course, this government changed its position dramatically. Recommendation 6 says the committee recommends that Primary Industries and Regions SA and associated agencies establish formal partnerships with the state's agricultural bureaus. It is this government that cast the ag bureaus aside. Agricultural bureaus, for nearly 100 years, had a direct relationship with the

Minister for Agriculture. They were direct advisers to the Minister for Agriculture, and it has been this government that has broken the nexus between the ag bureaus and the government, the minister of the day, yet now we see a recommendation such as this. Maybe the recommendation should read, 'Hell, we got that one wrong.'

There is a recommendation that talks about planning restrictions and the impacts that they have on primary industry. I have been fighting for a very long time to have the fire regulations changed when they apply to buildings outside built-up areas. I have relayed this in the house previously. There was a farmer in Keith in the Upper South-East who was producing high-quality export hay, who wanted to build and contract it to build three large hay sheds on his farm at a total cost of purchasing and construction of about \$120,000 or \$130,000 a pop. Then the local council knocked on his door and said, 'By the way, you have to put in standing water supply in case there is a fire.' These are sheds out in the middle of a paddock. The water supply was going to cost another \$50,000 or \$60,000 per shed—an absolute nonsense.

Yet this government has done nothing to address that. They made some small changes in regard to chicken sheds in the Murraylands where a Queensland investor threatened to pull out of a project there and the government came on board and made some changes, but they have not made those changes anywhere near far and wide enough to satisfy the needs of the farming community across South Australia.

Recommendation 13 relates to the South Australian bulk grain export supply chain costs. My only comment on that particular recommendation is: what do you do to help people who fail to help themselves? The grain farmers of South Australia were the proud owners of one of the best grain handling systems anywhere in the world. They were the owners and operators of it, and somebody waved a cheque in front of them and they took the cash and ran. Now they are coming back to government asking for some support. That is why, as a practising farmer, I question very seriously some of the outcomes of the work of this particular committee.

Laucke's have been mentioned. Of course, case in point: power prices. As much as this government might try to walk away from their involvement in the creation of the highest power prices and the least reliable power delivery system in the world, all the blame rests right at the feet of this government.

We have seen incredible increases in emergency services levies in this state under this government. Most of those cost increases have fallen on the farming community because it is a property-based tax. In my electorate alone we are talking millions and millions of dollars. It is the same for natural resources management levies: millions and millions of dollars have been extracted from the farming community in my electorate. These are real issues that have real impact on the viability of farmers and my constituents. There is no mention of either of those matters in this particular report. I think the committee has missed the mark on those two at least.

While talking about the emergency services levy, why did the government, in the lease of the forests in the South-East, leave it open for OneFortyOne Plantations to apply to have the whole of those forests regarded as one primary production enterprise under the Emergency Services Levy Funding Act, and therefore instead of paying something like \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year are now paying a couple of hundred?

Time expired.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:37): I suggest that it is a good time that the member's time has expired. In reality, for the life of me I should not be surprised, but I do not know how you can speak like the member for MacKillop just did on the report claiming that we missed the point of the report without having read it, or having just a cursory look over the recommendations. Had the member for MacKillop actually read the report, he would have seen those recommendations in context—not what he thinks they mean. Notwithstanding that, it was a good effort to talk for—

Mr Williams: Good try, Paul.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, it's true. It was a good effort to talk for as long as—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: It was a good effort to talk for as long as you did without knowing anything about what you were talking about.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Deputy Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet. Sit down. I have the book out now and I will start calling members to order. I cannot hear what the member for Colton is saying. I would like to extend to all members the courtesy of silence while they speak to the house. Member for Colton.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Unlike the member for MacKillop, who has not read the report, I have, but I am not going to talk too much about the report. I commend the report to the house and stand by its recommendations. What I can say is that I have enjoyed these last four years on the Economic and Finance Committee. I think we have done some exceptional work and I think this report is another piece of evidence about the exceptional work we have done.

Going back to the NBN report that we did before that—even before this term, the report that we presented on taxation in this state—the NBN report of course highlighted a lot of issues that are now, I expect, being raised by many constituents throughout the electorate offices in South Australia because we highlighted where there were going to be some problems and where what was being proposed to be delivered would not be able to be delivered. So I have enjoyed that very much.

This was another very good report, which I know the committee got its teeth into. We spoke to many people within the primary industry sector and got a greater understanding of not only what their needs were but, more importantly, the encumbrances that were an impediment to them being able to meet their own needs. That is detailed within the report as well. Some simple little things can be done to enhance the way in which those people in primary industries carry on their business.

Since the time that I was the agriculture minister, and even before, I have said that the young people and not so young people standing at bus stop 28 to catch the bus into town, who come into the city to do their work, are generally not aware of the importance of primary industry to our state's economy. A lot is said about mining. I have no problems with mining, but mining is boom and bust. If you get things right, agriculture and primary industry will be an underpinning significant plank in our economy today, tomorrow and well into the future. I think it was a report that was necessary.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I beg your pardon? Wind it up, did you say?

Mr Odenwalder: No, the opposite: keep going.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Okay. I was a bit confused there, which is not unusual, but I will keep going for a little bit longer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only for a moment.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Confused for a moment; that is true. Quite often within this parliament, the reality is that the role of committees is underestimated by the government of the day. I guess I was no different when I was in the executive: here comes another report. What is it going to do? It is going to collect dust. I think it is important for the parliament as a whole to continue to back the role that committees play and the assistance that those committees can provide to the executive government of the day in regard to the inquiries that they undertake.

Of course, we have committees that have statutory responsibilities and they will continue beyond the next term. I do not want to get on the bandwagon about what the committee structure might look like next year when parliament resumes because I will not be here, but I still will care what they look like because they have a significant and prominent role to play. I think some work needs to be done in such a way that the parliament and all those who make up the parliament have a good look at how committees can be restructured in the future to not only meet their statutory obligations but fulfil their significant role in advising parliament on any decisions it might make.

I think I can wind up soon because someone else has come who is going to speak, even though we are all always here. Getting back to this particular report, this was a good report and I think it was a good report. My mum used to say that self-praise is no recommendation. However, unlike the member for MacKillop, who has not read it and says it is a bad report, those who do read the report will say, 'You have done some good work here,' and I am proud to have been a member of a committee that has done that good work.

In conclusion, I want to thank my fellow members of the committee. The Presiding Member, amongst others, has done an excellent job of managing the committee. Most of the projects we have done have been undertaken with bipartisan support across the committee table, and that is a good thing. I want to finish off by thanking and congratulating our committee staff. They have been as good as any I have worked with, and I thank you all for it, not just for this report but for all the reports we have done in my time on the committee. I think that you are great assets to this parliament and the role that you fulfil is a role that assists not only committee members but the parliament as a whole to be a better parliament than it would otherwise be without your input, so thank you.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:43): I rise to speak to the 'Paddock to the plate: a fair return for producers' report conducted by the Economic and Finance Committee. I was gladly surprised when the member for Light came and proposed terms of reference in this way to help look at an issue that is very important to South Australia. We know that our agriculture and food manufacturing industries are the largest employers in South Australia. They employ one in five South Australians. Happily, that is more than the level of people employed in the Public Service in South Australia. For us to help unlock the potential of this industry is extremely important.

We undertook to take evidence right across South Australia to understand and get at the heart of what roadblocks there are in the way of helping us to get better returns for producers and also for manufacturers. I want to pick up on three of the recommendations. The first of those is in relation to greater partnerships and coordination with the state agricultural bureaus.

When we were out in the Barossa and had a day's hearings in the Barossa Council chamber, a number of the agricultural bureaus came to speak to us and they were quite frank about the issues they were facing. Energy costs was an issue they talked about quite strongly, and they showed their frustration about the current energy situation and how that is impacting upon their business. Some of the dollars they were talking about where I am sure hurting the ability of their businesses to operate and grow.

But certainly our state's agricultural bureaus are an important part of helping us to grow, modernise and advance agriculture in South Australia. It is a body primarily set up to help improve and look at innovation in the production and growing of food for consumption, and they do a great job. They get out and apprise themselves of what is going on in the world, so to look at having greater interaction with agricultural bureaus is extremely important.

The second recommendation is around planning restrictions. The phrase 'right to farm' gets bandied around in this place quite a lot, and I know that it gets bandied around in the council quite a lot. It is very difficult at times to understand what that means. One would consider that farmers have the right to farm. They are producing billions and billions of dollars a year worth of X farmgate value; they are able to farm.

To try to get into the specifics of the concerns of a number of farmers, many of whom exist in my community, I think the central way we can and should define 'right to farm'—and those who feel that their right to farm is under threat—is due to planning and mixed-use considerations: for example, where there are competing agricultural and farming systems that do not really work together. That is certainly an issue anywhere where you have broadacre and horticulture sitting by side—by horticulture, most predominantly viticulture.

The two competing systems do not always work well together, whether that be burn-offs that the broadacre farmers do from time to time—which is not advantageous and is potentially dangerous towards grapegrowers—and, by the same token, some spraying that grapegrowers undertake that may damage broadacre farmers' crops, and spraying also undertaken by broadacre farmers that may damage grapegrowers' crops. That is an issue that needs to be dealt with, and it is something in an evolving space.

I look at the work that Biosecurity SA has done. I also look at, especially in the Barossa Council area, the way that they have tried to advance new planning decisions to help take account of these things with the use of buffer zones and screening, essentially to try to find a planning solution. There are broader planning issues. We know in the Barossa that if you want to set up a cellar door, that is okay, and if you want to set up a tourism venture, that is okay. But as soon as you want to set up a retail outlet selling the food you grow on your farm, that becomes a lot more difficult from a planning perspective.

To set up small-scale production that value-adds your on-farm produce also has some difficulties. That is why I am glad that, even though this is a majority government committee, the committee was mature enough to talk about the fact that there are current planning restrictions that place an undue burden on farmers. We need to preserve their right to farm so that they can continue to grow the produce that helps to deliver export dollars into South Australia. If we are lucky enough to win next year, it is something that I will certainly be pushing hard for, because I think that my community in the Barossa is at the coalface of growing residential development butting up against broadacre farming, butting up against viticultural operations.

We need to find ways to make these all work in harmony and that there is greater understanding between the different groups and greater acceptance that we live in a broader community that needs to be mindful of what others are doing in and around that community. So I very much support recommendation 8, as it seeks to highlight and give voice to an issue that has frustrated many in the farming community for a long time. The last recommendation I want to talk about is in relation to the grocery code of conduct. I note that the recommendation is worded in such a way as to be as soft as possible, and I certainly supported that. Recommendation 9:

...suggests that [a] statutory review of the Grocery Code of Conduct, to be conducted at the request of the responsible Commonwealth Minister in 2018, should consider recommending that the Code be mandatory in nature.

I think this is about as soft a way to put a recommendation. I am happy to support it in this context. It is written in a very sympathetic and soft manner because what we are talking about is a huge dilemma in that we know that there are issues around major supermarkets not always dealing fairly with their suppliers. The ACCC has undertaken some very significant investigations that have resulted in multimillion-dollar fines against major supermarkets. We want that problem to be fixed because markets are not always perfect, especially in the grocery sector where there is a concentration of power that leads to an imbalance of power, and it is always the smaller player in that negotiation that comes under fire.

As a community, we want to get to the right answer whilst still preserving the rights of businesses to undertake vigorous negotiations to deliver the best value produce at the cheapest price for its customers. A mandatory code of conduct in and of itself goes to a step that Australians have not been willing to go to up until this point. The idea of trying to have a court decide where the line is between fair and vigorous negotiation and undue market influence is a very fine line to achieve and one that I think is quite difficult.

Essentially, what we are trying to express through this report is that there is still an issue there, that there is still an imbalance of power and that it needs to be dealt with and fixed. A mandatory code of conduct for the grocery industry is a very extreme step, but we have to look at all options on the table. We need to keep applying pressure on those who exert or have the lion's share of the bargaining power in any two-way negotiation. They need to be responsible. We are watching them and watching their conduct and, if we see that there is a further misuse of power, we may have to go to a stage where we talk about contemplating a very draconian step.

We want to make sure that our food industry grows and prospers. It is extremely important that that happens. I look at South Australia and I look at Foodland, for instance. Foodland is a great supporter of South Australian produce. I believe that one of the key reasons we have as strong a food industry in South Australia as we do is that we have a grocery supermarket chain that has been willing to support local producers to help them to develop economies of scale, which helps them to tackle other markets, such as dealing with other major supermarkets and also growing markets interstate and then growing markets overseas.

The reason I know this works is that I spent 20 years of my life before coming in here doing just that with the family business. It is why this report is so important and why I am happy to support it. I look forward to a better way of operating for our food industry into the future so that we can grow and gain more of those desperately needed jobs for our state.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:53): I want to thank the house and the whips this morning for their forbearance and their indulgence in allowing us to bring this matter forward. It was a pleasure to be part of the preparation of this report and this inquiry.

First of all, I want to mention the staff again. I will not embarrass them any further, but it has been an absolute pleasure working with them over the last four years. As I said before, we always receive an excellent report and excellent support from the staff. I want to thank members for their contributions today. I want to thank all the members of the committee, particularly the member for Schubert, as I said before, who has ensured that, unlike some other inquiries, this has been quite a bipartisan exercise and one that I think has yielded some pretty good fruit as a result.

In closing, I mention again the member for Light, who is an excellent local member. He drove this inquiry and he puts lie, as he alluded to in slightly stronger terms, to the idea sometimes put forward by the other side that we on this side do not represent the interests of rural and regional South Australia. We do, the member for Light particularly does—he has been doing it for the last 12 years, day in and day out—and he has been a major driver of this report and I commend it to the house.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:55): I move:

That the 11th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2016-17, be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I move:

That the 29th report of the committee, entitled 'Briefing report: work health and safety concerns related to the home care and support of South Australians with a disability and elderly South Australians', be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:56): By leave, I move:

That the 577th report of the committee, entitled 'Enhancement to Narnungga (Park 25) in the West Parklands Precinct, between West Terrace and the rail corridor, Adelaide', be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 578th report of the committee, entitled 'Flinders Link project: extension of the Tonsley rail to Flinders Medical Centre', be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 579th report of the committee, entitled 'Port Adelaide renewal project: waterfront land release, north west and fletcher's slip', be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 580th report of the committee, entitled 'Port Adelaide renewal project: waterfront land release, Dock one and port approach south', be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 581st report of the committee, entitled Oaklands Crossing Grade Separation Project, be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 582nd report of the committee, entitled Port Dock Railway Line Project, be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 584th report of the committee, entitled Riverine Recovery Wetlands Phase 2 Infrastructure, be noted.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:58): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled 'Review of report of Legislative Review Committee into the partial defence provocation', be noted.

I do note that this is an ongoing process. The Attorney-General was right on top of it. Provocation is a complicated area of law and, hopefully, one day we will resolve it to everyone's satisfaction. I commend the report.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:58): By leave, I move:

That the 583rd report of the committee, entitled Operations Control Centre Relocation Project, be noted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA: By leave, I move:

That the 585th report of the committee, entitled 'Metro trunk mains renewal: Silks Gorge Road project', be noted.

Motion carried.

Bills

LABOUR HIRE LICENSING BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 2, page 3, line 7—

Delete 'a day to be fixed by proclamation' and substitute '1 March 2018'

No. 2. New clause, page 4, after line 15—After line 15 insert:

4A—Registered group training organisation exempt from application of Act

(1) This Act does not apply in respect of a registered group training organisation to the extent that the organisation supplies apprentices or trainees to do work for other persons.

(2) In this section—

registered group training organisation means a group training organisation registered in South Australia on the Group Training Organisation National Register maintained by the Commonwealth.

No. 3. Clause 5, page 5, after line 7—After the definition of *premises* insert '*provider*—see section 6(1);'

No. 4. Clause 5, page 5, line 32 [clause 5, definition of *substitute responsible person*]—

Delete the definition and substitute:

substitute responsible person means a person appointed as a substitute responsible person under section 27 or section 27A;

No. 5. Clause 6, page 5, lines 35 to 36 [clause 6(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) A person (a *provider*) provides *labour hire services* if, in the course of conducting a business, the person supplies, to another person, a worker to do work in and as part of a business or commercial undertaking of the other person.

Note—

See section 7 for the limited definition of *worker*.

Note—

The definition of labour hire services is mainly directed at engagement arrangements generally referred to in industry as 'on-hire' but also includes other engagement arrangements that (unless exempted in accordance with this Act) satisfy the requirements of this section because the nature or structure of the engagement or arrangement involves a worker being supplied in circumstances where the provider has a pre-existing agreement with the worker under which the provider may, from time to time and at the provider's discretion, send the worker to work in another person's business or commercial undertaking but be paid by the provider for the work.

Examples—

Guy runs a plumbing business and has an employment contract with Tracey under which Tracey is paid to come to work each day at the plumbing business and be assigned work. Corey runs a grape growing business at which there is a problem with the plumbing. Corey enters into a contract with Guy to diagnose and fix the problem at the business and so Guy sends Tracey to Corey's grape growing business to do the work. Guy does not provide labour hire services in sending Tracey to do work at Corey's business.

Richard runs a manufacturing business for which he requires a production worker to work on the production line assembling components. Amy has a pre-existing arrangement with Steve under which Amy may, from time to time and at Amy's discretion, send Steve to do work for other persons for which Steve will be paid by Amy. Richard enters into a contract with Amy under which Amy will supply Steve to Richard to perform the work in the manufacturing business. Amy provides labour hire services in supplying Steve to do work at and as part of Richard's business.

- (1a) The regulations may prescribe circumstances in which a person does not, despite subsection (1), provide labour hire services for the purposes of this Act.

No. 6. Clause 7, page 6, lines 21 to 24 [clause 7(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) An individual is a *worker* for a provider if the individual enters into an arrangement with the provider under which—
- (a) the provider may supply, to another person, the individual to do work; and
- (b) the provider is obliged to pay the individual, in whole or part, for the work.

No. 7. Clause 9, page 6, line 38 [clause 9(1)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

- (a) the person's character including, for example, the person's honesty, integrity and professionalism;

No. 8. Clause 9, page 7, lines 7 to 9 [clause 9(1)(e)]—Delete paragraph (e) and substitute:

- (e) in the case of a natural person—
- (i) whether the person has sufficient business knowledge, experience and skills for the purpose of properly carrying on business under the licence; and
- (ii) whether the person has previously been the director of a body corporate that has previously held a licence under this Act or a corresponding law and whether such a licence was suspended or cancelled;

- No. 9. Clause 10, page 9, line 15 [clause 10(1), penalty provision, (a)]—
Delete '5 years' and substitute '3 years'
- No. 10. Clause 11, page 9, line 26 [clause 11(1), penalty provision, (a)]—
Delete '5 years' and substitute '3 years'
- No. 11. Clause 12, page 9, line 37 [clause 12, penalty provision, (a)]—
Delete '5 years' and substitute '3 years'
- No. 12. Clause 14, page 10, line 31 [clause 14(4)(a)]—After 'cancelled' insert 'under section 21'
- No. 13. Clause 15, page 11, after line 20 [clause 15(1)]—After paragraph (a) insert:
(ab) a person nominated to be a responsible person for the purposes of the licence is not a fit and proper person to be a responsible person; or
- No. 14. Clause 15, page 11, line 26 [clause 15(2)(b)]—Delete '28' and substitute '14'
- No. 15. Clause 16, page 12, line 9 [clause 16(1)]—Delete 'may' and substitute 'must'
- No. 16. Clause 16, page 12, line 14 [clause 16(1)(a)(ii)]—Delete '; or' and substitute '; and'
- No. 17. New clause, page 13, after line 7—After clause 17 insert:
17A—Prohibition on licence transfer, sale etc.
The holder of a licence must not transfer, sell, dispose of, lend or hire out the licence to another person.
Maximum penalty: \$25,000 or imprisonment for 1 year.
- No. 18. Clause 24, page 17, lines 2 to 9—Delete the clause and substitute:
24—Requirements for responsible persons
A responsible person, for a licence, must be an individual who—
(a) is responsible for the day-to-day management and operation of the business to which the licence relates; and
(b) is a fit and proper person to be a responsible person; and
(c) satisfies any other requirements prescribed by regulation.
- No. 19. Clause 26, page 17, lines 19 to 21 [clause 26(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:
(2) An application under subsection (1) must be accompanied by—
(a) the information required by the Commissioner to determine the application; and
(b) the prescribed fee.
- No. 20. Clause 26, page 17, lines 22 to 23 [clause 26(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:
(3) The Commissioner may approve the application if—
(a) the Commissioner has complied with the requirements of section 27B; and
(b) the Commissioner is satisfied that the proposed appointee is suitable for appointment as a responsible person.
- No. 21. Clause 27, page 17, line 34 [clause 27(2)]—
After 'appointment of a person under subsection (1)' insert '(but in any case within 7 days)'
- No. 22. Clause 27, page 17, after line 36—After subclause (2) insert:
(2a) The holder of a licence must, on providing notice to the Commissioner under subsection (2), pay to the Commissioner the prescribed fee.
- No. 23. Clause 27, page 17, lines 37 to 38 [clause 27(3)]—Delete subsection (3) and substitute:
(3) The Commissioner may cancel the appointment of a person under subsection (1) if satisfied that—
(a) the person is not a fit and proper person to be a responsible person; or
(b) the licence holder has failed to pay the fee under subsection (2a) in accordance with that subsection.

No. 24. New clauses, page 18, after line 12—After clause 27 insert:

27A—Appointment of substitute responsible person by Commissioner on application

- (1) If a responsible person for a licence will be absent from the business to which the licence relates for a period of more than 30 days the Commissioner may, on application by the holder of the licence, appoint another individual as a *substitute responsible person* in respect of the licence for the period of that absence.
- (2) An application under subsection (1) must be accompanied by enough information about the person proposed to be appointed to enable the Commissioner to decide whether the person is suitable for appointment as a substitute responsible person.
- (3) The Commissioner may only appoint a person as a substitute responsible person under this section if—
 - (a) the Commissioner has complied with the requirements of section 27B; and
 - (b) the Commissioner is satisfied that the person is suitable for appointment as a responsible person.
- (4) If the Commissioner approves the application, the Commissioner must update the register to record the change to the licence details.

27B—Objection to appointment of responsible person or substitute responsible person

- (1) If the Commissioner receives an application to which this section applies, the Commissioner must cause notice of the application to be published on a website determined by the Commissioner.
- (2) A designated entity may, in response to a notice published under subsection (1) in respect of an application and by notice in writing, lodge with the Commissioner an objection to the application on the grounds that the person proposed to be appointed as a responsible person, or as a substitute responsible person, is not a fit and proper person to be a responsible person.
- (3) A notice of objection under subsection (2) must—
 - (a) state reasons for the objection; and
 - (b) be made within 14 days of notice of the application being published under subsection (1).
- (4) If the Commissioner receives a notice of objection under subsection (2) in respect of an application, the Commissioner must—
 - (a) forward a copy of the notice of objection to the person making the application as soon as reasonably practicable after receiving the notice; and
 - (b) allow a period of 14 days from the date of forwarding the notice for the applicant to respond to the notice of objection.
- (5) If a notice of objection has been lodged under subsection (2) in respect of an application—
 - (a) the Commissioner must not grant the application unless the Commissioner has taken into account the objection and the response of the applicant to the objection (if any); and
 - (b) if the Commissioner grants the application, the Commissioner must give notice of the grant to the designated entity that lodged the notice of objection.
- (6) This section applies to the following applications:
 - (a) an application under section 26(1)(b) to appoint another individual as a responsible person for a licence;
 - (b) an application under section 27A(1) to appoint an individual as a substitute responsible person.
- (7) In this section—

designated entity has the same meaning as in section 15.

No. 25. Clause 28, page 18, line 20 [clause 28(1)(c)]—After '27' insert 'or 27A'

No. 26. Clause 30, page 19, lines 32 to 33 [clause 30(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) The Commissioner may, by instrument, appoint any of the following as an authorised officer for the purposes of this Act:
 - (a) a public sector employee under the *Public Sector Act 2009*;
 - (b) the holder of a statutory office;
 - (c) a person who is appointed as an authorised officer or inspector under a corresponding law;
 - (d) a person in a prescribed class of persons.

No. 27. Clause 32, page 20, line 31 [clause 32(1)]—Delete 'For the purposes' and substitute:

Subject to subsection (1a), for the purposes

No. 28. Clause 32, page 21, after line 8—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) The following powers may only be exercised with the authority of a warrant issued by a magistrate:
 - (a) the power to enter and search—
 - (i) premises that are not, or that are not reasonably suspected of being, a workplace; or
 - (ii) any part of a workplace that is used only for residential purposes;
 - (b) the power to stop, enter and search a vessel or vehicle that is not a workplace;
 - (c) the powers under subsection (1)(c) and (i), insofar as they relate to items or things found in a vessel or vehicle that is not a workplace or in premises that are not, or are not reasonably suspected of being, a workplace,

(and the requirement for a power under subsection (1) to be exercised at a reasonable time does not apply if the power is exercised under the authority of, and in accordance with, a warrant).

No. 29. Clause 32, page 21, after line 14—After subclause (3) insert:

- (4) In this section—
workplace has the same meaning as in the Work Health and Safety Act 2012.

No. 30. Clause 34, page 21, line 30—After 'authorised officer' insert:

, or a person assisting an authorised officer,

No. 31. Clause 38, page 22, lines 37 to 38 [clause 38(1)(b)]—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) a decision under section 17 to impose a condition on, or vary a condition of, a licence held by the person (including a condition imposed on the grant of the licence);

No. 32. Clause 38, page 23, after line 4 [clause 38(1)]—After paragraph (e) insert:

- (f) a refusal to extend the appointment of a person as a substitute responsible person under section 27(6);
- (g) a refusal to appoint a person as a substitute responsible person under section 27A.

No. 33. New clause, page 25, after line 19—After clause 43 insert:

43A—Advertisements to include licence number

The holder of a licence must not publish, or cause to be published, an advertisement relating to the provision of labour hire services unless the advertisement specifies, alongside the name or contact details of the holder of the licence, the licence number preceded by the letters 'LHS'.

Maximum penalty: \$2,500.

No. 34. Clause 44, page 25, lines 20 to 40—Delete the clause

No. 35. Clause 45, page 26, lines 26 to 27 [clause 45(4)]—Delete subsection (4) and substitute:

- (4) This section does not apply in relation to a prosecution for a contravention of section 10.

No. 36. New clause, page 28, after line 12—After clause 48 insert:

49—Review of Act

- (1) The Minister must cause a review of the operation of this Act to be conducted and a report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister.
- (2) The review and report must be completed as soon as reasonably practicable after the third anniversary of the commencement of this Act (but in any event within 6 months after that commencement).
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Because of the fortuitous circumstances in here presently, I am going to be very quick.

The CHAIR: Everyone says that and then they are not.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We will be accepting all of the amendments. I thank all of those people who have participated in the process. There was a great deal of contribution here. We have accepted amendments elsewhere after consultation and this will mean that dodgy operators in the labour hire business are going to find life a lot more difficult. It means that honest employers, who are interested in paying people and managing people in a way that is safe, will be supported and will not face unfair competition from crooks. I thank the people upstairs for supporting this, and I accept the amendments.

Motion carried.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION LAW REFORM (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND RELATED AMENDMENTS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXTREMIST MATERIAL) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXPLOSIVES) BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. New clause, page 5, after line 20—After clause 5 insert:

5A—Review

- (1) The Attorney-General must undertake a review of the operation and effectiveness of the amendments effected by this Part.
- (2) The review required under this section must commence not later than 3 years after the commencement of this Part.
- (3) The Attorney-General must prepare a report based on the review and must, within 12 sitting days after the report is prepared, cause copies of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

No. 2. Clause 6, page 8, after line 4—After inserted section 72E insert:

72F—Annual report on explosives powers

The following information must be included in the annual report of the Commissioner under section 75 of the *Police Act 1998* (other than in the year in which this section comes into operation):

- (a) the number of occasions on which the search powers under section 72D were exercised during the period to which the report relates; and
- (b) the number of occasions on which property was seized as a result of the exercise of those search powers and the nature of the property seized; and
- (c) whether any persons were charged with explosives offences (within the meaning of section 72D) in connection with the exercise of those search powers; and
- (d) any other information requested by the Minister.

No. 3. New clause, page 8, after clause 6—After clause 6 insert:

6A—Review

- (1) The Attorney-General must undertake a review of the operation and effectiveness of the amendments effected by this Part.
- (2) The review required under this section must commence not later than 3 years after the commencement of this Part.
- (3) The Attorney-General must prepare a report based on the review and must, within 12 sitting days after the report is prepared, cause copies of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Because we are having such a rollicking good time today, I am going to be very brief and say that I indicate that we will be accepting the amendments from the other place. I will also say that I do not want to jinx this, but if the other place continues to function as it has been functioning for the last 24 hours, I, for one, will applaud that because it is such a refreshing and stimulating—

Mr Pengilly: Don't issue the challenge.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I won't. Sorry, I withdraw everything I just said. I think the member for Finniss makes a very good point. Hansard, can you please delete every word I just said about that because I do not want them to respond in a contrary fashion? I love the amendments.

The CHAIR: You are agreeing with them?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November 2107.)

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:05): The opposition rises to support the bill. The bill covers a number of different areas. Some may say they are minor changes; there are some that are major changes. In summary, the bill increases the subsuming period for camera-detected offences of unregistered vehicles from when the first camera offence fine is issued and before the second one may be issued from seven to 14 days.

I think most members of parliament would have had people coming to see them, particularly since the stickers that reminded people when their registration was to be renewed were discontinued. They may be regular commuters going past a fixed-point camera site, they may not be aware that

their car is unregistered and they then go through a camera that detects that they are unregistered. Just like the so-called efficiencies that Australia Post has undertaken in recent years, where we do not know how long it takes now to send a letter, the period has gone out from seven days to 14 days before you can be pinged again for driving an unregistered vehicle to give the driver more time to receive the expiration notice in the mail and realise that their vehicle is unregistered.

Certainly in my experience, people are devastated when they find out that their vehicle is unregistered. With the number of people who have come into the office with this problem in Unley, I think they are more embarrassed about the fact that they were driving an unregistered vehicle than they are about the penalty they have to pay. So this fixes that issue that we as local members have been dealing with for quite some time.

The bill also ensures driver's licence suspension periods do not count towards minimum period requirements for holding a driver's licence or learner's permit and also that interstate and potentially overseas licence suspensions are also acted on. Again, it is just tightening up that process. Police will be able to withdraw a period of licence disqualification issued in error rather than having to go back to the court. Again, this is one that I think many local members of parliament would deal with on a regular basis. Also, the courts will be able to backdate a period of licence disqualification to the commencement of any applicable period of an immediate licence loss.

For offences detected by a safety camera, section 79B of the Road Traffic Act will be amended to simplify the process for drivers to nominate another person as the driver of the vehicle by doing away with the requirement to make a nomination using a statutory declaration. Again this is a process that obviously will make that easier; however, it increases the penalties for anybody who uses that system to make a false claim or provide false information to \$25,000 or four years' imprisonment.

It also tends to encourage corporate bodies, which in the past have been quite happy to pay the fine and not identify the driver to save on demerit points. It will also encourage those corporate bodies to nominate the offending drivers as opposed to paying the corporate fee because the penalty will now be five times the expiration amount rather than the current expiration amount plus \$300 or \$600. For some of those very large fines of \$400-odd, the fine for not identifying the driver is closer to \$2,000.

I think it will encourage a lot of people, who are responsible for that vehicle but were not driving at the time but know who was, to nominate the driver more often. The whole idea of penalties for traffic offences is about making our roads safer, making people accountable for their actions on the road and making sure they understand and obey speed limits, traffic lights and other safety measures that are put on the road to make our roads safer.

The Road Traffic Act will also be amended to allow for the towing of light vehicles left unattended on prescribed roads in breach of a clearway, a bus lane or a bike lane. This will be done by private contractors to a nearby convenient street, and the registered owner will be charged for the towing cost, which the government has said is approximately \$180 plus the expiration notice. I understand that this is a practice that happens in other states. I witnessed it on a trip to Melbourne a few years ago.

We were having a cup of coffee in the CBD area, and I think at about 3 o'clock the clearway kicked in. At about five past three, it was noticed that there was still a vehicle parked in the clearway and the vehicle was dragged up onto a flat top. The total operation took about five minutes, and the clearway was then free for drivers to use. Obviously, Unley, for example, is an area where clearways are very important.

Unfortunately, until this amendment bill was brought to the parliament, the only option was for a fine to be placed on the windscreen of a vehicle by police, but it did not do anything to alleviate the bottleneck the parked vehicle in the clearway had caused. This will see a much better outcome and I think it will also force people to be more aware of where clearways are. I suspect that more attention will be paid to clearways as we continue to see more traffic in Adelaide in particular.

I have a concern with this section of the bill. I am not sure it will happen that often, but I think it may happen occasionally. People in my electorate will be particularly affected by this because a

number of clearways run through my electorate, and there is a lot of strip shopping, and that tends to lead people to breach the clearway time. I know it would concern residents in my electorate of Unley if a vehicle were left in the street for a prolonged period of time and they had to wait for the owner to collect it. I am sure that it would also be a similar concern for members in the electorates of Dunstan and Bragg and the seat of Adelaide.

In some circumstances, for example a convertible vehicle which cannot be locked, there is a provision that the vehicle be taken to the security of a tow-truck yard, and signage will be changed to reflect the new arrangements with the necessary contact numbers. If the vehicle cannot be secured, in my understanding of this bill, the expectation is that the car will be taken elsewhere and the driver will be notified as to where they can collect it.

The last thing the bill addresses is changes for local governments. This has been initiated by the Adelaide city council for a new section of the Road Traffic Act which will enable councils to set their own expiation fees for certain parking offences, being able to fix fees lower or at the same rate accepted by the state government. In other words, they cannot increase them higher than the gazetted amount, but they can certainly set them lower.

We saw some media recently with the Adelaide city council issuing a statement that they were keen to look at reducing the amount that they must collect in traffic fines. I think they are seeing that as a way of making it more attractive to come into the city more often. If people make a mistake, the penalty is not quite as bitter, if you like, as the fees that are there now. With those comments, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (12:17): I thank the member for Unley. I apologise to him that I was not here for the full course of his comments.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am sure I did. I appreciate his collaborative approach to this bill and his words of support about this. Although there are a range of measures within this bill, I think it is readily apparent the sorts of benefits which the community is likely to receive as a result of its passage, so 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) (12:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (12:18): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Bills, Orders of the Day Nos 12 and 18, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Thursday 30 November, to take precedence over Government Business forthwith.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Bills***NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY (PROHIBITION) (PUBLIC MONEY) AMENDMENT
(2017) BILL***Second Reading*

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (12:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

In April 2016, the Parliament amended section 13 of the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000. Section 13 read:

'Despite any other Act or law to the contrary, no public money may be appropriated, expended or advanced to any person for the purpose of encouraging or financing any activity associated with the construction or operation of a nuclear waste storage facility in this State.'

The amendment made by Parliament re-numbered the existing provision as subsection (1) and provided a new clarification of the extent of the prohibition as subsection (2). The clarification reads:

'Subsection (1) does not prohibit the appropriation, expenditure or advancement to a person of public money for the purpose of encouraging or financing community consultation or debate on the desirability or otherwise of constructing or operating a nuclear waste storage facility in this State.'

The Private Members Bill, as introduced by Hon Mark Parnell MLC in the other place, re-instated the Act to its pre-2016 state by deleting this clarification. He did so on the grounds that the provision was no longer necessary since the Royal Commission, Citizens' Jury and Community Advice & Response Agency processes were completed.

The Government introduced an amendment to replace current section 13(2) and state that the ban in section 13(1) on public money being appropriated, expended or advanced will 'not prohibit the appropriation, expenditure or advancement to a person of public money for the purpose of financing the maintenance or sharing of information or to enable the State to engage with other jurisdictions'.

The amendment ensures that integrity of information is maintained over time and that records are accessible; that government is able to share information and be responsive to the community and stakeholders, including in other jurisdictions; that consideration is given to the diversity of perspectives within the community and their needs; and that public value will continue to be delivered from the nuclear fuel cycle royal commission and community consultation process and outcomes.

As those amendments were accepted by the Legislative Council, the Government commends the Bill to the House.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:21): I rise to speak on the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition)(Public Money) Amendment Bill 2017. I am the lead speaker for the opposition, but I will not be keeping the house too long. I think this will go fairly smoothly, but I would like to put a few things on the record. This is a bill that came first to the other place. It was brought forward by the Hon. Mark Parnell, and it is essentially in response to a bill which went through both houses many months ago—I do not remember exactly, but certainly more than a year—which had a direct effect upon the state government's desire to import high-level radioactive waste from overseas.

The way the law was set out was that not only at that point in time (and still is I should say) was it illegal in South Australia to develop a nuclear waste storage facility of any type but it was also illegal to spend any public money on developing one. So the government, which was already deep into consultation—it had already funded a royal commission to look into this and already had public servants working on it—realised that they had probably better try to catch up, close the loop and get the law changed so that they were entitled to spend public money on that sort of work.

The opposition supported that change because we believed that to have a frank, thorough and open look at that issue it would be necessary to spend some public money on it, so we certainly supported that. That then enabled all that to be done and, of course, we are at where we are at now, with the reality that that effort is not going to be pursued any longer. The state Labor government was and probably still is extremely keen on importing toxic radioactive high-level waste from overseas and bringing it into South Australia for permanent storage.

The opposition opposed that position, and we opposed that position for several reasons. One was that the citizens' jury, which was established by the government to gauge public opinion, and which the government fully expected would support the proposal, actually opposed the proposal. Putting aside for a second the merits of how that citizens' jury was run, the reality is that it had very close to a two-thirds opposition to the process.

Through the parliamentary select committee, which looked into this issue, we discovered from evidence given to us that it would require approximately \$600 million of taxpayers' money just to get to the decision stage. That was not to build anything, to do anything or to take any affirmative action if it was the case that affirmative action was recommended. It was \$600 million just to get to the point of making a decision on whether or not to proceed.

If the state got to that stage, then there was going to be a massive investment required—in the billions of dollars—to start the process of storing nuclear waste: importing, storing temporarily, going through different phases through to permanent storage. The state did not have that money, so it would have been necessary for the state to import the waste and take up-front payment before the final storage solution was developed. That was the only way that the state could have afforded to do it.

The other option was to spend the money to develop the final storage solution, then take the waste and the payment for the storage later on, but of course the state could not afford to do that. We then got to the stage where the Premier said, 'If it gets the nod and it looks like we want to do it, I will run a referendum on whether or not we should proceed.' Most referendums fail. The Premier then said, 'If the referendum happens to get up, then Aboriginal people will have a right of veto.'

So the citizens' jury said, no, that the state does not have \$600 million just to get to the decision-making point, that the state does not have the billions of dollars required to fully develop the final storage solution before receiving an income, and I do not believe anybody in the public would have been comfortable with the idea of taking the waste onto our shores and the up-front payment before having the final storage solution clearly planned, clearly articulated and clearly implemented. I think it was very unlikely that a referendum would have got up and I think it was very unlikely that Aboriginal people would not have used that right of veto.

On that last point, there is a range of opinions within the Aboriginal community on this topic. I think it is fair to say that most Aboriginal people oppose this, but not everybody. As I say regularly, Aboriginal people are just as entitled to have a range of opinions within their community as non-Aboriginal people are, of course. It is important to recognise that Aboriginal people have a range of views on this, but I think it is also true to say that most Aboriginal people—at least most Aboriginal people who have spoken out—are in opposition to this.

If you go through all those steps—\$600 million, citizens' jury, Aboriginal veto, a referendum, trying to find the money to build a solution and so on—it actually was just not going to happen anytime soon, so the Liberal Party said, 'We do not support continuing the process when we know it will not happen anytime soon.' The Premier then said, 'Okay, it's a dead duck for now.'

Let me also say that nothing I have said so far and nothing I believe has anything to do with a concern about our capacity to actually store the waste responsibly. I believe that South Australia, given the appropriate funding and given the appropriate time, could access the right scientific and engineering information, knowledge and skills that would be required to do this job properly. I am not saying that the job could not be done. I am saying that the job was never actually going to get done anytime soon. It was just impossible to do it.

I would also like to put on the record my appreciation for the work former governor Kevin Scarce did in leading the royal commission. I know that he would have been very disappointed with where this topic ended up, but I also know that he put in an enormous amount of work, which he did in a very open-minded and objective way. He kept his personal opinions in the background, whatever they may have been, but he went about this work in an extremely professional way. The fact that, in the end, both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party decided not to proceed is no reflection whatsoever on the work that he did.

When all that was all wrapped up, the Hon. Mark Parnell in the other place quite understandably brought forward a bill to say, 'Right, let's undo what was done previously by the

parliament to allow public money to be spent on this effort.' It is quite sensible, quite natural and quite understandable that the Hon. Mark Parnell, representing the Greens, would want that to happen. The reason that that is very relevant is not only because of the particular beliefs of the Hon. Mark Parnell but also because, at the moment, the federal government is undertaking an investigation into whether it is possible to have a low-level nuclear waste storage facility, with the potential for some medium-level waste as well, somewhere in Australia. They are currently short-listing and investigating three possible sites in South Australia: two near Kimba and one near Hawker.

I think this process should be allowed to continue. I think we should all just take a breath, sit back and let the local communities get their views well and truly sorted out. Let them participate in the federal process and let us see where they land before any of us make a decision on this issue. We certainly support the amended bill that has come back to this house from the other place.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:31): I rise to make a few comments on this bill. It will not be a surprise to anyone in the house that I am disappointed with the result of the discussion we had on the proposal for a nuclear spent fuel storage facility. I am disappointed that we could not continue that discussion. I acknowledge the point that the member for Stuart made, that nothing was going to happen soon, but no-one ever suggested that it would happen quickly. It was always expected to take a significant amount of time, so the excuse to not continue the discussion rings a bit hollow. Be that as it may, it is dead, it is finished and it is done, and that is the way it is.

Those of us who supported the idea are disappointed and those of us who opposed the idea are happy, and we move on to the next discussion. But there are a number of people who contributed a lot of work to this proposal, particularly, as the member for Stuart already mentioned, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, commissioner of the royal commission, who certainly did a lot of work. I would like to congratulate him on the quality of the work that was done in that royal commission. It was a very political debate, and that is not surprising—it should be expected that this would be a political debate—but the suggestion that he was somehow biased was, in my opinion, deeply unfair.

I think Kevin was certainly not opposed to the idea; I think he was fairly neutral. Regardless of his personal views, he certainly conducted himself in a very thorough and, I think, impartial way. I very much enjoyed reading the report. It was surprisingly very readable for a royal commission report. It contained a lot of information. It was very well thought out and very well structured, and I think the economic case behind it was very solid. The member for Stuart is right that it did—and it especially came out in the parliamentary committee, of which I was member—talk about the need for \$600 million up front, and possibly an even higher figure.

What the member for Stuart has not talked about is the fact that some of that could be defrayed by getting other countries to contribute, or in fact the NECG report, which was the economic report looking into the economic report of the royal commission, suggested a way that it might be done cheaply and with less risk in allowing you to make a decision much more quickly. There is no point rehashing the details in any great way, but there is a huge amount of work that went into the royal commission. There was a huge amount of work that went into the citizens' jury. The contributions made by those who put together the citizens' jury, who appeared as witnesses, and those who participated in the citizens' jury should all be acknowledged. They certainly gave it their best efforts. They went in there and gave it thorough consideration, and I thank them for that.

I thank everybody who participated in the wider consultation process right around the state. It was probably one of the largest consultation processes the state has seen. It was heartening to see so many people participate, so I thank those who undertook that consultation and those who participated in it. Finally, I thank my fellow members of the committee, the parliamentary select committee in this matter, who were part of the investigation. It was an enjoyable committee to be on, despite the way it ended. It was certainly a very enlightening committee. A lot of information was taken on. Even though I thought I knew a lot about it, I certainly learned a lot as that process went on.

I note that there is still a discussion to be had about a low-level waste repository. I think that is a really important discussion not only for our state, with the amount of low-level waste that sits around in South Australia, but for the country. This is a matter that we as a country and as a state need to resolve. It is not difficult. It is more difficult politically than it is technically. One of the

interesting things to come out of the select committee was that there was very little focus on the safety aspect. Almost everyone agreed that burying nuclear waste, or spent fuel, was the appropriate solution, and it was really just a matter of where that was located.

No-one seriously questioned the safety of the handling of the waste. No-one seriously questioned the technical ability to handle the spent fuel. It happens every day all around the world, and there was no serious technical challenge to our ability to do that. Ironically, it came down to a discussion about economics. I certainly did not expect that when I went into the process. I certainly did not expect that there would be much criticism of the economics. It looked like an open-and-shut case to me on the economics, but that is where it ended up. I think that there were positions there that were grossly misrepresented but, be that as it may, we are still here.

Again, I commend the bill to the house. I thank the people who were involved, especially Kevin Scarce, and I look forward to contributing in some way to the debate and decision around low-level waste in the future.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (STATE PLANNING POLICY)
(BIODIVERSITY) AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I have very few remarks to make on this other than to say that this bill from a member in another place, the Hon. Mark Parnell, largely came out of a report undertaken by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, of which I am the Chair. We investigated the state of biodiversity in South Australia. Again, there was another thorough report. We were very well assisted in that. One of the points made in the report was that, when undertaking planning decisions especially, we do not have a biodiversity assessment component in the planning acts.

There are two acts at the moment, neither of which have some sort of formal recognition or assessment of biodiversity. This bill intends to include that. I think it is a good idea. The biggest single contributor to the destruction of wildlife is the destruction of habitat, and the biggest single contributor to the destruction of habitat is humans and the way we interact with the landscape, particularly the way we build cities, towns and farms. It is a good idea to take into account the impact we might have when we are dealing with planning. I think the bill is timely and I commend it to the house.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:39): Similarly to the member for Newland, I will make only very brief remarks on the bill. Like the member for Newland said, biodiversity can be significantly impacted by the consequences of development. I understand that it may have been an intention, when planning laws went through this parliament last year, that biodiversity be canvassed as part of those reforms.

For one reason or another that did not occur and so the member from the other place, the Hon. Mark Parnell, has made a suggestion to both houses that we look at a biodiversity component being embedded into the legislation. That is something that my side of the house is happy to support today. I think we have to be careful that the legislation itself does not become an example of green tape. Some of my colleagues have raised the fact that it could become green tape and bureaucracy, which would slow down worthy development processes. We hope that in the implementation of this legislation, should it pass today, that will be taken into consideration and an appropriate balance attained. With those brief remarks, I commend the legislation to the house.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:41): Thank you ma'am. I am happy to leave it there and I thank the member for Bright for his contribution.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:42): I move without notice:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Other Motions, Order of the Day No. 32, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Thursday 30 November, to take precedence over Government Business forthwith.

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.

Resolutions

WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Consideration of message 223 from the Legislative Council:

1. That this council—
 - (a) notes that it is in the best interests of South Australia for the commonwealth water portfolio to be separated from the agricultural portfolio and that it is held by a separate minister as it is in the South Australian government; and
 - (b) notes the history of gross mismanagement of water resources and the Murray-Darling Basin in this country.
2. That the resolution be transmitted to the House of Assembly seeking its concurrence thereto.
3. On the House of Assembly's concurrence, requests that the President conveys the resolution to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia.

(Continued from 15 November 2017.)

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:44): I move:

That the resolution of the Legislative Council contained in message 223 be agreed to.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:45): I speak in support of the motion. Not only would this approach be consistent with our current state practice but this motion has a strong constitutional basis. The commonwealth's water responsibilities and obligations are better managed from within the environment portfolio. With the exception of matters covered by state referrals of power, it is based on its constitutional powers to legislate on matters relating to Australia's obligations under international agreements that the Australian government introduced key elements of the Water Act 2007, such as the biodiversity convention and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. These obligations are primarily environmental in nature.

We have a water act and a basin plan. These are a direct result of the history of the mismanagement of the water resources of the Murray-Darling Basin. The Murray-Darling Basin is the lifeblood of Australia. In South Australia, it provides over 90 per cent of our drinking water. Despite many attempts to put in place agreements, policies and plans, there has been a history of water being overharvested or extracted from the basin. It was only the devastation of the extended Millennium Drought that brought about the recognition for all states to act together to manage the resources of the Murray-Darling Basin.

Under the Water Act and a basin plan, there is a requirement to ensure that basin water resources are managed in an integrated and sustainable way for all basin states, including South Australia. By separating the agriculture and water portfolios, the federal government would be removing the real and perceived bias created by having the one minister attempting to represent the separate interests and concerns inherent in each portfolio.

For the health of the Murray-Darling River system, the surrounding communities, industries and people who rely on the health of the River Murray, the water portfolio should be ring fenced from those responsible for advocating for consumptive users. This move is essential for effective commonwealth oversight and leadership on compliance.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:47 to 14:00.

Petitions

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD: Presented a petition signed by 600 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.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr WHETSTONE: Presented a petition signed by 215 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to undertake upgrades to the Brown's Well and Ngarkat Highways, in particular road widening, shoulder sealing and surface repairs, to address safety concerns rather than reducing the speed limit.

RIVERLAND COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE

Mr WHETSTONE: Presented a petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reinstate funding to the Riverland Community Legal Service Inc. to maintain the same level of local service, knowledge, expertise and meet the legal needs in the Riverland and surrounding districts.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today members of the Granite Island Probus Club, who are guests of the member for Finnis; pupils from Paracombe Primary School, who are guests of the member for Newland; and members of the West Lakes Probus Club, who are guests of the member for Lee.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

Berri Barmera Council Annual Report 2016-17

Elliston, District Council of Annual Report 2016-17

Grant, District Council of Annual Report 2016-17

Murray Bridge, The Rural City of Annual Report 2016-17

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

Adelaide Film Festival Charter—November 2017

Australian Children's Performing Arts Company Charter—June 2017

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

Investment Attraction South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Community Road Safety Fund Revenue and Expenditure—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Chief Psychiatrist of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

Controlled Substances Advisory Council—Annual Report 2016-17

Health Advisory Council—

South Australian Medical Education and Training Annual Report 2016-17

Veterans' Annual Report 2016-17

Health Performance Council—Annual Report 2016-17

Health Services Charitable Gifts Board—Annual Report 2016-17

Lifetime Support Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

Maternal and Perinatal Mortality in South Australia 2015—Annual Report 2016-17

National Health Funding Body—Annual Report 2016-17

National Health Funding Pool Administrator—Annual Report 2016-17

National Health Practitioner Ombudsman and Privacy Commissioner—

Annual Report 2016-17

Parole Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

South Australian Public Health Council—Annual Report 2016-17

Ministerial Statement

GAMBLING REVIEW

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: On 26 September 2016, the Hon. Tim Anderson QC was appointed by the government to undertake an independent review of the state's gambling regulatory framework and the administrative arrangements for regulating the gambling industry in South Australia. The intention of the review was to assist the government with the development of future commercial gambling regulatory arrangements. Mr Anderson undertook extensive consultation and provided the government with his finding on 9 December 2016.

In April 2017, South Australia reached an in-principle agreement with the commonwealth to negotiate broad reforms to combat the harms associated with the normalisation of gambling within the community, particularly in relation to the online gambling sphere. Sadly, progress has been slow. However, any change to the current South Australian regulatory model at this time may hinder or cut across the implementation of national consumer protection measures. Bearing this in mind, and to ensure that the IGA has an opportunity to respond to the report before any decision by cabinet, further progress will await this response.

Disturbingly, it has come to my attention that online gambling providers are sending unsolicited advertisements to children and, I believe, to other vulnerable people to encourage them to open an account and to participate in online gambling. Under-age gambling is against the law. It is predatory, so is cold canvassing people who have a gambling problem or are otherwise barred from traditional forms of gambling.

A person can easily open an account with online gambling services without verification of their age or other relevant details. Under current rules, providers can have up to 90 days to verify a

person's identity. This may obviously not occur before a lot of money has been wagered. Interestingly, getting money out does require proof of identity; fancy that!

So we have unsolicited bait advertising, cold canvassing and no proof of age or identity being required to commence betting. Imagine if this were the case with alcohol or tobacco. The barrier to entry must be there. It should be just as hard to establish a betting account as it is to establish a bank account. It should be no easier to promote gambling than it is to promote tobacco. This honey-potting practice must end.

On 30 March 2017, the government called upon the commonwealth to implement 10 important measures to reduce the harm caused by online gambling. Progress has been slow and frustrated by compromise and an unwillingness to stand up to the online gambling lobby. I call upon online gambling providers to implement measures to require a person to properly satisfy all proof of identity checks before opening an account and to put an end to all unsolicited advertising, especially to minors or other vulnerable people.

I ask any South Australians who have been in receipt of unsolicited advertising from online gambling service providers to report the details of such advertising to the Office of Consumer and Business Services. Also, any examples of advertising to children or letting children open accounts should be reported. This information will be collected to assist this government's advocacy for better protections for children and other vulnerable people from online gambling. I will be publicly outing any operators who are identified.

INVESTMENT ATTRACTION AGENCY

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) (14:06): With your leave, I would like to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The South Australian government took a very bold step of establishing an investment attraction agency just over two years ago. The agency was an initiative first proposed by the Economic Development Board in early 2015 and was modelled on similar international bodies. The decision to move to a centralised investment attraction agency, by relocating resources across the whole of government into a single agency, meant that government could fund the new agency from existing resources.

We headhunted a global economic expert from Wales, Mr Mike Hnyda, and the agency became operational from 1 October 2015 under the guidance of an international advisory board chaired by former banking executive Rob Chapman. I thank both men and the whole of the board for their service. Its three objectives were to create 6,000 jobs by the end of 2017, to maximise capital investment into South Australia and to have a transformational impact on the state economy. I am pleased to report to the house today that this has been a job well done.

As of today, we have announced 24 projects secured by the Investment Attraction Agency. These projects bring in \$1.78 billion in capital expenditure, with an estimated economic benefit of \$6.667 billion. Most importantly, the 24 projects have created 7,084 jobs—that is more than 1,000 over target. The new jobs will be at global aviation giant Boeing; Babcock; Datacom, who are a welcome employer in the electorate of Newland; IT multinational NEC; Orora; French company Neoen; Tic:Toc home loans, the app-based start-up in the FinTech sector that has just been named as an emerging star in KPMG's international annual Fintech100 list for 2017; and others.

Ten days ago, the Premier announced the decision by VeroGuard Systems to move its cybersecurity operations from Victoria to South Australia. Former auto component sector employees have already been hired by VeroGuard Systems. On every measure, Investment Attraction SA has been a stunning success. I note today that economic analysts Deloitte released their 'Make it a plan Adelaide' report proposing the creation of a multibillion dollar South Australian investment corporation. Is it not curious that we already have one, Mr Speaker?

I am advised Deloitte visited our agency chief executive, Mr Mike Hnyda earlier this year, and it is pleasing to see that they took notes, took the concept up—although ours is a more cost-

efficient and effective model—and then repeated it in today's report. I have asked Mr Hnyda and Mr Rob Chapman to further inform Deloitte on the success of IASA and the impact of the international board which might inform the next report.

Today, I congratulate the board, the agency and its hardworking staff on helping to deliver the economic transformation that was promised. Those 7,085 jobs represent new careers, meals on the table and confidence for our future. Delivered under the economic priorities of this government, investment attraction has been a great success. We do not hear much about it from the pessimists, but there is every reason to be optimistic about South Australia where we made a plan and then delivered on it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the leader and the deputy leader.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:11): I bring up the 54th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Deputy Premier. After becoming the Minister for Housing and Urban Development following the 2014 election, did the Deputy Premier seek the advice of an independent QC about the development of the Riverbank Precinct?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:12): I thank the leader for his question. It is made clear throughout the report which was tabled in parliament from the Auditor-General about the Festival Plaza project that throughout the course of the project there was a significant amount of advice and analysis which was provided to government to enable it to make decisions at various points along the path. In fact, I think it is even spelt out to this level of granularity: a lot of that information was provided so that cabinet could make a decision at various different junctures. Of course, in that context, it would be inappropriate to comment about the specific nature of that advice.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): A supplementary, sir: did the advice relate to all actions of the government prior to the 2014 election and whether, as a result, the government had any obligations to the Walker Corporation?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:13): I think as I was making clear in my earlier answer, given that this was a process that occurred over a number of years and that there was a significant amount of analysis and advice that was provided to government throughout the course of those discussions and those negotiations, the advice that was provided was, as far as I am advised, ultimately relied on by cabinet to make decisions, and in that context it would not be appropriate of me to divulge what that particular advice was.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): A supplementary to the Deputy Premier, sir: was the Deputy Premier concerned that his predecessor may have made commitments to the Walker Corporation that were binding on the government?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:14): I'm not quite sure how the Leader of the Opposition can draw that scenario from the report that the Auditor-General has tabled in parliament. The Auditor-

General makes it quite clear what the process was that occurred both before and after 2014 and who had the superintendence of these matters.

The SPEAKER: The members for Finniss and Chaffey are called to order, and the deputy leader is warned. Leader.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): After receiving the advice, did the government decide it was locked into continuing exclusive negotiations with the Walker Corporation?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:14): We seem to be stuck in this particular groove, where the Leader of the Opposition is trying to elicit from me, or from government, the details of a certain piece of advice which, if it was provided, was provided for the basis of the government to make decisions about this. Given that a lot of the advice, and the decision-making of course, was made at the cabinet level, there is not really much more I can say about this.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Does the minister agree with the Auditor-General that, instead of deciding in late 2013 to continue negotiations with the Walker Corporation, the government should have gone out to test the market?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:15): Again, I thank the leader for his question. Certainly, throughout the report, in different stages, it is made clear by the Auditor-General that he has been provided documentation which supports the fact that the government did procure external expert advice, showing that this arrangement that was entered into between the government and Walker Corporation was of value for the government and, in fact—

Mr Marshall: For the government? What about for the people of South Australia?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Indeed, the government, on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Morialta and Unley are called to order; the member for Morialta in a previous answer, and the leader is warned. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying, the Auditor-General makes it clear in his report that documentation has been provided to him in the course of his investigations, which demonstrates that this was good value for government. In fact, I think the wording—and I will check this—is that the terms of the agreement was to the considerable advantage of the government, rather than, of course, the other party to the agreement, being the Walker Corporation.

LIVE MUSIC SCENE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. How is Adelaide gaining recognition around the world for its vibrant live music scene?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. He is an avid consumer of live music, and I am sure that back in the day you would have found him at the stage door at the back of the Shandon Hotel listening—

Mr Duluk: That's 16 years of highlights wrapped up in one question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. When this man had hair, he would have been down there bopping to the tunes of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is a great member of parliament and an avid consumer of live music. The live music scene in Adelaide is going from strength to strength. Just this week—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —this is good news, I know they all want to hear it, it's good news—travel publication Lonely Planet has recognised Adelaide as Australia's live music city—a massive statement. This is in their newly released *Culture Trails* publication, which presents cultural highlights from cities around the globe. They have highlighted some of our great live music venues, including the Exeter and Wheatsheaf hotels as drawcards for music lovers. All of this hard work that has gone into developing our live music sector is now paying off.

The state government has driven a number of regulatory reforms to support the live music industry. The streamlining of regulations has made it easier for music venues and musicians to access audiences in a range of different settings, all adding to the vibrant music scene that Adelaide is well-known for. Recent reports have shown that the music industry in South Australia now employs 6,300 people, including part-time and contract jobs. Meanwhile, there has been a 34 per cent increase in the number of venues hosting live music and a 15 per cent increase in the number of gigs being held over the past two years. As the state's Minister for the Arts, I am delighted to highlight this fantastic recognition of Adelaide.

Our ability to collaborate between local government, the private sector and performers has seen live music thrive in a way that sets us apart from other cities in Australia and around the world. In fact, it even led to our designation as a UNESCO City of Music, a title we wear with pride. It's not just good news for industry, but for South Australia generally. Live music and festivals bring visitors to the state. Visitors buy food, stay in hotels and visit our cities and our beautiful regions.

They also create a fantastic vibe and sense of fun in the community, whether it is during Mad March in Adelaide or in winter during the Umbrella: Winter City Sounds festival. We are hearing the sound of music not just in our hills—we are also hearing the sound of Xenophon in the hills, but that is a different matter; that is the thing that really agitates them—but in every pub, every club and every bar. Of course, it is the people who make the industry buzz and we have amazing individuals receiving their own recognition.

Just last night, two of our finest South Australian artists were honoured on the national stage at the ARIA Awards: pop phenomenon Sia as Best Female Artist and hip-hop duo AB Original, one of whom hails from South Australia, for Best Urban Album. Even our music educators were recognised, with Renee McCarthy from Woodcroft College taking out the first ARIA Music Teacher of the Year Award.

This recognition comes on top of Lonely Planet's best travel places, Lonely Planet's coolest neighbourhoods and, of course, the top 10 cities to visit since 2014. This is a city which is growing in excitement and I think the people of South Australia are beginning to find that it is an even better place to live.

Ms Cook: And Paul Kelly.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: And Paul Kelly.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Fisher and the Minister for Agriculture for that mirth, and I call to order the members for Adelaide, Davenport and Stuart. I warn the members for Davenport, Finniss, Morialta and Chaffey, and I warn for the second and final time the members for Finniss, Davenport, Morialta and Chaffey. The deputy leader.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Treasurer. As the minister for housing and urban development in late 2013, was he aware of a meeting between Mr Lang Walker and the chief executive of DPTI which the Auditor-General has described as 'inappropriate as it was inconsistent with good process and procurement practice'?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:21): From at least the first reading of the report, it is

clear that the concern from the Auditor-General was particularly about the level of documentation that was provided about that meeting. Indeed, in the rest of the report, the chronology that is provided makes it clear that a decision was taken for the then head of the infrastructure agency to participate in this process, given it was, in essence, an infrastructure project. That was the rationale for the meeting between, as I understand it, the then chief executive and the representatives of the Walker Corporation.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: given the minister's indication that this was a decision of the chief executive of DPTI to do, did he receive any instruction or request from the government to do so?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:23): I did not say that it was a decision of the chief executive of DPTI because it is not clear, except that there was essentially a meeting, I think, on 27 November that the then chief executive of the infrastructure agency sought to try to manage this process in a way which would carry forward the government's opportunity to try to procure an upgrade to the car park facility.

Of course, if we all cast our minds back, it has been obvious I think for some years that this car park was getting to the point where almost literally it was falling down around the ears of certainly members of parliament but also people who frequented the Festival Theatre, let alone other people who chose to park there in the precinct. It was clear throughout the process that, at the very minimum, there was a requirement from government that this project be delivered.

I should also say it is not a simple project of itself, given that there was the need to replace at the very least the infrastructure that there was but also, as is referenced in the report, there was a growing desire, which was expressed from the Adelaide Festival Centre, to try to take the opportunity to improve some of their facilities. Of course we heard, I think it was from approximately 2013 onwards, of the increased desire of SkyCity to at the very least redevelop the facilities they have at the Adelaide Railway Station precinct, if not in fact invest in a significant addition to those facilities at the back of the railway station. In that context, any car park would have to take into account the sometimes competing needs of those different precinct stakeholders.

It is not just a question of building the car park and leaving it as such. The surface treatment was important as well. Although a little later than the period of time that the deputy leader is referring to, since the extraordinary (and quite literally, to some extent, unforeseen) success of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment and the level of patronage that was garnering, and the flow back and forth across the footbridge, there was also the growing desire to make sure that whatever was developed for the car park—on the top of the car park and hence the precinct—was taking that into account as well.

In short, at that point of time it was seen as an infrastructure project that did require a level of superintendence of somebody of the skills of the then head of the infrastructure agency. That, I think, is the context in which we—

Mr Marshall: Who instructed the chief executive?

The SPEAKER: The Leader is on two warnings.

Ms Redmond: Okay, I'll ask it: who instructed the chief executive?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is the basis under which that meeting—as far as one can glean from the report—

The SPEAKER: That's better.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Further supplementary to the Treasurer: given the minister's answer in response to the question as to the action of the chief executive then meeting with Mr Walker, did the chief executive make the decision to change from Renewal SA to DPTI's management of this project, or was it the government?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:26): It also goes on in the report to outline that—I believe it was on 7 January or in early January immediately following that November, in the beginning of 2014—the then chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet corresponded with the chief executive of the infrastructure agency to get an understanding of where negotiations were up to. It makes it clear in the report the response from the chief executive of the infrastructure agency and his reading of that. Beyond that recollection from the former chief executive—of the infrastructure agency that is—I am not quite sure what else can be added. The inference, I think, that the deputy leader is trying to give the chamber is that there was something—

Ms Redmond: No, it's an implication from her; it will be an inference on your part.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Heysen says 'an implication'; some might call it an imputation—neither of which, in any event, would be relevant.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Supplementary: could the minister, having indicated the government's desire to progress this project, advise the parliament, at this meeting with Walker Corporation on 26 November 2013, did the company ask the government to remove Renewal SA as the government's negotiator for the Riverbank Precinct and substitute the chief executive of DPTI?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:28): I am not sure that anyone can glean that from the contents of the report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister does not need the assistance of the Minister for Education; she is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. I think the criticism of the Auditor-General's Report, amongst others, was that early in the conduct of the discussions between government and Walker, and in particular regarding the conduct of that particular meeting, was that there were insufficient records that were able to be made available to the Auditor-General about that particular meeting. I think that is the basis for the criticism. To then try to draw the inference or the imputation that the deputy leader seeks to, I think is a bridge too far.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary to the minister: during or after the meeting on 27 November 2013 with former senator Nick Bolkus, then the lobbyist for the Walker Corporation, did he discuss his decision to change the government's lead negotiator with Walker Corporation?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:29): I am not personally aware of that particular meeting. I would have to see if there is any advice that could be provided to me about that. Again, I think that the criticism levelled by the Auditor-General about the particular discussions between the former head of the infrastructure agency and Walker Corporation is the lack of record keeping about the particular conduct of those meetings. I think that it is up to that subsequent exchange of correspondence between the two chief executives of Premier and Cabinet and the infrastructure agency to shed further light on it.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: of the meetings of which the criticism has been raised and acknowledged by the minister, were there no records made, or were records made and conveyed to cabinet and therefore are no longer in the agency, or is there any other explanation?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:30): Well, it's a good question because the

Auditor-General does, I think, attempt to examine that particular delineation between what documents were able to be provided. I think that what the Auditor-General does say is that, in terms of the capacity of government, i.e. ministers in cabinet, to make decisions, there was analysis and there was information that was able to be provided to form the basis of those decisions that were taken at those various junctures at different points in time.

However, that's quite separate, I think, from what the deputy leader is getting at, and that is whether sufficient records were kept, particularly of that meeting she mentioned earlier in her questioning between the former chief executive of the infrastructure agency and Walker Corporation. Given that the description by the Auditor-General of the lack of those records and the documentation that was able to be provided to him, it seems, at least from reading, that those documents were unable to be provided, at least, or potentially uncovered at all.

I think the concern that informs a lot of the recommendations of the Auditor-General about this particular process is that those sorts of meetings between public servants and Walker Corporation were insufficiently documented for the basis of appropriate record keeping in the public sector, let alone for any subsequent overview by somebody like the Auditor-General.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why has the bundle of documents regarding the correspondence between the Department of Transport and Infrastructure and the Walker Corporation on the Festival Plaza redevelopment, identified by the freedom of information officer in DPTI and forwarded to the Attorney-General's Department last year, not been returned to her with advice as to the confidentiality of any documents or at all?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:33): In trying to follow the precise nature of the deputy leader's question, I think what she is getting at is whether the information that has been provided to her under a freedom of information request reflected the information that has been provided.

What I am advised is that the development agreement that was entered into between the government and Walker Corporation—and, I should make it clear, somewhat subsequent to the events we were just discussing back in late 2013 and 2014, the development agreement that was reached at some later stage—has not only been provided to the deputy leader in a briefing with the head of Renewal SA but has, in some redacted form, been provided to her by freedom of information. I remember also receiving questioning on this as Minister for Housing and Urban Development in my first estimates committee and reading the information into *Hansard*.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary to the Attorney-General: given that three freedom of information applications were issued in respect of correspondence covering the period in late 2013, of which the Attorney-General himself—

The SPEAKER: Can we have a question?

Ms CHAPMAN: —as the minister provided one document, can he explain why the bundle of documents prepared by DPTI and the FOI officer that was sent to the Attorney-General's Department late last year has not been returned?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:34): As we would all appreciate, dealing with freedom of information matters, either as requestors or as people held to account for their contents, these matters are managed by the agencies. What is discovered, of course, needs to be done in accordance with the provisions of the FOI Act. The level of detail within the documents that are discovered is also—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: This is the second time I have pointed out to the leader that he is on two warnings. I thought the idea of the member for Heysen interjecting instead was an inspired one. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, the way in which these responses are managed is done by agencies according to law. The level of discovery and the level of detail which is released within those discovered documents is done by the accredited FOI agents within each of these agencies. If the question is: why haven't documents, which were provided for the purpose of responding to a freedom of information application to one agency that were provided by another agency in an effort to respond to that, not been returned to the client agency, well, that's a great question. I will ask the agency involved.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development: were you aware that the documents bundled together by the FOI in the Department of Transport had been sent late last year to the Attorney-General's Department?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:36): I can't say that I am. It would be highly unusual for me to receive a running commentary on how documents are placed in a pile and collected together for the purposes of—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —transporting from one agency to another, whether it is for the benefit of an FOI application or otherwise.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary to the Attorney-General: given the answer of the minister just received to the parliament, will the Attorney-General make inquiry as to the whereabouts of this bundle of documents in his department and confirm to the parliament where they are and why they have been held here a year later?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:37): I took it from the previous questions that the bundling in question was done by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, so I would have thought that it would have been within my purview to follow up with that agency about when the bundling occurred, the nature of the bundling and the transmission that was able to occur after the said bundling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Unley a first and a second time and I warn the deputy leader for the second and final times. Question.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My supplementary is to either the Attorney-General or the minister. When the bundle of documents is identified, could you inquire whether any of those documents was made available to the Auditor-General for the purposes of undertaking their investigation of this matter?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:38): Now it seems we are at cross-purposes. I thought that the earlier questions were about the bundling for the purposes of a freedom of information request. Now we seem to be interested in bundling for the purposes of an auditor-general's inquiry. It would be up to the management of an agency, which is currently in the process of responding to a request for information from an auditor-general about what documents and whether they are bundled or loose-leafed, that they are provided to the Auditor-General.

I am happy to provide some information to the house, seeking further information about whether they have been provided for the purposes of a freedom of information application, but the transmission of documents for the purposes of an inquiry surely is the purview of the management, not the executive government, and the Auditor-General who conducts the inquiry.

OLYMPIC DAM

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you inform the house on any progress on the expansion of the Olympic Dam mine at Roxby Downs?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:39): I thank the member for his question and his keen interest and appreciation of the government's key role in supporting strategies that unlock the full potential of South Australia's mineral assets.

The eyes of the international investment community are on South Australia this week, with BHP conducting a briefing and site tour of its Olympic Dam project. After 30 years of producing copper, gold and uranium in this world-class ore body, we have only just begun to scratch the surface of its potential and the benefits that can be generated for South Australia. In the past few years, BHP has spent a lot of time and effort to try to work out the best options for delivering better returns to its shareholders and South Australia from the world's third largest copper deposit.

This week, investors and analysts from interstate and overseas have been brought to Adelaide so that BHP can better explain the investment potential for Olympic Dam. The move into the Southern Mine Area, which represents 70 per cent of the known resource, has created 120 new jobs, while the smelter maintenance campaign currently underway has generated new investment to improve the productive capacity of the mine and provided work for 1,300 contractors. Analysts were told BHP plans to spend \$US800 million between financial year 2018 and 2021 on surface infrastructure and a further \$3.1 billion on expanding the mine.

The surface work includes the ongoing smelter campaign and upgrades to its water infrastructure, electrolytic refinery and tailings storage. BHP also announced that a new remote operating centre based in Adelaide is part of the technology in development. Underground, BHP have 20 kilometres of new mine under development, with three new blocks in the Southern Mine Area. A third decline is being developed, the Whenan shaft is being refurbished and the underground rail line is being extended.

This week's investor tour has also been an opportunity to highlight the \$2.1 billion brownfield expansion option. If approved by BHP, this option could almost double current capacity to 330,000 tonnes a year. Increased production from Olympic Dam aligns with the government's copper strategy target of tripling the state's production of the red metal to one million tonnes by the year 2030. Longer term investment options, such as scaling up a heap leach technology to increase the volume of copper production, have the potential to further build on the increased output from the brownfields expansion option.

While BHP has stressed that any investment must compete for capital against other options within the company's vast portfolio, quite frankly, with copper and gold prices rising and the shift down the cost curve at Olympic Dam, the fact that institutional investors and analysts have been flown here to be briefed about the positive aspects of these investments should send a positive message to South Australians about the prospectivity of mining and the future of the resources industry in South Australia.

We are seen as a very good jurisdiction to invest in the resources sector. Hopefully, we can maintain that mantle. The most recent Fraser Institute findings show South Australia as the highest ranked of the states. What can risk that, of course, are moratoriums on things like unconventional gas and things like land access—things all members opposite will espouse at the next election.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Why for the past five years has his government failed to ensure that its commitment to the

Adelaide Riverbank development was conducted properly, such that, according to the Auditor-General, 'the integrity and probity of the process could not be demonstrated'?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:43): I thank the leader for his question. As I was saying in one of my earlier comments, the Auditor-General's Report does make it clear that the government had been provided with advice that the agreement it entered into with Walker Corporation did deliver 'value for the state' and that there was also expert external advice that was provided by consultants that found that the terms of the agreement were 'considerably in favour of the government and therefore commercially defensible.'

In that context, albeit as we have already discussed certainly at the early stages of the process, there was an undocumented series of meetings, principally the one that we had discussed involving the former chief executive. Certainly, the outcome of the deal has been concluded in a manner that not only delivers a development that has in parts already commenced but one that will provide a substantial contribution and opportunity to improve the visitation experience of our city.

Yes, as the leader said in his question, it did take a long time. There is no shirking that, that the process did take a long time, particularly from the issuing of the expression of interest, which I recall being in 2012, to the reaching of the agreement and the key commercial terms in 2016. That is a relatively long time for that to occur. It's implicit, I think, in the report the criticisms in the very early stages about recordkeeping and that, because of the inability for the Auditor-General to cite certain records, he was unable to have it demonstrated to him the rigorousness of the procurement process and the probity arrangements.

Certainly, the outcome of the arrangements that were entered into was, as stated in that report, good value and in favour of the state. It has been done in a way in which not only are we entering into an arrangement for a car park and associated plaza development, but it is being delivered in a way that enables SkyCity to proceed with their development and it enables them to reach an agreement with Walker so that they can have several hundred car parks reserved for their use. It also means that deliveries, let alone visitation, can occur upon its completion to the Festival Centre, to the Convention Centre, to the Intercontinental Hotel, to SkyCity as well as to the parliament precinct.

Mr Knoll: I think I'm going to have bedding for my chickens for the next 15 years.

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

ONE COMMUNITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): My question is to the Premier. Will the Labor Party pay back the \$750,000 of taxpayer funds that the Auditor-General has said were used by One Community for political purposes?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:46): Well, will the Liberal Party put back \$210 million back into the schoolchildren of this state that they shamelessly breached their agreement with us? This is a fundamental—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader! If the leader utters another sound for the rest of question time, he will be removed, reluctant as I am to do that. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Back when the Hockey budget was handed down in 2014, South Australia was one of the few Labor governments anywhere in the nation, and we declared war against that budget, and those opposite—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for McKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: The point of order is relevance, sir.

The SPEAKER: No, this is intimately relevant because the question is: will the Labor Party pay back the money that was used for One Community? The Premier is now arguing why that expenditure was proper expenditure.

Mr WILLIAMS: Sir, you have just said the Premier is arguing why, therefore he must be debating.

The SPEAKER: Well, let's hear what the Premier says.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Being lectured by the man that wanted us to hold up the white flag on the River Murray—being lectured by the man who wanted us to haul up the white flag on the River Murray. Mr Speaker, in this very place I brought together the non-government sector, the whole of the education sector, the whole of the health sector, and we met up there in the Balcony Room. We met up there and we put on the table the question about whether we were going to stand and fight or whether we were going to capitulate, and we decided to stand up for South Australia. We decided to stand up and fight. We achieved a small victory: \$125 million. It's not bad value for our investment in the fight—a small investment.

I can tell you one reason why that money was handed over. I can remember Senator Birmingham squirming when we demonstrated, as he went from school to school, the amount of money each of those schools had cut by the federal government, and he didn't like it. He didn't like it when we held him to account.

They signed up with this government and every government in the nation that signed up to the Gonski agreement. They solemnly entered an agreement—two governments, the commonwealth government and the stated government—and then they went to an election. You remember the signs, Mr Speaker. You remember the signs everywhere, saying 'Dollar for dollar', 'No cuts', 'We're on a unity ticket with the Labor Party on school funding'. And what did he do when he was safely out from underneath the election? He broke that promise. Well, we are holding him to account. We are holding the guilty party to account: the Liberal Party of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Newland, and I warn the members for Fisher and Newland.

ONE COMMUNITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Supplementary question: will the Premier rule out that his office was involved with the development of any of One Community's campaign materials?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:50): Yes; I don't think our office was involved. We contracted with—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, let's go through the history of this. I remember being at the meeting. At the meeting we said, 'We want to run a campaign,' and I can remember at the time Peter Sandeman was more than willing to put up his hand to say, 'We can run a campaign on behalf of this group'—not just the government but all the non-government organisations, the health sector, the education sector, SACOSS. And indeed that non-government organisation put a proposition to government that we were more than happy to fund, and they developed the material and the resources that were necessary to produce that material. I don't know whether there was any involvement in my office, if we were asked to participate.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, this is a campaign that we were cooperating in. We supported it. We supported the campaign. Now, whether the precise materials—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —were the subject of discussion with us, I don't know, but I don't think it would have been surprising if they had made a discussion with us, because we supported the campaign. We offered public money to campaign against the federal government and indeed any political party that were raising their voice against South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: You want to take money off the children of South Australia, you're going to buy a fight with me. You're going to buy a fight with me every day of the week.

Mr Marshall: Supplementary, sir—

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I call to order the member for Heysen. I warn the members for Adelaide, Heysen and Wright, and I warn for the second and final time the member for Wright.

Ms Chapman: She's giving a valedictory today.

The SPEAKER: She will be unable to give a valedictory if she's not in the chamber.

ONE COMMUNITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary, sir, to the Premier. Why did the Premier personally employ Mr Brad Chilcott after he was dismissed by One Community for engaging in party-political activities while employed by them?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:52): Brad Chilcott is a fine and talented young man. I would be more than happy to employ him every day of the week. He is a very talented young man. I don't know the circumstances in which he left One Community. I suspect it had a bit to do with the federal government putting pressure on some of those constituent organisations that comprise One Community and putting the heat on them. I suspect that's actually what happened. What is at stake here is \$210 million for the students of South Australia, and today we have the revelation that an incoming federal Labor government will restore that \$210 million. That is the simple solution here. That is the simple solution: vote Labor.

ONE COMMUNITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Will the Premier now terminate the employment of Mr Paul Flanagan after the Auditor-General's findings that he approved the One Community grant when he didn't have the appropriate financial delegation to do so?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:53): No.

REGIONAL TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:53): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Recreation and Sport. How is the state government supporting tourism, recreation and sport in South Australia's regions?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:54): I thank the member for Ashford for that question. The government helps in a lot of ways, particularly through grants to tourism operators and food and wine—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned. The member for Davenport is on a full set of warnings for a previous outburst.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —and recreation and sport—and I know people in Kangaroo Island are very happy with the money that went to Dudley United Netball Club; \$203,000 went there for a brand-new facility that was opened just a couple of months ago. Of course, McLaren Vale received \$293,000 for their women's change rooms at the netball club.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The netball club in Willunga also received \$500,000. I know there is a lot of good stuff happening out in the regions. In the Wine Industry Development Scheme, \$1.8 million for the Wine Industry Development Scheme is going into cellar doors and into regional wine associations to make sure that our cellar doors are as good as anywhere in the world. It has been a tremendous program. I know that 17 wineries in McLaren Vale received grants and three on Kangaroo Island.

But one of the great funding initiatives that this government has come up with is the \$20 million Fund My Neighbourhood idea. It has been terrific to see local communities right around the state come together, and I think if anyone wants to look at how a community does it really well, Willunga managed to pick up three of the Fund My Neighbourhood ideas. The CFS got \$100,000. There was a Willunga to Aldinga bike trail which received \$150,000. There is a new Nature Play playground in the rose garden at Willunga which received \$150,000. I think Willunga probably, pound for pound, has taken more money out of that fund than any other town in South Australia. Myponga also did well with their community centre getting \$150,000 to upgrade their stormwater facilities around the community centre.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The McLaren Vale Primary School received \$50,000 for a new air conditioning system in their gymnasium, so that is going to make the voters feel nice and cool on 17 March when they all go to the polls and line up there in McLaren Vale. It is a great polling booth for the people of McLaren Vale, but now it will also have air conditioning, as well as when we go for functions, assemblies and sporting events in that wonderful school gymnasium.

As we saw around the state, it was town versus town, street versus street, suburb versus suburb. But on Kangaroo Island we had a great competition between a mother and a daughter. We had Jayne Bates who put up a project to get a swing bridge at Penneshaw to connect the two sides of the sculpture park; \$150,000 went to Jayne Bates's project that she put up. She beat her daughter, Megan Harvey, by seven votes because Megan wanted something else for Penneshaw. She wanted a Nature Play playground by the skate park at Penneshaw. It was great to be on the island on Monday to see Jayne and her daughter, Megan. They were back on speaking terms and things were going well.

I really think this Fund My Neighbourhood idea has been absolutely terrific. When we go out for our country cabinets, we ask people for their ideas. I know that at Parndana, they received \$28,000 for the memorial which we are doing up, and also while we were on Kangaroo Island for the country cabinet, we gave \$110,000 to the people at Kingscote for a new skate park. This is something these people have wanted for 25 years. The local member never came and asked us for it, but we went down there and the Premier announced it. There was a woman called Marie who burst into tears she was so excited in the hall that night in Kingscote. Thank you, Premier, for this wonderful Fund My Neighbourhood project.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Does the minister agree with AEMO, which reported yesterday in regard to energy security in South Australia this summer that, 'AEMO will probably have insufficient resources to cover both demand and reserves. Involuntary shedding of load may be required to make the system secure?'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:58): Can I just say that was beautifully selective quoting again. It was excellent. Well done. I give great credit to the shadow minister. Lucky for us, we have—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. P. Caica: You've said that twice, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Lucky for us, we have 276 megawatts of South Australian reserve. Lucky we have a battery in Jamestown. Lucky we have abundant solar reserves. Lucky we have wind power generation.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But of course, you just heard the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition, 'Are you sure?' Well, yes, while Labor is in office, we will have a generator owned by South Australians. What we can't be assured of is that if we lose the election, members opposite won't privatise the generator again. So we have our reserves, and if we need to use them, we will.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59): Supplementary: given that the minister just outlined all those aspects of his energy plan, why does AEMO still say—AEMO armed with all of that information—and I quote, 'The risk' in Victoria and South Australia of 'Unserved Energy' through involuntary load shedding will be higher than in recent years?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:00): It will be higher in Victoria because they lost the Hazelwood generator. Of course, AEMO don't count non-market participants in their forecast. Our generator, on my advice, is not a market participant.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: So it's going to get worse?

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Stuart just told the chamber that AEMO's advice factors in our generation.

An honourable member: They are fully aware of it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They are fully aware of it—no, that's not what he said. He said that they are factoring in our generation in their forecast. I will come back to the chamber because I am pretty certain that is not accurate. I am pretty certain that they don't count non-market participants. Importantly, it's always important to check the veracity of what the shadow minister says, but—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the reality is that for the first time in the state's history since the privatisation of ETSA we have our own generators to call on. We used to have Torrens Island, we used to have ETSA, we used to have—

Ms Sanderson: Where's the interconnector you promised?

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —our own poles of wires, but they were sold out from underneath us by members opposite. I hope in the valedictory speeches of members who were here when they voted yes to privatise ETSA that perhaps they will give us an apology, perhaps they will apologise for what they did, perhaps they will regret what they did, but I suspect that members opposite will do no such thing whatsoever.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): Supplementary: if it comes to light that AEMO have factored in the government's diesel generators, will the minister come back to the house with an apology?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:01): First and foremost, questions starting with 'if' are hypothetical, and I would have thought you would have had to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand, Mr Speaker, that you don't want to enforce the standing orders. However—

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will stop singing paeans to himself.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I enjoy it so much, sir.

An honourable member: Chuck him out!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Chuck him out, Mr Speaker. Every time the opposition forecast doom and gloom in South Australia, every time they forecast blackouts, what they are secretly hoping for this summer is for there to be blackouts. They are secretly hoping for there to be chaos this summer. They want business to feel nervous. They want people to be anxious. They want people to feel anxious and uneasy about the electricity system. We are investing \$550 million to make sure that we have reserves in place, to make sure that if there are shortfalls we can step in.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is still here.

ESTIMATES REPLIES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister answer before the end of the year the more than 30 questions he took on notice during the estimates but has not yet answered?

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) (15:03): I am happy to inform the member for Schubert that I was not a minister during the estimates process, which he might want to check if he remembers that key fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: However, I have been very keen to make sure that we are updating the member for Schubert with information that was taken on notice by the former minister for police. and have been regularly submitting questions on notice that have been taken. I will seek an update in terms of where we are up to in terms of the numbers of that. I regularly have been signing off responses to the member for Schubert, and I am happy to chase that up further.

ESTIMATES REPLIES

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the Minister for Education prior to the end of the parliamentary year, being tomorrow, bring answers to the 50 questions that she took on notice but has not yet answered?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:04): I understand that—

Mr Knoll: You're going to have to find a different excuse to the previous answer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Well, I was indeed at estimates, so it was a very accurate question.

The SPEAKER: I think the previous excuse was a compelling one. Minister.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: And Corey thought so highly of you.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have recently been going through some of the questions that—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —have not yet been responded to, most of which, if not all, have been answered in various other forms, including a series of FOIs that the member has put in, but I will be reviewing to see whether there are any outstanding questions that are required.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders. They have had a lot of rain out your way.

OYSTER INDUSTRY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:05): Too much, sir, at this time of the year—never mind, it is all part of the challenge. My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Will the minister waive government fees and charges for South Australian oyster growers, given they are expecting little or no income during 2018 through no fault of their own?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:05): I thank the member for Flinders for that question, and that is something that we will definitely be looking at. We have done that for the Coorong fishers because of the problems that they have had down there. I want to congratulate the member for Flinders on the great way that he deals with issues in his area and the way we deal with the department: you can go straight to PIRSA and we get things sorted out. In fact, within the first week of—

The Hon. P. Caica: He is the best.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: He is the exemplar. I've got to say that the member for Flinders is best on ground on your side of the chamber. He's an absolute champion.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You have upset Tim now.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: POMS is Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome, which hit Tasmania last year with devastating effect and, under the Livestock Act, I had to sign off on a declaration to not allow any oysters to come into South Australia from Tasmania after the outbreak of the Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome in Tasmania. What happens is that about 90 per cent of the spat, which are the tiny little oysters that are bought by the oyster growers here in South Australia, came from Tasmania and only about 10 per cent was produced here in South Australia.

What we did was we had SARDI grow more spat, we had the regional development minister put more money into boosting the spat producers here in South Australia and we have helped two other spat producers to set up business here on Eyre Peninsula as well. Overall, I think we have spent about a million dollars on the response to the Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome outbreak in Tasmania to make sure that we are sustainable.

The member for Flinders is right: the income of these growers—I was in Port Lincoln last week and I spoke to one of the growers over there—is going to be severely impeded, and production will be severely impeded in the next growing season as we have this gap. I want to reassure the member for Flinders that we will keep working with him. He and I were there within a week of that outbreak. We were sitting down in Port Lincoln with the oyster growers and with the association.

I know that there are some oyster growers over on Eyre Peninsula who don't get on so well with the Oyster Growers Association, but I would really urge everyone to get united and come in under the one association. It doesn't matter who we deal with in what portfolio area, it is always better if a region or a group of like-minded people have the one voice and the one association. I know that there are people sitting outside the association at the moment saying that the government hasn't done this and the government hasn't done that.

We have actually been doing a lot of work for the oyster growers on Eyre Peninsula but, if they are not connected to their local South Australian Oyster Growers Association, they are probably not getting that word filtering through to them. There are some good things happening. It is impossible for us just to magically make all this spat appear out of nowhere. It is going to be a slow process to make that happen, but we will be there working side by side and shoulder to shoulder with the oyster growers, as we do with anyone who gets hit by adverse conditions, like the apple and pear growers in the Adelaide Hills, who we announced \$500,000 for to build a new extraction machine.

MARINE SCALEFISHING LICENCES

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:09): My next question is also to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, what is the reason for the state government suddenly no longer allowing marine scalefishers to transfer their licences?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:09): That's not something that has suddenly happened; that's something that was always meant to have happened and it hasn't always been able to be enforced. What we have heard from a lot of the fishers around South Australia, and that included people who are in the commercial fishery, is that there are too many competing for too few fish. If people have not been using their licences—

Mr Whetstone: I thought it was the rec fishers?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It is interesting that the member for Chaffey talks about rec fishers. There are 277,000 rec fishers in South Australia, and the Liberal Party went out yesterday and told their association, which is a very good association—RecFish SA, very good to deal with—and said—

Mr Whetstone: You just said about dealing with one body and now you're talking about dealing with three. You are a goose!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —that they're going to shut down RecFish SA. I tell you what, RecFish SA has been excellent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is within a hair's breadth of departing.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Sir, can I take a point of order, please?

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do recall that at one stage I called the member for Stuart 'a goose', and I was forced to—

The SPEAKER: Could the minister be seated while I take this point of order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —withdraw and apologise, and the member for Chaffey just called the minister a goose.

The SPEAKER: Twice. And indeed all references to members as animals throughout Her Majesty's realms are out of order.

Ms Chapman: Even a rat?

The SPEAKER: Yes, even a rat, which really cramps the style of Labor Party members. So I ask the member for Chaffey to rise and withdraw and apologise for calling the minister a goose.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw and apologise for calling the minister a goose, but remember, sir, a goose is not an animal.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It just goes to show the quality of the opposition. These people are going to go to the electorate on 17 March and ask for your vote. They are just a rabble. They are a rabble, and I can't believe what South Australia would look like if they ever got to sit on this side of the chamber.

We believe in RecFish SA. The Labor Party supports RecFish SA, so we will be there, working with them. They are very sensible people with very clear ideas on sustainable fishing in South Australia. Again, I advise those who have a different point of view to work with the peak body, which in this case is in RecFish SA, and together we will achieve much more than by having a couple of smaller groups splinter off.

*Ministerial Statement***ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TREATMENT ACT REVIEW**

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) (15:13): I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Health in the other place, entitled 'Government response to assisted reproductive technology review'.

*Grievance Debate***EDUCATION FUNDING**

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:13): This government over 15½ years has committed many atrocities upon the people of South Australia. They have put themselves before the people whom they claim to serve over and over, time and time again. In the last week, one of the most disgraceful examples of that has been put front and centre by the Minister for Education and by the Premier, who would take the extraordinary step of using children in South Australian schools as political pawns—as political hostages—in their game playing with the commonwealth.

The fact is that on 8 January next year half the funding that the commonwealth government is to provide to South Australia's schools—half of \$1.3 billion—is due to be paid to South Australia's schools. That is nearly \$500 million to South Australia's public schools, \$412 million to South Australia's independent schools, and \$383 million to South Australia's Catholic schools, due to be paid by the commonwealth to those schools and those systems next year—half of it on 8 January. This minister and this Premier have put all that funding in jeopardy because they refuse to sign a statement of principles with the commonwealth that gives the commonwealth the legal mechanism to pay under the federal Australian Education Act.

The failure of this government to do that puts our students at risk. It puts the needs of this government's political pointscoring and headline-seeking desire for attention ahead of the needs of our children. The members who sit behind them stand condemned. They claim to care for our children, they claim to care for our schools, but by their actions, by not signing a completely inoffensive document, the principle of which I will outline in a moment, they identify themselves as hypocrites who do not care about the interests of our children, who only care about political pointscoring and game playing.

There was \$491 million to South Australia's public schools, \$383 million to South Australia's Catholic schools and \$412 million to South Australia's independent schools. All it needs is for the Minister for Education to sign a document. What does that document say that is so offensive that the member for Torrens wants her schools to lose millions of dollars? Signing this document is all that needs to happen. The government is asked to sign an agreement that the commonwealth and the states are jointly:

- a. responsible for developing, progressing and reviewing national objectives and outcomes for schooling
- b. [that the commonwealth and the states] committed to ambitious long-term school improvement underpinned by quality reform plans, based on evidence of what works, to support progress towards achieving national and state and territory goals and targets
- c. [that the commonwealth and the states and territories are jointly] funding and regulating the Australian school sector.

It goes on to talk about consultation and collaboration. It says specifically:

Agreement to these principles for the purpose of establishing an interim agreement does not indicate intention on the part of any state or territory to enter into a future national schools agreement.

There is nothing stopping the government from signing this document and continuing to argue for increased funding from the federal government. There is nothing in this document that stops the government from continuing to argue for that. The South Australian Liberal Party, for goodness sake, will always argue for the best deal for South Australia. We will continue to do that. A Marshall Liberal government will continue to do that. But we would never put at risk funding that will help our schools.

What other impacts will it have? It has been described as playing a game of chicken. I do not always agree with Rebekha Sharkie, the member for Mayo, but she is right when she says that it is a game of chicken and only families will suffer.

What do other people say about it? From the Greens, Senator Hanson-Young says that politicians must stop holding schoolchildren and their education to ransom. What about the non-government sector, who the Premier said he stood with in the Balcony Room in arguing against federal cuts? What about the non-government sector, who are going to be most directly affected by this, who cannot necessarily just rely on Treasury to prop them up? The Australian Association of Christian Schools chief executive, Martin Hanscamp, has pleaded for Dr Close to sign the new funding agreement. He says:

Non-government schools do not have the cash reserves to cover wages and running costs for the first half of 2018 and the Christian school sector does not appreciate being made pawns in a game of political brinkmanship.

What about Carolyn Grantskalns, chief executive of the Australian Association of Independent Schools of SA? She says:

It is time to stop the squabbling between the State and Federal governments over school funding...It is time for all politicians to put the children of South Australia first.

What about the Catholic sector? Neil McGoran, formerly the head of the SACE Board, says:

Obviously we would like this matter to be resolved promptly...The sooner we have the certainty the sooner schools [will] be confident that they have the necessary funds to support their plans for the 2018 school year.

The South Australian government's reckless game playing is putting politics before their kids. I have a message for the minister, the Premier and the government: stop it. Put our kids first. Sign the agreement and let that funding roll to our schools.

FLOREY ELECTORATE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:18): As this parliamentary year comes to a close and the session ends as well, this seems like a good time to reflect on the past 20 years in this place. It is a rare and great privilege to represent an electorate and carry on the Westminster traditions at a local level to deliver the best possible outcomes to the greatest number of people. Democracy happens every day, not only once every four years. It is this belief that has driven me from my earliest days of activism, and I do not mean running beside the car helping my father to deliver brochures when I was about eight years old.

My public life really commenced when my children began kindy and I started to take an interest and be part of the management committee. Since that day at Holden Hill, part of the then electorate of Florey in 1983, I began to put back into the community I now serve. Over the years, I have met thousands of people, helped many of them and made many friendships and acquaintances. I have become part of many schools, community groups and sporting clubs, working alongside hundreds of volunteers and learning from what I have heard from them.

The people of the north-east are amazing. From the U3A Tea Tree Gully to service clubs, like Lions and Kiwanis, and those in retirement villages and nursing homes, their combined knowledge and wisdom is vast and almost endless. Their nurturing of our young people and next generations of leaders has produced a group full of ideas, energy and vision. In all of this, though, and with an eye to South Australia's future, we need to look on what is ahead.

For me, the basics are to ensure that people have full and happy lives, good health services—and this means aged care as well—and education and training opportunities to ensure that they have satisfying jobs. Access to shelter and social housing is vital, as are the means to live, the cost of living and the ability to pay bills, being something constantly on people's minds. Governments seem to be directly responsible for less as time goes by, but what they will always be required to do is set policy direction and maintain a firm eye on what is going on around them.

No longer can governments say that this is not their responsibility, because eventually everything is in one way or another. The nexus between federal, state and local government must work better and the frustration we see at elections that brings a variety of smaller parties and individuals to parliaments is a warning to the two major parties that their business models are no

longer acceptable. If we are to get to a position where public confidence is restored and stability returned, people in public life need to listen, learn and deliver. Leadership is important, but not at the cost of meeting the needs of the communities we serve.

As the days to the next state election on Saturday 17 March 2018 roll by through Christmas and the summer holidays, voters will be asked to focus on the policies they hope will be introduced after the election. They could be forgiven some cynicism because they have heard it all before; even the negative campaigns are beginning to have a familiar ring. That aside, I hope the forthcoming campaign will be fought on positive issues and progressive agendas, restoring good basic services while making a start on seeing that young people are best placed to take advantage of all that the 21st century offers.

Their teachers and trainers need to be supported in their roles and their families strengthened to give them the basis to reach their potential. Recent large funding grants to the Valley View Secondary School, Modbury High School and The Heights School mean facilities in our local area will improve, but there are concerns for TAFE and university fees and course availability. There is much work to be done in the health sector and all things to do with the ageing.

I have had much help in my work in the parliament and in my office, and I thank all the staff who have worked to serve our local community over the years. Their dedication has been superb and I thank all of them. To my friends, family and supporters, my ability to represent Florey electors has been bolstered by you. To the electors of Florey, it is an honour to work for you. You have the power of the vote, something people like Muriel Matters fought for and something I will always defend and endeavour to strengthen within our democracy. I know you will use it wisely.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.R. Kenyon): Members should be aware that tearing up is against the standing orders.

Ms BEDFORD: There is no water in these eyes, sir, I assure you.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:22): I rise to speak about the very unfortunate and avoidable energy crisis that we have here in our state. Everybody in this chamber, and in fact all over the state and all over the nation, knows that unfortunately South Australia has the most expensive and the most unreliable electricity in the nation. The government has put us in this position, saying that they are trying to save the environment, saying that they are pursuing renewables, but the reality is that all they are trying to do is save themselves. For purely political purposes, the state Labor government has run headlong towards renewables, without putting any effort whatsoever into ensuring that they actually can fit into our grid, that supply can be integrated and that customers are not punished.

Of course, we must transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy, but it must be done in a sensible, well-planned, well-managed transition, not in the helter-skelter approach that the current government has taken without any care whatsoever for the consequences of electricity consumers who, from the smallest household all the way through to the largest employer, have been absolutely punished by this government.

Only this week we have seen another disgraceful act by this government, with the government trying to pretend that electricity prices are going down. I ask you, Deputy Speaker, to point out any household, any business, small or large, that can actually show you a bill that proves that their electricity prices are going down. Electricity prices are going up and up. Residential households receiving retail bills had an 18 per cent increase on average across the state on 1 July this year. That was on top of a 10 per cent increase on 1 July last year, yet the government, which created this problem through dreadful policy over many years, is actually trying to pretend that it has not happened.

Both the Premier and the Minister for Energy have gone out there saying that electricity prices in South Australia are decreasing. The reality is that what they have done is selectively quote a moment in time and it is completely contradictory to the real-world experience of South Australian electricity consumers. It is also completely contradictory to the forward market and we have on record the energy minister, the man who has been in charge of electricity policy for over six years now,

saying to this parliament that the very best indication of future electricity prices in our state is the ASX forward futures market. Let me tell you, that information again contradicts the government trying to spin and pretend that electricity prices are going down.

For the very next whole quarter, the March quarter (January, February and March), the latest figures show that the Queensland price is \$99.50, the New South Wales price is \$108.30 and the Victorian price is \$145.50. The South Australian price in dollars per megawatt hours is \$173.25—completely contradictory to what the government would have the people of South Australia believe and, what is worse, the government knows it.

I have used those figures from the next whole quarter of the ASX futures market, which the energy minister says is the best indication of where prices are going, but do you know what is even more concerning? The government has released its energy plan trying to convince South Australia that if the state Labor government spends \$550 million of taxpayers' money to fix the problems that the government itself created and imposed upon the taxpayers, that if the government spends all that money, everything will be okay, but they have refused to provide any independent modelling that supports that claim.

The Liberal opposition, on the other hand, has provided independent modelling done by ACIL Allen, which clearly shows that, if our energy policy, our very positive broad energy policy, is put into place, it will drive down the wholesale price of electricity. We will deliver cheaper electricity. We will deliver more reliable electricity and our policy is greener as well. Do not believe me, believe the ASX futures contract price that says that over the next few years, all the way up to June 2021, South Australian electricity prices will be 15 per cent higher than the national average under this government's policy. The government's policy is factored into that market and it is disgraceful.

Time expired.

STRETTON CENTRE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:27): Today, I would like to talk about the Stretton Centre, which is a major centre in Munno Para. It is a centre named after Professor Hugh Stretton. The centre is a place of innovation and policy leadership. The reason I mention it is that the centre has recently celebrated its second birthday and I was proud to represent the Premier at the event.

For the past two years, the centre has been the focal point for collaboration between researchers, industry and government. It is a partnership between the Australian government, the South Australian government through Renewal SA, the City of Playford and the University of Adelaide. The centre has provided a clear demonstration of how powerful industry development can be a driver of sustainable community development. The month prior to that, I was there for the announcement of funding for two of the businesses based at the Stretton Centre.

The grants were from the South Australian government's Small Business Development Fund and they went to two co-workers at the centre, including Sally Ryan, Manager of Pathways to Recovery, an NDIS registered provider of disability and mental health support. The good news about that is that it has grown so quickly that soon she will be moving out of the centre and setting up in another location, so our key objective of growing small business has been achieved. Founder of Solution for Construction, Naveesh Sharma, a civil engineer and project manager, also won a grant to grow business in there. At the heart of the Stretton Centre are initiatives that create jobs, diversify businesses and promote innovation. It is a major focal point for jobs in northern Adelaide, providing a physical site for start-ups and entrepreneurs to link with local research organisations and industry.

Early this week, I was again at the Stretton Centre on behalf of the Premier. I had the privilege of officially launching the Gig City network at the Stretton Centre.

Mr Whetstone: With that moustache, yes, it worked well, didn't it?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It did; it has actually won me a lot of things. I win a lot of races by a whisker, you might say.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Time is up, Tony; you wasted your last few minutes talking about your moustache.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That cannot be right.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, apparently—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The table was engaged in really important conversation, but you have now been reinstated with three minutes.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I thought you had shaved off a few minutes there.

Mr Whetstone: I can smell something.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, I am smelling the roses. The Gig City network enables the development of leading-edge, data intensive and real-time applications in industry sectors such as biotech, advanced manufacturing and film postproduction. It will help drive economic development in the northern parts of Adelaide. Since the launch of the program only five months ago, more than 100 businesses have signed up to Gig City, demonstrating the high demand for affordable ultrafast internet connectivity in Adelaide. The Stretton Centre, with 31 businesses co-working under one roof, is a focal point for job creation in northern Adelaide.

I also acknowledge that SABRENet, a leading innovator in digital communication, provides the backbone infrastructure for the connection. I understand that is so successful that it is using as much data now as some of the other centres in Adelaide, such as Technology Park. One of the important parts of the Stretton Centre's programs that it has also supported is the northern economic growth program, which was launched early this year. Part of the economic growth program, which is funded by the Department of State Development, was to provide co-workers with spaces for small businesses who are moving literally from the home but are not quite ready to go into their own premises but who also, importantly, needed business advice, mentoring and networking advice on finance, etc.

One of the small businesses, Red Centre Enterprises, which is a business run by Indigenous Australians, specialises in native foods. I am pleased to say that, with the support and guidance from the Stretton Centre, the mentoring program, the business advisory services sector, this enterprise centre has now moved out of the Stretton Centre and relocated into my electorate, of course, and they are starting to employ additional people. This enterprise won a contract with Vili's pies and pasties for their a new line of spices and herbs and other ingredients for pies and pasties.

It is clear from these examples that, by providing the right support to small business, we can then promote them to grow not only business but, more importantly, jobs in the area. Just these two businesses have provided over 10 jobs in the list this year alone, so we have 10 more people in the northern parts of Adelaide working and making a very important contribution to their families and the community. I commend the work of the Stretton Centre. I commend its director, Dermot Cussen, and also the City of Playford for working closely with the state government for the north.

APPRENTICESHIPS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:33): Today, I rise to speak about a really concerning issue in the Riverland and Mallee that has parents very worried. The future structure of apprenticeship support is under review in South Australia and there are community concerns that, as a result, Riverland and Mallee students will be disadvantaged. The shadow minister for education has asked questions in the South Australian parliament. I have written to the Minister for Higher Education and Skills, but I am yet to receive anything. The shadow minister is yet to receive an answer to these community concerns.

As it currently stands, apprenticeship brokers in the Riverland operate under Trade Schools for the Future, based in Berri at the Glossop High campus, and they have been a valuable asset. Some of those campuses, some of these schools that have brokers include East Murray Area School, Glossop High School, Karoonda Area School, Lameroo Regional Community School, Loxton High

School, Renmark High, Riverland Special School, Swan Reach Area School and, of course, Waikerie High School.

According to the website, the Trade Schools for the Future program is an education initiative that enables government and secondary school students to combine their South Australian SACE studies with vocational and educational training (VET) in the form of a school-based apprenticeship or traineeship. One of the concerns raised with me is the potential change in services provided by the brokers for this program, who regularly visit the local schools.

Concerns have been presented to me by members of the community that these brokers may be replaced by a compromised service run by private providers who may or may not be committed to providing local apprenticeship options for young adults in our region. Again, these are concerns raised with me by members of the Riverland community, and I am still waiting for a response from the minister, which is never a good sign.

I have a copy of an internal DECD letter about the secondary learners student pathway review. The letter states that there were changes after DECD corporate office's restructure early last year, with the learning improvement division established and a newly formed secondary learning directive, absorbing the work of the previous student pathways and the years 8 to 12 policy initiative. The letter goes on to say:

In 2016 a review of the Student Pathways strategy led to a number of recommendations. These recommendations aim to support sites with SACE Improvement, career development, STEM achievement and pathways for students, including vocational pathways, in a more strategic, equitable and sustainable way.

Again, the letter advises measures in response to the Student Pathways Review, including 14 permanent apprenticeship brokers who will be transitioned into adjusted roles. What does that mean? Officers will be provided with an opportunity to indicate their location preference where appropriate and quarantined selection processes will be undertaken. Band B3 student pathway senior leaders will have contracts conclude in January 2018. The ASO8 business partnership managers, of which there are five positions, have contracts concluding in January 2018, and according to the letter these positions will not continue. Again, there are more jobs missing out of the education system in regional South Australia.

As you can see, there is a reason behind the uncertainty in the Riverland community. The Trade Schools for the Future program has been seen by the community as very successful. Apprenticeships and trainees are critical to obtaining young people in our workforce. These young people are about the future of the Riverland and Mallee. They are about the future upskilling of what they will present, the benefit they will present to their local community. I ask the minister to clarify the future vision of the apprenticeship program, ensuring that the individual education and vocational needs of our local students and the sustainability of our regional communities are catered for under any proposed changes to the existing scheme.

The uncertainty that the education system is providing to South Australian schools, apprenticeships and training provisions at the moment is very, very concerning. Again, we see the Minister for Education blaming the federal government. We see the shadow minister for education telling the minister, the Premier, the Deputy Premier—all of the government side—not to play games with children. Do not play games with education in South Australia, particularly in regional South Australia.

FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:38): Today, I rise to speak on the community-based statewide Fund My Neighbourhood project, which in my experience was welcomed by all those I spoke with from right across South Australia. They viewed it as a great opportunity to have their projects funded in their local communities, and if this time they missed out they viewed it as a really good community awareness raising exercise so they could garner future support when seeking funding.

I am delighted today to highlight the eight successful projects within the electorate of Elder and the surrounding areas, all with the focal point of supporting and building community, a function I am extremely passionate about. The projects are as follows. First is a basketball court upgrade at Trinity Baptist Church in Colonel Light Gardens. Trinity Baptist Church is an amazing community hub that caters for all ages, and there are basketball courts there that are used freely by the community

during daylight hours. Many hundreds of different people from the surrounding suburbs use these courts daily. The resurfacing of these courts will make this a safer place for people of all ages to remain fit and active, playing all sorts of sports, including basketball.

Recently, I was pleased when doorknocking in the area to drop by when a holiday program was underway with well over 100 children in attendance, enjoying both indoor and outdoor fun supplied by a group of committed volunteer adults. Another project is in Hawthorn at the Westbourne Park Uniting Church in Sussex Street. They called their project Crafty Chairs, which is an innovative way to get support for freestanding chairs to replace the non-stackable pews that are presently in place. Currently, about 260 people from the local and broader community attend the Thursday craft activities at the Westbourne Park Uniting Church. They decided that having stackable chairs, 200 of them in fact, would free up the space and be able to help them make different configurations in this area to facilitate the building of community and enjoying each other's company while doing craft.

Another really well-supported project was Mortlock Oval BBQ Community Space in Colonel Light Gardens. Local resident, Jim, was an absolutely passionate proponent of this project, ensuring that the community got behind the fact that they needed a barbecue area, picnic benches, lighting and toilet facilities. Jim letterboxed the area tirelessly and extensively and made sure there were many conversations on this particular project. Mortlock Oval is a beautiful open space, a great playground and bike track. It is next door to Colonel Light Gardens Primary School where children use this oval constantly. It is well frequented by people from all over the area, not just those local to Colonel Light Gardens. Ultimately, when people get there with their families, they are searching for toilet facilities, so this will be welcome in the area.

Kaz, another amazing local person, spearheaded a campaign for the Edwardstown Primary School to gain funding for a Nature Play playground on the grounds of the Edwardstown Primary School. She tirelessly walked the suburb, letterboxing while walking with her baby in the pusher. She promoted this amazing project and was successful in gaining the funding to make sure that they get the funding for the water play, sandpit, large rocks and everything else needed for a Nature Play playground. Well done to Kaz. What an amazing community person.

Hawthorn was another winner at Price Memorial Oval where the project was called Project Fun. The locals got behind this project to make sure that playgrounds and park spaces will be transformed to engage the play space for outdoor fun and to encourage children to stay active, be active, engage and enjoy the social activity. Well done to those local residents of Hawthorn who got behind this particular project.

Finally, three last things: Hawthorn Bowling Club gained funding for shade, shelter and irrigation with the shade to encourage older people to stay engaged in sport; St Mary's Food Bank, sponsored by Edwardstown Baptist Church, gained extra funding to provide the support they needed to ensure those in need in the local area receive food and goods, as the bank builds a designated place to give out their goods to those who need it; and also we will see toilets at Avenue Road playground and skate park in Cumberland Park which is a really well-used park by all ages of the community. Congratulations to all projects that were awarded funding, and I look forward to working with all of you to see these ventures come to fruition, enriching our community.

Adjournment Debate

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (15:43): I seek the leave of the house on indulgence for retiring members to make valedictory remarks.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In 1988, when I obtained ALP preselection for the state district of Spence, which was to become Croydon, I was 30 years old and had lived in Croydon for only two years.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I had much to learn about the area. Although the electorate bordered the city and North Adelaide at Ovingham and Hindmarsh, many of its neighbourhoods were poor and were years away from becoming fashionable. Most of the town of Hindmarsh councillors in 1988 were Labor and their outlook had been formed by the Great Depression and the Second World War. They were my mentors. I valued the advice of the Hindmarsh councillors and the old Australia they represented, the Australia of my parents, Melva and John, and Australian grandparents, Fred and Emma. I am still close to the Charles Sturt councillors, and I value their friendship enormously.

On average, the electorate was older than I was. Thousands of Spence voters came from Calabria, Benevento, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia (as it then was), Vietnam, Cambodia and the former Soviet Union, and they brought with them the language, apparel, religion and culture as it had been practised exactly when they left. Some were refugees, traumatised by their experience of communism. I came to love the people of my electorate—not all of them, of course. I enjoyed learning about them, reading their history, picking up words and phrases from their language, worshipping God in their churches and temples, drinking their grog and their coffee, riding around on my cyclos.

It seemed to me that in the communist countries they had been treated like laboratory mice in a Leninist experiment. Now they were in Australia to live under the Crown and the rule of law in a mixed economy, own their own home (and maybe another to rent out), raise their children and get them a good education, run a business, grow vegetables and fruit trees, keep chooks and goats—Christos Kalaitzis and Spyro Karzis grazed their goats on the verges of the town of Hindmarsh when I was first a member—enjoy some domestic bliss unencumbered by a rapacious ruling class, practise their religion freely or perhaps not at all, and work out their own salvation.

His Excellency the Governor, Mr Hieu, was the first Vietnamese person I met who answered this description. He returned to Vietnam for the first time in 2006 with me, and we visited the town of his childhood, Quang Tri, and the Shrine of Our Lady of La Vang. C.S. Lewis wrote in *Mere Christianity*:

The State exists simply to promote and to protect the ordinary happiness of human beings in this life. A husband and wife chatting over a fire, a couple of friends having a game of darts in a pub, a man reading a book in his own...garden—and that is what the State is there for. And unless they are helping to increase and prolong such moments, all the laws, parliaments, armies, courts, police, economics, etc., are simply a waste of time.

So my job, as I saw it, was for the South Australian government to let them do this and help them out in a way governments in their old homeland, did not. I was watchful for pressure groups, corporate interests and media outlets that were contemptuous of the people I represented and wanted to exploit them or experiment on them.

Gaya is one of the people I am talking about and, for the purposes of these remarks, Gaya can stand for all of them. Gaya is still puffing on her cigarettes, despite her stroke, and living in a Housing SA unit—the kind of state socialism she does not much like. Her family fled Russia after the October Revolution when the Bolsheviks used military force to disperse the only democratically elected parliament in Russia's history until 1991. Her family joined the Polish Armed Forces in their successful resistance of the Bolshevik invasion, and the family settled down in Eastern Poland. In 1939, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact gave them back to the Soviet Union, and in 1941 Nazi Germany invaded.

Gaya and her twin sister Nika were born in the midst of Operation Barbarossa, in 1941. Gaya's father joined General Andrey Vlasov's formation, and two pictures of General Vlasov still adorned Gaya's sideboard when I called on Monday. Vlasov's was a controversial outfit, but they were the liberators from the SS of the most beautiful city in the world, Prague, and they saved the old city from destruction. Her family avoided deportation to the Soviet Union in 1945 and, after the war, they went to Casablanca because it was part of France.

After more than 10 years in Morocco, they came to Australia. Gaya is deeply religious, but suspicious of priests. I made the mistake of congratulating her at a street-corner meeting in Renown Park about the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad reuniting with the Moscow Patriarchate. She gave me the rounds of the kitchen for that.

She lived with her twin sister in a beautifully decorated Housing Trust house on the Sam Johnston Estate, cluttered with icons, fine art and literature, embroidery and a samovar. They had

an exquisite garden. When Nika died, Gaya moved to Ridleyton and Housing SA pulled out the garden—*quomodo sedet sola civitas*. I visit her occasionally and it is the only time I smoke. She speaks fluent Russian and French, tells me Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago* is better in Russian than English, reads Russian newspapers and is full bottle on contemporary Russian politics.

Gaya tells me Ukrainians are little Russians; they only think they are Ukrainians. It is something we passionately disagree about. She is pleased that I can assure her that the dual citizenship saga does not mean she is going to be deported. Gaya has never been to Russia and never will. I am blessed to have a job that for the past 28 years has taken me to the homes of Gaya, Hieu and hundreds of people like them.

One of my happiest engagements with ethnic communities has been with the Greeks, who backed my preselection in spectacular fashion at the 1988 Spence East sub-branch annual general meeting. I was pleased to reciprocate their support by getting through parliament a motion recognising the Pontian Greek, Armenian and Assyrian genocide. I then travelled to Mount Athos and addressed a rally of between 5,000 and 10,000 people in Aghia Sophia Square in Thessaloniki on the anniversary of the genocide. Australian politicians do not normally get to do things like that.

When I returned to South Australia, disgraced News Limited employee Michael Owen wrote that whether the genocide occurred was 'controversial' and that I had offended the Turkish-Australian community. Perhaps he thinks the holocaust is 'controversial'. I say 'News Limited employee' rather than 'journalist' because journalists are people who subscribe to the Journalist Code of Ethics, and I say 'disgraced' owing to a formal finding being made against him by his professional regulator, the Australian Press Council, in a March 2016 adjudication No. 1663, and I am happy to say that on the Spin Cycle if I am invited.

My first term in parliament did not go well. Under the Bannon Labor government, the State Bank, which had promised rich dividends to consolidated revenue, lost \$3,500 million. Yes, much of it was subsequently recovered, but the disaster had a big influence on me and my generation of Labor candidates. Michael Wright from Premier Bannon's office rang me on a Sunday in 1991 at my electorate office. He told me the bank had lost \$1,000 million; that was the first stage. I put the phone down and thought, 'Oh, well, my career will now coincide with permanent opposition.'

We came to office in 2002 desperate to show we could manage the finances, although we were not always fiscally virtuous with windfall tax gains, as Michael McGuire relates in his roman à clef *Never a True Word*. I doorknocked assiduously throughout the State Bank disaster and, if I could doorknock as a member of one of the most unpopular governments in the state's history, I could doorknock in almost any kind of adversity. In December 1993, Labor was reduced to 10 members in this place and the new Liberal MPs spilled over to the other side and they were interjecting on us from the side and from the back.

At Minerva Crescent, Croydon Park, one Sunday afternoon I was invited in by the householder, a Scot, Mrs Marsh. She made us a cup of tea. She told me she would never vote Labor, but I was relieved to hear it was not anything to do with John Bannon or Tim Marcus Clark. No, Mrs Marsh would never vote Labor because Ramsay MacDonald had closed their local coalmine in 1929.

I apologise to my children, Hugh, Bridget, John and Christopher, for all those afternoons and evenings I spent riding my bicycle around Spence and then Croydon, and attending endless ethnic functions, some of which I took them to without obtaining their informed consent, especially Tet, which was loud, exotic and lasted for many hours. I missed much of your childhood, but you have grown into fine young people under Joan's guidance. I hope I can make it up to you. I thank Joan for supporting me for many years, especially those early years when we were still learning about politics, the years of being a tiny opposition, and my difficult first four years as a minister.

In 1996, the Liberal government was kind enough to accept my amendment to the Residential Tenancies Act. My amendment became section 90, and it allowed neighbours to apply to the tribunal to terminate a tenancy where the tenants had persistently caused a nuisance, or used the premises for an illegal purpose, or interfered with 'the reasonable peace, comfort or privacy' of the neighbour. As members of the House of Assembly, you are probably familiar with that section.

Before section 90, the Trust used to tell neighbours there was nothing it could do and the best the neighbours could hope for was that the disruptive tenant would be convicted of an offence and gaoled. An elderly Devon Park resident, Irene McKay, who lived in a Housing Trust dwelling, had suffered from a junkie living next door and putting on a festival of crime for the neighbourhood. I helped Mrs McKay make an application under section 90. A tribunal member refused to apply section 90 because, she said, she 'did not agree with section 90'. The president of the tribunal got another member of the tribunal to hear the case and Mrs McKay's application was upheld. The tribunal member who refused to do justice according to law was Penny Wright, later a Greens senator.

In modern politics—and I refer in particular to federal politics—the frontbenchers on both sides know that the electorate wants government benefits but does not want to pay the necessary tax, so they frame their policy accordingly and we end up with the highest debt in the country's history. I worry that both the federal Labor and federal Liberal parties have given up on a disciplined approach to budgeting, reviewing expenditure, making savings, justifying the savings to the electorate, making room for a combination of new expenditure and tax concessions.

Now that the Corbynite approach of promising loads of free stuff is in fashion and the 24/7 news cycle makes politicians so reactive, it is time for me to go, as the Nick Xenophon team, the Greens and One Nation break down responsible government. Not long after the turn of the century, Joan suggested we go to the Queen Street Cafe in Croydon more often and meet the new people in the area. I told her that I was happy with the old people, but I went anyway and still go regularly with my daughter, Bridget.

In recent years, I attend many funerals of those who have supported me, such as that of Jonny Andrea at St George Mile End earlier this week. I keep up with the doorknocking of new citizens and produce my new citizen and new constituent letters in more than 50 languages, including five languages from the Horn of Africa, four Sudanese languages, 10 Indian languages and so forth, but Croydon is moving on. I am pleased Labor has preselected someone who will now be more representative of the changing area than I can be. My biggest regret is that I could never get the numbers to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —reopen Barton Road. When I had them, thanks to Nick Xenophon in the other place, I did not have them in the house. And now that I have them in the house, I do not have them in the other place. I am confident that when 3,000 residents of Bowden Urban Village are on the electoral roll they will not tolerate going out of their way to get to O'Connell Street. A small slip of the redistribution pen might put them in the state district of Adelaide. Even the member for Adelaide told the Charles Sturt council that she would review her opposition to reopening Barton Road when Bowden Urban Village was complete.

Ms Redmond: That was going to be the first thing you did in government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my left!

Mr Marshall: You've got one day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Over the past 30 years, our Barton Road mailing list, which includes thousands of electors from the Parklands to the coast, has done good work in defeating state and local government candidates silly enough to oppose this worthy measure. Former Charles Sturt mayor, Kirsten Alexander, up there in Mildura, must regret responding to the member for Adelaide's urging to support continued closure.

In March 2002, I became attorney-general, minister for multicultural affairs and minister for consumer affairs in the Rann government. Mike Rann wanted the justice portfolio to be a combat portfolio as it had been in opposition, with Labor taking away law and order as an issue from the Liberals. My office was expected to lead the artillery barrage most days, so it was no surprise that I attracted a bit of return fire. I am grateful for Mike Rann's giving me the gig and sticking with me for eight years. One piece of advice Mike gave me that I will never forget is this: in politics, if it does not make you cringe, it is probably not worth doing.

Let me first outline the worst decisions I made as minister. The worst by far was in my capacity as minister for cemeteries and exhumations. After two years of my resisting, I surrendered to the Charles Cameron Kingston society, which claimed that this premier of South Australia—and rake—had fathered many illegitimate children and therefore the alleged descendants wanted their lineage established by the new technology of DNA. I told former premier John Bannon that, if Charlie could get away with fathering all these children at the height of the Victorian era, his secret should be buried with him, but John countered that Charlie would be chuffed to have his fecundity established after more than a century.

I fell for it. I signed the exhumation order, and the remains of Charlie and his adopted son, Kevin, were due to be raised from the family crypt at West Terrace, together with the remains of a lady who had been interred at Centennial Park. I imposed strict orders that no filming was to be done other than for an ABC documentary. One night, I came home to Croydon to watch the TV news and saw vision of a professor dusting off Charlie's femur. Joan reproached me, 'Did you let that happen?' My conditions had been broken. I revoked the order, no useful DNA was obtained, but the descendant-in-chief proclaimed that his lineage was established by rings in the flesh around the ears.

Nick Xenophon was a great friend to me in the last four years in opposition and the first years in government. He knows how much he helped Joan and me, and there were certain indirect knock-on effects for the state that have been wholly good. I will not say what they are. I admired his legislative work in another place, thinking that he used the house of review as it should be used, but we have grown apart and I do not welcome his returning to the state to hold the balance of power in the House of Assembly while refusing to participate in a government. In about 2004, we went on a family holiday together to Aldinga beachfront. There, I told him that I did not think he would make quota at the 2006 state election and would he be interested in joining the Rann cabinet and taking a spot on Labor's ticket for the other place? How wrong can you be?

I served almost eight years as Attorney-General. I had excellent and loyal ministerial staff, including my longest suffering staff member, Sally Bartlett. There were outstanding public servants in the policy and legislation section, the Crown, DPP and the AGD generally, including victims of crime commissioner Michael O'Connell and Simon Forrest's team at Multicultural SA. Vicki Antoniou, originally from Multicultural SA, still works for me. My shadow was the member for Heysen, and I enjoyed those long hours almost alone together in the chamber, debating legislation with no other member willing to listen to us voluntarily—there was a roster. We developed a kind of respect.

I will talk about my time in the portfolio under some headings: Nemer and the Director of Public Prosecutions; judicial appointments and the magistrates; two controversial cases, Easling and Keogh; and the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account. A thread running through these is that most lawyers conduct themselves honourably as officers of the court but, alas, there are some who do not. Another bad decision of mine was appointing Stephen Pallaras as Director of Public Prosecutions. His reference from the Office of the DPP in Western Australia was excellent, but a mate of mine in Perth rang to warn me that the reference was glowing for the usual reason. She was right.

We were too keen to appoint someone from outside South Australia to replace Paul Rofe. Paul Rofe had led from the front as DPP. He managed the operation in the early years on what Angus Redford described as 'the smell of an oily rag'. He had the respect of most of the staff. As his health declined, he tried to continue being a warrior advocate, but the temptation was to enter into charge bargains in some of his own cases so that he could cope. Nemer was one charge bargain too far. Although the defence lawyer was doing what she thought best for her client, at the end of the day her client came a gutzer.

Paul Rofe was also subject to a campaign against him by Graham Archer at *Today Tonight*. Graham Archer had covertly filmed him crossing Gawler Place from our building at 45 Pirie Street to the TAB opposite many, many times on a particular day, with the imputation that he was not concentrating on his work and therefore all Kevin Borick's clients who had ever been convicted should have the conviction set aside. I exaggerate the second imputation only slightly. Paul came to see me for our regular meeting. He told me that he bet according to a system that required him to reinvest after every win, and that day all his bets were winners. These days a punter would do it from his phone.

In August 2001, Paul Nemer had shot newsagent Geoffrey Williams in the eye, mistakenly believing the newsagent, making his early morning deliveries in the dark, was stalking two girls. The case was heard by my first Supreme Court appointment, John Sulan, but a charge bargain was entered into and Nemer received a suspended sentence. The state was convulsed by what it saw as an injustice. The DPP, having made the charge bargain himself, could not very well appeal against it on the ground of manifest inadequacy.

The Solicitor-General, Chris Kourakis, advised that the Attorney should direct an appeal under the DPP Act. The Crown Solicitor, Mike Walter, doubted that an appeal could be directed under the DPP Act and recommended no appeal. The public servants at the top of the Attorney-General's Department were appalled by the prospect of a directed appeal, which, they said, would undermine the independence of the DPP. They argued in a long meeting that, as the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor disagreed, a third law officer of the Crown should be called in to break the deadlock. They suggested parliamentary counsel Geoffrey Hackett-Jones.

I admired Geoffrey's work and I enjoyed his company, but the idea that parliamentary counsel should be called upon to break this deadlock was risible, a desperate last attempt by the AGD permanent heads to stave off the government they despised. Soon enough, they would have what they thought was their revenge. Of course, the Liberal Party opposed our directing an appeal. An appeal was directed by Acting Attorney-General Paul Holloway and heard by the Court of Criminal Appeal, comprising Chief Justice Doyle and Justices Prior and Vanstone. By 2-1, the Chief Justice dissenting, our appeal was upheld.

After the Solicitor-General's report on the Nemer charge bargain put pressure on Paul Rofe to resign, I had a meeting with him, Wendy Abraham and Pauline Barnett in my 11th floor office. At Paul's funeral, his brother told the congregation:

I think Paul was now like the magnificent marlin lashed to the side of the boat, making its way back to port in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. Hemingway wrote of huge, shovel-nosed sharks tearing pieces of flesh from the carcass. Shovel-nosed sharks. How amazing! Had someone beamed a photo of Mike Rann to Ernest Hemingway!

Well, what his brother could not have known is that, after Paul and his two supporting companions had left my room to consider Paul's position, a shovel-nosed shark caught the lift back to my office without Paul to put the case for his removal and the installation of Wendy Abraham forthwith. No doubt she was a mourner and joined in the applause of Paul's brother's remarks.

However, Paul's brother was right: principal responsibility for forcing Paul out was the Rann government's. During Mr Pallaras's tenure, serious organised crime became a major political topic and I was able to get a big increase in the DPP's budget. We more than doubled the number of staff. The more money we gave DPP, the more Mr Pallaras criticised us. Unlike Paul, he did not lead from the front.

Among my good decisions, I think, was appointing more women as magistrates, District Court judges and Supreme Court justices than any Attorney-General before or since. For me, it was not an ideological decision so much as thinking outside the square in the appointing process and making sure that people who were capable got onto the consultation list, even if they would not have been thought of at first if the process was on traditional lines.

I had a dinner group of close friends around me who advised me about appointments known as the Judicial Disappointments Committee because none of them got one until the late Rosey Davey finally scored while I was overseas and there was an acting attorney-general. May I take this opportunity to apologise to Alex Ward for never creating a resident magistrate at Ardrossan within walking distance of the jetty and commend the measure to the members for Enfield and Bragg.

For me, the Magistrate's Court was always the priority in budget deliberations. It was the court with which the people were most likely to deal, and if we could get the Magistrate's Court working well the justice system would be humming. We built new courts in Victor Harbor, Port Lincoln, Berri and Port Augusta, and I prevailed in my struggle to appoint to the countryside resident magistrates, which had been abolished under the Liberal government. The Supreme Court was offered a new building on the tram barn site to be built as a public-private partnership, but the justices

declined the offer, one because he might from time to time have to walk across Victoria Square to the Sir Samuel Way Building for a hearing.

When I appointed Chief Magistrate Alan Moss to the District Court, I was keen to replace him swiftly. I appointed Deputy Chief Magistrate Kelvyn Prescott as Chief Magistrate and then, looking at the file, noticed that a previous appointment panel had thought Andrew Cannon would be as good a deputy chief magistrate as Kelvyn. It was explained to me that Attorney-General Trevor Griffin had appointed Kelvyn Prescott instead of Andrew Cannon on character grounds. I did not heed Trevor Griffin's wisdom and thought that if Andrew Cannon was good enough to be deputy chief magistrate when the Liberals were in office, he ought to get the gig now. I appointed him forthwith so the magistracy would not be preoccupied by a long process—read 'faction fight'—though Kate Lennon rightly reproached me for not putting it through a panel process.

When one becomes a minister, one notices people laughing at one's jokes even when they are not funny. As Attorney-General, one has the authority to appoint magistrates and judges, so the sycophancy could be alarming, as well as the vindictiveness when a coveted appointment was not forthcoming. Andrew Cannon would take me aside to thrust on me his latest prolix manifesto on improving the Magistrate's Court and generally conducting himself like Edmund Blackadder as a courtier. This was a pity because practitioners tell me he was a magistrate who listened patiently, was fair and worked hard. Time passed, factional warfare broke out among the magistrates, Kelvyn was undermined by his deputy and stories about the unhappiness in the Magistrate's Court started appearing in *The Advertiser*.

I appointed Kelvyn to the Youth Court and set up a panel to appoint the new Chief Magistrate presided over by the Solicitor-General, Chris Kourakis, who is now the Chief Justice. There were many applicants, among them Magistrate Liz Bolton and Deputy Chief Magistrate Andrew Cannon. The latter came to see me regularly in his capacity as Acting Chief Magistrate and took the opportunity to lobby for himself. The panel recommended Liz Bolton be appointed. An agitated Andrew Cannon came to see me. I would normally see him in the small boardroom, but, as this was tough news for him, I invited him into my room. He strode around my room angrily, as I sat at my desk, proclaiming that the panel was corrupt.

The next Monday, he sought an emergency meeting with me. I met him in the small boardroom. The only emergency was that he told me I should appoint him a District Court judge forthwith. Nigel Hunt had a front-page story in the *Sunday Mail* in which Andrew Cannon accused Liz Bolton of impropriety at a suburban Magistrate's Court when she was a manager by dint of appointing a former colleague from commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, who was already a magistrate, to a temporary office that carried a small stipend. There was no impropriety. Liz Bolton, decent and conscientious person that she is, phoned me to say she wanted to withdraw her application for Chief Magistrate in light of the published story. 'Be buggered you will,' I replied.

After Liz Bolton became Chief Magistrate, Andrew Cannon issued what he called 'sentencing guidelines' and uploaded them on Juris, the shared website of magistrates and judges. It was not appropriate for magistrates to issue sentencing guidelines. Andrew Cannon's guidelines said that imprisonment should not be imposed in sentencing if the state of South Australia's prisons did not comply with a utopian set of prison conditions, such as one prisoner per cell, each cell having a view of the surrounding landscape and the prisons being close to the prisoner's relatives. There were other stipulations, all of them with huge budget implications. One could have viewed this more favourably if it were not so transparently an attempt to punish the government for not appointing him Chief Magistrate.

A career burglar called Bieg, whose offending demanded a term of imprisonment, was released by Andrew Cannon using his guidelines. As we found out later on, Bieg soon resumed his life of crime. More victims of crime were created by Cannon's decision. The prosecution appealed to the Supreme Court against the non-custodial sentence. Justice David heard the appeal. Unusually, Bieg's solicitor, Greg Mead, conceded that Andrew Cannon's decision was wrong. Both sides agreed, and Justice David made scathing remarks about Cannon's guidelines, calling them, and I quote, 'a press release'. Newsworthy though this was, *The Advertiser* did not print a word of it. The matter was remitted to the Chief Magistrate, and she sentenced Bieg to a term of imprisonment.

One of the conspiracies against the public interest perpetrated by the Law Society was keeping the decisions of the Legal Practitioners Conduct Board secret. During my time as attorney, lawyer George Mancini was a regular before the board and had been criticised by the Supreme Court, but his clients had no means of finding out. The current Attorney should be congratulated on ending this rort and publishing findings against lawyers on the website of the Legal Professional Conduct Commissioner.

Although Mancini had the benefit of his pre-2014 misdeeds before the new act came into effect being suppressed, I notice he has started quickly under the new regime, with an unprofessional conduct finding in 2014, just after the midyear start for the new regime, and in 2015 a finding of failing to appear in court to represent a client and failing to submit a client's application for legal aid. Hendrik Gout told radio FIVEaa listeners that George Mancini is a very well-respected lawyer in Adelaide.

I gave two grievances about the case of Thomas Easling on 17 and 18 of May 2011, and I stand by everything I said in those grievances. It is one of the few things Stephen Pallaras and I agreed on. In those speeches I told the house:

I am all for the polite convention that once an accused person is acquitted he or she is entitled to the presumption of innocence. Tom Easling is entitled to the presumption of innocence having been acquitted by a jury on 18 counts, 12 by unanimous not guilty verdicts and six by majority verdict. What I say is that a not guilty verdict is just that: it is not a verdict of innocent. It is a verdict that the prosecution did not prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. It sometimes happens that a criminal prosecution fails to prevail beyond reasonable doubt but that the same allegation prevails in a civil court on the balance of probabilities.

Mr Archer, Mr Gout and the member for Davenport—

I hasten to say a previous member—

prey on this legal principle not being widely known in society. It is appropriate that, once a not guilty verdict is given, the media, parliament and society should then apply the presumption of innocence. But Mr Archer, Mr Gout and the member for Davenport have not been applying the presumption of innocence as a shield for Mr Easling: they have been using it as a sword to assert that the not guilty verdict means that the investigation was crooked, the prosecution should not have been brought and the witnesses lied.

What I want to talk about now is the pressure that was brought to bear on ministers by Tom Easling's brother, John Easling. John Easling paid his money to attend Progressive Labor Business dinners. He was put on my table at one of these. His brother had not been charged at the time of the dinner. It was unusual for me to go to AFL football, but on one weekend a couple of years later I went to see the Crows play at Football Park. As I was taking my seat, I heard someone shouting at me from above me in the West Lakes grandstand. I scanned the crowd above. It was John Easling shouting that he had paid his money to Progressive Labor Business but now his brother Tom had been charged. His shouting was to the effect that he wasted his money and I was a useless minister.

Some years later, my partner, the member for Wright, was the minister for education and children's services. She had boarded a flight at Adelaide Airport. As she was settling into her seat, John Easling leant over the row of seats and shouted at her that she was a disgrace and much else besides. It took some minutes for the crew to get him to stop and lead him away. Needless to say, neither of us had any say in the prosecution decisions, as it should be. Those members who have not been ministers but have an ambition should take note: every day you go to work as a minister there are at least 100 ways you could lose your job.

In my early years as Attorney-General, Graham Archer wrote to me about the Keogh case. He pointed out that *Today Tonight* had screened some very harmful stories about me. He wrote that all this could change to positive stories if I did what he asked. I did not take up Archer's offer and never heard anything more other than vindictive defamation of me, culminating in a 2015 Hendrik Gout series that tried to link me to a family day-care scandal on the basis that I had been married to childcare centre operator Judith Atkinson. We barely knew each other, and neither Archer nor Gout had bothered to speak to either of us. Judith had not done anything wrong either, as it happens, but had been singled out because of her married name.

What I can say about the Keogh case and all the *Today Tonight* criminal cases is that even though I read all the Solicitor-General's advice carefully and painstakingly, I acted on the advice of the Solicitor-General at all times, and to have done anything else would have been a breach of my oath of office.

I wish Henry Keogh well now that his conviction has been set aside and now that he will not be retried owing to the poor health of a key witness. But here is the Court of Criminal Appeal's conclusion of its judgement after setting aside the conviction. It is the part that Graham Archer censors, not allowing Channel 7 viewers to hear it:

We do not accept the submission made by the applicant's counsel that there should be a direction of acquittal. To the contrary, we consider that the non-expert circumstantial evidence, when considered together with the forensic pathology evidence as it is now understood, is such that it would remain open to a properly directed jury to convict. However, we expressly recognise that a properly directed jury may consider that that evidence would not be sufficient to establish guilt beyond reasonable doubt. These are truly jury questions and this judgment should not be taken to express a view on whether the applicant in fact committed the crime with which he was charged. For our part, our review of the material does not establish a case for an acquittal following this appeal. Accordingly, we would set aside the conviction and order a retrial.

I turn now to the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account contretemps. The Supreme Court judgement dismissing Kate Lennon's unfair dismissal claim deals comprehensively with those issues. It took six years for me to be vindicated by the judgement, and by then I was no longer Attorney-General. I gleefully annotated and underlined Justice Layton's judgement in a lovely square in sunny Nafplio, in the Peloponnese, to which it had been faxed.

The most telling vignette in the whole case was a huge sum of money being returned to the justice department unspent from the new Adelaide police headquarters. It was so big that the deputy head of AGD, Kym Kelly, could not process it at all, as it was over his monetary delegation. He therefore split the sum in two and put it in the Crown Solicitor's Trust, half in one financial year and half in the other. I thank the then auditor-general, Ken MacPherson, and Michael Jacobs, at *The Adelaide Review*, for a clear-headed explanation of what was going on when the opposition and *The Advertiser* were hysterical.

Treasurer Kevin Foley had every reason to test whether unspent carryover should be retained by each department, and Kate Lennon's and Kym Kelly's attempt to cheat the Hyperion system by diverting unspent moneys into the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account and pretending that it had been spent was deplorable and a fraud on the budget process.

As my old parliamentary roommate and friend the late Frank Blevins once told me, 'In politics, never turn the other cheek.' No-one seriously believed I knew what Kate Lennon and Kym Kelly were doing, but this became conflated with the question of whether I knew the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account existed at all. Apparently—and any members who are about to become ministers should listen—my incoming minister's brief of about 1,700 pages had mentioned the trust account as one of 28 administered funds in the department in dot points at about page 1500.

The Rann government's criminal justice policies were mocked by the Liberal opposition, the Greens and their allies in the media, but our tenure coincided with a drop of more than 40 per cent in the crime rate. One of the key factors was our willingness to employ DNA technology which my two predecessors had been cautious about. The Rann government ordered the DNA testing of all prisoners, all people charged with offences, and Mike Rann and I went around to the Forensic Science Centre to be DNA tested as volunteers.

Ms Redmond: And did you have any?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Sorry?

Ms Redmond: Did you have some DNA?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, I thought you were interjecting, 'Were there any matches?' A modest increase in the imprisonment rate also assisted by giving society a slightly longer breather from career criminals, especially those remanded in custody. Improvements in car-locking technology helped, as did the widespread possession of iPhones and, of course, CCTV. I suppose 25 years of continuous economic growth helped as well, not that we are claiming credit for that. I also lifted the statute of limitations on historic sex offences. I was surprised by how many accused people pleaded guilty. We had to build special lodgings for male prisoners in their 70s and 80s. We also made much progress with the rights of victims of crime.

Returning to local issues, West Croydon matriarch Eileen Harris told me that the people in the queue for the cinema on South Road at Ridleyton in 1948 were talking about the need for an

upgrade of South Road. Now it is happening, even though the Greens opposed it. It will make Renown Park, Ridleyton, Croydon, Hindmarsh and West Hindmarsh much better neighbourhoods and improve productivity. We are also in the midst of putting the Outer Harbor and Grange lines under the standard gauge freight line in the Parklands and putting the passenger line under Park Terrace. We are going to get new upgraded, rebuilt railway stations at Bowden and Croydon. No longer will freight trains stop on Hawker Street or Torrens Road. Memo to transport minister: Eileen Harris would be a good choice as the person to cut the ribbon on the Torrens to Torrens project.

During my time, Labor governments have done wonders for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the wonders have not ceased. Dr John Horowitz has been telling patients in clinical situations not to vote Labor for about 25 years, whether we are in government or opposition, so I doubt whether the latest injection of funding for The QEH is going to stop his doing that. He told my dear neighbour whom he was treating for a heart condition, Stanija, that I had got him suspended from The QEH, which is of course ludicrous as I had no idea that a younger professional colleague had complained about him.

When one becomes a minister, one's income increases and, as the Rann cabinet illustrated, ministers' clothes improved. I thought mine did. But my friend Rory McEwen put me in my place by telling me often that I came to cabinet dressed like a pox doctor's clerk.

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Ashford says it is the bow tie; perhaps it is the braces. I think it would surprise most people to know that around the Rann cabinet table, minister Lomax-Smith and I were usually allies—the odd couple, as she put it. It was the two of us who argued unsuccessfully for the release on parole of lifers whose cases came before cabinet. I knew the Premier, then just a minister, was going for the top job when he deserted Jane and I and started backing continued incarceration in order to protect society.

One of the best things about the Rann cabinet was the presence of the member for Mount Gambier, Rory McEwen, and the member for Chaffey, Karlene Maywald. They brought to the table an understanding of the countryside and its rhythms, the price of grains and grapes, the price of lambs, wool and heifers, rainfall, the seasons, where small towns were located. During the drought and its dreadful effect on the Murray-Darling system, I would ring Karlene when I had looked at the Bureau of Meteorology website and exclaim, 'Karlene, have you seen how much rain they have had at Narrabri?' During the drought, we made plans to dam the Murray just south of Wellington.

The best things about the Rann cabinet, until about 2008, was that there were no leaks. We liked each other enough not to leak. And then the leaking started from the newly appointed Michael O'Brien, an old friend of mine from the mid-1980s. I do not know why he did it, but for him maybe it seemed sport. Michael was rewarded with glowing assessments of his abilities by those journalists to whom he leaked. The leaking contributed to the atmosphere of crisis leading into the 2010 general election, as did Michelle 'Chantel-wah', as Christopher Pyne always pronounced it.

After the 2010 general election, I went to the backbench because I had had enough. My marriage to Joan had broken up and I was living in an old row house on Coglein Street, Brompton, with my eldest son, Hugh. They were tough times for both Hugh and I, but he has done well ever since in his education and career, and now he is married to Dzenana and living in Hamilton Hill, above Fremantle.

In 2013, while I was in Hoi An in central Vietnam, on holiday with the member for Wright, I got a phone call offering me the Speakership. When the member for Wright then got a phone call from the Premier, she assumed she was going to be sacked or demoted—you know how it is, one per family. But, on the contrary, she was promoted to Minister for Education and Children's Services. We are grateful to the Premier for having confidence in us, despite our having been rusted-on Mike Rann loyalists, and these vocations have been fulfilling. We hope we did our best for the Premier and those we served. If I had known what a great gig the Speaker was, I would have got out of the ministry much earlier.

I have enjoyed my interactions with members of the opposition in my capacity as Speaker, particularly the leader, the member for Finnis, the member for Morialta and the member for Mount

Gambier. The number of opposition questions has more than doubled and the number of Dorothy Dixers is at an all-time low.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Thank you. The member for Wright has a gift for detecting and punishing my vices and excesses. I could not imagine life without her. The member for Wright and I enjoy our morning and evening walks around the western suburbs. Sometimes, in Kilkenny or West Croydon, we walk past an old shopfront attached to a home. The shop has long been closed. The member for Wright says to me that, whether the Hon. Peter Malinauskas is elected as the member for Croydon or not, I should rent one of these shopfronts in retirement and renovate it. I should put fresh glass in the window and on the window I should paint the state's emblem, the piping shrike. Above it, I should paint the words 'Mick Atkinson—

The Hon. P. Caica: JP.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —JP'—and below it I should paint the words 'former member for Croydon'. I should provide a JP service from there and wait for constituents disgruntled with the new member to come. I know you all think I could do it, but I will not be or anything like it.

I look forward to cultivating my verge gardens, reading many books I always intended to read, punting at country races in the South-East and in the western district, harvesting Senator Don Farrell's grapes at Sevenhill, riding my bike with the member for Wright on our adventures, attending the Holy Mysteries more often and parachuting into a few electoral contests with the member for Wright to work our special kind of magic. I feel about my time in parliament as Bert Facey did about his life, when he concluded his memoir with the words:

I now wish to end this story. I have lived a very good life, it has been rich and full. I have been very fortunate and I am thrilled by it when I look back.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, member for Goyder, top that if you can.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:33): Rather difficult, Deputy Speaker, but I do appreciate the opportunity. I commend the Speaker for his contribution, as all others will.

Can I start by saying that I never sought a life in politics. There are many in this place for whom it had become part of their teenage years and all through their 20s, when they sought a chance to be here. For me, it was a matter of being asked if I was interested. I am still grateful to that person who asked me. He and I do speak, though not as often as I would like. I reflect upon that telephone call he made to me, and I thank him for it because it has provided me with an opportunity I never thought I would seek or, indeed, have an opportunity to pursue.

I was preselected in April of 2005. It is an exciting period as a candidate. The ego goes wild and you think, 'God, people think that I am actually good enough to be in the parliament, the place where the great orators are, the most knowledgeable people who live in the state, those who possess every possible level of information and can make the best possible decisions for the future.' I have since learnt that I was rather naive in that belief I held coming into this place, but it is what I think should be captured as part of it. When I reflect upon the time I have spent here, it has not quite achieved the outcomes I thought it would, that is for sure.

When it comes to my political life, I will be forever grateful to those who believed that I had a future in it. I pay tribute to two people who have now passed, Robert and Sharon Schulze, who were from Maitland, where Donna and I live. I will be forever grateful to them. From a very early stage in my time working with Robert, he believed in me and became a very close friend and confidant. Sharon volunteered to remove herself from several roles in the Liberal Party to give me a chance not just to get to know the members in the area but also to get a greater knowledge of the community. I will always be thankful for their friendship and the support and encouragement they provided to me.

I was like all people as a first-time candidate: I thought my job was to go out and doorknock, and I did that for quite a few months while still trying to work full time. I left my work with the Yorke Peninsula Council only two months before the election, but I doorknocked about 7,000 homes and spoke to roughly 2,500 people. I was abused by many who reflected upon some actions and

statements made by me in my previous role, but I was really welcomed by the absolute majority of people, and there is no doubt about that.

Until the day I die I will remember being in Dublin on an exceptionally hot day. The perspiration had dried on my face and my face was caked with salt. A lady invited me in, gave me two glasses of cold water and encouraged me to keep going. I have forever been a friend of hers, and if there is anything I want to know in the local community I go to her because I trust her implicitly. In the district we serve, I think we all need to have people we trust to tell us the truth—whether we want to hear it or not. She was a reflection of people across the electorate.

Goyder is a community of 70 different towns and locations. It would be wonderful to think that you had a photographic memory of every possible place and that you could remember every person you had ever met or who lived in the district but, unlike the Speaker, I do not possess that ability, even though across the electorate I guess I know probably about 10,000 people by face. I pride myself on knowing three generations at Glossop. I love knowing family history and community history because not only does it give you a connection with those places but it helps you to make better decisions and to represent the community in an improved way.

I was very lucky to be elected in 2006 election, which was a challenging election for the Liberal Party—there were only 15 of us on this side. I was one of four members who were elected on the primary vote at 50.1 per cent. It has improved since then, so I have been lucky in that regard because I represent an area that has traditionally voted Liberal and is very much a blue community, but they have high expectations. They want to make sure that the person they select has an opportunity to hold senior roles in the government, and the community deserves that. If the support is there, they want to see a return on that investment.

In that regard, I was very grateful when not long after the election Iain Evans, who was about to be elected as the leader of the Liberal Party, rang me and said that he would like me to take up a position as a shadow minister in areas that I had no experience in, and gambling was one of those—I am not a gambler by nature; I am a very frugal person—and I loved it.

Mr Pengilly: Tight.

Mr GRIFFITHS: 'Tight' is a word that some people use. Going to some of the Gamblers Anonymous meetings opened my eyes to those who live with the terrible scourge of what gambling does to their lives every day. Some people said to me that it was 15 years since they had gambled but that every day they had the urge to go in there and put money in those bloody machines. In every portfolio I have had the blessed honour to be involved in, I have learnt something and benefited from it as a person.

In my maiden speech, I reflected upon the words of John Meier, who was the member for Goyder before me. He was elected in 1982 for the first time. My great frustration is that I had many concerns similar to those he had about the needs that exist in the community. That goes back to 1982, and I know that when the next member for Narungga, as Goyder becomes at the election next year, makes their maiden speech—and my greatest wish is that it is Fraser Ellis, who is the candidate selected by the Liberal Party to replace me, and I think he will do a great job—they will reflect upon many of those same frustrations.

I know that I have said many times that governments are here to represent all. It is not just for me and it is not whether political need exists for expenditure to be undertaken, but it is where the priority exists for a community. I have taken that very strongly on some of the debates that I have had within the roles, and prior to the 2010 election about elections commitments to make. I think it is important that all of us can hold our heads high and say that we are trying to get the best possible outcome, instead of the political opportunity it represents. I know we lost the 2010 election because of it, too, so you have to try to find that balance. Politics is about needing to somehow find that balance.

I might just recount a story I have told a few people. For me, even though I had never sought an opportunity to be in politics, or thought that I would, I had a dream about it in 1995. So 11 years before I became a member I had such a vivid dream that I was the member for Goyder. I was not even living in the district anymore. The next morning, I told my wife, Donna, who is here in the gallery, because it was so vivid in my mind. When eventually the telephone call came from John Meier in

December 2003 about an opportunity that might exist, I spoke to Donna and said, 'The dream is going to come true, darling.' I believed that no matter who else stood as a candidate I would be successful.

I am probably ad-libbing a bit on this, but I think Donna cried for three days. It was not because she did not believe that I could do it, but she was worried about the impact it would have upon us as a nucleus and on our family. It is still true today. I know for all of us in this chamber that it is a challenge to retain our relationships with our families, let alone with our friends. There is barely enough time in our lives to be close to those we love, let alone to those who have been important to us as we have grown up and, hopefully, will still be important to us as we leave. Donna has been such a wonderful support to me, and I will talk about my family later.

I have been grateful for every dollar that has ever been spent in Goyder, I have to tell you. When grant applications were made, my usual practice for a long time was to write to the minister and thank them. The member for Wright said to me, 'That's unusual, Steven. We don't get letters of thankyou from people.' But I believe it is important for those who sit on this side to have relationships with those who sit on that side. They can be collaborative. They do not need to be argumentative all the time; they need to be outcome based. So, when the money has come through, I have said thanks.

Indeed, I have thanked the Minister for Transport for the nearly \$40 million that is coming through to the district as we speak because I believe investment has been determined because the priority exists. We have waited for it for a long time, but it just a fraction of what we need. No matter who represents the electorate that I currently serve, and no matter who sits on that side, the ongoing pressures will be immense to make the right decisions all the time. I know I have always spoken about roads and health services and water needs that exist in the community. It occurred in the 1982 speech of John Meier, it happened for me in 2006, and it will happen next year for the new member also.

One of the challenges is that we have to remove ourselves from any shyness that we have. You have to be an outspoken person to be a politician. You have to have the confidence to stand up and speak at the drop of a hat, to know the right questions to ask and to be able to give the answers to the questions that are posed to us. I have really enjoyed being challenged intellectually in that regard. I am a person who by nature loves to know the detail. I am not sure how I can remember all of it sometimes, but I do manage to bring some of it out, but I think afterwards I have missed a political opportunity that the knowledge of that detail gives me the chance to do.

I have loved public meetings. I have done some big ones in our community, where we have had 700, 600, 500 and 400 attend, and they have been about health and that sort of thing. I have been blessed that when people stood up in the crowd and wanted to ask a question I knew who they were. It is just such a fantastic thing to do. It gives you a connection to the fact that, yes, the question is being asked, but you know the reason why the question is being asked, and you know the reason why the investment needs to occur to give those people hope. They are asking because they are desperate for an outcome and because they believe in government.

I do not believe that they actually distinguish between the three levels of government anymore. I think a blanket has been thrown over federal, state and local, and people just say they want 'government' to provide it without understanding how it is determined. That is part of the communication challenge that we possess in this place: to make people aware of it. I want to reflect a little bit upon the tumultuous times that I experienced within our party room in the first four years.

Iain Evans came in as leader with the member for Bragg as the deputy. The member for Waite became the leader, I think around 16 months later or thereabouts, and there were tumultuous times then also. Then the member for Heysen became the leader. In part of the process, I put my hand up as deputy leader on the previous ballot, not necessarily thinking that I was going to win, when the member for Heysen became the leader. It surprised a lot of people. I know I am not a political beast, but I wanted to try to ensure that I was part of a team that made a difference.

Subsequently, when another ballot was held a week later, when there was a change again and I became the deputy leader, I committed myself totally to the Liberal Party and, indeed, the member for Heysen. My life changed, I have to tell you. I barely saw many things that had been common parts of my life for the previous 40 years. In the five weeks prior to the 2010 election, I told

Donna that I had spent 13 hours in the electorate and for six of those I was asleep. There is nothing like it.

Members who live with the constant pressure adjust to it, I imagine. But from an opposition perspective your life is different. Yes, you are expected to critique and criticise and challenge all the time, but there is not the pressure that comes with the level of data that comes through in order to make the decisions to ensure that the structures you are in control of operate efficiently. In that nine-month period I had to step up to a level that I did enjoy. I loved getting to know everything. It felt as though we lived in this clustered, protected world, where we were told things that were occurring without necessarily experiencing them ourselves. We had to believe what others told us, and it was not always correct because they had a perspective on it, too.

Mr Pederick: Funny about that.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. I found it exhilarating to be told that, for two of the many press conferences I held, the future of the campaign depended upon how well I went. It did not quite turn out that way. It went alright, those went okay. I thought that election day in 2010 would be either the best of days or the worst of days for me. Politically, it was not: two days beforehand was. Some in this chamber know that I was then shadow treasurer, and I had to present the forward estimates and the predictions from the Liberal Party. I was proud that we put 27 pages of notes together, which we provided to the media, setting out what we wanted to do. A billion-dollar surplus was projected as part of that. I was indeed very proud of so many aspects of it.

In the 35 minutes or thereabouts of the press conference, I did not have to refer to those notes once. I am told by others that even experienced members, who are used to media pressure, start quivering at the lips and that sort of stuff once it gets to about 15 minutes. We get anxious about what the next question is going to be and what our answer will be. I know that I walked away proud of that, but the challenge for me occurred several hours later when, after words to one print media outlet, I said things that I do not necessarily walk away from. Upon reflection, I would say it differently, that is true, but the message I tried to espouse then would have been the same. I just would have said it in a slightly different way.

Others on that side seized upon that, and it was the lead story the next morning. My life started to fall apart, I have to tell you. It made it exceptionally difficult for the member for Heysen as the leader. I know that she was under extreme pressure. Isobel and I met very early the next morning, and I tried to explain what had occurred and what I had said. I think Isobel was suffering overload too.

Ms Redmond: Absolutely.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Absolutely. It was the busiest period of our lives. It did not happen the way I wanted it to. At the hotel that night—where we all were hoping to celebrate but instead we were commiserating—there was a bank of TV crews and we were doing all these successive interviews. We were talking about our belief that we could still win, even though it was close in a few seats, but the background question always was what had occurred two days earlier.

As a person who was used to a level of success and never failure, be it with the love of my life, the family I am blessed to have, the sport I had attempted to play or the professional career I had attempted to have in local government, to have the psychological mind change occur within a short amount of time was a real kick for me. It made it exceptionally difficult for me. I am not proud to admit that in the period after that I became a person I did not like. The person I portrayed it to most was Donna, and I will be forever sorry for the way I treated her and the way I reacted to her. The fact I am still with her is because of her strength and her character. For you, I say a sincere thank you. Blessedly, though, eventually I again became the person I had always been.

To some degree, we went through the cycles that occurred after that. Donna and I were on a cruise and we got a message that distressed me immensely. That was about shadow portfolio responsibilities also. Then changes occurred later on. However, I was returned to the shadow ministry before the 2014 election, and I am very grateful for that. It has shown me that there is more to life than what occurs in this place and how it impacts on us.

Our life is committed to it and it takes away our life. I reflected earlier upon the challenge to retain friendships, let alone the relationship with your family. I know we all have similar stories. At times you manage to get a few short hours to spend time with friends and all of a sudden you have to leave early because you have to go somewhere else and read a briefing paper and get ready for something that is occurring the next morning. Your partner is equally impacted by it, and you regret that and feel sorry about that and you can never make up for that, but when we get out of this place we have to try to improve ourselves. I have always been lucky.

I have enjoyed the parliamentary debates that have occurred in here. If I reflect upon a reasonably significant number of pieces of legislation for which I have had responsibility in this place, it was the planning, development and infrastructure legislation that nearly did my head in. That was such a complex bill, with 230 pages and eventually 400 amendments and a lengthy debate. I know I was fairly repetitive in my 3½-hour contribution to the second reading, but the committee stage debate went on for 10½ hours. It was exceptionally lengthy. To minister Rau, the Minister for Planning, I say thank you for sitting there that whole time while we went backwards and forwards asking questions about the scenarios attached to individual clauses.

I say a sincere thank you to the member for Heysen for her contribution in the committee stage, with no prior knowledge. The member for Heysen has the capacity to read legislation and consider an issue about that. She was here for those first two hours at the very start, which gave me a bit of a break, but it was just about exclusively me asking questions, other than a couple of minor questions from some members. Being in the chamber until midnight with the sole responsibility to ask questions takes it out of you. The fact that the member for Heysen and others have done it for hours and hours makes me think that there are really smart people who come to this place. Not all people are, but some are very smart. There is no doubt about that.

Mr Pisoni: Name them.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Now is the time, I suppose. It is because of my nature of being a detailed person that I wanted the questions to be asked. I truly believe that we have not, in my time in this place, used the committee-level investigation anywhere near enough. It has been very disappointing. That is partially our fault; significantly it is our fault. We are the ones who are charged with doing that from an opposition perspective.

Because the planning legislation is such a contentious area and because it has the risk for litigation to be undertaken, involving significant dollars, it is important to put scenarios on the record and to get a response from the minister because I believe that becomes a guide not just for the regulations that come from the legislation but for future decisions that are made against it. I think we should do that a lot more. The planning legislation was debated for five weeks in the Legislative Council. It is just mind-boggling to me that it occurred that way.

This morning, the five retiring members from the Liberal Party had a photo taken. Unfortunately, the member for MacKillop was not here on time. We thank the leader for being available for it. We know that we five from the Liberal Party have served 77 years. I did a quick addition on the Labor Party members who are retiring, and I pay recognition to that, and I think they were 108 years or thereabouts.

There is no doubt that a significant level of corporate knowledge is being lost. I am empowered when I see the quality of the younger people who come into our side. I know they will become good ministers, but please never be afraid to pick up the telephone and ask sometimes. While we might not have had the chance to sit over on that side, we have been involved in lots of discussions and we know lots of historical stuff and lots of scenarios and we can give those younger members some good advice. Not only will a lot of historical knowledge be lost but also a lot of experience and skillsets will be lost.

In my parliamentary time I had the opportunity to be on a few parliamentary committees. I was on a work-life balance select committee and Donna said to me, 'Why are you on that committee when it requires you be away from home more often? Why are you on a work-life balance select committee?'

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, I know, and they do not know anything about it. We formed some good guidelines because there has to be more chance for the family nucleus to exist. In the modern times in which we live, where what has traditionally occurred in families is being disjointed now to some degree, it is really important for that connection to occur more often. I say to employers: that is part of the challenge; give your employees that chance.

I really did enjoy the sustainable agriculture select committee, too, and there are a few other members in the chamber today who were part of that. It is such an important part of not just the community in which I live but the economy of the state. One of the main questions I asked of those who were policymakers was about the imbalance in the interaction between mining and agriculture and I asked that because of the mining proposal on Yorke Peninsula.

I asked—these are my words, not theirs—what level of land should be sacrificed for that diversification to occur? There is no correct answer to that, and I understand that. It is a decision that has to be made based on needs. The problem is that, when you are a member of parliament and you interact with the community seemingly every day and you talk about mining for nearly nine years, it wears you down. So as much as the planning legislation did my head in, the mining debate that occurs on the Yorke Peninsula area in particular is one that I cannot even begin to explain how I feel about.

I am torn between the need for the state government to provide a forum and an opportunity for diversification to occur—that is a prime responsibility at a policy level—and the needs of a community that does not want a change to occur. How do you get the balance right? Many outside the immediate area reflect upon the fact that they want the changes and opportunities to occur and they see the investment that will happen that will make a leap forward in growth opportunities and many services. They want to see it occur, so it is part of our challenge. I know the mining bill is not going to get through the other place. It does include a lot of changes that are good, but I still voted against it because of exempt land versus restricted land.

I want to put on the record that I officially love all Liberal Party members who live in Goyder. I am sending out Christmas cards now, which is much earlier than I normally do, I can tell you. To those people, I owe a sincere vote of thanks. I cannot begin to explain the personal levels of support that I have received from so many of those people over the last 12 years. They saw this 42 year old come in and thought he could represent them. They gave him a chance and I hope that the return has been there for them. I have been very lucky.

Like many members here, I have a busy diary. For me, a lot of it has been based around community needs. I have always had the philosophy that I accept the first invitation, not necessarily the one that might be the bigger event that gives me the opportunity to promote myself and the party more. I like to pay respect to those who invite me first. It means that sometimes you will be with little groups, but so be it. They are all important and I learnt that very early on.

Politics has also given me the chance to meet so many great people and indeed to see the sad side of our society too. The thing I have always appreciated, though, is that it gives you an opportunity to connect with them and hope that the experiences you bring to the role give them a chance to get the level of representation they need and to know who you need to contact to get people to help them.

For those on the good side of the ledger, it is in abundance. There are challenges for those people, but the number of people out there I have spoken to every day who are willing to take up that challenge of growth because they want their family to be successful and, by association, want their communities and the state to be successful is inspirational, and it is reflected in the 140,000 small businesses that exist in South Australia. All power to them. Government policy needs to support them, reduce the workload that exists upon them and give them the greatest possible chance of economic return and viability because they are the ones who take the risks. They are great people.

Others will reflect upon school tours. Not all of us have the chance to do them and there have been some busy times when some groups of kids have come in, but I have loved it. I probably got better questions from the little ones compared to the older ones.

Ms Redmond: How do you change the light globes?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, or, 'What is this button for?' and that sort of stuff. But in every tour I have done, there is a different question asked that I have never heard before. I have appreciated the member for Unley with his wooden swords and the talk about the blood line, and that sort of stuff. I have used the example many times.

The parliament has sat since 1857 and I believe probably close to 750 or 800 members have had a chance to be elected. Their portraits or their photos, where they exist, are on display in the members' lounge, so it is a very humbling thought to have had the chance to do this. It is a very select group. It is not just the ego and the chance to use the dining room or the car park that has been provided: it is the challenge that it represents with the community to be given that responsibility.

The Hon. P. Caica: And few of them would be as good a bloke as you are, Steven; that's true.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am very grateful for that. I understand that leaving voluntarily from this place after 12 years is a relatively short period of time compared to most. Like many who come in, who see themselves as 16 or 20-year people, I always hoped I would be here for 16 years. I understand the decisions that were made earlier this year about changes, but they made me lose my desire. I always hoped that the level of what I thought others saw in me—detail, trying to get the right outcomes and being thorough in what I do—would give me a chance one day to sit on that side of the Speaker and one day to sit in the front. That was never going to be a chance for me after the decisions made earlier this year, so I made the choice to be selfish. That is what it came down to.

I did so on the basis that I believed I could run next year. I believed I would be successful, even though a challenging political climate exists, but I knew I would let my community down in that four-year cycle. You have to try to forward-project yourself and consider what sort of person you become, and I just knew that I would be a grumpy, frustrated old man who would complain about everybody. The community deserves better than that and I think the parliament deserves better than that, so that is why I saw it was time for a change. Donna does not necessarily like that answer from me all the time, but I knew I would become that if I stayed here for one more term. I think that is a bit of an abject lesson for all of us, to consider when is the end our of time and what it can be.

To colleagues on all sides of the house, I say a sincere thank you. Some have been really close, friendly relationships, I have to tell you, and for that I will always be grateful. I tell people back in the community that there are some Labor members I would happily go to the pub with and have a beer, and I would not say that about all of my colleagues either—that is just it. I am not sure what has been said about me behind my back, and I have been grateful for that. This morning was an interesting example of legislation going through very quickly because there was a need to create time for people such as me to have a chance to speak before we rise tomorrow night, but it is interesting.

Parking across the road, I have walked to North Terrace and looked at this building in a different way. For so many years, we would drive the car park, come in the back way and, going up the lift, 'Shit, I'm on the second floor again,' sorry about the swear word, 'but I want to move somewhere else'. At least when we park in Hindley Street we walk across the road and get to see the building, and I have reflected upon it in a different way—not just on my own end of term period that exists for me but indeed on the importance of the place. It is as though I have had a connection back to what I always thought it was: the people's place. It is the reason we exist and why we are challenged to do what we do, and I hope others do it also because it is a great honour.

To Parliament House staff I want to say a sincere thank you for the polite way in which they have dealt with me at all times and the quick responses that have always been given to me, and that is the full spectrum of staff, here and in PNSG. I would like to thank ministers' staff for briefing opportunities and the chance to ask questions. They have always been very responsive and really quick in responding. Health has been a bit of a challenge to get responses in reasonably short time lately, I must admit, but the Minister of Transport, for example, is always good, so well done.

To the staff I have been blessed to have, all I can say is that I have been very lucky, and that is just it. I will name them by their first names: Skye, Vanessa, Maddie, Emily, Diantha, Haley, Rachel, Rosemary, Holly and Kim. The one constant person in those times is Kim. To her, I say a really sincere thank you. Kim has made me appear to others to be far more intelligent than I actually am, I

have to tell you. It is as though Kim and I started to think in the same way. The briefing papers Kim would help me prepare, or take the responsibility to prepare, were always as I liked them. It is not because I became lazy but because it reflected the way I thought. Kim is a wonderful person, a great asset to the people and the Goyder electorate office, and the parliament has been lucky that you have been working with us for so long, Kim, so well done.

In terms of the staff who have been with me—and Kim reflected upon this—people have not necessarily left me. She said, 'That is because of the quality of boss you are, Steven.' That is very nice of her to say so, but it is because I always say thank you to people, and that is part of my problem: I am too bloody polite. As politicians, you cannot be too polite all the time. To the staff who do things for me I have always said thank you, and I have been blessed in that 12-year cycle. Skye, for example, who was my first employee, was my PA at Yorke Peninsula Council. She left that role a month before she was eligible to get her pro rata long service leave to come and work for me and lost the opportunity of seven years' long service leave accrual. To her I say a sincere thank you, too. In the spectrum between Skye to who we are now, I have been very lucky indeed.

Friends have been a real challenge, I have to tell you. I reflect on how just prior to the 2010 election—two weeks beforehand—Donna and I went to Mount Gambier, to the wedding of a daughter of some of our best friends. I had to do radio in the morning, which interrupted the time we were spending with them. We had the wedding and the reception, and then we had to leave at 10.30 to drive back to Adelaide that night because the Liberal Party launch for the campaign was the next morning, or late the next morning or early afternoon.

We left at 10.30, and my friend was crying, not because his daughter was getting married but because he was grateful for the effort I had made to be there. I was humbled by that because I was there because I love him and his wife and his family—that is just it—but it is really nice to think that sometimes people think that we put ourselves out to do that. We all have to do that to retain those friendships; you cannot just say no all the time to invitations and opportunities. We have to try to find some really precious time within our diaries to actually be with people.

In terms of my own family, I have been very lucky. My son Tyler was only 16 when I was elected, and Tyler is now a wonderful young man of 28 and married to Katie, who is from Yorke Peninsula also. They live in Adelaide, and they have an 18-month-old child, Nate, so our family unit has improved tremendously. When Tyler and Katie got married I said, 'You improved the gene pool.' That is just it: tall, thin, smart. I could not ask for anything more than that, I have to tell you. And my grandson will be—

Ms Redmond: Tall, thin, smart.

Mr GRIFFITHS: He's smarter, yes. He will be very smart. My daughter Kelsey's husband, Peter, is a farmer from Yorke Peninsula, just a bit south-east of Maitland. He works hard. He really works hard. They farm about 6,000 acres, and they are leasing some more country, so they will be doing 7,500 next year. To me, he and his dad are examples of good people who deserve to be supported.

Pete and I have had a challenge, in that he has been very much against mining and I have had to be in the middle trying to get the process to be right and get the outcome right. I said at Peter and Kelsey's wedding that, while he and I do not agree on everything—there are some things, indeed, we do not talk about—I will always respect that as a young person of only 24 he stood up and became a voice for what he believed in. He got involved in high-level groups, took on chairing roles and deputy chair roles. He is chair of an egg bureau now and that sort of stuff. It is really fantastic to have young people stand up; my son-in-law is an example of that and I am tremendously proud of him.

I wondered how I was going to finish, beyond saying a real thank you to everybody, but I am a bit of a TV watcher from way back, and *M*A*S*H* was one of my favourite shows. Those who know the *M*A*S*H* series may know the last episode was called Goodbye, Farewell and Amen. For me, it is Amen.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (17:07): First of all, I would like to acknowledge that we meet today on the land of the Kurna people and pay our collective respects to the elders both past and present. I am very proud that this has become part of our procedure in this house and at many functions and meetings we go to.

I finally summoned up enough courage to read my first speech in this place, which was on 4 December 1997. We had a bit of trouble in the office finding it because on the same day I also made a speech about unfair dismissal and my concerns about the changes that the then Liberal government were going to bring in restricting workers' access to unfair dismissal measures. One of the reasons why I was quite concerned about my first speech is that, as people know in here, when someone passes on, in the condolence motion bits of the first speech are quite often read out, and I thought, 'This will be dreadful!'

One of the reasons I had such reservations is that it had never been my ambition to be a member of parliament. Basically, I had filled in as a Labor candidate for Hanson a few months before the 11 October 1997 election, and I was not quite sure what I was supposed to do or say, having got in here. I had spent many years in this place before becoming a member of parliament, particularly as a youth, housing and environmental activist and as a feminist and a trade union official lobbying government, both federal and state and commenting on legislation and policy and demonstrating, particularly out the front of Parliament House. I must say these days I find it very strange demonstrating out the front of Parliament House when I am actually in here, but I am sure I will lose that concern shortly.

I had the opportunity to campaign in my other life on changes to the Equal Opportunity Act, the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act as it was called, the Worker's Rehabilitation and Compensation Act, Disability Discrimination Act, and I had been (and still am) a very big campaigner against uranium mining and now dumps. My experience up until then was as a South Australian Housing Trust board member, a member of the Prime Minister's Advisory Committee on Women, on various industrial relations committees and inquiries, and in lobbying and campaigning.

I was told that the Liberal Party was delighted when I took over from the previous hardworking and excellent candidate for Labor, Mark Butler. They put out information describing me as a person who had a track record of being a feminist, a trade unionist, a socialist and an environmentalist. So while doorknocking and at many preselection functions and public meetings, I was asked if this description with the implied criticism was true, and of course I would answer yes very proudly.

I think it would be fair to say that despite the great support I got during the campaign, it was a shock when I won. It meant that my dear better half, as he calls himself, Kevin, made the decision to put his career aside in Canberra and come back to Adelaide. In fact, because he had not been involved in the election campaign, he was quite shocked to see a poster of his other half on the Stobie poles all the way from the Airport to where we were living in Mile End. It really was quite a shock for him. I am very proud of him and delighted that at least he got the opportunity to do his PhD at Adelaide University. I know he has been of great assistance to the wider labour movement and more recently with the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia.

My family, both the Purse and Key family, have always been supportive, even though these days we have an expanding clan and we have a couple of Liberal voters and also a couple of Greens voters. Despite this, they have always helped me in all election campaigns. I have to say that my friends have been outstanding in their support. I still have the same close circle of friends I had when I started, so I am very pleased, and I hope that continues. I have also made a lot of new friends, too.

After discussion with Kevin; my late mother, Ms Steve Key; and Ms Betty Fisher, now in her 90s, I decided that my only way of surviving in this new job was to have a clear agenda. The electorate office work was almost second nature, having always been working as an advocate. I love electorate work and following that, not in the same order, was my agenda when I started here. As other members have said, like them I was fairly unhappy coming into this place, my first couple of years in particular. I had gone from a job that I loved, being a trade union official and advocate, to coming in here and being not really sure that this was the place I should be.

Anyway, my agenda included matters that I have been involved in outside, which were improvements to the Equal Opportunity Act, particularly in regard to recognising de facto couples, same-sex couples, adoption and parenting rights. I was particularly keen to make sure that the rights of the child to know their biological origins was clear. Twenty years ago, it is interesting to look at some of the information that was coming out about reproductive technology, and I was very concerned about the fact that in some cases people did not have access to that information.

The rights and support for injured and ill workers were certainly on the list, as was parental leave. I had been successful as a union official in negotiating unpaid parental leave and adoption leave, but it was really the next step of getting financial support for parental leave that I was keen on achieving. There is occupational health and safety legislation, particularly in the areas of mental health, dust diseases and repetitive strain injury. Because of my work at the Transport Workers Union, I was particularly keen to see improvements for long-distance transport drivers.

I am a great supporter, and always have been, of the Public Service, and have lamented the number of things that have been contracted out, even to the non-government sector. I do not think that is a very good strategy, but it has happened. I am opposed to further privatisation. On housing and homelessness, I had the opportunity as a housing activist and also, as I said before, as a board member of the Housing Trust, to work in that area.

I am really concerned. If we look at the statistics that came out today, we still have too many people who are homeless and we need to do something about that. We also have a number of people who cannot get affordable housing. I think it is something that we can solve in SA, and I commend the Don Dunstan foundation. The member for Fisher and I have been working with them on their zero homelessness campaign. That is something that is achievable, so we really need to keep an eye on that.

I am one of those old environmentalists who thinks that opposing uranium mining and nuclear waste dumps is a very good idea. I know there have been different arguments about so-called job creation in that area but, sadly, my original view about job creation in that sector has come true. I joined very early on as a member of parliament the national politicians' group for a nuclear-free future. The only thing wrong with that group was that having convened a couple of the meetings here in South Australia with the Democrats, who were particularly prominent at the time, of the two days that we had for the meeting one day was spent on what we would call 'the group'. So I found that fairly depressing, but we did come up with 'Politicians for a nuclear-free future'. That is what we are and that is what we continue to be.

The other area that I feel quite passionate about, having benefited from adult education, is access to further education, TAFE, Workers' Educational Association and university. As someone who has benefited from that scheme, I feel very strongly about people having an opportunity, not just school leavers—obviously I feel concerned about them—but also people having a chance to educate themselves. Education is one of the most powerful things that one can do, particularly to change their circumstances.

I had a wonderful experience working for the Australian Council of Trade Unions as a disability advocate, which is really important. I also worked for the Trades and Labor Council on recognising different abilities and disabilities of people. In those days, I did not even dream about the NDIS. This is something that I know the member for Reynell and minister is going to follow through with, but it was beyond my dreams that we would even have that sort of agenda.

Boosting consumer rights is an area that I feel very strongly about. I had the opportunity to work with Ralph Nader, from the US, who was the campaigner in this area. His influence has always been with me. I also know that as much as I did not have a lot to do with Don Dunstan as the premier—he was certainly before my time at the Working Women's Centre—looking at consumer legislation was one of his areas, too. I know that Mike Rann was very passionate about this area as well.

What we now call advance care directives—we have a term—getting people to think about their arrangements, not just having a will, has been something that has been with me for a long time, too. I became a Justice of the Peace in my early 20s when I was at the Working Women's Centre, and I have seen a number of people needing to get their act together in this area. I commend all the people who have worked on this reform. This is something that I feel that I have contributed to. I think it still needs more work, but I would particularly like to acknowledge the member for Playford, minister Jack Snelling at the time, for carrying on and introducing that legislation.

I have raised the need for recognition of carers, from the experiences of both family and friends. I am really pleased that there is some recognition at this time later for both voluntary and paid workers in the caring area. Over the years, I cannot count how many people, particularly young

people I know, who have been carers for their family and friends. This is an area that has now been taken up and looked at. We need to do more work, but certainly there have been some improvements.

An area that I could go on about for quite some time, but I will not, is my passion for promoting community arts projects of various types. I have had the benefit of being involved in many different projects myself both as a trade union person and also as a community activist. I had the honour of being on the Community Arts Network Board for many years, as a peak body, and note the great work that they did.

I have been involved and campaigned with a number of women's organisations. EMILY's List had just started and I am very proud to be a foundation member of EMILY's List. I am also a Women's Electoral Lobby long-term campaigner and also a long-term member of the Women's Abortion Action Coalition. In latter years, I am very pleased that, with the inspiration of the member for Florey, the Muriel Matters Society has done some fantastic work in the equity area and taken up a lot of the issues that many of us feel need to be promoted in the community.

Following on from previous members of parliament, one of the areas that I am really happy about is the women's caucus in the South Australian parliament. The Hon. Sandra Kanck, the Hon. Anne Levy AO, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw AO and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles were significant members of that early caucus. I think they had to be significant because there were not that many women in parliament. We managed to swell the numbers of women in 1997 and the Labor Party has had a commitment to do that ever since.

I want to pay tribute to them to make sure that new women coming into parliament feel supported. I am very pleased to say that, along with a number of my colleagues who are not here now, we have continued the tradition and it is alive and well. I say to members in this parliament and certainly the new parliament that the sisters are watching you, and there are a number of us who will be outside the parliament shortly who will be watching.

I have been committed to the reform of the sex industry in South Australia for a long time now, probably 30-odd years, having had the benefit of working with sex workers when I was at the Working Women's Centre, as well as through different trade union jobs that I have had. The Sex Workers Union, which was originally connected, in South Australia at least, to the Federated Clerks Union and then the Australian Services Union, as it is now, have been fantastic campaigners—unsuccessful ones, but fantastic.

I am very impressed with the opportunities I have had and the education I have had through Scarlet Alliance, SWAGGER and also our local group, the Sex Industry Network. They have done some fantastic work to support sex workers in South Australia and across the network through New Zealand and Europe.

Voluntary euthanasia was on my list, mainly because my parents were strong supporters of voluntary euthanasia and were hoping that this would become law a long time ago. I must say that as older children we were always very worried about our parents' advocacy in this area because we just imagined that one day we would go and visit them and they would have taken their own action with regard to voluntary euthanasia. Fortunately, that did not happen, but I always that that feeling of concern, because particularly my mother felt so strongly about people's right to be able to chose their own end.

It is probably good that I have not had the opportunity in the past to speak about my view on voluntary euthanasia, which I guess would be a very pure one. I think it is a person's right to decide their end, and I think it is also a person's right to decide whether they want to assist someone with that decision. I am very concerned about some of the legislation that has come forward. I have been involved in a number of bills in my time in here, but I would really like to congratulate the Victorian parliament on their decision today to pass what I think is reasonable voluntary euthanasia legislation.

I would also like to thank the colleagues who have worked on this legislation over time: the late Bob Such, the late Frank Blevins, Sandra Kanck, Anne Levy AO, John Quirk and Duncan McFetridge in particular. I thank them very much for the work they have done. I also mention the joint bill that I had with the Hon. Mark Parnell.

Others can judge how well my agenda has gone, but I have certainly had that in mind. It has been important to me because it is very easy to be drawn off onto other issues. I think there are enough issues there for someone to be pretty busy as it is.

I have also appreciated the opportunity to be a shadow minister, despite the complete lack of resources and support in those days. Not that I have ever had a problem with this, but it did provide a work discipline that made me read the estimates documents, the Auditor-General's Report and annual reports, and also take much more interest in what was actually being presented in parliament. I keep on saying, particularly to the member for Morphett, that it is good practice. I know the member for Morphett has since left the Liberal Party, but it is good practice, and if you are a shadow minister, it will make you a really good minister.

As much as he and I are good friends, he was saying that he would be very happy if I had not won the seat of Ashford in the last election because he really wanted to be a minister. I think there were a few others over there who said the same thing. Being a shadow minister did help with the rigours of being a minister, and I really appreciated the help that I received when I was a shadow minister. A lot of people were very excited about the fact that I had a number of different portfolios.

I cannot name them all, but I would really like to acknowledge the work particularly of some of the non-government organisations like SACOSS, SPARK, YACSA, the Working Women's Centre, Positive Life SA, the women's studies resource centre—that does not exist anymore; I will not go there—Community and Neighbourhood Houses, community centres, and SA Unions. I also acknowledge individual unions including the Australian Services Union, United Voice, Transport Workers Union, PSA, the Australian Education Union, and some of the housing organisations that I worked with, like Shelter SA.

I was very proud to become the social justice minister in 2002 and also a further education minister a bit later in the Rann Labor government. The portfolios that I had responsibility for at different times were women and youth, which I had for the entire time; ageing; disability; housing; community welfare; further education; employment; and higher education. I absolutely loved working in all those areas. I was greatly supported by other ministers.

The Speaker and member for Croydon talked about some of those early days in the first four years of our being in government. I had the best ministerial office. It was headed up by Mr Angas Story. The team, including our two drivers, who were fabulous, was a great group of people. I really appreciate all of them. I will not name them all because I think it is probably a career-limiting move on their part, but they were all terrific. We had a lot of fun, too. I think that they had more fun than I did, but it was a good place to be. At the same time, the long-suffering electorate staff, Geoff McCaw, Meredith Boyle, Carol Martinella and all the volunteer JPs, were excellent in supporting me to be able to be a minister as well as dealing with the electorate issues we always seemed to have in our place.

I have had the privilege of being on a number of parliamentary committees, including the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation (whose name has to change) and the Natural Resources Committee as a member and then as the Presiding Member of the OSRC and the NRC. I have found committee work to be educative, rewarding and fun. It has been a great opportunity to work across the houses of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly and with members from other parties and Independents. I am proud of the committee work that has been achieved.

The staff supporting these committees have been excellent, and I thank them all for their research, support, advice and also patience in some cases. In mentioning the staff in Parliament House, I need to pay tribute to the fabulous labour force in this house. The care and support they show is really appreciated. To the catering staff, cleaning staff, building services, chamber staff—both in the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council—administration, Hansard, support services and all the other staff, thank you. You really are appreciated. All the parliamentary counsel have been helpful and patient over the 20 years, but I would especially like to thank former parliamentary counsel Richard Dennis and, more recently, Mark Herbst and his team for the work they provide.

Along with the constituents, I believe that Hanson and Ashford—Team Ashford—have had a number of wins, whether it is getting red-light cameras at local primary schools, negotiating a power or water bill or reopening a railway station like the Millswood station. I am proud of the work we have done at the Ashford electorate office. There are a number of people I have had the honour to work with, and I will mention them because it is fairly obvious that they are on the Labor side of politics: Manuel Chisan and Michael Subacious, who were the first to job-share one electorate staffer position, Lindy McAdam, again when we had one person in the electorate office; Astrid Roth; Meredith Boyle; and then a whole series of trainees who came into the office.

The team we have at the moment is Geoff McCaw and Carol Martinella. They have been pretty constant. Our current trainee is Elena Kaipalexis. There have been a number of casual staff who have worked in our office, and we have had a number of JPs; in fact, every day we have a JP service with a volunteer, and I am very impressed that they take the time to do that.

We have a number of volunteers who are very happy to be letter-stuffers and also walk the streets of Ashford, and we have also had a number of staff who have helped on specific campaigns: the wonderful Anne Bunning and the work that she has done in particular on a number of issues, but certainly on voluntary euthanasia; all-rounder, the late Paul Martinella; and Mark Thomson, who is my partner in crime with all things community arts.

We are currently working on a big campaign with regard to the digital divide in the community, which we are really worried about. Former senator Anne McEwen has been a very casual electorate officer but wonderful part of the team. Penny Gregory used to work for the former member for Reynell, Gay Thompson, and she has turned up and been a fabulous help. There are also a number of other people who back up our staff, and if we can get them into the office we do.

I am very proud of the work done in the electorate office. I see our electorate office doing a good job, providing support and responding to requests and problems that come up in the electorate and in the area. The member for Kavel knows this, but I have also been the duty member for Kavel and, more recently, the duty member for Morphett. I would like to thank the sub-branch members in those electorates for all their work and also say that they have felt quite comfortable about going to their local member, despite being obvious ALP members, and I found the staff and the members to be very supportive, as we are and as we should be.

Over the past 20 years, I have had the pleasure (maybe 'pleasure' is not the word) of working with a number of local councils—to start off with, Charles Sturt and, more recently, Mitcham, Unley, Marion and West Torrens, and also the Local Government Association. I particularly valued the work and support of Jim Hullick and also Wendy Campana. I want to thank them for their input.

As an MP and minister, I have had an opportunity to work with or receive advice from—whether I wanted it or not—a number of federal members of parliament: former members Amanda Vanstone, Jennie George, Nick Bolkus, Simon Crean, Julia Gillard, Brendan Nelson, Anne McEwen and Peter Duncan. There are lots of others, but they are ones who stick in my mind in particular. I have had the wonderful opportunity to have advice from the late Gough Whitlam, Neal Blewett, John Cornwall (who was the state health minister here), Bob Hawke and, more recently, comrades like Linda Burney, Penny Wong, Tony Zappia, Mark Butler, Tanya Plibersek and Anthony Albanese.

I also need to acknowledge my first campaign manager, the now member for Hindmarsh, Steve Georganas and, of course, Wendy, and really the whole expanding Georganas family. They, the adults, are true friends and comrades both to me and to Kevin. During my last campaign, Ben Waters was the campaign manager. With his great skills and patience, he has now found his place working for a borough in England as a chief of staff and, before that time, being involved in general elections as an advocate for the British Labour Party, managing to return a Labour member of parliament in a seat held by the Conservatives. He was feeling pretty happy with himself. The member he supported was an openly gay man in the community, so he was very pleased that he was involved in that campaign. He is a great friend and I can see him going places.

In addition to my Labor colleagues, I have made some great friends in both houses. I feel particularly close to the women MPs in this place, but I was disappointed this morning to hear the Prime Minister being criticised on radio. You might think that strange coming from a Labor member of parliament, but our Prime Minister was being criticised for not being 'mongrel enough'. This is

something that has always been an issue for me and probably a reason why I would never be a successful leader in the Labor Party, or in any party for that matter. I really dislike this part of politics.

I am happy to have a good debate; in fact, I am happy to have a good argument. I am also into the sport of being a member of parliament in this place and also the fun and some of the other things that happen in here, so I do not think I am a wimp by any means. I have been in situations, certainly as a trade union official, where if I had been a wimp I would not have survived. But I am not prepared to support bad behaviour or personal attacks on members of parliament by each other and especially not by the media. I have a very strong dislike of the media. When I first came in here, I was accused of lying.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Tell us how much you won from *The Advertiser*.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: No, it is a confidential agreement, but you can guarantee that at least for the next six or seven years I did not get any publicity in *The Advertiser* as a result of winning that case. I also have put a ban on the ABC morning program and refused a number of times to go on there. They know why and they know that I have stuck to that. I will never speak to those journalists because of the way they slandered me on radio.

I do not mind being criticised for things I do wrong, but I object to having my work ethic questioned. Those two guys said on radio that I did not have a good enough work ethic and that it was amazing I had won the last election because of that lack of work ethic. Other than being called a liar, not having a work ethic cuts pretty deep with me, so I will never forgive them for that.

On a more positive note, I am really pleased to have such an impressive candidate for the newly named seat of Badcoe, Jayne Stinson. She is wonderful. She works really hard and her team is headed up by the equally impressive Bridget Atkinson. What a campaign manager she is. I think Jayne will be a great member of parliament and I wish her well. I also wish all the other candidates well who are going into the next election. I am very pleased I am not—very pleased indeed—but I wish you all well. On St Patrick's Day next year, I will go back to being a general activist and I guess I will have to draw up a new list.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:43): It is a pretty hard act to follow in here this afternoon, I have to say. It has been most entertaining listening to other members' speeches, so I feel privileged to be able to make a contribution. In fact, I have always felt very privileged to have the opportunity to be a member of parliament. It comes to very few. We come under a fair bit of pressure, but that is how it is.

To quote a well-known book title, I consider I have had a 'very fortunate life'—and I am not planning to die yet I might add. My direct journey into this place came after an evening call on 9 November 2005. My predecessor and good friend, Dean Brown, rang me and told me that he was going to announce on the 11th, Remembrance Day, that he was going and that I needed to consider whether I would have a go at preselection and journey on from there. I said I would discuss it with Jan, my wife. Jan said to me, 'If you have a go and lose, at least you have had a go. If you don't have a go, you will be a pain in the neck for the rest of your life,' or words to that effect.

With that encouragement, I decided I would have a go, and I was very fortunate. Bear in mind that it was only three months out from the election by the time I was preselected. I won the preselection against the sitting mayor of Victor Harbor, Scott Schubert, and also the member for Morialta, Mr John Gardner, who at that time was the president of my state electorate committee. One left the country, the other one is now a member of parliament. Anyway, that is life. It was a challenging election, as was pointed out here earlier. I had a redoubtable Labor Party candidate in Mary-Lou Corcoran who put in an enormous effort and was very active and did all she could to win the seat for the Labor Party. I also had an Independent—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: She tried too hard. She would have beaten you if she had not tried so hard.

Mr PENGILLY: I will retake the floor. Of course, I had an Independent National in Kim McHugh, who won 17 per cent of the primary vote. It went to preferences and I was elected member. I had gone to a community on the Fleurieu, which I knew, but with only 12 weeks to become known, so it was a lot of hard work. I have no doubt that without the contribution that Dean Brown made I

would not be here, quite frankly. He was a huge asset and he is a wonderful man. Anyway, one thing led to another, and I entered this place.

I was enjoying life. I was in a role in another place and enjoying that role, so it was a significant change. Around July 2016, on a Sunday morning prior to a sitting week, my wife asked me, 'When are you going back? She always used to ask prior to that, 'When are you going away again?' When she asked, 'When are you going back?' I thought, 'It is about time I considered my position here.' We talked about it, and I made the decision that it was time to announce in due course that I would not be standing again for preselection. I announced that in December, and the rest is history. It was not an easy decision. A lot of things happen in one's time while in this place.

The Speaker indicated earlier that he has been here for a long time. I will have been here 12 years when we finish. I came in with my colleague the member for Goyder, who is leaving, the member for Hammond and also the member for Unley. In that time, my children have all been married and we now have four grandchildren, and I am never sure whether there is another one coming. I do not get told a lot. It is on a need-to-know basis, and Jan seems to need to know and I do not. The kids have gone their own way. Three years ago, I lost my mother. We all lose parents; that is a part of life. She was widowed at 52 and lived to nearly 91, so that was pretty remarkable. We miss her, but that is life as well.

I have loved my time, and I still do, as a member of parliament. I love the people side of it. I love doing things for people and being able to find my way through the maelstrom of bureaucracy and quite often achieve outcomes for people that are in their best interests. I am not going to suggest for one moment that I have enjoyed being in opposition my entire parliamentary career; in fact I despise it, but that is how it is, once again. There are some good reasons for that, of course, but we will not go into that. I would add that, in our leader, Steven Marshall, and deputy leader, Vickie Chapman, we have the longest serving Liberal team in the state parliament since the days of Sir Thomas Playford. That does not go unnoticed, and I think that paves the way forward.

I mention one thing I did learn when I came in here. I noticed the former member for Flinders, Liz Penfold, always read her speeches. I spoke to Liz one day about that, and she said, 'Well, I've been here nearly 13 years', or whatever, 'and I find that I can't do it without it. I just have to concentrate on it'. She acknowledged that it was very difficult for her. I thought, 'I'm not going to read speeches. I'm going to do it off the top of my head.'

In the time that I have been here I have read two speeches, as I can recall. One was my maiden speech, because I did not want to get that wrong, and the other one was a significantly poignant moment when I did a speech on the death of Sapper Jamie Larcombe, the son of friends of ours on Kangaroo Island who died in Afghanistan. I think that was the hardest speech I have ever made in here. I did not want to get it wrong, and I drafted up what I wanted to say, and my very, very good friend John Schumann tidied it up for me to make sure that I got it right. I am forever grateful for that. It was a significant moment for me and one that I will never forget.

I can only be very grateful to the electors of the seat of Finnis. As you know, the seat of Finnis—my current seat—has been carved in half, and I will come back to that a little later. They have been sensational; they are a sensational electorate. The people are just wonderful. I have no doubt whatsoever that I have the most attractive geographical electorate in South Australia. I do not care what anyone else says, and I think there is probably someone here who would well agree with me, sitting not far away from me, but that is my view on it. I have hundreds of kilometres of coastline on both the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island.

We have some wonderful natural assets, but the people side of my electorate is very important to me. In a redistribution I took on Sellicks Beach in 2010. John Hill said to me: 'You won't do too good down there. You will poll about 20 per cent.' I thought, 'I've got a bit of a message for John,' so I doorknocked every single building in Sellicks Beach, every one, even the ones with large dogs and high fences and all sorts of—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What about the one with the Buddha?

Mr PENGILLY: Well, the Buddha was up the road and John Hill and Paul Holloway and I had a bit to do with that, I might add. I did very well in Sellicks Beach and continued to do so, and I

have worked it very hard. So I had outer metropolitan added. I did lose Goolwa. I lost it in a redistribution to the seat of Hammond. But I was there for four absolutely dreadful years of the Millennium Drought, and I saw the Goolwa people in a different light. They pulled together. They had their disagreements, but they were determined to keep their town going. They were determined to do everything, and despite the efforts of Mr Flannery, who said that the River Murray would never run again—there would never be any water in there ever again—it did rain, and a few months later it was running a banker. I remember going to a rally down at Goolwa with 4,000 people and having to speak to them.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. C.J. Picton.

Mr PENGILLY: It is an interesting role, and the observation that you make as you go through the role of an MP is profound. I have always been a great supporter of our returned service men and women because my father was a returned serviceman and my grandfather was in the 9th Light Horse Regiment and fought in the Battle of Beersheba. My godfather was in the 1st Light Horse Regiment and then went back as a padre and did the Middle East and Kokoda in his 40s in World War II. I have had the RSL and whatnot drummed into me since I was knee high to a grasshopper.

When I first started, at the annual Victor Harbor RSL lunch after the service the entire large dining room of the Hotel Victor was full of people, and we had multiple numbers of World War II diggers who attended with their wives and families, but now we are down to the small dining room with just a handful. That is the passage of time.

I am a little frightened by the passage of time because when I went to boarding school—and mum and dad gave everything to get my sister and I through boarding school—I remember going to ANZAC Day and the Boer War veterans were still going down Rundle Street in jeeps. That ages me a bit, but I can remember that. Across my electorate, the numbers of old diggers who have gone and, more particularly, the ones I met originally in Victor Harbor and those on Kangaroo Island, including my uncle, are profound. The passage of time spares no-one, but it is something you have to deal with.

It is hard in opposition to achieve things, but we have achieved numbers of upgrades to schools in the electorate. I thank the government for that over the years. The redevelopment of the Kingscote Area School was much needed. As to the Victor Harbor High School redevelopment, I would have to say I conspired with the principal at the time through the public works process to get him to ask some very leading questions that we could get up in the Public Works Committee. We got that up. The Port Elliot school was completed. The TAFE centre was built, although Mary Lou Corcoran laid claim to that, but I will allow her that.

Returning to Mary Lou, she did not win in 2006 and then she gave me an undertaking that she would never stand again and then she popped her head up again in 2010 and I gave her a flogging. But there you go. I enjoyed that. She was a redoubtable candidate, as I said before, and she had a way about her that she took a lot of people with her, but 2010 was not an election that the state government did as well in as they did in 2006. She moved on. She worked up here and then suddenly left. I have not seen her for quite a while, be that as it may.

I have enjoyed my work on the Public Works Committee. I had 11½ years on the Public Works Committee in this place, and that has been a fascinating role for me. I got off it a few months ago for the reason that I was leaving and it was time to give someone else a go. I have had a great interest in prisons. I was lucky enough to be shadow for correctional services for a period of time, and one of my great disappointments is that there is not enough work for prisoners. There is simply not enough for them to do.

Anyone who has not had the opportunity, and it does not come easily I might add, to go into prisons and see what goes on in these places. There are a couple of thousand prisoners in South Australia. I shake my head because I have spoken to prisoners and said, 'What are you going to do when you get out?' They have said, 'We will probably go back and get on whatever we were going on before we came in here and then be back in here.' Some of them actually feel comfortable in prison because they get their three meals a day.

I do not suggest we go back to cracking rocks. I know that there is a level of thought in the current government that they need to do more as well. People I know and grew up with are in prison

in the prison system, but the amount of work for them or the amount of capacity for them to do something is nowhere near enough. My observations of Port Lincoln Prison where they grow a multitude of vegetables and fruit and sell everything they can into Port Lincoln is great. You have lifers in there doing that. It is a great experience for them and they absolutely enjoy it. I have enjoyed the parliamentary Public Works Committee.

I had a term on the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee (the JPSC), and I must relate a small story to the house. Bob Sneath of blessed memory was the President. Those of us who know Bob know that he is a big chap—a former shearer and AWU rep—and did not stand a lot of nonsense. At the time the Oval was being upgraded, we got a letter from Adelaide city council to say that they were going to take back the car parks out the front of the building. Bob's words were along the lines of, 'Over my dead body,' but a little bit more flowery. He said, 'Get them in.'

At the next meeting, the CEO of the council and Lord Mayor Yarwood came in and proceeded to give us a lecture about how they were going to resume with car parks out the front. We all sat there as it went on and on and on: they were their car parks, and if they wanted them in traffic flows they were going to take them. They got to the end and Bob said, 'Any questions?' There were no questions. He then turned around and said, 'Right, you pair of buggers, have you finished?' They said yes. He said, 'Well, get out of here. We will legislate to get rid of Adelaide city council. The only reason it exists is because of the parliament. I never want to see you again.' We never heard another word about it. It was a salient lesson in how to deal with people who thought they knew better than the actions of the parliament. The parliament is just so important.

I need to move on to my staff. I have been blessed, as others have said with their staff. I have had fantastic staff. I inherited Joan Fogarty and Julie Wheaton (she is Julie Wheaton to me, but she is Julie McLaren now). I inherited them from Dean; I kept Dean's staff. Indeed, Julie is still there. She was the original trainee and she is still in my office. Joan retired. I was very fortunate in being able to appoint Leone Fitzgerald as the office manager. Leone is from Yankalilla and is a delight. Her work capacity, her knowledge and her ability are outstanding, and she goes far above beyond what she is meant to do. She has other roles, including councillor at Yankalilla council, and she does various other things. I am very indebted to my staff at Victor Harbor, including young Hayley Vowles, who comes in to assist and backfill from time to time.

On Kangaroo Island, Penny Wheaton was Dean's staff member and she stayed with me. The problem with Penny Wheaton and I is that many years ago she could not get anyone to assist her at the Rural Youth deb ball. I think I was 19 and she was not much older—only a few months older. So Penny and I go back to about then. She retired and I took on Stephanie Wurst. Steph Wurst happens to be Des Corcoran and Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's granddaughter. She became enlightened, saw the way and decided to vote Liberal, so that helped the job out no end. Steph is on maternity leave and Penny is back.

I cannot speak highly enough of my staff. In this job, you need a few people you can trust completely, rely on and bounce things off. Dean Brown is always there when I need him. He never interferes, but he is always there. I also pay tribute to Jackie Kelly, who is a former mayor on Kangaroo Island. We have had our differences in local government, but we always respected each other's position. I can ring up Jackie and say, 'What do you think of this?' or that or something else. She will give me a no-nonsense answer and I will formulate an opinion on that.

The other person I have relied on for so long is Mr Graham Trethewey of Penneshaw, but he is currently enduring some ill health. He has been the president of the Kangaroo Island branch of the Liberal Party up until earlier this year when ill health precluded him from going on, but he is still there. I would have loved for him to be here today. He has such a deep knowledge of Kangaroo Island and politics in general, and I am never stuck for advice from Graham. I ring him once or twice a month to see how he is and ask him what he thinks. You need to thank these people. I know that we need to get up eventually, so I will not go on for much longer.

I am very grateful to the Liberal Party for giving me the opportunity, as others have said about their respective parties, but I do not always agree with them. From time to time I could cheerfully blow the Liberal Party off the face of the earth, but one does not do those things. I get very frustrated, but it is there and it is a great party, as is the Labor Party, I might add.

When people say to me, 'You are no different,' I say, 'Yes, we are. As Liberals, we respect the rights of the individual and encourage the individual to move forward.' That is why I am a Liberal and have been a Liberal for a long time. I have actually been a Liberal since my father gave me membership when I was 21. He said, 'I have paid for this. You pay for it from now on,' which I did. I think the member for Flinders is probably in a similar position.

I feel that it is necessary to make a few points about where things are going. Obviously, as a third-generation islander and my wife being a sixth-generation islander, the island is very close to my heart. We have lived there all our lives and watched the activities take place. This is a bit self-indulgent, but I think you are allowed to do that in your final speech. I do get concerned and I have been concerned about aspects of some areas of where the island is going.

As fate would have it, not that long ago—I twigged this was happening anyway—a member of the Labor Party said to me, 'Of course, you know that the plan was for Mawson to be retained by the Labor Party, but to do that they had to win over Kangaroo Island.' I thought, 'Yes, well, I will sniff that out,' and it has been interesting to observe. There are a multitude of reasons that the people of South Australia will not support the Labor Party at the next election. The fact is that only one in four people in South Australia is showing an indication that they will vote for Labor, but that may change.

The people of Kangaroo Island have many reasons, as do the people in the rest of Finnis, not to support the current government. There has been a large amount of spin, nonsense and propaganda put forward by members of the government and, in particular, the Attorney-General. Members may remember the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island Act, which I vehemently opposed. I thought it was a complete waste of money, and I still do. It is not much more than a front for the government.

I have an article in the local paper over there this week where I state that I think they have put more spin on things, with a combination of a couple of well-known spin doctors from decades past. It concerns me. I do not believe that the current member for Mawson will get any traction on Kangaroo Island. They can hand out all the money they like and they can make big noises, but people are not stupid in that respect and they will not be sucked in.

The Hon. P. Caica: They voted for you for so long.

Mr PENGILLY: They voted for me, but they were very lucky, Paul, and they voted for me in increasing numbers every election, I might add. I spoke to one of my professional colleagues this week. Members may be aware that I have made the odd comment in here about the activities of the Kangaroo Island Council.

An Ombudsman's report has come out in the last week or so that is heavily critical of the council in relation to an aspect of the Whistleblowers Protection Act where a resident put in a complaint that her name had been displayed as a whistleblower in council documentation. She took it to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman found in her favour. She sought to have her name retracted initially from the council minutes as a whistleblower. The Ombudsman has suggested to the council that they remove her name. They have not, and that disappoints me. I am all for proper process to be followed, and I think it is a distinct breach of an act of parliament for the council to have exposed this whistleblower.

The Whistleblowers Protection Act is there for a very good reason: to protect the person who believes that there is wrongdoing. There is wrongdoing at the back of this which will move on a bit further. I am really disappointed. We expect our public officers to do the right thing as far as process goes and not to make mistakes. A lot of them do very good work, do not get me wrong, but there comes a time when things go pear-shaped and need to be sorted out. I believe, as the parliamentary representative of, in that case, the people of Kangaroo Island, I need to put that forward. I am not going to let it go; it is not good enough. I believe the chief executive has failed dismally to do what he should have done. He will not be pleased that I have said that, but I cannot really be bothered about that. There have been a number of inquiries. I will probably move on from that.

Yes, I have thoroughly enjoyed the interactions with my colleagues, as have others in here. There have been a couple of people in this place who nobody has trusted but, by and large, I have trusted nearly all of my colleagues on both sides of the house, and I continue to do so. The member for Ashford and I enjoyed a bit of time away on a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

conference in Canada a couple of years ago. I had never been there before. It was no junket, I can assure you. We paid to go; our travel allowance is gone, etc. That is the way things are.

I would urge members who remain in this place, and those who come into this place, to stand up for their rights. I think it is sad that things have gone from members of parliament. To the general public, members of parliament are a target. Many members of the public make a blood sport out of attacking members of parliament. Those of us who are in here know how many hours and much hard work are put in. I have received phone calls on Christmas Day from people who do not have food or have nowhere to go, and I have been able to sort that out through the churches, particularly in Victor Harbor. Those are the things that you can do.

Members of parliament work exceptionally long hours and they work exceptionally hard, and they need to stand up for their rights and not be rolled over by ideology. I never came into this place for money. I never did that; that was not my aim, and that is just not me. I came here because I had the opportunity and because I thought I could help people. I thought I could do things for people. There is a huge amount of work that needs to be done in the wider community. I get concerned.

My view is that social media will take us all out eventually, the power of social media, Twitter, Facebook, whatever. People can write whatever they like. Quite often they cannot be identified, and—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: No, actually, not that one. I think it will take us out. I was speaking to a well-known defamation lawyer around 12 months ago and he said 'It's going to get all of us eventually.'

The Hon. P. Caica: As you do regularly.

Mr PENGILLY: No, I don't, actually; that is not correct, Paul. But, it does concern me where it is all going with the media. I look back at my career in here. I have two newspapers in my electorate: *The Times* at Victor Harbor and *The Islander* on Kangaroo Island. When I came in, Carolyn Jeffrey was the editor of *The Times*, and she and I locked horns a few times. In the end, I said, 'Look, I've got my job to do. I know it is your role to do this and that, but we are not going to get far if we don't sort this out.' She was actually very good. If I had done something she did not agree with from time to time, she would have a crack. If I did something she did agree with, she would write it up.

Of course, the other editor was Shauna Black on Kangaroo Island. Many of you on the other side would know Shauna. She is a strong advocate for the Labor Party, let me say. Every time she could have a go at me she would go 'whoosh!' in the paper. I learned that I was not going to win that one, so I might as well keep rolling with it. It actually worked in reverse in the end. People get sick of that sort of thing. The media changes. The media is so strong, the radio stations are so strong, but life will go on. I will sit back and watch what transpires in the media.

I am hoping against all hope that we form government after the next election. I think it is time for a change in South Australia. I am a great believer in the idea that no-one should stay around too long and no government should stay there too long. I think that—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Twenty years will do just fine.

Mr PENGILLY: You have opened your mouth, member for Croydon. I think that there can be a capacity to stay too long in this place. When you think that the world revolves around the parliament, it is time you got out. I have never thought that, but I do not believe in career politicians. It is no disrespect to some in the chamber who have been here a fair while; I just think that it is time to get out and have fresh blood coming in. You have five members over there who are going that you know of. There will be more members in here going who do not know it yet but will be going. We have five members who are going.

I think that the new blood coming into the parliament will refresh the parliament. They will have a lot to learn, as we did. The poor old Clerk of the house is rolling his eyes and thinking, 'How am I going to put up with a heap of new members?' I am very grateful to the parliamentary staff. The parliamentary staff across the building have been wonderful and I cannot thank them enough. Those of us who are here from the country know that when you come in, in our case on a Monday morning, you are here for the week, away from your families. The parliamentary staff and the catering staff are

just wonderful. They are all good. One develops a great rapport with them. That is something that I want to acknowledge in the *Hansard*, that I respect and gratefully thank the parliamentary staff.

One could stand here and go on half the night if one wished to, but I am not going to do that. I know that there are other members ready to go, so I take the opportunity to wish every member and every member of staff a happy Christmas, and I hope you have a good new year. To those who are retiring, I hope they enjoy their retirement, going to the races and other activities they have planned. I am sure that we will run into one another from time to time. I am going to miss numbers of you. There are some I will not miss, but there you go—that is life.

Thank you very much. Once again, I thank the people of Finniss for the opportunity to sit in the parliament. I have learned a lot. I have not always got it right and, indeed, other people do not get it right either. That is just the way of the world. With those words, I thank you for your time and my self-indulgence, and I will sit down—period.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, bearing in mind that you may need longer than 45 minutes, we need to extend beyond 7pm because we have an extra speaker. We need to suspend standing orders because we have one more speaker. The member for Wright is going to speak and the member for Kavel is going to speak, so we need to have an absolute majority, and we need to do it now rather than interrupt the member for Wright when she is on her feet.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Madam 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. 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) (18:22): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended to extend the adjournment of the house beyond 19:00.

Motion carried.

Adjournment Debate

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (18:23): This has been my life for 20 years. So much has happened along the way, and I tell this story today most particularly for my grandchildren and beg the house's indulgence in doing so.

I have not been a traditional grandmother, although I like to think that they have all enjoyed some wonderful experiences they would not have otherwise. I want them one day to be able to reflect maybe a little on what their grandma has been about. It might also be a defence for them in future years from hearing these stories over and over again.

I remember so well my first day in this place, starting work for the newly elected member for Briggs on the first day of the new parliament in 1986. I had just moved down from Port Pirie with my boys; their dad was yet to follow. I went home to find a little boy in tears after his first day at his new school. Mum joined him in tears after her first confusing day in this place. I started here with tears and it is highly likely there will be more shed today and tomorrow. Most of you probably do not know this, but I am a little softie.

The class of '97 celebrated our 20th anniversary on 11 October this year. It was the sweetest defeat ever. In 1993, state Labor was crushed, with only 10 members elected. We gained one more in a by-election about six months later. Conventional political wisdom was that we would be in opposition for a generation—not so, as it turned out. Under Mike Rann's leadership, we gained

10 seats in the 1997 election and went on to take government in 2002, so my first term in this place was in opposition.

It goes without saying that no political party aspires to be in opposition. However, it was a great grounding and learning experience for me, and, I am sure, my colleagues, in having to be completely self-reliant in preparing questions, speeches and press releases, identifying local issues and running local campaigns, always with your eye on gaining the ongoing support of your electorate and, ultimately, government. I think that two local campaigns were instrumental in my election—the campaign to stop the erection of a phone tower in the Cobbler Creek Recreation Park and the construction of a new police patrol base to serve the Tea Tree Gully area.

I want to place on record, as I prepare to leave this place, my ongoing appreciation to those who resisted so strongly the erection of that telephone tower in the park. Completely disillusioned with the lack of advocacy from the local Liberal member at the time, residents came out in droves to try to prevent this happening. For over 100 days, mums, dads, kids, older residents and young people blocked the entrance of the park for 24 hours a day. We had a caravan set up on site where the men took turns sleeping overnight. My shifts were in the morning as people were going to work travelling along The Grove Way, again in the evening and the late evening shifts on Thursday nights.

On my first Thursday shift, I rang the local pizza bar down the hill in Salisbury to order some food. It became a regular thing and quite a joke when they would confirm the delivery address: first caravan on the left heading up The Grove Way. Much to the annoyance of the Tea Tree Gully council, we had a 44 gallon drum in which we lit a fire to keep warm on cold nights. They desperately wanted to remove it, but did not dare. Vodafone tried several times to enter the park, but we were successful in keeping them out until one morning at about 6 o'clock, a week after the election, when I received a call from a resident telling me that Vodafone had entered the park under police escort and that a barricade had been erected.

I flew up there, glamorous in my trackies and beanie. Over the barricade I went, only to be confronted by a security guard telling me that I could not enter the park. I make the point that I had not even yet been sworn in, but my response was, 'I'm the local MP for this area. This is a public park. I've got more right to be here than you, so piss off out of my way.' That emboldened the residents and over the barrier they came. They sat on the phone tower, putting paid to any progress on construction. These people were incredibly brave. Most had never been part of a demonstration or protest and probably had never even complained to a member of parliament, yet here they were astride the tower refusing to budge.

It was a long day of attempting to negotiate with police and to contact the then Liberal minister for the environment, who had that very day withdrawn permission for Vodafone to enter the park, yet the police officer in charge at the site refused to accept his letter. He brought in the STAR Group to remove residents, despite being repeatedly told they would leave if instructed to do so. I wanted no-one harmed or put at risk.

It was scandalous behaviour and embarrassing for officers, who at midnight came into the compound area to remove residents. The tower went up. Sometimes you win and sometimes you lose, but I believe that this episode cemented my reputation as being prepared to take on tough battles and fight for local people right down to the wire, not just before I was elected but also after. To those residents, I say thank you for your courage and support.

The other monumental battle I waged was to have a new police station established. The Liberal government had closed police stations left, right and centre. Para Hills was closed and Tea Tree Gully patrols were moved into the old Para Hills station. It was substandard, with a roof that leaked when it rained, and not located in its patrol area. I battled the Liberal government and then our treasurer and police commissioner. When I say 'battled', it was a battle over two terms before a commitment was made.

We have for several years now enjoyed the benefits of a police patrol based in Golden Grove servicing surrounding areas of Tea Tree Gully. It has promoted a far greater sense of safety, and crime levels have dropped. For this, I thank the former minister for police, now Australian Conservative, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, who gave me such a great issue on which to campaign and become well known, and also to the two previously mentioned gentlemen who strongly resisted

the provision of this facility until they were interviewed on Leon Byner's radio show about the release of the identity of a young man to lawyers representing some thugs who had been charged after crashing a local party. The young man's father was livid. His son had been assaulted, after asking specifically that his identity not be released.

This lapse by the police resulted in the commissioner being embarrassed on radio and, voilà, we got the patrol base. I will not share with the house the remarks of the treasurer at this change of heart, but it is fair to say that he was more than a little surprised that the commissioner had all of a sudden decided that we needed a new police facility at Golden Grove. Since that time, the people in my area have benefited from the construction of a new MFS fire station at Golden Grove and the new Salisbury command station, which has the MFS and SES co-located. These facilities and the people who work there have massively increased the safety of my community.

I was also able to secure one of the first children's centres established by this Labor government—Keithcott Farm kindergarten, now Keithcott Farm Children's Centre. I want to thank the leadership of the centre and the parents who took the gamble to expand this facility to become a children's centre. The centre has just recently undergone a further \$2 million investment that will enable it to improve and expand the important services it provides for our little ones and their families.

The longest and most arduous campaign is to have Golden Grove Road upgraded. Golden Grove Road was the boundary of the Golden Grove development and not considered in the works that occurred during the development. The section of road from Park Lake Drive to One Tree Hill Road remained a narrow country road. I began this quest when Diana Laidlaw was the minister for transport.

Much work has been done over the years on improvements to the road, but I am absolutely delighted that on the eve of my departure \$20 million has been allocated to undertake the much-needed resurfacing, provision of lighting and other improvements necessary for a road which carries such a large volume and diversity of traffic. Mums and dads ferrying kids to schools and kindergartens on a narrow, unlit road, compete for space with quarry trucks, B-doubles, articulated buses, light and heavy industry vehicles. If nothing else, it is an example of never giving up. I thank the Treasurer for listening and understanding that this is a much-needed road safety measure.

Members may remember the departing comments of the former Labor leader Mark Latham—or not, but I surely do. He said in one interview that what he was most proud of was forcing the Liberal government into funding the vaccine to prevent pneumococcal disease. What he did not say was that it started here in this chamber with a motion I put to the house calling on the federal government to do exactly that. My motion was supported by the opposition—the member for Morphett, in fact—and it was voted on the very day I proposed it.

So I embarked on a mission around the state, alerting people to the dangers of this disease, that it caused death or permanent disability, that it was preventable, that there was a vaccine available but that it was not funded by the commonwealth and so for most families it was too expensive. I went to childcare centres, kindergartens and anywhere there were families with children, from Port Lincoln to Port Augusta, from Claire to Mount Gambier. Petitions were signed and support gained from local country newspapers. I lobbied Julia Gillard and then Mark Latham. They saw both the health benefit and the economic benefit of funding this vaccine. That is how it happened.

I thank the member for Morphett, who supported my motion on the day and enabled me to say to people that this was a statewide, bipartisan campaign. He understood the merits of my argument. The fact that the shadow minister for health, Dean Brown, came charging into the chamber after the motion passed on the voices, red in the face and more than a little agitated, might have been an indication that he was not quite as pleased with the member for Morphett as I was, but the lesson in this, quite frankly, is: take your opportunities when they present.

That is just a tiny snapshot of my 20 years as a local member and I have not even touched on the massive improvements that have been undertaken in our schools across the entire electorate. Our schools were in such a bad state of repair when we came to government that they were pleading for upgrades and repairs to their toilets. The schools, particularly in the Salisbury area, are unrecognisable now compared to the disgusting state that they were in in 2002. In that, I take much pride.

I have also been fortunate to be a minister in this government for nine years, and I held 15 portfolios during that time. I was never given Treasury, and I still wonder why. When the Premier is considering a reshuffle, on occasion they ring to see what portfolios might be desired. When asked what I might like, my standard response was, 'Tourism, Rec and Sport, and the Arts.' I figured I could do grand finals, opening nights and travel the world promoting our great state as well as anyone. My grand standard reply was, 'Over my dead body.'

The portfolio I most enjoyed, however, was Families and Communities, with Housing, Ageing, Disability and Families. We had the benefit of the housing stimulus package. We had a once-in-a-generation opportunity and I was determined to make the most of it. I asked my agency not to come to me with plans just for three-bedroom houses but to look at how we could make real inroads across all those sectors, and they did: housing for residents, we needed to move out of Strathmont, appropriate housing for older South Australians, purpose-built housing for people living with a disability, normal homes for children in care who did not have foster families to care for them, homes that would allow large groups of siblings to stay together, and housing that would provide the opportunity to settle children before they went into a carer's home to try to lessen the cases of breakdown.

The Uno apartment building was the jewel. It is a 17-storey apartment building available to Trust applicants, community housing, those eligible for affordable purchase as well as apartments to be offered on the open market. We also located specialist youth homelessness accommodation and support in this building.

No lift snobbery, a totally mixed community—I was told it would not work, but it did. At one point we had to pull apartments off the market, they sold so well. Uno went on to win national awards and we won the award for the best use of stimulus package. I was told only last night that Uno is up for another award today. I am proud indeed of the wonderful people who worked so hard to make this a reality. I thank a specially Jos Mazel and Phil Fagan-Schmidt.

The youth detention centres were also part of this portfolio. The Magill centre was old, decrepit and provided worse facilities than any adult prison in this state. Funding was to be provided for a new centre as well as prison expansions and then it was cut when the GFC hit. Those who had worked so hard to get this new centre and who were dedicated to providing an environment that would really help turn kids lives around were devastated. We needed a new facility that would promote a whole new way of interacting with young people and create a positive culture amongst staff.

'You want it, you fund it,' was the message I got, so we did. It was a \$67 million new state-of-the-art facility that says to these kids, 'You can learn. You can do better. You do matter.' There will always be some who do not make it, but many, many more will now make positive changes in their lives and come out stronger and better equipped to make a future for themselves because of this centre and the way it now works.

We commenced individualised funding for people with a disability long before NDIS became a reality. It began cautiously but enthusiastically with families who were both keen and wanting to take on this responsibility. I am still of the view it is not for everyone, but it was important to develop processes that supported those who wanted to take it up. For those individuals and families, it was life changing.

Two challenging emergencies we had to deal were the Stockport floods and the arrival of around 100 residents from Yuendumu in the Northern Territory. Already in a meeting with Jos Mazel, my CE, we were told that 100 Aboriginal people were on their way to Adelaide—current location: slightly north of Port Augusta. I looked at Jos, she looked at me. I just said to Jos, 'Make out it's a fire. Do what we do if it was a fire,' and it worked. Our emergency services and recovery unit went into action and we had a place for them to stay when they arrived and they were eventually housed in the old police academy at Fort Largs until it was safe for them to return to their home.

Stockport, on the other hand, was devastating. To see homes destroyed by water with such force as to push walls in, strong enough to pick up fridges and freezers and deposit them in backyards, to have every precious object covered in slime and filth was truly unbelievable. The flow of water hit the town from four directions, and people told me they literally had to run for their lives.

When I arrived, they were all in shock. They stood out the front of what was their homes. They walked inside to try to find something, anything, that had not been destroyed. They knew clean-up had to begin, but they did not know where to start.

The most urgent thing, in my view, was that these people did not feel they were on their own. Emergency service volunteers were bussed in that day. The process of support and clean up got underway and I cannot say what a privilege it was to be part of this. To say I enjoyed it is the wrong word, but I loved being on the ground doing what I could in a practical way, visiting people, making sure they had what they needed when they needed it. The township got back on its feet and made many improvements. This trauma delivered benefits. The people got together and formed bands of friendship that I think will be forever ongoing. I still take the detour through Stockport on occasion just to see what is happening.

Many initiatives were put in place during the term of the state Labor government to improve the outcomes for children and to better protect them. I took over the education and child development portfolio at a difficult time. I think it is fair to say that if the education department had had a different culture and way of dealing with complaints of child abuse, much of the hurt and anger that occurred may have been avoided. I came into the portfolio as the DeBelle inquiry was underway. I met personally with many parents to listen to their stories and their concerns.

These situations are extremely distressing and they take their toll, but I felt it was important to provide these opportunities. If I felt hurt, it was nothing compared to what these families were going through. I appointed Tony Harrison, former assistant police commissioner, to head up the department and to put into place rigorous, consistent and proper processes in dealing with complaints against teaching staff and any other departmental employee, and he did just that. He appointed skilled investigators and implemented rigorous processes. The department is all the better for his efforts, and I thank him.

After the 2014 election, we finally had air space in which we could concentrate on education policy and directions, and then Tony Harrison and David Waterford came to my office to tell me about Shannon McCooole. I do not believe anyone in this place has dealt with anything more horrifying. It is shocking to read daily files on abuse and neglect of children by their families. You do what you can to prevent it, and when it does happen you do your best to support and care for these children. It was quite something else to have a person employed to provide that care to little children who had been removed from their families to systematically abuse them.

At the time, I was told that police had not finished their interviews and until they were ready we could not tell the public. When they were ready, it was clear what I could say and what I could not say. I took advice from the police at every step of the way. I was able to publicly confirm that McCooole had gone through all the appropriate processes when he was employed and that there were no identifiable concerns. That was later found to be incorrect information.

However, I was not to speak about any concerns that may have been raised about him during his employment. A concern had been registered against McCooole during his employment but it was clear from our discussions that the senior police heading up this investigation did not want this information released publicly, as it was part of their investigation. I briefed the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister. I told them there were still things I could not tell them. It was harrowing and the leader wept at the news. He hugged me and said it was so terrible the opposition would not be using this politically. That lasted about a day before he was on the radio.

He then came into this place and asked questions day after day that he knew I could not answer. My estimation of the calibre of the Leader of the Opposition was cemented as a result of his crocodile tears and subsequent actions. The only question put to me through 64 questions over two days about the wellbeing of the children was put by the member for Adelaide, and for that I give her credit.

The matter of the concerns noted was leaked to the media. Commissioner Gary Burns was on leave. His first day back, he fronted up for his media slot on ABC morning radio. He was asked about police not investigating the concern lodged about McCooole during his employment. He confirmed two things: the police did receive a concerns notice about McCooole and that, based on the information in the report, they made the judgement not to investigate. He also confirmed that I had

done absolutely the right thing in relation to not divulging information about McCoolle's employment history, that he was responsible for the investigation and that he would decide when it was appropriate for information on a live investigation to be released.

Shannon McCoolle is the epitome of evil, his actions sick and depraved—beautiful little children his victims, and families, further traumatised, also his victims. I consider myself fairly robust, but this all but broke me. It was not the opposition, it was not the media, it was not the police, it was not being wrongfooted with incorrect information: it was the children—children just like the little ones in my family I love so dearly. I lost count of the nights I sobbed myself to sleep about these kids. I again say to the families who lived this trauma and continue to try to support the children through the challenges I have no doubt they continue to face: I am so terribly and deeply sorry.

I have been lucky to have so many precious moments and I have so many people to thank—those who voted for me and gave me these 20 years, those who challenged me and those who became my friends, and those who have always supported me, mentored me and at times pulled in to gear. I extend my deep appreciation to Trevor Smith, former national secretary of the CFMEU, to whom I gave a great deal of stick the first time we met. Trevor strongly supported my preselection and I am eternally grateful.

The staff I worked with in my electorate office, in particular Lynn Byrne, Rachel Stelmach and Kristianne Foreman, are all stars. Those who have worked in my ministerial office, too many to name individually, but to all of them I say a sincere thank you. The public servants who worked in my ministerial office, most particularly those I worked with when I had the education and child development portfolio, these people gave 110 per cent every day. They were dedicated and driven and they were committed to making sure that we did the best we could.

Angela Duigan, my chief of staff during my first term as minister, was key to my election in 1997 and helped keep my head above water from the 2006 to 2010. In 2011, Blair Boyer came on board as my chief of staff and put together the most amazing ministerial support team any minister could ever hope to have. They supported one another, particularly through the tough times we navigated, as much as they supported me—and support me they did. I hope they know the high esteem in which I hold them and to them I owe much.

Blair Boyer is now Labor's candidate in Wright. His experience is extensive. He is grounded—how could a father of three girls under four, including identical twins, not be grounded? He is genuine, considered and passionate, and I have no doubt that he will make a great member of parliament. Gail Gago: politics is not a great place for making real friends, but Gail has been a strong and true mate and I feel truly blessed to have had her friendship.

The wonderful Joan Kirner and Cheryl Davenport, cofounders of EMILY's List—these women both encouraged and supported me from my preselection through to my election and beyond. It was beyond my comprehension that someone like Joan Kirner would care, worry and remember every little detail about this lowly little candidate here in South Australia. She would ring regularly and was first on the phone on election night. She was an extraordinary woman and it was a great privilege to know her and count her as a friend. Cheryl mentored me, visited me from Perth regularly and kept me sane, and 1997 was the first election of EMILY's List women—six in one hit here in South Australia—quite fantastic and a great achievement.

My first election campaign was, I think, the most fun and the most scary. There was no option for me but to win. It was not until about 18 months after, in the refreshment room here at Parliament House, when a group of us were talking about our campaigns, and I said, 'I found party office to be very helpful.' They were all having a little grizzle. I said, 'They didn't cause me any angst at all.' John Hill set me straight. He said, 'That's because no one thought you had a hope in hell of winning.'

Anyway, for me there was no option. I would wake up in the middle of the night in a cold sweat, panicking that I might not win. I would calm down, and then I would panic about what it would mean if I did win. This was the time when I had the realisation that I was a tad competitive.

Lyn Byrne came and worked with Angela and I, and she stayed. Lyn worked with me for over 15 years in both my electorate office and ministerial office. I could not have had a more loyal, decent, hardworking friend. She went beyond her commitment not just to me but to those we were trying to

help, a truly good person to whom I will be forever grateful. To me, Lyn is family, as are the wonderful Elizabeth and David Haebich. Two police families, both with little boys, we were living in Peterborough, and the Haebiches were in the neighbouring Jamestown, more than 40 years ago. Every election, every momentous event, they have been there with their love and support. I am so lucky to have such friends.

Ten days before Christmas in 1977, our family was packed up. We left Peterborough and moved to Port Pirie where, one fine day, there was a knock on the door. I opened it to find a fellow with a shock of bright red hair, a red beard, front tooth missing, who had arrived at my home in a lime-green Mini Moke with a floral hood just to set it off. Denis Crisp became my dear lifelong friend. To him I owe so much. Together we ran the Port Pirie sub-branch. He encouraged me to apply for my first political job, personal assistant to the member for Stuart, Gavin Keneally. He came down and managed my 2002 campaign, and I did not let him go.

Denis had great joy in his life, enhanced enormously as his grandchildren arrived, and by meeting, loving and marrying Jane. He was funny, absurdly funny at times—most times—and generous to a fault. He was loved and respected by all those who worked with him. He was a teacher and was always teaching. I learnt many things from Denis. The most important was how he managed the tragic loss of his wife, Vivienne, and how, in the last years of his life as he battled cancer, he did not allow the enormity of what he was facing to overwhelm him. It was one step at a time, overcoming one challenge at a time, a lesson I have used over and over.

Our family came back to the city in 1986, and I started working with Mike Rann, as I said, the newly elected member for Briggs. It was right back when he still had gorgeous curls. We had no office, so I had to share a desk with him in Parliament House for a number of months before the electorate office was completed. That was a real challenge.

We were living at mum's. One stinking hot day, when the buses were not running, Mike offered to pick me up on his way into town. Mum's phone rings; it is Mike. 'Sorry, but my car has broken down in the middle of the North East Road-Sudholz Road intersection, but it's okay. I got the police to come and push it into their car park. Can you come and pick me up?' His car was, by the way, a very, very old, battered Toyota with octopus straps holding down the boot.

Mum goes into a panic and wants to dust my car before I pick him up. He came back to the house and met mum and dad. They were overwhelmed to have him in their home, but he was so lovely to them then and always. On the way into town he complained about how hot it was. I suggested he remove his jacket; it was fast heading north of 40°. 'I can't,' he replied. 'I have only ironed the front panels of my shirt.' I thought, 'And my mum wanted to dust my car for you!'

Mike was not great at that stuff, but Mike took the Labor Party from facing a future in the political wilderness after the 1993 election to government in 2002, where we have remained since. He was an amazing strategist and tactician, and I got to witness just how he achieved what he did up close. As do so many in this place, I owe my political career to him, his political skill, tenacity and personal strength.

We have gone through many highs and lows, both personal and professional, together. We have laughed a lot, gossiped a lot. Mike is a really terrible gossip. We have seen each other's children grow up. On the 1997 election night, he rocked up at my election night gig and did not leave until he was sure I had won. Mike has been a great mate. He has that very rare commodity in politics of unwavering loyalty to his friends. I want to thank him for his encouragement and support. I hope he feels I have honoured the faith he placed in me.

Often with a change in leadership, those seen to be closest to the predecessor are not necessarily encouraged to stay on in the ministry, but that was not the case with our current Premier, and I want to thank him for his trust. The people of South Australia are seeing that our Premier is a man with a vision. He is determined to carve out a positive future for our state. He is mild mannered but a man of steel. I have no doubt, despite the Electoral Commission's best attempt at handing government to the Liberals, that the people of South Australia see a Premier who stands up for them and will re-elect a Labor government in 2018.

I joined my beloved Australian Labor Party about 1975 and went to my first sub-branch meeting in Peterborough, where we had over 300 members at the time. I remember well wanting to

ask a question, breaking out in a cold sweat, my throat seizing up and I could not talk. Some have said that it is a shame that did not continue.

I am so proud to have been a Labor member of parliament representing the people of Wright in this place. For 20 years they have put their faith in me to work to improve their lives and ensure a future for their children. I am so grateful. I am grateful to my parliamentary colleagues for their mateship and most particularly their kindness in difficult times. To you I make this final promise: I will not be on the phone giving you the benefit of wisdom post election, and I certainly will not be on talkback radio prefacing my remarks with 'As the former minister for...' I cannot, however, make that promise in relation to the person with whom I am sharing my retirement, but I will do my best.

I thank my beautiful family: my sister Natley, my best friend on whom I can always rely for unconditional love and support; my brother-in-law Doug, who puts up with these sisters and who has climbed more Stobie poles on my behalf than could be reasonably expected; and Casey, Nathan and Annie, no folding, no stuffing, no handing out how-to-vote cards was too daunting for this trio, but mostly thank you for allowing me to just continue to be your Auntie Jen. Your darling girls, Georgia, Abby, Ruby and Bianca, have put up with this crazy great-aunt who whizzes about, in and out, but whom I love so dearly. To my sons, Matthew and Brett, I could not have done this without you. None of the past 20 years would have had purpose or meaning without you or my beautiful grandchildren.

I will conclude with a snapshot of just a few of my most precious moments. They include being proposed to on stage by a departmental employee receiving a graduation certificate. All of the front row heard it and burst out laughing, and I said it was the best offer I had had in a long time.

A chief minister from a nation I shall not mention, clearly interested in renewable energy, wanted to come to my house to see my solar panels.

I had a near-death experience with a minister in China thanks to the rice wine toasts. I was told three toasts from the minister is a sign of friendship. Down the hatch they went. I was not told it would be three toasts from every person around a very large round table. Mick rang me every 20 minutes throughout the night to make sure I was still alive.

I twice travelled with our now Governor, Hieu Van Le, enjoying his company and hearing firsthand his amazing stories. I stood in Times Square to watch the inauguration of Barack Obama on a huge screen with thousands of New Yorkers. I did not bother to turn on the TV to watch Donald Trump.

Ada Barclay, Doug's mum, Nanny to us: at 14, she crocheted a doily of the new parliament house in Canberra, which is the Old Parliament House now. She gave it to me after we took government in 2002. I promised to frame it and hang it in my Parliament House office. That eventually led to an unveiling, which Mike Rann dutifully agreed to do, such is the life and demands on a premier. Members will remember the Speaker announcing her presence in the chamber last year. We were celebrating her 100th birthday. I am disappointed that she is not able to be in the gallery today, but I am pleased to report that she is doing just fine, now 101 and on a flight to Brisbane to meet another new great-grandchild.

My family: having my family at my swearing in in the ministry after the 2006 election, Olivia 13 months old at the back of the room spots me as we walk in for the ceremony, starts waving and calling out 'Maba, mama.' TV cameras swept away from us to this 13-month-old delicious little girl. The next day's papers headline was 'Olivia's gran joins cabinet'. When I arrived at my electorate office that day, every possible surface was covered with that page of the paper, courtesy of course of Dennis and Lynn.

Julia Gillard's book: open it up and in the middle of the book there is McKenzie Rankine's photograph taken the day of the signing of the Gonski agreement. Julia made her way through the schoolyard holding McKenzie's hand, talking to her. We returned to my ministerial office, Macca vomited on the carpet and then went to sleep on my sofa, clutching a photo of her and the PM. McKenzie's fame, of course, does not end there. A TV crew turned up at her school for vision and interviews after their NAPLAN testing. They made the mistake of asking this little one how she found the test. 'Easy peasy,' was her reply.

Mr Darcy and Patrick, chatting like the two grumpy old men in the Muppets, on tiny chairs by a big window, enjoying special biscuits made by Liz Scarce at Government House, I would love to have heard their conversation. I suspect they were hatching another plot about how to overthrow their dominant, bossy older sisters. All of them at various times decked out in traditional dress, attending a multitude of multicultural events, upstaging me during speeches and being surrounded by them, great nieces and all, when I stood down from the ministry.

None of these kids was born when I was elected, so they have only known me in this role, and most of the time as a minister. I was delighted beyond belief when our little surprise Alexander arrived a month after stepping down in 2015. He was the one I would have the time with, all the time in the world, but devastatingly he passed away at 15 months of age. The bravery of my daughter-in-law Briony and son Matthew throughout this grief has been remarkable and continues so. No position, no job, protects you from life's tragedies, but these two people are remarkable examples of how you survive.

My dear mum, who cannot be here today: her last visit, though, she looked so beautiful in her pink sequinned dress and pink shoes to match. She worked so hard on that first campaign. I walked around the back one day to pick up another batch of folding and stuffing and she looked at me and said, 'I'm sick of the sight of your face'.

My dad at 78, having suffered three strokes, stayed at my 1997 election do until stumps. Denis Crisp later told me that when he arrived he went up to dad and asked, 'What do you think of your girl now?' My dad said, 'I think she's a corker.' There is no higher praise.

My dad left school at grade 7. He was a timber worker. He bought his own truck after the war and cut wood with an axe. He joined the E&WS and helped build the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, and he claims to have laid the very first pipe. A Labor man through and through, but he never had any expectation that a member of our family would be a member of parliament. Indeed, I had no expectation or ambition ever to be a member of parliament, let alone a minister.

People ask, 'What's next?' In pondering this, I have come to the realisation that my first 20 years as an adult were not as I planned. The last 20 years were never planned, so there is not much point really in planning the next. Life just happens, and so far it has been great. I have every confidence that the member for Croydon and I will embark on great adventures as life unfolds at a slightly more leisurely pace.

Thank you, Mr Speaker, for pushing me when I needed to be pushed, for holding me when I needed to be held, for wiping my tears, for making me laugh and for making life so interesting and such fun.

The first time I stood to speak in this place was to ask a question, and it was about the phone tower at Cobbler Creek. I was incredibly nervous and had been told that I wring my hands when I speak when I am nervous. I devised a plan. I was not going to let anyone know I was nervous, so I kicked my shoes off so as not to wobble in high heels, and I gripped the bench with my hands so as not to wring them. The only thing I did not have control over were my kneecaps, which involuntarily jumped up and down the whole time. I asked my question, the house erupted and I sat down, knowing I had found what I want to be when I grow up.

That, my darlings, is your grandma's story, as briefly as I can put it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am just disappointed that you did not mention calisthenics anywhere. Member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (19:05): I am pleased to stand here in the house this evening to deliver my final speech in the parliament as the member for Kavel. As other members have done in their valedictory speeches, I would like to reflect on some things that have taken place over the 16 years that I will have been a member of parliament here. Going back to the early days of my successful election to this place in February 2002, the lead-up to my successful election in 2002 was not necessarily what I regard as easy.

I was preselected when the campaign proper period was running. The then premier, Rob Kerin, had called the election. The member for Kavel at the time, the Hon. John Olsen, had announced that he was retiring, and I was preselected as the candidate for Kavel, with less than

three weeks to run a campaign before the election day in February 2002. On reflection, it was probably the most intense period of my life, particularly my working life, those three or so weeks of preselection and then looking to mount a campaign to hold the seat.

We had a fairly formidable opponent running as an Independent, who had quite a high profile in the electorate. However, with the strong team effort of the local Liberal Party members and the SEC, we held the seat with a narrow margin, only 3 per cent. I think I polled 43 per cent of the primary vote and we received the 10 per cent preference flow that then brought me to 53 per cent against the Independent, who came second on the primaries.

I was fortunate enough to get a reasonable percentage of the ALP preferences in that election. I went through a lot of analysis and came to the understanding that there were some Labor Party supporters who would rather see somebody like me represent the electorate than the Independent person. However, in subsequent elections, particularly in 2006, we saw the margin go out to 10 per cent. It was fortunate for me, personally, as the sitting member looking for re-election, that Labor polled second. They came second in the primary vote because the Independent who ran against me in 2002 joined Family First, and the Family First candidate came third on first preferences and those preferences flowed to me considerably and pushed the margin to about 10 per cent.

In subsequent elections, in 2010 and 2014, when that person did not run, I think it reflected the true vote in the electorate when, after preferences, I won both those elections—2010 and 2014—on the primary vote and saw the margin push out well into the mid double digits, around 14 or 15 per cent. I am grateful for the very strong team effort that has supported me within the Liberal Party structure and overseen my success over those four successive elections.

From that time until now, and it will continue to be, I have always regarded it as an honour and a privilege to represent the voters in Kavel. It will be 16 years that I have regarded as being a very important and very enjoyable part of my life. It has been my life. To carry out the responsibilities properly of a lower house member, you have to commit pretty much your whole life to the job. I witnessed firsthand the commitment that my father made to the role, so I had a clear understanding of the commitment that was expected and that you needed to make a success of the job.

There have been highlights through the years, but there have been some tough times, too. Like all of us in this place, there have been family and personal issues that have had to be dealt with as well along the way. There have been some very humorous times, some funny times. Some humorous situations have come along. Conversely, there have been some very tense and serious situations that have arisen that have had to be dealt with.

The role of a lower house MP is a very varied role. Obviously, we have our parliamentary role, and I have valued my time as a shadow minister. I was involved in the shadow cabinet for approximately five years. I was a shadow minister—and I cannot recall the particular length of time—under the leadership of Iain Evans (the then member for Davenport) and the member for Heysen, Isobel Redmond, and I was in the shadow cabinet under the leadership of the member for Waite.

I have had some time as the Opposition Whip and I have been a member of a parliamentary committee, being the Economic and Finance Committee. Obviously, there is the electorate and constituent work and the political party involvement. We all know it is a very varied role, but I have enjoyed it all. As I said, there have been some good times and bad times.

The most rewarding part of the whole job has been the electorate and constituent work, to help individual people, community organisations, and to deal with the wider township and district issues. I have found that the most satisfying and rewarding. The thousands of people my office and I have assisted has been the best part. I sat down to try to calculate how many individual people we would have endeavoured to assist. After 16 years, if you times that by 52 weeks in the year and the number of meetings I have had with constituents, it literally runs into the thousands. In my maiden speech on 9 May 2002 I said, to quote from the *Hansard*:

...I believe it is a privilege to represent the people of Kavel and I look forward to honouring the trust they have placed in me and fulfilling my commitment to them in being a good, effective, accessible local member.

I am sincerely grateful to the voting public of Kavel who have put their trust in me as their local MP for 16 years. I think I have achieved being a good, effective and accessible local member. I go out of this place satisfied and proud of my work.

With the indulgence of the house, I would like to list some of the positive outcomes in the district. Some examples include improvements to health, education, road safety, transport infrastructure, emergency services, police, policing, sporting facilities and the environment. I have also been proud to maintain and support standards in social justice matters.

I have to say that I have only one real regret since being here and that is not being a member of the government. There was a very short period of time—

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It was for just an hour or two on the very first sitting day, the swearing-in day in 2002, that I sat over in the back bench where the member for Ashford and the member for Light currently sit. The member for Morphett and I sat over there for about an hour or two on the very first sitting day until the Labor Party was supported into government. An enormous amount has been said, discussed, debated and argued about that over a long period of time so I do not need to trawl over all of that.

I want to look to the future and I want to speak about the endorsed Liberal candidate for Kavel, Mr Dan Cregan. He is a person of high intellect and high integrity. Dan works locally in Mount Barker and lives in that town with his partner, Jen. I am delighted that Dan is the party's candidate. A person of his calibre running in this seat is very pleasing. He is working every day on his campaign to win the seat and I trust he is successful on 17 March next year. He will be a real asset to the electorate, the parliamentary party and the parliament.

Talking about local issues, the Adelaide Hills is a most unique region in the country—not just in South Australia but in the country—so it is important that the government specifically focuses on this region. Mount Barker and surrounding districts and neighbouring towns such as Nairne and Littlehampton continue to grow and these towns will need specific attention by the government of the day. It requires ongoing attention to meet the needs and demands for services and infrastructure and I believe that that has not necessarily been the case over the past years. There is always work to be done.

In closing, I need to acknowledge and thank a number of people for their support, loyalty, care and friendship, people such as Lyn and John Nitschke, and Marg and Colin Westmore. I will list some others but I want to talk about Lyn and Marg for a moment or two. My involvement with Lyn and Marg dates back to the late 1990s when I first became more involved in the party structure. Lyn was the president of the Kavel SEC. I became the secretary of the SEC and Margie Westmore was the treasurer of the SEC, so our friendship and their support for me goes right back to the late 1990s.

In July 2001, I succeeded Lyn in becoming the president of the SEC. I had been approached previously to that about considering running for parliament. It was put to me that the then member obviously would not continue forever, and I might like to consider a parliamentary career. I thought about it and discussed it with my wife and, when I became president of the SEC, I made the decision that when an opportunity came up, I would avail myself of that opportunity, and that opportunity came up pretty quickly, as I said, in late January or early February 2002.

I thank those specific people, as well as Brian Pym and his late wife, Margaret; Liz Hunkin; Phil and Liz Turner; Michael Guthrie; John and Gloria Seidel; Mal and Faye Wade; the late David Gordon and Mrs Sheila Gordon; Kevin and Jan Kleeman; David and Wendy Kuchel; and Des and Beryl Stanbury. These are just some of the people who have been strong supporters. I could list hundreds more people who have been strong supporters, and I offer my sincere thanks to them personally and the party members who have shown their strong support.

I also thank the Liberal Party. The member for Finniss raised this point, which is most important. I would not be here as the member for Kavel without the Liberal Party. It is important that I thank my staff for their loyalty, support and commitment over the years. I have been fortunate to have very good staff in my office. A number of staff have worked in my office over the 16 years, but the two longest serving staff members are currently with me, one of whom has been with me my

entire career, Ms Airlie Keen. The other staff member, Ms Jana Kranixfeld has been with me for 9½ years. My trainee, Joe Clayton, started in June this year and is doing well.

We all know how vital the work is that our staff in our offices carry out. They are our representatives to a large degree and have an important responsibility. It is not an easy job working in an electorate office. It is a demanding job and, to some degree, they work in an adversarial environment, so I want to thank my staff for their loyalty, commitment and support. I look forward to maintaining contact with them into the future once I retire.

I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues. I like to think I have got on with pretty much everyone on this side of the house and with some on the other side. I enjoy and value the friendship of a number of my colleagues: the members for MacKillop, Bright, Schubert, Davenport, Heysen and Hammond to name just a few. In the upper house, the Hon. Terry Stephens, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan CSC, the Hon. David Ridgway and the Hon. John Dawkins are just some members I regard as good friends. I want to thank them, the leader, the deputy leader and other colleagues for their support and friendship. On a personal level, I want to thank my personal friends who are not directly involved in politics. I have valued their friendship throughout my career. They have helped me maintain perspective on important aspects of life.

Finally, I need to thank my family most deeply: my parents, my sister and brother-in-law, my brother and sister-in-law, my extended family (uncles, aunts, cousins) and, most importantly, my children and my wife, Tracey. My children were 10 and seven when I was first elected to this place. Over 16 years, I have seen them grow into adults. They have been through university and they are fully grown adults now who are pursuing their own individual careers very well. Most importantly, my wife has been an absolute pillar of strength in her unwavering support. It would have been impossible to operate at the level I have without that support from my wife.

Again, thank you to one and all. I wish you all a very happy Christmas and look forward to the election of a Marshall Liberal government in March 2018.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DRINK AND DRUG DRIVING) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the alternative amendments made by the House of Assembly to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 and 2 and agreed not to insist on its disagreement to amendments Nos 3 to 6 upon which the House of Assembly had insisted.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TERROR SUSPECT DETENTION) BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Long title—Delete 'and the *Police Act 1998*' and substitute:

the *Police Act 1998*; and the *Young Offenders Act 1993*

No. 2. Clause 5, page 4, line 12 [clause 5, inserted section 3B(1)(b)(i)]—Before 'has' insert 'is or'

No. 3. Clause 5, page 4, after line 14 [clause 5, page 4, inserted section 3B(1)(b)]—

After subparagraph (ii) insert:

(iii) is, or has previously been, the subject of a control order under Part 5.3 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code

No. 4. Clause 8, page 5, line 9—Delete '(e)' and substitute '(f)'

No. 5. Clause 8, page 5, line 11—Delete '(f)' and substitute '(g)'

No. 6. Clause 9, page 5, lines 14 to 18 [clause 9, inserted section 19B]—

Delete inserted section 19B and substitute:

19B—Arrest of person who is or becomes a terror suspect

- (1) If—
- (a) a person who has been released under a bail agreement becomes a terror suspect while subject to the bail agreement; or
- (b) a terror suspect who has been released under a bail agreement is the subject of a certificate issued by the Commissioner of Police under this section,
- the bail agreement is taken to be revoked and a police officer may arrest the person without warrant.
- (2) The Commissioner of Police may issue a certificate for the purposes of this section in relation to a terror suspect who has been released under a bail agreement certifying that the Commissioner is satisfied that significant new information has come to light in relation to the person that should be considered by a bail authority.
- (3) In any proceedings, a document that appears to be a certificate issued by the Commissioner of Police under this section may be admitted in evidence and is proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matter so certified.

No. 7. Clause 11, page 6, line 24 [clause 11(3), inserted subsection (4)(a)]—After 'is' insert:

, or has previously been,

No. 8. Clause 11, page 6, after line 26 [clause 11(3), inserted subsection (4)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

- (d) is, or has previously been, the subject of a control order under Part 5.3 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code.

No. 9. Clause 14, page 7, line 8 [clause 14, inserted section 74B(1)]—After 'on parole' insert:

or a terror suspect is, while on parole, the subject of a certificate issued by the Commissioner of Police under subsection (9)

No. 10. Clause 14, page 8, after line 7—After inserted subsection (8) insert:

- (9) The Commissioner of Police may issue a certificate for the purposes of this section in relation to a terror suspect who is on parole certifying that the Commissioner is satisfied that significant new information has come to light in relation to the person that should be considered by the presiding member of the Board.
- (10) In any proceedings, a document that appears to be a certificate issued by the Commissioner of Police under this section may be admitted in evidence and is proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matter so certified.

No. 11. Clause 20, page 10, line 36 [clause 20, inserted section 5A(1)(a)]—After 'is' insert:

, or has previously been,

No. 12. Clause 20, page 10, after line 38 [clause 20, inserted section 5A(1)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

- (d) is, or has previously been, the subject of a control order under Part 5.3 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code.

No. 13. New Part, page 15, after line 43—Insert:

Part 6—Amendment of Young Offenders Act 1993

28—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

- (1) Section 4(1)—after the definition of *Chief Executive* insert:

Commonwealth Criminal Code means the Criminal Code set out in the Schedule to the *Criminal Code Act 1995* of the Commonwealth, or a law of the Commonwealth that replaces that Code;

- (2) Section 4(1)—after the definition of *Department* insert:

designated member means the member of the Training Centre Review Board designated by the Attorney-General in accordance with subsection (3) and includes any member designated by the Attorney-General in accordance with that subsection to act in the absence of that designated member;

- (3) Section 4(1)—after the definition of *spouse* insert:
- terrorism intelligence authority* means a terrorism intelligence authority designated by regulations under section 74B of the *Police Act 1998*;
- terrorism notification* means a terrorism notification under section 74B of the *Police Act 1998*;
- terrorist offence means—
- (a) an offence against Division 72 Subdivision A of the Commonwealth Criminal Code (International terrorist activities using explosive or lethal devices); or
 - (b) a terrorism offence against Part 5.3 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code (Terrorism) where the maximum penalty is 7 or more years imprisonment; or
 - (c) an offence against Part 5.5 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code (Foreign incursions and recruitment), except an offence against subsection 119.7(2) or (3) (Publishing recruitment advertisements); or
 - (d) an offence against the repealed *Crimes (Foreign Incursions and Recruitment) Act 1978* of the Commonwealth, except an offence against paragraph 9(1)(b) or (c) of that Act (Publishing recruitment advertisements); or
 - (e) an offence of a kind prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition;
- terror suspect*—see subsection (4);
- (4) Section 4—after subsection (2) insert:
- (3) The Attorney-General may, from time to time, by written instrument—
 - (a) designate a member of the Training Centre Review Board who is a member of the Court's judiciary as the designated member for the purposes of sections 41BA and 43; and
 - (b) designate another member of the Training Centre Review Board who is a member of the Court's judiciary to act for the purposes of those sections in the absence of the designated member,

and in any proceedings, a certificate purporting to be executed by the Attorney-General certifying as to a matter relating to a designation under this subsection may be admitted in evidence and is proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matter so certified.
 - (4) A youth is a *terror suspect* for the purposes of this Act if the youth—
 - (a) is, or has previously been, charged with a terrorist offence; or
 - (b) has ever been convicted of a terrorist offence; or
 - (c) is the subject of a terrorism notification; or
 - (d) is, or has previously been, the subject of a control order under Part 5.3 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code.
 - (5) For the purposes of subsection (4)(a), a youth is only taken to have been charged with an offence if an information or other initiating process charging the youth with the offence has been filed in a court.

29—Amendment of section 39—Reviews etc and proceedings of Training Centre Review Board

Section 39(2)(b)—after 'recidivist young offender' insert 'or a terror suspect'

30—Amendment of section 41—Application and interpretation of Subdivision

Section 41(2)—after 'recidivist young offender' insert 'or a terror suspect'

31—Insertion of section 41BA

After section 41B insert:

41BA—Suspension of conditional release if youth is or becomes a terror suspect

- (1) If a youth becomes a terror suspect while released subject to conditions under this Division or a terror suspect is, while released subject to conditions under

this Division, the subject of a certificate issued by the Commissioner of Police under subsection (9)—

- (a) the designated member must, on becoming aware of that fact, issue a warrant for the arrest of the youth; and
 - (b) on the warrant being so issued, the youth's entitlement to conditional release from detention is suspended until a determination is made under this section.
- (2) A warrant issued under this section authorises the detention of the youth in custody pending the making of a determination under this section.
 - (3) The designated member must, as soon as practicable, determine whether there are special circumstances justifying the youth's continued release from detention.
 - (4) A terrorism intelligence authority is entitled to be heard by the designated member in relation to the making of a determination under this section.
 - (5) The designated member is not required to provide to the youth any grounds or reasons for a determination under this section.
 - (6) Information forming the basis for the making of a determination under this section must not be disclosed to any person (except to the Attorney-General, a court or a person to whom a terrorism intelligence authority authorises its disclosure) if, at the time at which the question of disclosure is to be decided, the information is properly classified by the terrorism intelligence authority as terrorism intelligence under section 74B of the *Police Act 1998* (whether or not the information was so classified at the time at which the determination under this section was made).
 - (7) If the designated member determines that there are special circumstances justifying the youth's continued release from detention, the suspension under this section is lifted and, on release from custody under this section, the youth will continue to be released subject to the conditions for the balance of the unexpired period of the detention order.
 - (8) If the designated member determines that there are not special circumstances justifying the youth's continued release from detention, the youth—
 - (a) must be returned to detention under the original order; and
 - (b) is liable to serve the balance of the sentence unexpired as at the date on which the youth was taken back into custody under this section; and
 - (c) will be taken to have been serving that balance of sentence during any period spent in custody pending the making of a determination by the designated member under this section.
 - (9) The Commissioner of Police may issue a certificate for the purposes of this section in relation to a terror suspect who has been released from detention subject to conditions under this Division certifying that the Commissioner is satisfied that significant new information has come to light in relation to the youth that should be considered by the designated member.
 - (10) In any proceedings, a document that appears to be a certificate issued by the Commissioner of Police under this section may be admitted in evidence and is proof, in the absence of proof to the contrary, of the matter so certified.

32—Insertion of Part 5 Division 4

After section 42A insert:

Division 4—Terror suspects

43—Special procedures for terror suspects

- (1) Despite any other provision of this Part, a decision of the Youth Parole Board relating to a youth who is a terror suspect is of no effect unless it is confirmed by the designated member in accordance with this section.
- (2) The designated member must, before confirming a decision relating to a youth who is a terror suspect, invite a terrorism intelligence authority to make submissions to the designated member in relation to the proposed decision.

- (3) The designated member—
 - (a) must not confirm a decision of the Board to release a youth who is a terror suspect from detention unless the designated member determines that there are special circumstances justifying the youth's release; and
 - (b) must not confirm any other decision of the Board relating to a youth who is a terror suspect unless the presiding member is satisfied that the decision is appropriate in all the circumstances.
- (4) The designated member may determine to—
 - (a) confirm a decision of the Board (in which case the decision of the Board is taken to have effect immediately); or
 - (b) reject a decision of the Board and substitute the designated member's own decision (in which case the Board is taken to have made the decision as so substituted and that decision is taken to have effect immediately); or
 - (c) refer the matter back to the Board for a further decision with any recommendations the designated member thinks fit (in which case any further decision of the Board will be subject to the requirement for confirmation under this section in the same way as the decision at first instance).
- (5) The designated member is not required to provide to the youth any grounds or reasons for a determination under this section.
- (6) Information forming the basis for the making of a determination under this section must not be disclosed to any person (except to the Attorney-General, a court or a person to whom a terrorism intelligence authority authorises its disclosure) if, at the time at which the question of disclosure is to be decided, the information is properly classified by the terrorism intelligence authority as terrorism intelligence under section 74B of the *Police Act 1998* (whether or not the information was so classified at the time at which the determination under this section was made).

33—Transitional provision

- (1) The amendments to the *Young Offenders Act 1993* effected by this Act apply in relation to—
 - (a) a youth who is serving a period of detention in a training centre; or
 - (b) a youth who is released subject to conditions in accordance with Part 5 Division 3 of the *Young Offenders Act 1993*,
on or after the commencement of this Part (regardless of when the relevant offence was committed).
- (2) The reference in section 41BA of the *Young Offenders Act 1993* (as amended by this Act) to a person becoming a terror suspect includes a person who, on the commencement of this Part, becomes a terror suspect because they are a person to whom section 4(4) of the *Young Offenders Act 1993* (as amended by this Act) applies.

At 19:26 the house adjourned until Thursday 30 November 2017 at 10:30.