

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 14 October 2015

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:18 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The **Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:18)**: I bring up the 14th report of the Legislative Review Committee.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Animal Welfare Advisory Committee—Report, 2014-15

Ministerial Statement

GILLMAN LAND SALE

The **Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:19)**: I lay upon the table two ministerial statements, one by the Premier, the Hon. Jay Weatherill, and one by the Deputy Premier, John Rau, both on the issue of the response to the report of the Independent Commissioner against Corruption into the sale of state-owned land at Gillman.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT

The **Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:19)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the topic of the government's response to the dog and cat citizens' jury report.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. I.K. HUNTER**: Citizens' juries provide a unique opportunity to involve the local community in the democratic processes and in deliberations about difficult and controversial issues. Recognising that two-thirds of South Australians are pet owners and that cat and dog management is very important to the community, a citizens' jury was chosen as an appropriate mechanism to address the problem of the 10,000 dogs and cats that are euthanased every year. Jurors were specifically asked to deliver a verdict on mandatory desexing.

As part of the government's broader dog and cat management reform program, the citizens' jury delivered its report on 12 August, and today I am releasing the government's response to the jury's report and its recommendations. The seven recommendations are structured under three major objectives: preventing animal abandonment, reducing supply and reuniting pets with their owners.

The government supports the recommendations on education about responsible pet ownership, mandatory desexing, mandatory breeder registration and the implementation of a centrally managed database for microchip data. Some recommendations require further

investigations, including the recommendation for legislative change to assist with rental arrangements for tenants with pets and a recommendation to legislate the restriction of sale of dogs and cats in pet shops. These recommendations may have unintended consequences and require further engagement with key stakeholders, government agencies and the broader community.

Only one recommendation cannot be supported by government, which is the recommendation for the government to carry out a trap, neuter and return trial. TNR models contradict the responsible pet ownership model that the government promotes as they do not result in individuals taking responsibility for animals and, further, releasing a cat from captivity is an offence under the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 and may also constitute an offence of animal ill-treatment under the Animal Welfare Act 1985. The state government's preferred approach is to undertake actions that will directly address the feral cat problem, and this aligns with the Australian government's focus outlined in the Threatened Species Strategy and action plan released in July of this year.

The Dog and Cat Management Board and the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources will continue to work with key stakeholders throughout the development of this government reform. The government thanks the 35 South Australians who committed their time and effort to this important process and have contributed to important reform of dog and cat management in this state. The jury's final report and the government responses can be found at the yourSAy.sa.gov.au website. I table two documents: The South Australian Government's Response to the Citizens' Jury on Reducing Unwanted Dogs and Cats; and the Citizens' Jury 2015 Final Report to the Government of South Australia: Reducing Unwanted Dogs and Cats.

Question Time

JOB CREATION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister explain how the \$2.1 million in funding announced yesterday is going to deliver 815 jobs in regional areas as claimed? Will the minister clarify whether this figure refers to new jobs to be created or jobs that already exist?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. I was pleased, was it this week or at the end of the last week—they blur a little bit—to announce the regional money for our grantees. We are involved in the seven regions, and the metro is a separate region. A number of months ago, I announced the employment program and training funds for the metro area and just recently announced those for the regions.

These are employment programs that relate to both training opportunities and also employment-type programs. They offer a great deal of opportunity for people who are unemployed and also for those who need upskilling to be able to find employment. Many of these programs are linked to businesses and direct employment outcomes, and they are the estimated figures that the Hon. David Ridgway just mentioned.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Estimated! Plucked them out of the air? How does that work?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: These are the commitments that businesses have given to the grantee. It is through RDAs, so RDAs are working with these businesses and these businesses have indicated the possible uptakes that they could take. Even for those programs that are not directly linked to an employment outcome, nevertheless there are programs like career counselling, assisting people with their CV and other activities. So, even if it is not directly related to a job, it certainly puts that person in a much stronger position to achieve employment at a later date.

The work, as I said, is very closely linked to the local RDAs, and the RDAs are obviously very closely linked with and communicating with local regional businesses, so these programs very much reflect the different regions' needs and also opportunities. We are very pleased to have the opportunity to work with RDAs to offer these very important programs in our regions.

JOB CREATION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary question: in the minister's press release yesterday she indicated there was \$160,000 of funding going to the Barossa.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order: I understand a supplementary question is supposed to be based on the original answer given by the minister and not new extraneous material.

The PRESIDENT: That is true. Is your supplementary based on—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I will choose a different supplementary then, Mr President. Which particular businesses in the regions have identified that they will employ people? You mentioned \$160,000 in your press release—

The Hon. G.E. Gago: I didn't mention that at all.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The press release I referred to.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: I didn't mention it. I made no reference to the media release.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, just ask—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Which businesses—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —is my supplementary question, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Just sit down for one second.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: No. I am standing up to ask a supplementary question.

The PRESIDENT: I have asked you to sit down and let me explain. I am very tolerant with you—well, not very tolerant. You ask a lot of supplementary questions—not a problem—but they must relate to the answer given by the minister. Now, if you have got a question there that relates directly to the answer, by all means ask your supplementary question.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you, Mr President. Which businesses have been identified to the minister as being able to employ people as a result of this \$2.1 million funding and the 815 positions that I mentioned in my question?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:27): The RDAs are still working through those. As I said, these are programs that are coordinated and managed by RDAs, so they are businesses that RDAs have identified. I believe that some of them have been identified by RDAs and others are still being contracted, so those details are not yet available.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, Mr Ridgway.

JOB CREATION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): So the 815 people mentioned or places mentioned are just an estimate rather than an actual factual figure?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:28): I have already put that information on record.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:28): My questions are for the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation on the subject of the latest attempt to seek to provide fortnightly waste collections by East Waste, as follows:

1. Has East Waste approached the minister with this particular proposal?

2. Is he aware of any attitude held by Green Industries SA towards fortnightly collection?

3. Is he aware of whether fortnightly collection might be contrary to the public and environmental health regulations?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:29): I thank the honourable member for her most important question, and I am glad we are back to normal programming and I have the second question of the day. I have seen some media reports which suggest—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: A little snitchy on the other side today, Mr President.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable leader of the opposition, please allow the minister to answer the question.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President. It is always rewarding to remind those opposite about the rules of how this chamber operates, because they do forget. I have seen some media reports which suggest that some councils—notably, Norwood, Payneham & St Peters, and Campbelltown—are calling for a change to the weekly rubbish collection system, say those reports that I saw in the media.

There are other contradictory media reports, however, that suggest that previous endorsement of a fortnightly rubbish collection has now been ruled out by the Mayor of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters, Mr Robert Bria, who told *Channel 9 News* on Monday that there were no plans to change the rubbish collection schedule. Media reports have other councils calling for no change, including the Mayor for Mitcham, Mr Glenn Spear, who said that the proposal would not work.

I remind honourable members that this matter was considered back in 2009, I think, when legislation was introduced to establish a weekly rubbish collection in metropolitan Adelaide. Nothing has changed since 2009 in that regard. I still believe that the community expects a weekly rubbish collection, and that is what the current legislation provides for, as I understand it.

This matter is not being revisited by the government. It does not form part of the current waste reform discussion paper, as far as I understand. As I have outlined in this place before, the waste reform paper came out of extensive feedback the government has received from the waste and resource recovery sector.

I remind honourable members that this is a \$1 billion industry in our state, employing about almost 5,000 South Australians. The industry contributes over half a billion dollars to our state's economy, a larger contribution than the fishing and aquaculture industry combined. The industry has suggested that regulatory change could help the sector grow. Of course, we are very happy to hear from the industry and how they plan to grow the sector over the coming years. The waste reform discussion paper sought input from the industry about what changes were required to help facilitate expansion of their sector and to enable it to create more jobs for South Australians.

Getting our regulatory settings right is one part of the puzzle. We will continue to work with the sector to explore ways to expand jobs. Studies have shown, for example, that for every 10,000 tonnes of waste that we recycle, we can create about nine full-time jobs, and that has certainly been our experience in this state, as the sector has grown over the years. We have some of Australia's best recycling and waste recovery rates, and this has helped create jobs and to protect our state's environment.

In closing, let me say again: changing the frequency of rubbish collection does not form part of the discussions we are having, nor have any changes been contemplated, and the legislation we passed in this place in 2009, I understand, will not allow it anyway without some revision and some permission from both houses of parliament.

TAFE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills questions in relation to the future of the TAFE campus in Millicent.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I understand that there is currently a statewide review of TAFE SA campuses. As part of this review, senior TAFE staff visited Millicent on 24 September to consult with the local community about the future of its TAFE campus. My questions for the minister are:

1. What is the aim of the statewide review of TAFE campuses and which person, or persons, is undertaking the review?
2. When will the results of the review be finalised and publicly released?
3. Is it possible that, in response to the review's findings, some TAFE campuses will close, staff positions will be lost or the number of TAFE courses offered in regional communities will be reduced?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. TAFE has undergone a process to transform the way it is delivering training to South Australia. The aim of that review is to increase access, flexibility, job outcomes and build TAFE's reputation as Australia's largest training provider.

The state government recognises TAFE as a quality provider. It provides very important access, particularly to many of our remote and rural regions, where more competitive arrangements for best delivery would not be viable. The significant reforms are aimed at TAFE campuses being more innovative and flexible in the way they deliver services to students, their need to improve their use of scarce resources and their need to reduce their draw on the public purse. They have also indicated that they need to provide a more sustainable business to be able to operate in a highly competitive market.

In terms of messaging, they have indicated that they want to use this process to provide improved access to training to ensure that their courses lead to jobs or to further education. Also, there is the need to ensure the availability of lecturers and place those where they are needed, improve access to online training, reduce waste and ensure that the facilities they use are modern and fit for purpose.

TAFE, I have been advised, is also developing regional training plans based on the priority training needs for each region informed by TASC, the RDA roadmaps, TAFE regional managers and intelligence re demand for training. Assessments are being made in relation to the opportunities to further modernise their delivery through, as I said, improved online delivery and improved access to lecturers by arming them with the necessary technology and equipment so that they are more mobile and able to deliver training wherever it is needed and where it may not have been previously available.

TAFE SA, I'm advised, currently has 45 delivery sites. Many of those facilities are very old buildings and not of a standard that the community currently expects for training. A number of these have low student training numbers. Training demand has shifted and training methods have also changed considerably, given the uptake of online training to date. TAFE is obviously looking for opportunities to improve the delivery of training. It is looking at blended models of delivery—a combination of face-to-face and online, moving more training out to workplaces and farms and suchlike, and looking at opportunities to co-locate with other organisations and not necessarily have stand-alone infrastructure.

A report will be given when they have finished their consultation throughout all the regions and that will then be made publicly available. TAFE has indicated that it has not made any decisions at this point about site closures or the particular requirements of each site. TAFE is still consulting,

as I said, and a final report will be made when that is completed. As I indicated, that report will be made publicly available.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Wade.

TAFE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:38): In terms of trying to understand the balancing of the online and the physical access to courses that she referred to, would the minister take on notice the proportion of metropolitan and country students who access services through the online option? I'm seeking to understand to what extent fair access for country students is still being provided through a physical presence.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:38): I would suggest that this is a highly operational matter. I don't have access to that information. I would invite the honourable member to directly liaise with TAFE SA to obtain that sort of operational detail.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Point of order, Mr President. I just make the point yet again that the minister is accountable to this house no matter how much she misunderstands the governance model under which TAFE operates.

MURRAY BRIDGE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about the support provided to residents of Murray Bridge.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: Murray Bridge has a significant number of residents facing barriers to employment. Can the minister inform the chamber as to what initiatives there are in the region to provide greater employment opportunities to the residents of Murray Bridge?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. We are keenly aware of the need to support people seeking employment, particularly those facing barriers to employment. This is especially important in regional areas that may be showing higher unemployment levels.

I was very pleased to visit Murray Bridge last week to see firsthand the benefits of some of the programs being delivered there to connect job seekers to training that is tailored to industry needs and to support industry to employ local people. Through the regional employment grants the Department of State Development provides Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland with around \$380,000 for employment and career services projects across the Murraylands and Riverland regions. This funding was provided as part of transitioning Skills for Jobs in Regions to WorkReady.

The projects in the Murraylands and Riverland are designed to be responsive to industry and community needs in the area. I was interested to note, particularly when I was visiting, the indication of high rates of job vacancies. There were a number of local organisations that indicated their inability to meet their job demands, particularly from the local community. This funding will be used to help develop and deliver tailor-made solutions to industry needs and to assist jobseekers to overcome barriers to gaining and maintaining employment.

Whilst in Murray Bridge I visited the Australian Portable Camps (APC) which provides an incredibly innovative approach to camp facilities and infrastructure solutions across Australia and is based in Murray Bridge. It is very deceptive from the road and looks like quite a small facility but when you go in there are numerous large workshops and warehouses with the most amazing equipment relating to a whole range of functions.

APC designs and builds each camp module specifically to suit the project and tailored to meet the needs of the client. There are currently 150 people employed in a range of occupations including manufacturing, construction, logistics and transport. APC is focused on improving standards for camps to ensure that the latest innovations are being included in camp solutions. I was pleased to hear that APC will look to source suitable local workers where possible for these positions, which will be in a range of occupations such as electricians, plumbers, carpenters, welders, sheet metal fabricators, painters, plant operators, labourers and heavy vehicle drivers. They were one of the organisations that indicated some problems in the past in being able to recruit locally. We had a long discussion about that.

Another organisation I visited whilst in Murray Bridge was Murraylands Training and Employment, a group training organisation that currently employs over 40 apprentices and 15 trainees. The support provided to apprentices and trainees that it provides plays a very significant role in the success of their apprentices and trainees. The apprentice locksmith in the Murraylands, Jason Sarpa, recently won apprentice of the year in the 2015 Manufacturing and Engineering Institute of Australia Engineering Trades Apprentice of the Year Award.

Group training organisations make an extremely valuable contribution to the traineeship and apprenticeship system in South Australia, employing 22 per cent of South Australia's trade apprentices and having a completion rate that is almost 6 per cent greater than other employers. Their completion rates are incredibly impressive.

Until this year, GTOs received funding jointly from the commonwealth and state governments through the Joint Group Training Program. However, most unfortunately, the commonwealth Liberal government has cut funding to the program in 2014-15 and has indicated that it will entirely cease funding to GTOs in 2015-16. This funding is vital to support the pastoral care model that group training organisations use and plays an important role in increasing completion rates.

I also had a productive discussion with the recently appointed chief executive of the RDA who shared her vision for the Murray Bridge region and discussed a number of future opportunities. She is a very impressive person and I look forward to continuing to work with her. I also visited the Victim Support Service where I discussed with them the recent federal government initiatives and ways that we could work to ensure that they linked in with existing state programs. As I said, the Murray Bridge region is a strong example of where there is ample potential opportunity in employment outcomes with the right leadership and supported initiatives.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, representing the Premier, on the topic of leadership on medical cannabis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Earlier this year I wrote to the Minister for Health to ask him to show leadership on a particular constituent's case, that is, the case of the Fulton family, formerly of Victor Harbor. The Victor Harbor family of eight have two daughters, Tabetha, 12, and Georgia-Grace, 8, and those two girls suffer from a rare degenerative diffuse lung disease which prevents their cells from absorbing oxygen properly.

Late last year, Tabetha's condition became so bad she collapsed at school, prompting medical examination that concluded she was toxic due to the amount of steroids she was on and her organs were shutting down. Her parents, Bobby and Marcus, faced a heartbreaking situation. She desperately needed the anti-inflammatories for her lungs and airways but the quantities she needed could kill her. In a desperate bid to save her, her mother secured a two-month supply of cannabis administered as an oil and prepared in a smoothie. Within two weeks of taking this oil, Tabetha experienced a significant turnaround and the side effects of the steroids—including a lump on her neck, weight gain and depression—were decreased. The case was covered in the Victor Harbor *Times* at the time.

The Fulton family did not want to leave Australia but they felt that they had no alternative so that their daughters could legally start cannabis oil treatment. In July this year the family made that

move. I wrote to the Minister for Health at that time, asking, should the family be able to be medicated in Canada where medical cannabis is legal, what provisions would this government make for their return? The response I received from the Minister for Health was disappointing to say the least and indicated that South Australia would continue to sit on the sidelines.

What I would like to report to this council and to the Premier is that the family have successfully medicated through the system in Canada where medical cannabis is legal and they have prescriptions for their two girls and the treatment is working effectively. Now this family is living in Canada, waiting to come back to South Australia as medical refugees. I call on the Premier to take urgent action on this particular case to allow the Fulton family to return to South Australia and let those little girls be medicated, as they have been with a prescription in Canada, in this state.

I note that this week, the Premier of Victoria Daniel Andrews has taken leadership on this issue and he has said that it is his proudest day as Premier. I also note that Labor leaders in Tasmania, Queensland and WA have all indicated that they will stop the suffering of their citizens. So, I ask the minister to refer this question to the Premier: when will the Premier of this state stand up and stop making South Australians medical refugees and legalise medical cannabis?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her most important question and will refer that to the Premier in another place and bring back a response.

Ministerial Statement

MINISTER'S REMARKS

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:49): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the ICAC report on the sale of state-owned land at Gillman made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Treasurer, Tom Koutsantonis.

Question Time

PUBLIC SERVICE LEAVE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government questions about Public Service leave.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There has been a series of questions placed on notice since late last year to all ministers in relation to the level of untaken leave as at 30 June 2014. Some 10 months (or almost a year) later, four of the 14 ministers have responded to those questions. From those questions we can glean that, in some agencies such as communities and social inclusion, some public servants have up to 109 days of annual leave untaken as at the date of 30 June 2014. In the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, it was up to 91 days, in the then DMITRE, it was 88 days, and in the then DFEST, it was some 60 days. My questions to the Leader of the Government are:

1. Is there one public sector-wide policy that all departments are required to implement in relation to public servants taking annual leave, or are departments allowed to develop their own policies in relation to this issue?
2. If there is one policy, what are the details of that particular policy?
3. Will the minister undertake to seek answers from the 10 remaining ministers who have still not responded to the questions relating to the level of untaken leave as at 30 June 2014?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his questions. I will need to take those on notice. I am not aware of the details of the policy arrangements, so I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (14:51): My question is to the minister for climate change. Will the minister inform the chamber about the South Australian government's efforts to provide public and reliable information on our changing climate?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. The government has always based—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —its decisions on scientific fact rather than blind ideology, which is what we see the Hon. Mr Ridgway come to this chamber with every day: blind ideology not informed by fact, with assertions that are made up on the run. We do it slightly differently. For example, we based our negotiations regarding the Murray-Darling Basin Plan on the best possible scientific evidence available. We listen to our experts, as well as historical and scientific evidence, regarding when and where to undertake our prescribed burning program, for example.

We introduced the ban of commercial solariums as a result of sound advice and extensive scientific evidence. Unlike the Liberal Party, the South Australian government has long accepted the science on climate change. This government also accepts that it is important for business and community to have access to reliable scientific data so that everyone has the opportunity to inform themselves. This is why we are making South Australia's most comprehensive set of climate projections available for re-use publicly as open data.

The data is available through SA Climate Ready and can be accessed from the Enviro Data SA website. It offers projections through to 2100 for a range of climate variables, including rainfall, minimum and maximum temperature and evaporation. Importantly, it also includes detailed information about each of the state's rainfall areas across natural resources management regions.

The SA Climate Ready project was led by the Goyder Institute for Water Research, a partnership between the South Australian government, the CSIRO, Flinders University, the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia. The data is the result of extensive research and analysis of multiple climate change models spanning a five-year period. It has delivered what has been described as the most accurate and extensive data available about our future climate.

The data is being made available, as I said, under the state government's open data initiative. Of course, many of us here in this chamber are aware that we are living in the age of data. Making such information publicly available is important for driving innovation and allowing creative types in our community, and others slightly less creative, to use it to make new applications and tools to help us improve our daily lives. This data will be of great use to people or organisations involved in planning, management, decision-making and modelling. It can help to ensure that planned infrastructure such as roads, bridges and farm dams are designed to take into account the impacts of climate change.

It will assist in anticipating changes in extreme heat and fire risk to help emergency services and other sectors in their planning. Most importantly, it will add to the information and facts that are available in the public realm. We know that people armed with the facts usually are able to make better and more informed decisions, unless they are members of the Liberal Party of South Australia.

I welcome this further engagement with open data. We believe on this side that making factual information available to communities means that they have a better decision-making process and can make better decisions for their own lives.

EPILEPSY

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing questions to the minister representing the Minister for Health on the subject of epilepsy in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: This afternoon, I hosted a briefing about epilepsy and its impact on thousands of South Australians. Most touching was the presentation of a parent whose young child has experienced regression in cognitive function to the point where they now have an intellectual disability, as a result of a rare form of epilepsy. This child once had a seizure that lasted approximately 55 minutes. However, the parents have struggled to get an adequate diagnosis and support, waiting approximately two years for something as basic as seeing a neurologist. Despite raising the issue of epilepsy in this place back in February, I have to date received no response from the minister, so I raise the questions again now, in case they were somehow missed by his office:

1. Is the minister aware of the unmet need in regard to epilepsy support, services and education, particularly in the northern suburbs of Adelaide?
2. If not, why not, given that this proposal for the support of people with epilepsy in the northern suburbs was brought to his office some two years ago?
3. Is the minister planning to address the issue of unmet need in the northern suburbs in particular?
4. Why does the Transforming Health document remain silent on the issue of epilepsy support and services?

To those questions I add:

5. What is the minister doing to address the up to 5-year wait to see a neurologist for epilepsy diagnosis and treatment?
6. Why does the minister continue to ignore the lack of support for epilepsy diagnosis and support in the South Australian health system?
7. Given that 34,000 South Australians currently are diagnosed with epilepsy and a further 34,000 will experience at least one seizure in their lifetime whilst not being explicitly diagnosed with epilepsy, why is South Australia still the only state in Australia to my understanding not to recognise epilepsy in and of itself as a disability?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions and her ongoing interest in this important subject. I will undertake to take the questions she has raised previously and the other three questions she has asked today additionally to the Minister for Health in the other place and seek a response on her behalf.

INDIGENOUS ADVANCEMENT STRATEGY

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation questions about the Indigenous Advancement Strategy from the commonwealth.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I am referring to a media release from September from the commonwealth Minister for Indigenous Affairs. The release talks about the federal shadow minister's call to scrap the Indigenous Advancement Strategy (IAS) at a time when the commonwealth is working on optimising funding to Indigenous communities. My question to the minister is: does he agree with his federal colleague, Shayne Neumann, on these calls to abolish the IAS and, if so, why?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, there has been, from communities I have visited, some criticism of the Indigenous Advancement Strategy. Some of the funding decisions that have been made communities have not understood and have not been given an explanation for. This is a new strategy, pooling funding that has previously gone directly to communities and to other things in communities that are not necessarily going to where the money has gone before.

There have been many reports over the last month or so in *The Australian*, particularly in *The Weekend Australian*, on where some of the money has gone and just how effective, and in some

cases ineffectual, that money for that strategy has been. I think there should be a very hard look at this strategy to see if it is meeting its objectives.

I think it is a good idea to try new things, but this has been going for more than a year now, and I think it is worth having a look to see if it's meeting its objectives. There are clearly things, from what communities have told me, that aren't working and should work better, and those elements certainly need to be changed.

TARNANTHI FESTIVAL OF CONTEMPORARY ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER ART

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister tell the house about the recent launch of the Tarnanthi Festival of Contemporary Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Art in Adelaide?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for that question. As Chair of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, he has, I know, a very great interest in these matters. Tarnanthi is the inaugural Festival of Contemporary Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Art showcasing and celebrating Indigenous culture not just in South Australia but from right around Australia.

Tarnanthi is the Kaurna word for 'come forth' or 'appear', like the sun and the first emergence of light or a seed sprouting, and it's an appropriate name for this inaugural festival. I think it's worth putting on record our thanks to the principal sponsor, BHP Billiton, for their incredible support that's made this extraordinary exhibition possible.

Tarnanthi is an exhibition on a scale we have never seen here before in South Australia. The festival features many new works of art from right across Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander artists communities. There are about 400 artists who have made a contribution to this exhibition, which is being showcased across 22 different venues right across South Australia. Of course, the Art Gallery of South Australia plays host to one of the major exhibitions.

Tarnanthi is the largest and perhaps most significant exhibition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander art in South Australia's history and quite possibly in Australia's history. I have been calling it the biggest and most significant in Australia and no-one has called me a liar, so I will continue to do that.

I was privileged last week to join Premier Jay Weatherill and former Australian prime minister Paul Keating at the official launch. On the steps of the Art Gallery, Stevie Goldsmith led the Welcome to Country in front of a huge crowd of several thousand and brought up former prime minister Keating and Premier Weatherill as part of the welcome. It was incredibly moving and powerful to witness.

Former prime minister Keating delivered an opening address worthy of such a showcase and reminded everyone in attendance of the power of art, culture and expression for Aboriginal people. He also reminded us that we must continue to work together to address issues of inequality for Aboriginal people. Following the speeches, many from the crowd visited inside the gallery to see for themselves that part of the spectacular exhibition and the hundreds of artworks from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples from right across the country.

To name just a few, we had artworks from artists from Arnhem Land, the Kimberley, the Pilbara, Alice Springs and surrounds, North Queensland and of course our own celebrated South Australian artists from around the state, particularly those from some of the art centres on the APY lands where of course there is the oldest continuing art centre anywhere in Australia in Ernabella Arts. Nick Mitzevich, Director of the South Australian Art Gallery, and curator Nici Cumpston have worked tirelessly to bring these artists together and showcase their incredible work. I would echo comments that this festival celebrates the roles that artists play in shaping our world.

I would also like to make special mention of one South Australian artist, Ms Yvonne Koomatrie. I had the pleasure and honour of launching one of the highlights of the festival by this phenomenal South Australian artist and proud Ngarrindjeri woman—her exhibition as part of Tarnanthi. Yvonne's exhibition was the first major retrospective of a weaver in Australia, something

that Yvonne does and should feel incredibly proud of and something that is a great privilege to see. I would encourage all members to have a look upstairs in the Art Gallery at this exhibition of woven works of baskets, eel traps and a whole lot of other works.

Yvonne is a senior Ngarrindjeri woman who has been a trailblazer in art over several decades. This is the largest selection of Yvonne's work ever presented in a single exhibition. Yvonne's work is a poignant reflection of the Ngarrindjeri culture. It's a tribute to the strength of Ngarrindjeri people and their important history in South Australia as keepers and custodians of the Murray and Coorong. The material used in these works—native reeds and Yvonne's dedication to its use in her art—signifies the health of the river and the connection of the river's health to Aboriginal culture and identity in caring for country.

Yvonne's is a genuine story of the Riverland's history, growing up with her parents largely earning their living as itinerant workers, a type of work that has been so important for this part of the state and its economy. As I mentioned, it is the largest retrospective of such work, but it is also unusual to have a major retrospective of a solo weaver, Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal. It is a testament to Yvonne's work and of her achievement of taking Ngarrindjeri weaving into the realm of contemporary art.

The works in this exhibition range from traditional functional Ngarrindjeri objects, such as eel traps and egg scoops, to contemporary innovations in forms such as biplanes and balloons. I know, from speaking to people in the room, that works in this collection have come from both public galleries and private collections from right up in Queensland, Darwin and other places right around Australia.

I commend the Art Gallery of South Australia and others involved for the significant collaborative effort that has brought together that particular exhibition. Not only was it a great exhibition but there is also a very interesting book that chronicles the exhibition that is available from the Art Gallery's gift shop. Once again, I commend the curators for this particular exhibition, Hetti Perkins, Jonathan Jones and, of course, Nici Cumpston, on the work that they have done.

As part of Tarnanthi I have also attended a number of other events, such as, on Thursday last week, an informal lunch with many of the artists who have travelled here to be with their works in the Art Gallery courtyard. I also appreciated spending that time to talk with more artists, as well as on Friday afternoon attending the art fair that was held on Friday and Saturday at Tandanya.

Also on Friday night I was privileged to attend the Kulata Tjuta at Government House, on the lawns in front of Government House, where hundreds of spears were arranged in a circle and some of the most senior Pitjantjatjara men—and a number that I have had a fair bit to do with over the last six months, like Gordon Inngatji, Willy Burton and Hector Burton—performed an inma: singing and dancing that is rarely performed outside the APY lands.

This exhibition right across Adelaide runs for a number of weeks, right into early next year. I would encourage everyone to take the time over the next few weeks to get down to the Art Gallery and other places where it is being held to have a look at works from all over Australia. It truly is unique and ground breaking, and I think it is something South Australia should be very, very proud of.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Ms Franks.

TARNANTHI FESTIVAL OF CONTEMPORARY ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER ART

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:07): Will the minister also find time in his busy schedule to go to the exhibition at Fontanelle Gallery of Black Douglas and Amanda Radomi, who are both contemporary urban Indigenous artists on the more cutting edge side of Tarnanthi?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:07): Over the 22 locations and the many, many exhibitions, I will endeavour to get to as many as I humanly can.

CYCLING REGULATIONS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure questions regarding cycling rules.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: The minister recently announced that, as of 25 October this year, cyclists of all ages are able to ride on footpaths and that cars are required to adhere to a one-metre rule when passing cyclists who are riding on the road, when travelling up to 60 km/h. The minister noted that 70 per cent of the public who were surveyed supported these changes. While cyclists will be required to ride to the left of the footpath, give way to pedestrians and signal a warning bell when approaching pedestrians, these changes present some serious potential issues for pedestrians who are blind, deaf, elderly or disabled in particular.

As I understand it, there is no restriction to the speed at which a cyclist can travel, which may increase the danger to pedestrians, especially those in the more vulnerable categories that I have just outlined. In addition, there is of course the issue of liability and who will be sued should an accident occur on the footpath. Cyclists are not required to register their vehicle, of course, or their bicycle, or pay CTP insurance, as motorists are. Should liability fall to councils, it would mean that they will have to take out insurance, meaning residents bear the cost of additional policies via rates and the like.

Whilst we support added safety measures for cyclists, as I am sure all members do, Family First does have concerns about potential issues that this regulatory change will bring. My questions to the minister are:

1. How many people in total were surveyed and was the survey conducted outside cycling enthusiast circles? For example, and did it extend to speaking to stakeholders representing people with disabilities and those who represent pedestrians?
2. What measures, beyond what is currently required of cyclists, have been put in place to protect pedestrians, such as those who are blind, deaf, elderly or otherwise disabled, particularly in instances where the person's vulnerability or disability is not easily seen or detected?
3. Who bears the liability for accidents which may occur on the footpath?
4. Why has this change been made by regulation and not via legislation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his questions. I will refer those questions to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Conservation and the Environment, representing the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, questions regarding suicide prevention programs for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and questioning community.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Members of the South Australian LGBTIQ community have a significantly elevated risk of suicidal thoughts and taking their own life. Figures from the National LGBTI Health Alliance, published in the 2013 LGBTI People mental health and suicide briefing paper, paint a harrowing picture of the prevalence of these issues in our nation. It also highlights that the high rate of suicidal thoughts and suicide is due to a multitude of reasons that are often not due to an individual's sexuality, sex or gender identity but because of discrimination and exclusion.

The report contains a number of concerning statistics, and I will mention just a few. Members of the LGBTIQ community have the highest suicide rates of any population group in Australia. Twenty per cent of transsexual Australians and 15.7 per cent of lesbian, gay and bisexual Australians report having suicide thoughts. Up to 50 per cent of transsexual people have attempted suicide at least

once in their life. Same-sex attracted Australians have up to 14 times higher rates of suicide than heterosexual Australians. For same-sex attracted youth, the rate is six times higher. The average age of a first suicide attempt in the LGBTIQ community is just 16 years of age, often because they have 'come out'.

The Andrews government in Victoria, carrying on the work already started under the previous Coalition government in that state, is spending almost \$5 million on suicide prevention in the LGBTIQ community alone, and I saw some of that work firsthand when I visited that state a few years ago. However, in South Australia, whilst we have a state suicide prevention strategy, targeted government campaigns and programs for individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex or questioning are extremely limited.

I should, however, point out that last Friday, at the Mental Health Coalition's Festival of Now event in Rundle Park, I did witness some of the very good work done, with limited resources, by the Mental Illness Fellowship of South Australia in their program in the gay community in this state. My questions are:

1. Will the minister advise what specifically targeted LGBTIQ suicide prevention programs or campaigns the state government currently operates?
2. Will the minister commit to looking into the work the current Victorian government is doing and consider implementing similar initiatives here in South Australia?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions and also for pointing out that the increased prevalence of suicidal thoughts and depression—and I can add mental illness and substance abuse—in the LGBTIQ community in this state is not due to some innate predisposition due to sexuality, which some people would like to think it is: it is actually due to discrimination—community-led discrimination, personal-led discrimination and exclusion from society.

It is an important area of work that we need to do further work on always. It is also important that we recognise as well that the current debate we are having at a federal level in terms of equal access to marriage—gay marriage, as it is sometimes called, but I prefer to call it marriage because it is marriage that we all want to have access to—needs to be held with some respect, because there is the potential, as has been pointed out by, I think, the Western Australia Premier, that by engaging in a debate on a plebiscite, for example, we may be giving permission to the darker side of our community coming out and engaging in that debate and putting more undue pressure on, and exposing to more discrimination, younger members of our community who would be questioning their sexuality.

It is an important point, I think, that the honourable member is asking in his question—whether we will look at the Victorian good work in this area and what targeted prevention programs there are currently in the South Australian agenda. I undertake to take those questions to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse in another place and seek a response on the member's behalf.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would just like to acknowledge the presence here today of the Taxi Council of South Australia and representatives from the taxi drivers, operators and owners from the Indian community and the Transport Workers Union. Welcome.

Question Time

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:15): Supplementary, Mr President: can the minister also outline what the government is doing to support people and prevent suicides—particularly those of young people and LGBTIQ people—in regional areas, given the apparent increased rate of suicide in regional and remote areas?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. The Hon. Mr Dawkins has also raised in this place many times the unacceptable level of suicide in the rural and regional communities of South Australia—a higher proportion, of course. Again, there is some speculation in the literature, I understand, that a large part of that is due to pressure on people as they are exploring their sexuality. It is an important question. I undertake to take that question also to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse in the other place on behalf of the Hon. Ms Vincent and seek a response.

HIGHER EDUCATION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about a new mental health and cultural resource.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Higher education institutions are constantly striving to enhance learning and teaching experiences for their students. My question is: can the minister tell the house about the development of a new mental health resource led by Flinders University?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. I was delighted last week during Mental Health Week to be able to officially launch a new mental health and cultural resource for undergraduate students focusing on the complex issue of the interplay between mental health and culture.

A Flinders University project called 'Reshaping curricula: integrating culturally diverse/mental health online content to prepare work ready health professionals' addresses the vital aspect of providing to students a more nuanced and personalised experience when dealing with people often well outside of their own experience.

I was particularly pleased to be able participate in this project, having formerly been the mental health minister and also being the Minister for the Status of Women, given that there are actually a lot of female workers in this area, and also because it just happens that the person leading this important project, Professor Eimear Muir-Cochrane, who is the Chair of Nursing (Mental Health Nursing) Flinders University, actually did some work with me many years ago when I was secretary of the Australian Nursing Federation. I was very pleased to be able to connect with her again.

It is a two-year project that is being funded by the Office for Learning and Teaching, which is set up to promote and support change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching. It is a national first. Its groundbreaking teaching and learning materials were developed by Flinders University and, as I said, the project is led by Professor Eimear Muir-Cochrane Chair of Nursing (Mental Health Nursing) Flinders University School of Nursing and Midwifery, along with a comprehensive team of staff and academics from across partner universities.

Close collaboration with community stakeholders has ensured that the resources are culturally appropriate and relevant. The resources bring together two complex social issues—mental health and culture—and examines the interplay of these issues, something that has not been done in undergraduate curricula before. In fact, it's really wonderful material and very easy to navigate through. I only wish that when I was a student of nursing that I had had access to such a wonderful learning program.

These media-rich online resources specifically focus on mental health and wellbeing for people from Indigenous and migrant cultural groups. By reshaping current curricula through online content and detailed stories which form the core focus of the resource it is hoped that students will better understand the negative impacts that stereotyping and stigma have on people with mental health issues, and help to prepare work-ready health professionals.

As a former nurse I certainly know and understand how important it is to listen to your patient, to try to walk in their shoes and try to look at the world through their eyes. Being able to really sit

down and listen to someone is vitally important in creating empathy, trust and communication which are all a critical part of the therapeutic environment and healing.

While we quite rightly celebrate the rich blend of cultures that is modern Australia, it is a sad fact that mental illness is also part of modern Australia. Mental health issues can affect all people regardless of age, culture or social background. Ensuring that our future health professionals understand the interplay between mental health and culture and are equipped with the practical knowledge and skills to be able to effectively respond is an important way forward—and that is why these resources are so significant.

I would like to again take this opportunity to commend this resource and the work of Professor Muir-Cochrane and other university partners who have contributed to its development. It is an impressive project and it is a great credit to all those involved.

AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions about proposed changes to national air quality standards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Over the last several years the federal environment department has been pursuing a project to vary the National Environment Protection (Ambient Air Quality) Measure. A big part of this standard relates to dust particles that might be emitted from industry and other activities. Looking at the submissions that were made to that inquiry it seems that the South Australian EPA has strongly recommended tougher air pollution standards, particularly in relation to dust pollution. They do that on the basis of the known negative impact to human health from dust emissions. My questions to the minister are:

1. Under the Environment Protection Act, the EPA is under the direction and control of the minister on all matters except for licensing and enforcement. Did the minister have any input into the EPA's submission to this process?
2. Are there any particular industries in South Australia that the minister believes might be impacted by a change to national air quality standards?
3. I understand that December this year is when environment ministers will be settling on the final changes to this policy. What position will the South Australian minister be taking to those talks?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions about air quality standards both here and at a national level. As the honourable member is aware, this has been a topic for the environment ministers' meeting that happens two or three times a year. I think he might have asked me a question about this after our last ministerial meeting. I can't quite recollect what I said to him at the time but I will try to recap some of that territory.

In terms of the EPA making submissions, my understanding is that my ability to direct is under the legislation but that is not the normal process on a day-to-day basis. On a day-to-day basis the EPA conducts its work in accordance with its remit under the legislation. In terms of the involvement of the officers at a national level with the EPA here in South Australia and its interstate colleagues, that submission, in terms of the air quality, I believe they undertook themselves. They may have briefed me on it. I cannot quite recall at this point in time, but that is something that is part of their normal everyday work and I would expect them to continue to do that.

At a national level, of course, it is up to the ministers to make determinations about when new air quality standards will be introduced. Our last ministerial meeting determined to tackle that issue in November of this year at our next meeting. As to what position South Australia will be taking to that, I advise the honourable member to watch this space.

*Matters of Interest***TAXI INDUSTRY**

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:25): I would like to draw the council's attention to my concerns about the potential of UberX operating in South Australia. Let me outline just some of the costs currently imposed on the taxi industry. A CCTV surveillance camera costs \$3,300; leasing taxi plates, \$500 per week or \$400,000-plus to own it outright; taxi driver accreditation five-day training course, \$1,600 and, if you fail, it costs another \$1,600 to sit it again; annual registration fee, about \$6,000; comprehensive and public liability insurance, \$5,000; cost of a new car, \$35,000.

In comparison, what are the costs of setting up UberX? Zero! That is right, a big fat zero. It is really disappointing that the opposition leader, Mr Steven Marshall, and his Liberal team have come out in support of UberX. The Liberals want a trial which is merely a code word for allowing UberX to operate freely. Uber Technology is the parent company of UberX. It recently raised \$2 billion. The company is worth \$50 billion. Uber Technology also received funding from two of the biggest internet search engines in the world in Google and Baidu.

This is a classic example of the Liberal Party yet again coming out to bat for their big end of town mates. An online ABC News article, dated 23 September 2015, was entitled 'Making UberX legal will create jobs, South Australia's Opposition says'. In the article Mr Marshall says that by allowing UberX to operate freely it will create 5,000 jobs. I think Mr Marshall confused the 5,000 likes on Uber Facebook for 5,000 new jobs.

Why are the Liberals trying to destroy the taxi industry when it is currently employing over 4,500 drivers and at least 20,000 indirect jobs. Many of these drivers and operators are students and migrants who are not afraid of hard work and not averse to competition. Many have put in long hours, 70-plus hours a week, to put food on the table. Why attack an industry that has served our community well for over half a century and has paid its fair share of taxes and charges?

How can we expect these people who have to pay all these government costs to then compete with one of the biggest companies in the world which refuses to pay anything? Let's have an equal, regulated playing field. Let's make UberX pay for CCTV surveillance cameras, leasing plates, registration fees, comprehensive and public liability insurance, etc. Make UberX pay for these costs and then let them both compete. Let's have a fair fight. I'll be backing these hardworking Australians. However, under Mr Marshall's plan as premier, there will not be a fair fight. UberX will be allowed to operate freely.

The WA Liberal government is also advocating for UberX. In an article dated 18 August 2015 by Andrew O'Connor, a taxi driver and owner was demanding the WA government compensate him \$338,000 for the cost of setting up a taxi business. It is only fair that taxi drivers, operators and owners are compensated if Mr Marshall does not want to make UberX pay for the associated costs and allow them to operate freely.

I have written to minister Mullighan and am working on a submission to the Taxi Review Panel about my concerns with UberX on behalf of the taxi industry and the Indian community. I will continue to fight for them to ensure a fair, level playing field.

LONE PINE

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:30): In August this year I had the privilege of being a member of a delegation of this parliament that represented the people of South Australia at the centenary of the Battle of Lone Pine. The delegation was led by the Minister for Veterans' Affairs and, in addition to myself, it comprised: the Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly, the member for Taylor and the shadow minister for veterans' affairs (the member for Morphett).

Like my fellow members of the House of Assembly, I wish to note the centenary of the battles of Lone Pine and The Nek at Gallipoli and gratefully acknowledge the courage and heroism displayed by the forces involved, the significant injuries suffered by the gallant ANZACs (the soldiers of Australia and New Zealand) and the tenacity of the opposing Turkish forces.

The August offensive of 1915 commenced only a few months after the landing and was a valiant attempt to break the stalemate that was cruelly developing. Despite the extreme risk, the

chance to force a decision on the peninsula was humbly accepted by the officers and their men. The losses suffered during this offensive were on a horrific scale. Up to 9,000 Australians died, as well as 3,000 New Zealanders, 21,000 British and Imperial soldiers and 10,000 French.

One could not help but be overcome with great sadness as we walked among the ordered graves of the dead, many of whom lived much of their short lives growing up in South Australia and playing in the suburbs and streets that are so familiar to us all. Many of the graves of our dead soldiers are now watched over by large oak trees, which act as sentinels guarding the souls and memory of our lost sons. The stillness of this sacred place is broken only by the cool sea breeze. On a clear day one can see as far as Troy, an ancient reminder of the folly of war.

I found the inscriptions on the gravestones of family members particularly moving. They are a startling reminder of the mothers and fathers crippled by the pain of losing their beloved sons in a military campaign that they struggled to understand. The pain of the loss, as expressed in simple sentences, still resonates loudly on the otherwise quiet and pensive peninsula.

The parliamentary delegation attended two significant commemorative events during the visit. The first was the Bringing the Spirits Home Ceremony. Together with the Governor-General, we were privileged to witness the ceremony conducted by Indigenous soldiers of the three services of the Australian Defence Force. The spirits of our Indigenous soldiers were called home to their land and its sacred earth. The ceremony contained elements of all our Indigenous cultures, stretching from the Torres Strait Islands to inland Australia.

The parliamentary delegation also attended the Lone Pine cenotaph and the ceremony of commemoration on the day of the centenary of the battle. The Lone Pine Cemetery is located on what was considered in 1915 the strategically important plateau on the southern extreme of the Anzac sector. It was attacked by Australian forces on 6 August 1915, commencing at 05:30. We laid a wreath on behalf of the people of South Australia, the members of the Legislative Council and the members of the other place.

I wish to pay particular tribute to the young men of my former school who fell in this and other battles on the peninsula. Accounts of their lives can be found in the recent publication titled *Fallen Saints*, authored by Mr Robert Kearney. One of them was James Leslie Gordon. He was born in Port Pirie and educated in Adelaide. Upon completing his schooling, he attended the law school at Adelaide University and then practised law.

He enlisted in September 1914 and was killed in action in July 1915. He is buried at Beach Cemetery. His loss was deeply felt by members of the legal community. His brother Kenneth also enlisted and was killed in a campaign. He is buried at Lone Pine. One can only imagine the grief of their parents, who lost two sons, one shortly after another. Thankfully, the younger brother survived the war and returned home.

I wish to thank the staff of the Department of Veterans' Affairs for their assistance to the parliamentary delegation. I also thank the Turkish officials who gave us such a warm welcome. We must never forget the sacrifice of the young men who died for their king and country. We must ensure that future generations know of their toils in foreign lands and remember their sacrifice.

RENEWABLE ENERGY INITIATIVES

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:35): Last night, I attended a web-based seminar delivered by Professor Andrew Blakers, who is the director of the Centre for Sustainable Energy Systems at the Australian National University. Professor Blakers' work has profound importance for South Australia, because it could well be the key that unlocks the potential for South Australia to become the first 100 per cent renewable energy state in Australia.

As members know, our state already leads the nation in renewable energy. We have half the nation's windfarms and an impressive uptake of solar photovoltaic panels on homes and businesses across the state. Despite dire predictions that the grid could not cope, it does cope, and it will continue to do so as technologies develop. With the completion of the latest Snowtown wind farm, South Australia will be generating nearly 40 per cent of electricity from wind and solar.

However, there will come a point at which intermittency will need to be balanced with energy storage. That is one of the reasons why replacing the soon-to-be decommissioned coal-fired power

station at Port Augusta with a concentrated solar thermal and storage plant is such an exciting concept. But that is not the only energy storage option available. We also have the emerging new battery technologies that are forecast to drop even further in price and will allow whole communities to go off grid and become self sufficient using renewable energy.

Another exciting prospect, and the one that Professor Blakers spoke about last night, is what is known as off-river pumped hydro energy storage. As its name implies, this technology involves the generation of electricity using hydropower, extracting the energy from water as it passes through a turbine. Traditionally, such schemes have involved the construction of massive dams on major rivers, such as the hydro schemes of the Snowy Mountains or south-west Tasmania. It is simple technology, but it comes at a massive cost, both economically and environmentally.

Off-river pumped hydro, on the other hand, does not require the damming of major rivers. It involves the construction of relatively small water storages at the top and bottom of hills, with connecting pipes between them. Similar to farm dams, these would be around 5 to 10 hectares each, with a head of between 100 and 1,000 metres. For example, a system comprising twin 10-hectare reservoirs, each 30 metres deep, with a 750-metre elevation difference, can deliver about 1,000 megawatts for five hours. At a national level, between 20 and 40 of these systems would be enough to stabilise a 100 per cent renewable Australian electricity system.

How it works is relatively simple. When there is excess electricity (from wind farms or solar panels), water is pumped through a pipe from the lower reservoir to the upper reservoir. The energy is later recovered by letting the water flow back down again through a turbine that converts it back into electricity. Efficiencies of 90 per cent in each direction are possible.

Electricity storage systems need to be able to deliver instant power output for periods of up to a few hours. This covers short-term fluctuations in wind and solar outputs, peaks in consumer demand, such as the very hot summer afternoons, and unplanned outages of generation and transmission infrastructure.

Australia has thousands of potentially excellent sites in hilly areas which are outside national parks, forests or other conservation reserves. They do not even need to be near a wind or solar farm, but proximity to the existing grid is an advantage. Off-river electricity storage has several advantages over typical on-river facilities, including the fact that the water is re-used over and over again, with only minor and manageable losses through evaporation.

Of the available electricity storage options, such as batteries and flywheels, pumped hydro is by far the cheapest. It has no standby losses while the water waits in the reservoir and can reach full power in 30 seconds.

In terms of construction costs, as the reservoirs are relatively small compared with typical hydro reservoirs, they are a minor component of the cost. Most of the cost is in the power components: the pipes, pumps, turbines, transformers and transmission. Initial estimates suggest that the cost of an off-river system at a good site is around \$1,100 per kilowatt over its life or \$33 per megawatt hour of energy actually stored, and that is far cheaper than batteries or stored heat from CST plants.

Professor Blakers and his team at the Australian National University are currently investigating all the good sites in Australia for pumped hydro. They know there are thousands of suitable sites, including many in South Australia. The hills around Whyalla, Port Augusta and the Mid North are likely to feature prominently in their audit.

On behalf of the Greens, I would urge the government to look very seriously at the prospects in our state for this exciting development in renewable energy. If members would like to know more, you can look at the various online papers or at the feasibility study currently being undertaken in Queensland at Kidston, which is west of Townsville.

DIABETES

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:40): Today, I would like to talk about some of the research undertaken at SAHMRI by the CSIRO Food and Nutrition flagship. This group was responsible for the renowned Total Wellbeing Diet. The research I wish to talk about today was

research I was directly involved in. The research leader was Grant Brinkworth—a Senior Research Scientist in Human Nutrition at the CSIRO. The two-year CSIRO study on type 2 diabetics was done in collaboration with UniSA, the University of Adelaide and Flinders University. The study involved both diet and exercise.

Firstly, some background on diabetes. Diabetes is Australia's fastest growing chronic disease. There are approximately 1.1 million people with diabetes in Australia. Every day, 280 Australians develop diabetes; one person every five minutes. It is the fastest growing chronic condition in Australia. More than 100,000 Australians have developed diabetes in the past year. In 2013, diabetes caused 5.1 million deaths globally.

There are different types of diabetes. The three main types are type 1, type 2 and gestational diabetes. We know that type 2 diabetes involves a complex disruption to the glucose mechanism, including insulin resistance in cells and the more gradual loss of pancreatic function and insulin production. Type 2 diabetes occurs in a higher percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons than in the general population. It is estimated that 58 per cent of type 2 diabetes can be prevented.

People at risk of type 2 diabetes can delay and even prevent the condition by following a healthy lifestyle by maintaining a healthy weight, regular physical activity, making healthy food choices, managing blood pressure, managing cholesterol levels and not smoking. Being overweight or obese is one risk factor in type 2 diabetes; it is not a direct cause. Some people who are overweight may not develop type 2 diabetes, while some people who are at a healthy weight will develop type 2 diabetes. Many Australians, particularly those over 40, are at risk of developing type 2 diabetes through lifestyle factors such as nutrition and physical activity. Family history and genetics also play a role in type 2 diabetes.

Now, back to the study. The CSIRO commenced the study in 2012 and required participants to commit to one of two diets: one centred on a very low-carbohydrate, high-protein diet, and the other centred on a highly unrefined carbohydrate, low-protein diet. Participants were required to undertake one hour of supervised exercise three days a week.

So, what were the outcomes? In terms of the overall study, during the first 12 months, there was an overall average 10 per cent reduction in body weight. No difference was noticed in the two diets, and this was expected as both groups were on kilojoule-matched, limited diets. Furthermore, blood pressure lowered by an average of six millimetres of mercury, HbA1c levels lowered by an average of 1 per cent, fasting blood glucose levels lowered by 13 per cent, insulin lowered on average by 35 per cent, and LDL cholesterol lowered on average by 6 per cent.

These changes in clinical measurements represent significant health improvements that could reduce the risk of diabetes-related complications. The interesting observation was that, in the next 12 months, results slipped as participants became less vigilant about their diet and exercise. This is a challenge for researchers on how they can continue to motivate and support people with diabetes to start and, just as importantly, continue to exercise and maintain a healthy, structured diet.

The epidemic of type 2 diabetes has huge implications for our health system, noting that diabetes is the prime cause of cardiovascular disease, kidney disease, blindness, strokes, neuropathy and amputations. With one person in every five minutes in Australia being diagnosed with diabetes, it represents a huge challenge to our health system not only in terms of cost but also in terms of human suffering. I commend the CSIRO's food and nutritional group for the critical role they are playing in enhancing the state's health research.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:46): I rise today to speak about cuts to services at the Modbury Hospital under the government's Transforming Health plan. Last week, the government announced that it was walking away from its plan to build a dedicated elective eye centre at Modbury. Back in March, the government told residents of the north-eastern suburbs that in future, if they needed to have a cataract removed, laser corrections or glaucoma treatment, they would 'be able to get it locally at Modbury Hospital'. Eight months later, the government says that they have consulted with eye doctors and the idea will not work. Eight months later, there will be no eye hospital at Modbury, but the government does not know where the dedicated eye centre will be built.

This is just the latest backflip which demonstrates that the Transforming Health plan is ill conceived and poorly consulted. Last week, the government also announced that it plans to transfer complex and emergency surgery, and orthopaedic and cardiology services from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin. These decisions will reduce Modbury's emergency department to the level of an ambulance transfer station.

On this morning's radio, Dr Scott Watkin, the head of surgery at Modbury Hospital, raised concerns about the government's health plan. He said that, if the government pushes ahead with its plan, a senior surgeon at Modbury Hospital 'will be no better than a first aider' who will 'turn up and be frustrated by the inability to do anything other than put pressure on the bleeding' and who will have to put the patient 'in an ambulance and send them off to a team in another hospital'. The receiving team, Dr Watkin said, will have 'never been in that person's wound, they don't know what the potential problem might be and they [will] have to start from scratch'. Dr Watkin also revealed that, under the government's Transforming Health plan:

...there will be no emergency surgery at Modbury...not only during office hours but after hours, if you have appendicitis you need to go elsewhere, if you have an abscess to drain you [will] need to go elsewhere.

This is not what people living in the suburbs surrounding Modbury Hospital have been promised and what they have been led to believe would be delivered over the last few months. This is not what the members for Florey and Newland have been telling them through leaflets and letters, reassuring residents that the broad range of services currently provided at Modbury will be maintained.

I am very concerned about the long-term viability of the Modbury Hospital. At present, the Modbury emergency department handles over 35,000 presentations a year. Under Labor's plan, only day cases will be admitted to Modbury. Most other surgical cases will be transferred or diverted. It has been put to me that only about a third of Modbury's current emergency department load would meet the day case criteria. While Modbury might be receiving 1,800 more elective procedures and scopes, it looks like losing around 12,000 emergency surgical procedures.

Emergency physicians rely on specialist support from beyond the ED to be able to undertake diagnosis and treatment. If Modbury Hospital does not provide a range of general surgical services, the emergency department may well not have the critical back-up that emergency departments require to operate.

The Royal College of Surgeons has also warned that Transforming Health is a threat to two trainee surgical placements at Modbury Hospital. Trainees are crucial to supporting quality health services, and they are also crucial for ensuring that there is an adequate flow of new surgical specialists entering our health system in the future.

As we have seen from the Repatriation General Hospital campaign, the government is not afraid to close down hospitals, even in the face of an unprecedented public outcry. The threat to the viability of the Modbury Hospital is real. I would remind the people of the north-east of an article by *The Advertiser's* Brad Crouch in June 2014. He said:

While upgrades on three other hospitals also have been suspended, Modbury appears to be the most likely candidate for closure if the government decides on a big ticket action to cover the gap. Senior government sources said that it was the worst case scenario but it may be a better option than trying to plug the huge gap with multiple small measures.

I implore the government to back down from its Transforming Health plan and to reverse its decision to cut specialist services from Modbury Hospital. I fear that its cost-cutting plans will inevitably reduce access to health services and may well cripple the future of the Modbury Hospital.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of what I presume are members of the Police Association. I welcome you to the chamber; you are held in very high regard.

*Matters of Interest***PUBLIC SECTOR ENTITLEMENTS**

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:51): I rise to address some further comments in relation to the use of credit cards in the broader public sector. Last month, I raised the issue of breaches of Treasurer's Instructions in relation to credit cards in the office of minister Leon Bignell, and I instanced some examples where a ministerial adviser, Ms Kerry Treuel, had paid for expenses for trips within South Australia with the use of a credit card, for which it is my view she was not entitled to use within the state of South Australia, under the terms of the Treasurer's Instruction, as applied at the time. I have raised those issues publicly in this house, and no responses, of course, have been provided.

I raised those questions by way of correspondence to the Auditor-General last month, and I have sought a response from the Auditor-General as to whether or not there were breaches of Treasurer's Instructions in relation to the use by Ms Treuel of credit card entitlements for those purposes I have outlined.

I do note that, in recent days and subsequent to my letter to the Auditor-General, Ms Treuel posted on Facebook a cosy photograph of herself with Ruth Sibley, another staffer, and Leon Bignell sitting with what looks like a glass of wine, with the following sign-off:

End of an era. It has been a great eight years, but all good things must come to an end. So glad to have worked with Ruth for the past three years and Leon for the past eight years. Couldn't have asked for better workmates.

My office has pursued the issue with the Auditor-General, asking when there might be a response to the concerns I raised in the letter to the Auditor-General. They have indicated that correspondence has been received and that the Auditor-General will respond in due course.

I note that in the Auditor-General's Report, whilst there are concerns raised generally about use of government purchase cards and credit cards within the broader public sector, there is no specific reference to issues raised about the use of credit cards within ministers' offices. I think there are important issues. Of course, I am not aware whether at this stage Ms Treuel has resigned from the public sector generally or whether she has just left the minister's office and moved to another position within the public sector.

I suspect that is not the case, but the issue will be whether the Auditor-General is pursuing any breaches of Treasurer's Instructions as to whether the resignation of a ministerial staffer means that the Auditor-General would continue, if he so chose—and this is obviously a decision for him—to investigate breaches of Treasurer's Instructions or whether the Auditor-General would discontinue any investigations of concerns that have been raised as a result of a resignation from a ministerial office.

As I said, the report of the Auditor-General, in the Executive Summary Part A, does raise a number of significant concerns that the audit office has about the use of purchase cards and/or credit cards in the public sector generally.

He lists on page 25 of that report a number of concerns in relation to inaccurate purchase card registers; evidence of transactions to support payments not being submitted in a timely manner; instances where records did not clearly demonstrate that the expenditure was for business purposes—clearly a significant issue—and officers incurring or certifying expenses beyond their approved limits or approving expenditure when they were not authorised to do so. There are a number of specific concerns that he raises which do not necessarily directly coincide with the concerns I have raised with his office in relation to the use by Ms Treuel of a credit card within the minister's office.

CONSERVATION AND HUNTING ALLIANCE

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:56): I recently had the pleasure of representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Ian Hunter, at the Conservation and Hunting Alliance of South Australia's Wine and Wild Food Dinner which took place at the National Wine Centre last week.

The Chairman of CHASA, Tony Sharley, opened the proceedings with a traditional welcome and I was pleased that Mr Sharley noted that the Kurna people and, indeed, all Indigenous

Australians were the first hunters, gatherers and conservationists. Among the 120 guests, I acknowledge Mr Dan Van Holst Pellekaan MP, Mr Tim Goodes from DEWNR, Mr Bob Lott, President, Nature Foundation, and CHASA Secretary, Tom Vartzokas.

We enjoyed a variety of delicious and sustainably-harvested wild food prepared by renowned native food pioneer and chef, Andrew Fielke, as well as local wines from Angove Family Winemakers. The practice of coming together to enjoy wild food provides us with social and cultural benefits, as well as a deeper appreciation of our natural environment. When undertaken responsibly, hunting does not threaten conservation and biodiversity values.

CHASA was formed in 1994 and is a not-for-profit organisation that connects a network of environmentally-aware associations of South Australia to achieve joint goals. Eight hunting groups with conservation interests are represented by CHASA. The South Australian government acknowledges the responsible and humane modern hunting practices promoted by CHASA.

CHASA has recently released Strategic Plan 2020, which has taken the initiative to incorporate the government's state strategic priority of premium food and wine from our clean environment by showcasing how CHASA and its members help the state in achieving its goal.

The commercial kangaroo industry, for example, offers the state the economic benefits that come from employing professional shooters, processing plant workers and drivers. The industry also contributes to achieving land management and biodiversity benefits. Abundant kangaroos cause devastating impacts to crops and the environment. The humane harvest of kangaroos allows their meat to be exported throughout the world.

The sustainability and welfare of animals plays an important role in any hunting practices. Duck and quail hunting is a good example of this and are governed by strict guidelines. Before a hunting season can be announced, assessments of waterfowl numbers are carried out to ensure the conservation and sustainability of the waterfowl species. This data then informs the process that decides whether or not hunting should be permitted, which species may be hunted and in which locations hunting can take place.

It is also important to acknowledge that hunting organisations often undertake significant conservation and wetland restoration work, including the management and revegetation of game reserves and the regeneration of habitat on private land. These works have provided major benefits for the conservation of wetland systems and the wildlife that they support.

Duck hunting is often integrated with wetland conservation activities. For example, at the Tolderol Game Reserve near Lake Alexandrina, I understand that CHASA is working with the government and the local bird groups to help re-establish a wetland watering system to benefit a variety of bird species. Similarly, along the River Murray, Field and Game South Australia has worked hard to restore a number of wetland complexes back to health, and in the Upper South-East Wetlands and Wildlife is actively rehabilitating 12,000 hectares of threatened aquatic and floodplain habitat.

As well as wetland restoration the Sporting Shooters Association of Australia continues to work closely with the rangers responsible for our state's magnificent national parks. This formal partnership between the Sporting Shooters Association and the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources has helped to achieve significant conservation outcomes through the management of feral animals. CHASA's 2020 strategic plan reveals some of the economic benefits of its organisation's efforts. In its strategic plan it states:

In 2013-14 556 members of the Sporting Shooters Association of Australia Conservation and Wildlife Management (SA) Inc made a contribution to feral animal control in South Australia's National Parks and Conservation Reserves totalling 16,480 hours and 82,800 kilometres travelled, valued at \$469,400. Their efforts removed 3,946 goats, 90 foxes, 204 feral cats, 914 rabbits and 53 deer.

I would like to acknowledge the valuable work done by CHASA and its membership and I wish them the best for the future, implementing their strategic plan and the release in 2016 of their hunting guide.

*Motions***DAILLER, MS G.**

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:01): I move:

That this council urges the Attorney-General to—

1. Refer the death of Graziella Daill r, who died on or about 15 May 2014, to the Coroner for a coronial inquest; and
2. Request an inquiry into all the circumstances leading up to Graziella Daill r's death, including but not limited to—
 - (a) ascertaining the actual date of death;
 - (b) identifying the cause of death;
 - (c) identifying the circumstances of the alleged killing by Dion Muir and his death;
 - (d) identification and assessment of the involvement of agencies, including SA Police, prior to the deaths;
 - (e) identification and assessment of the response of agencies, including SA Police, after receiving notification that Graziella Daill r was missing and at risk of harm; and
 - (f) any other circumstance that contributed to the death of Graziella Daill r.

This motion is in relation to a request by the family of Graziella Daill r to have a coronial inquest into her death. People would be familiar with the case through the media as it has been reported. Unfortunately, we are too familiar as a society with domestic violence and deaths from domestic violence. I think the statistics that used to be quoted were one death a week in Australia, and that is now two reported deaths a week, at the hands of partners.

I would like to acknowledge at the outset of my contribution that there are a number of members of the White Ribbon Foundation of this chamber and their contributing to ending domestic violence in Australia.

We are very familiar with the horrific toll that this problem is causing in Australia and there have been many speeches on it so I do not intend to cover that ground again. In South Australia there have been coronial inquests into the death of Zahra Abrahamzadeh in 2010 and Robyn Hayward in 2009. Those inquests were held in 2014 and 2012 and made a number of recommendations.

There are some similarities, particularly with the Zahra Abrahamzadeh case, and this situation with Graziella Daill r. Her family have sought an inquest into her death, and the motion outlines the terms of what is requested by them.

I would also like to acknowledge the member for Bragg, the Liberal Party spokesperson for Attorney-General matters, who has met with the family. It was her initiative that this motion be put to the parliament. Things being as they are, with the various agendas of our different houses, Ms Chapman's motion is listed for 19 November so I have had the opportunity to address this matter before her but I do acknowledge that it is on her initiative that the Liberal Party is bringing this motion before the parliament.

In this particular situation, Ms Daill r was found dead at her home on or about 15 or 16 May 2014. Her former partner, Mr Dion Muir, was also found deceased at the premises and the matter was reported as a murder suicide. Ms Daill r's children have spoken publicly about this plight and they have stated that Mr Muir, as her former partner, had an intervention order and yet was allowed to continually harass their mother. I will quote from an article in *The Advertiser*, dated 13 July 2014, by Jordanna Schreiber, entitled 'Murdered woman's family calls for inquest, electronic monitoring'. It states:

...Dion Muir was repeatedly allowed to harass their mother, despite being under an intervention order.

The intervention order which I have mentioned, and I now quote again:

'We feel really angry and let down...it's really good to see that they (the Abrahamzadeh family) got some answers and we'd like a little bit of that,' Mrs Palmer said.

That is Mrs Natasha Palmer, who is one of the three children. The other two children are Adelaide Holly and Vincent Holly. Mrs Palmer went on to say:

'I feel that my mum would still be alive if the courts had kept him in jail and not let him go.'

The article continues:

Muir had a court hearing on April 7 this year—

This is 2014—

for breaching an intervention order issued against him by Ms Daill r. Muir had repeatedly damaged Ms Daill r house and car after she left him in 2012. Ms Daill r was preparing to return to her native France for good to escape her tormentor. The children do not blame the efforts of police, but say police and courts need more power to prevent and punish perpetrators of domestic violence, including electronic monitoring of people subject to intervention orders.

Mrs Palmer is quoted as saying:

'He was denied police bail on a couple of occasions, but the courts would let him back out on the streets. Even though she's got an intervention order, it's just useless...police and courts need to work more closely together.'

Apparently the relationship had existed for approximately 12 months. I think the family have outlined their case for why a coronial inquest into their mother's death would be useful. I acknowledge that there are a number of initiatives that have been taken by this parliament and this government, including changes to our intervention orders in late 2009, from memory, and also that we have a number of interagency organisations working together in a formal sense, and I think those have been discussed at length by a number of members—the Multi-Agency Protection Service and Family Safety Framework, to mention two, which are providing very useful assistance.

However, these are specific matters about someone who was continuously able to breach intervention orders, and I think that those matters certainly deserve further investigation. There is the ability for the Attorney-General to direct for an inquest under section 21 of the Coroner's Act and, therefore, we believe that the Attorney-General ought to utilise this power within the Coroner's Act to conduct an inquest into Graziella Daill r as requested by her family. I endorse the motion to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

Bills

EVIDENCE (JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (16:09): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Evidence Act 1929. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (16:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill contains provisions that, if enacted, will shield journalists from being required to reveal their confidential sources. This bill seeks to underpin the critically important role that the media and the profession of journalism plays in protecting the rights of the individual against capricious acts of the state.

In a liberal democracy the media facilitates rational and critical debate, which in turn provides an additional check on all the branches of government. This bill sets free the journalist to use their pen for the benefit of the community. The bill allows journalists to receive and recount information provided by those citizens who would otherwise feel constrained under the existing law to disclose sensitive information. This is a measured legislative initiative as it allows for the courts to exercise a discretion to order disclosure in certain circumstances where there are competing interests.

Government legislation is increasingly enlarging the power of the state's investigative agencies, yet at the same time there has not been a corresponding increase in the oversight of these

same agencies. All we are told is that there is criminal intelligence which justifies a particular course of action. We never see this intelligence, nor is it likely to ever be tested in a court.

In this environment, where the basic and longstanding rights of our citizens are under constant attack by the government and ultimately removed due to vague notions of operational necessity, we need a free and active media to hold the state to account. It is disappointing that our citizens cannot always rely on their parliamentary representatives or the institutions of the state to protect themselves. Many have had to resort to defending their rights in the public sphere.

This bill endeavours to assist journalists in their important work while at the same time ensuring that, in certain circumstances, a court can seek information where it is in the public interest to do so. This bill is identical to the preceding one which was introduced to the chamber by the Hon. S. Wade last year. The chamber passed that bill despite not having the support of the government. Unfortunately, the bill lapsed in the House of Assembly because the parliament was prorogued.

This is not the first such legislative initiative seeking to protect journalists and their sources. A bill was also introduced last year by the Hon. J. Darley, which preceded the Hon. S. Wade's bill. This earlier bill incorporated Liberal amendments and also passed this chamber. As the Hon. J. Darley's bill did not have the government's support, it was defeated in the other place, being passed in the negative.

At the outset I acknowledge the work of the Hon. J. Darley and the Hon. S. Wade and their endeavours on this important legislative initiative. The Liberal Party has decided to bring a new bill before the parliament and once again provide its members a further opportunity to support the same, or reconsider their opposition.

The introduction of this bill is testament to the significance that members of the Liberal Party place on the need to provide protection to journalists while conducting their important work in our community. This bill is a symbol of the Liberal Party's commitment to enhancing open and accountable government. The Hon. S. Wade has passed the baton to me, and I gladly take it to hand, for personally I believe that these are important amendments which will go some way to ensuring that governments are held to account and, in turn, the rights of our citizens are protected.

The common law does not protect journalists from revealing their sources. The legal rationale is that unless the courts can compel answers they will not be properly informed. This in turn disrupts the proper administration of justice and may contribute to an undermining of the public confidence in the legal system. The inability to obtain information also has the potential to lead to injustice. In other words, the paramount interest in the administration of justice requires that cases be tried by courts using all of the relevant and admissible evidence.

Those who believe in the importance of the role of the media in a free society, however, argue that the protections in this bill are essential. Investigative journalism cannot survive without confidential sources. The media claim an ethical obligation to keep the identity of some of their sources confidential. Unless journalists can guarantee anonymity, they will not be trusted with information which needs to be disclosed in the public interest.

The industry standards for the practice of journalism, peer pressure and the need for individual journalists to compete provide some mitigation against abrogation. On balance, the Liberal Party has sympathy for the proposition that it is in the public interest to shield journalists from revealing their sources. The public interest necessitates the freedom of the media because of the crucial part it plays in communicating and debating issues that are of interest to the public and in defiance of the desires of the state. This is particularly so for stories on corruption, maladministration and the abuse of power.

Under this bill, journalists will only be compelled to reveal their sources if the case fails the public interest test; that means where the public interest in revealing information outweighs potential detriment to the source. The privilege against disclosure of a source includes situations where a person is compelled to answer a question or produce a document that would disclose the identity of an informant or enable that identity to be determined. The bill does not require an explicit promise of secrecy from a journalist to the source of the information in order for it to become privileged. The nature and circumstance of the communication determines whether the protection will apply. The

journalist may need to discuss their story with the editor or another representative of their employer. This communication does not remove the protection of the source.

It is our view that the bill strikes an appropriate balance between the public interest of a free press and the public interest in the administration of justice. The bill leaves the balancing of competing interests and the particular facts of each case to the courts for adjudication. The government has made its views known in respect of the provisions of this bill. In late 2014, the government opposed the earlier bill, which contained identical provisions, in the other place. The Attorney-General made a contribution to this debate on this earlier bill, outlining the government's position.

I ask the government to revisit its opposition to this legislative initiative of the Liberal opposition. We have fallen behind the majority of the states and the commonwealth in this realm. If the government benches need some comfort, they only need to look to the contributions to the debates in the commonwealth parliament by members of their own party. A succession of Labor attorney-generals and shadow attorney-generals have supported this type of legislation. The respected Labor senator John Faulkner acknowledged in a debate in 2009 that the protection of journalists' sources is one of the basic conditions of a free press, as recognised by the European Court of Human Rights in 1966. Without such protection, sources may be deterred from assisting the press.

We do not believe the provisions of this bill to be ridiculous or unconstitutional, as they have been described by the Attorney-General in old debates. We do not believe that we have to identify any particular mischief that has occurred in South Australia to warrant the introduction of this bill. There are ample examples from outside the state and overseas. I would remind the government and the Attorney that if these were the criteria for the introduction of a bill, a large proportion of the government bills would not come before this chamber. My mind quickly turns to recent government initiatives in relation to the organised crime in this state, colloquially known as the 'bikies bill'. The act may be found to be unconstitutional, was copied from Queensland, only limited evidence justified the need for it, and it was considered by some academics to be ridiculous or worse.

The government's position has been that the law, as set out by the High Court, should not be amended by the parliament. This shyness to legislate over the views of the High Court is not something we have often seen from this government, which has so often proudly proclaimed its desire to affect change by statute.

The High Court sets out what the traditional common law position is at present, but does not assert what good policy should be. We assert that the law should be changed to better the lives of our citizens. While it is pleasing to read the remarks of the Attorney-General in the other place on an earlier version of the bill, stating that the High Court position is compelling and strikes the right balance, I do wish the Attorney had paid similar attention to the utterings of the High Court and other justices in other courts in relation to the separation of powers. It could be argued that the recent laws passed by this chamber which breached the separation of powers are reason enough to strengthen the fourth estate.

A free media is essential to a functioning democracy. We do not accept that the bill leans far too much to protecting the interests of journalists and discounts legitimate public interest in the administration of justice. Further, we reject the argument that the bill, if enacted, will undermine the operation of ICAC. The bill contains provisions that allow the courts to weigh competing interests. To use the words of senator John Faulkner, 'Judicial discretion in these matters is not something to be afraid of.'

I have great faith in the work of our media and its important role in our society. I do not share the same cynicism of the operations of the media as expressed by the Attorney in the debate on the earlier bill. In my experience, the vast majority of journalists approach their trade professionally and ethically. The fourth estate plays a critical role in our society in voicing public opinion and questioning the cold narrative of the state.

The executive government is constantly growing in its power. The traditional role of the parliament is being weakened. It is therefore increasingly important for the media to hold the

executive accountable for its decisions and actions by reporting on matters against the will of its collegium.

The media's important role in our society comes with significant responsibilities to be fair and accurate. If the media are to enjoy the privilege granted by this legislation, it is incumbent on journalists to be professional at all times. I am confident that the profession of journalism and the ethics that underpin it will continue to ensure that these standards are maintained. The Liberal Party seeks the support of the chamber for the passing of this bill because it is an advocate for transparent, accountable and open government. I commend the bill to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

POLICE (RETURN TO WORK) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (16:23): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Police Act 1998. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (16:24): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This, I believe, is a very important bill and a bill that will restore some justice to one sector of our society that is exceptionally different from all other sectors of society in our workplace, and I will deal with that in more detail in a little while. For the history, the situation regarding the change from WorkCover to ReturnToWorkSA did create quite a lot of debate, not only in the parliament here but also out in the community. There was a lot of pressure on the government to actually do something about the ballooning of WorkCover costs. In fact, we had the highest WorkCover costs in Australia.

Business sectors right across the state were saying to the government, 'You have to do something about it.' Therefore, there was pressure on the government and also pressure on the parliament to try to assist the government to rein in this ever-expanding deficit when it came to WorkCover and the consequences to jobs. Of course, the government said that there would be about \$180 million in a given year returned to the business sector if the parliament was to support the legislation to change from WorkCover to ReturnToWorkSA.

At that time, there was always concern expressed about the fact that South Australian police may become very disadvantaged if they were lumped into the overall structure of the reductions in WorkCover protection. In fact, whilst the union movement generally did not have a lot to say—I guess they had a fair bit to say to the government behind closed doors, but I think it is fair to say that the union movement generally did not have a lot to say about the legislation that went through at that point in time and that became gazetted and law on 1 July 2015—there was one association or one union that did have something to say. Looking at my second reading speech back then, I note and I want to put on the record what was said at that time. This is an extract from my second reading speech:

I have not had the unions come to me at all on this legislation, and I want to put that on the public record.

The reason I put that there was that obviously, generally, the union movement must have accepted that, for general workplace situations, whilst they would not have been happy with it, it would not have had the potential impact that one workplace would definitely have. I then said in my second reading speech:

In fact, the only union I have seen with any credibility that has come out has been the Police Association through its President, Mr Mark Carroll, who said on ABC radio that the changes could leave injured officers financially worse off in doing their job.

Then I go on to say: 'I will quote what he had to say', and this is the quote:

To find themselves left out in the cold if they suffer any other further injuries because, as we know, the payments under the new legislation...will cease two years after the original injury, and we just don't think that's fair and reasonable for our members who have put themselves in harm's way to protect the community.

I then went on to say:

I totally agree with the Police Association, but they are the only ones who I have seen come out arguing the case against supporting this legislation.

To put it back clearly on the public record, the Police Association had been right up front from day one arguing that there were special circumstances for protecting our police officers, and I intend to illustrate the reasons behind that. I also, up front, want to advise colleagues that it is the intention of Family First to put this particular bill to a vote in the Legislative Council on Wednesday 18 November. Wednesday 18 November is a private members' day and I flag that I will be putting the bill to a vote then, and I will be confirming that in writing to all colleagues, together with this second reading explanation and a copy of the bill.

It is interesting that, at a meeting I had to attend this morning, I met with a gentleman who is a former police officer. He had worked for over 20 years as a police officer and as a police prosecutor. He has a son-in-law now who is a police officer and a daughter who is an ambulance officer. He started to discuss these matters with me because I told him that I was going to be introducing this bill this afternoon.

He said that, when he finished being a police officer in 1990, it was far different back then from what it is today. He said that the job always had challenges but nothing like the challenges he sees police confronting today. In our discussions, we agreed that those challenges are not going to get any easier for police. In fact, the reality is that the future of policing and maintaining law and order and safety in our community will only get more complex, more challenging and involve more risks for our police.

He said that his daughter goes to some horrendous incidences as a paramedic and that they assess those situations when they get there. Whilst there may be people there who are injured and who are at risk, first and foremost they assess their own risk and they will call for what he called a blue car, meaning a police car.

Some members may have been out on patrols with police. I have certainly had the privilege to go out on general police patrols on several occasions over the years. When you go out there, it is never quiet for very long. Some of the incidents you attend are horrendous and put those officers in extreme and immediate danger and, at times, can even endanger their life.

When you go out with the ambulance officers, there are horrendous incidents there as well but, if there is an accident or a risk to safety, police will be called. Of course, many of us have been involved with the CFS and, yes, there are risks there. We know that one risk to the CFS and the MFS is that of the potential risk of contracting cancer as a result of what they come across when they attend a fire incident. The parliament has addressed that matter to make sure that those men and women in the CFS and MFS are now protected when it comes to their being faced with a more unusual situation than most.

What is the impetus for this bill? The changes to the return-to-work legislation have caused and will continue to cause serious injustice, in my opinion, for members of the police force who are unable to return to work or who will be required to pay for ongoing medical expenses once the legislatively prescribed compensation period ends.

In terms of return-to-work legislation, I suggest that one size does not fit all and that, whilst the government, for the reasons I have highlighted, tried to get one size to fit all, it is very clear that, in the few months since the legislation changed on 1 July 2015 to more draconian legislation for workers, one size does not fit all—and we are seeing that already with some injured SAPOL officers.

I am asking the parliament and the government to realise that we did not quite get it right when it came to the legislation at that point in time. I have therefore tabled today amendments to the Police Act so that we can give the police officers and their families proper entitlements.

Given the nature of policing and the injuries officers face in the line of duty, we are finding that officers need additional support over and above that of other workers, which includes extending the payment period for income maintenance and medical treatment for officers with no work capacity or limited work capacity. The key point, I believe, and the very strong argument for amending the Police Act, is that police officers have the only occupation where they are bound to enter dangerous

situations. Workers in every other occupation can choose not to enter a situation where their personal safety could be placed in jeopardy.

The advice we have received is that police are different in how they are employed. Unlike traditional jobs, where someone enters a contract of employment, once police are sworn in, they are in an entirely different category to any other worker. In fact, once a police officer has been sworn in, they are effectively on duty 24/7. If they see certain situations, they are duty bound to act and they have sworn to commit to that situation, no matter what.

That is a real problem for policing when it comes to safe workplaces. They cannot refuse to go to any incident at all and I want to highlight in this second reading speech some of the consequences for police officers of doing their work—often heroic work—to ensure that the rest of South Australia is protected and kept as safe as possible.

SAPOL are self-insurers and all workplace injury matters are managed, overseen and paid for by SAPOL and not ReturnToWork SA. For all these reasons, I believe it is definitely appropriate to change the Police Act, and the amendment bill I have tabled here today puts to the parliament the opportunity to change the Police Act.

Members of SAPOL are regularly exposed to danger in their work for the benefit of the community and this bill adopts the scheme established pursuant to the Return to Work Act (RTWA) but with special modifications that support members of South Australia Police who suffer injuries at work as a way to reflect the important role SAPOL plays in our community.

On that issue, some members would ask: what is the cost going to be if we support this legislation? The government knows what that cost is. They did not have to do, and they will not have to do, actuarials as they did when they put up specific legislation for the MFS that the parliament then ensured also covered the CFS.

In that case, the actuarials were unknowns but, until 1 July this year, what is in this bill is what the police were to receive if they were injured at work. What I am saying is that, up until 1 July this year, the police commissioner of the day and the head of finance in SAPOL know exactly (on average) how much money they would have been paying these officers. I suggest that, as tough as the police budget is, given that they know the costs, they can manage this particular amendment to get equity and fairness back into SAPOL.

Let us have a look at the current law. Weekly payments for income are cut off two years from the date of injury and not from the time of the claim, so that in instances where the injury is not immediately apparent, the person can lose a period of valuable compensation to which they would have previously been entitled. In policing particularly, you do not know the extent of injuries immediately. That has been demonstrated in an excellent article in the recent edition of the *Police Journal* which I want to refer to and which I trust all members have had a chance to read. If they have not, I would encourage them to read it as they deliberate on this bill.

Medical expenses are cut off after three years and many SAPOL officers still require treatment as they cannot yet return to work or, if they are able to return to some form of work, they still require ongoing medical treatment. In fact, some of them would need ongoing medical treatment for the rest of their lives. Only a permanently injured worker who has a whole-person impairment of 30 per cent can receive payments beyond this point. With the new changes, obtaining a determination of 30 per cent is extremely difficult, even with some of the horrendous incidents that occur with police. Again, I will go into that in a short while.

So what does the bill do? It inserts a new schedule 1A into the Police Act. It allows police to receive ongoing payments for income maintenance and for medical treatment beyond the legislated time frames under the RTW Act. Once a police officer reaches the cut-off time under the RTW Act the Police Act amendments that I have tabled here today come into force allowing for these additional payments. After the designated two-year return-to-work period ends, the prescribed entity must assess and make a determination that the worker has no current work capacity, after which time the officer is entitled to weekly payments.

The bill makes provision for income payments for officers to be equal to 80 per cent of the officer's notional weekly. I put on the record again that the 80 per cent was something that they lost

from 100 per cent when there were other amendments put through some few years ago. An officer with a limited work capacity may apply to the prescribed entity for income support. The officer can receive income support if the prescribed entity is satisfied that, due to the work injury, the employed police officer will be likely to be indefinitely incapable of undertaking further or additional employment which would increase the officer's earnings. Refusal of weekly maintenance cannot occur unless the prescribed entity has referred the matter to the tribunal for the opinion of one or more independent medical advisers, and they are of the opinion that the officer is not so incapable.

The bill provides where an officer is deemed to have a limited work capacity they will be able to receive payments equal to 80 per cent of the difference between the officer's notional weekly earnings and the officer's current weekly earnings. The income payment provisions have been drafted to reflect the wording of seriously injured workers rather than reflecting the wording under the previous act: (a) this decision was made after consultation with numerous agencies and legal professionals where it was determined that, whilst SAPOL rarely exercised its option to cut off workers payments in various circumstances, it was still a legislated possibility under the old wording of the legislation.

SAPOL, I am informed, virtually never cut off workers' payments. This may have been a policy decision—I have not been able to establish that fact—but other self-insurers frequently use this provision, and the concern for me is that SAPOL may be going down that track or will go down that track. This would create inequity for the injured workers and their families in instances where workers are unable to return to their former work capacity but fail to meet the level of seriously injured worker.

Essentially, these provisions create the same situation that SAPOL was in prior to the RTW Act, in that injured workers are able to receive ongoing payments as determined to be appropriate. That is the key to the bill. The bill has been drafted to ensure that workers who are subject to the new RTW Act will be covered retrospectively for the period between 1 July 2015, when the RTW Act came into force—and hoping that this bill is passed by both houses of the parliament, I would presume some time in 2016 it would obviously come back to where it was. There has to be that retrospectivity for those already injured police officers.

The bill prescribes that where an officer is incapacitated for work or is likely to be incapacitated for work for more than one year the prescribed entity must review the payments and, finally, decisions for extended income support for both officers with no work capacity or limited work capacity are reviewable.

I would like to turn now to some case studies. I advise the house that, in the background work leading up to the drafting and consideration of this bill, I sought some advice on certain cases and how police officers would be affected. I had 56 examples of where the draconian amendments not only disadvantaged officers but also their families. They can still have their long-term security and capacity to be able to continue a fair and reasonable life—which they clearly could have had if they had not been injured—as far as possible if we have fairness in the protection of their WorkCover entitlements and support.

The August 2015 issue of the *Police Journal* is extremely well written in highlighting some examples of what police have to go through. It contains an article, entitled 'Injured and abandoned', and I think that is an excellent title because it explains in three words just what has happened to our police officers who are basically caught in a trap where they are committed to look after the community but they are not having the commitment come the other way when things go wrong for them.

I would like to put on the public record a few of the case studies. Again, I encourage colleagues to read the full detail of it and, given the workload that we still have tonight, I will not go through it in huge detail but, for the general public who will be reading the debate on this matter, I also want to make it pretty clear as to what officers face on a daily basis. In fact, they do not know from call to call just what is going to cause a huge change to the future for them and their families.

One police officer, Alison Coad, a wife and a mother, was attending an incident. This incident was a potentially life-threatening incident to the people they saw in Whitmore Square where there was quite a violent situation occurring. It is worth reading all the background to this because it

highlights what I said earlier where a retired police officer said to me that the challenges are greater now than they ever were when he was there and will only get more complex. I want to put on the public record some of the things that Alison Coad pointed out, as follows:

A two-year cap now applies to income maintenance and a three-year cap to medical expenses. And only a determination that an injured copper has a 30 per cent 'whole-person impairment' will get him or her coverage of income and medical expenses beyond those cut-offs.

So, if they slip out of the net and they are classified at, say, 28 per cent whole-person impairment, then for the rest of their lives they have to pick up their medical. If they have a situation where they cannot advance in policing, they have to go back to two or three days part-time or whatever, they get no support whatsoever. The article continues:

The new Return to Work Act—which contains all the unpleasant detail—defines a person so impaired as a 'seriously injured worker'. This unpopular legislation, implemented by the Weatherill government, threatens to leave Coad to foot hefty medication and treatment bills for the rest of her life.

As strong a person as she is and with her family, the reality is that she will face challenges for the rest of her life. Medicine and the medical fraternity cannot cure the fact that when Alison was spat on she received herpes in a form that is incurable as a virus and continues to come back and affect her wellbeing. As I said, the unpopular legislation implemented by the Weatherill government threatens to leave Alison and her family to foot hefty medication and treatment bills. The article continues:

And her plight is set to begin in 2018, after the government effectively abandons her. So, in fewer than three years from now, the costs of managing the disease she copped serving the community—

keeping people safe, making sure that a potentially life-threatening situation did not occur when she went in there with her partner, waiting for back-up—

will be all her problem.

It will not only devastate Alison but her police officer husband and her 11 year-old son. That is one case that is very much worth reading and the pictures tell the story as well.

I want to put on the record another case, that of Senior Constable Brian Edwards, still a young man. There was a suspect leaking tank of anhydrous ammonia at a hardware store. The CFS and Senior Constable Edwards arrived at the scene together and started to talk about a strategy to manage a potentially very high risk explosion. The risk accelerated very quickly. In fact, as Senior Constable Brian Edwards said, 'You don't often see fires panic,' but on this occasion there was panic at what was occurring. The *Police Journal* article states:

'but he (the captain) just said, "Get out of here!" We didn't have time to think. They (the CFS crew) scooted off and I got into the police car and started going down the road.'

But Edwards only got about 50 metres down the road when he saw a car approaching the scene of the gas leak.

He could have made the decision to just keep going but, as I said earlier, the police are sworn to protect the community. The article continues:

He swung his police car around and across the road to block the path of the oncoming vehicle, which had its windows down and a young family inside.

Edwards was desperate to stop these two vulnerable parents and their children from driving straight into the potentially deadly gas leak. And he succeeded: the car stopped and the father stepped out.

'Mate, get back in your car, get your family and just go!' Edwards exclaimed. He had no time to explain the emergency other than to bellow a hurriedly spoken warning that the tank was leaking toxic ammonia. 'I was fairly to the point' he remembers, 'and he just ran back to his car and drove away, and that was good.'

Edwards, who had likely saved that family from serious injury, if not death, turned to step back toward and into the police car, just a few paces away. But, doing his duty, directing the family out of danger, had for too long kept him too close to the escaping ammonia.

A cloud of it had crept up on him like an invisible stalker. 'And bang!' he recalls. 'It just hit me like a wall. It was like hot shards of glass down my throat after I'd taken about one or two steps to get to the car door. I gasped, but the problem with ammonia is that it shortens your breath so you gasp even more, and then, of course, you're taking more of it in. You're not getting any oxygen; you're just getting the ammonia. So, when I gasped a second time I kind of doubled over and was just exhausted.'

...Edwards, a father of three, wisely agreed to go to Modbury Hospital, where its staff brought the full reality of his condition home to him. 'One male nurse said, "In the next four hours your lungs could close over and you could die," Edwards recalls.

There is quite a lot more in that particular story as well as in Alison Coad's. Another story is highlighted, 'Shot in the Face'. It is another horrific case, that of injured Senior Constable Brett Gibbons. I am sure all colleagues would remember this particular incident, because it was only in 2011 when Senior Constable Gibbons and his patrol partner, Travis Emms, were the first to respond to the Hectorville triple murder. I quote:

...both determined officers crept cautiously into the house to investigate, before Corbo suddenly appeared with a shotgun! He aimed the weapon at Gibbons and fired on him from point-blank range!

Tragically, and sadly, the blast left Senior Constable Gibbons with the right side of his face ripped open, his jaw broken and his teeth and facial tissue exposed. He went through a lot of surgery, and there is still more surgery to come. Of course, Senior Constable Gibbons now has to undergo bleaching to fade the scar further and there will be more restorative work on his mouth. I quote further:

...under the new return-to-work legislation, he might yet have to pay for that surgery himself—and any other future medical bills related to his work injuries.

Extraordinarily, Gibbons may not meet the 30 per cent whole-person impairment threshold, despite the extensive damage to his body.

The reality is that, until 30 June, that was not an issue. He was covered. He had to go and work through the situation, but at least he and his family knew that they were covered and protected. At this point that is not necessarily the case. Senior Constable Gibbons says it is:

...'really worrying' that he might yet have to carry not only the physical but also the financial burden of his work injuries. He knows that he would never have the means to manage costs which, over time, could well mount up into a six-figure sum.

'It's going to impact on my whole life if this legislation is allowed to stay without police being returned back to their former situation.' That is paraphrasing what Senior Constable Gibbons said. He also said, and I think this is key:

We've always taken the risks knowing fully that the government and Opposition would support us if the worst came to the worst. We knew that if we were called upon to give something of ourselves we would be looked after but, now, that's not the case. It is going to impact on my whole life if this legislation is allowed to stay without police exemptions.

In concluding my remarks at this point, I just reiterate that one size does not fit all, as hard as you might try. We have highlighted that police are the only employees, the only men and women in a career, who have no choice when it comes to what they do in South Australia. It is equivalent to what men and women do when they go to a war zone or a war conflict; they have no choice. They have signed up and they have to go in.

I am appealing to the government and asking my colleagues in the parliament to realise that we do need to change this Police Act. We do need to give assurance to the police men and women, their families and their children, and also to those who are contemplating making policing a career, that the Police Act will protect them and give police officers the proper entitlements that they fairly and rightly deserve.

As I said earlier, and I want to reinforce, this is an urgent matter. I myself admit that I should probably have fought even harder at the time, because clearly we knew that police had to be an exception. But it is not too late. We have an opportunity now to get this right. As I said, the government cannot use an excuse that it is going to set some precedent or that it is going to cost them a lot of money. It is not setting a precedent; it is only returning them to what they deserve, what they had and what must be given back to them if we are to ensure that our police officers are protected while they go about keeping South Australia a safe community.

I commend the bill to the house. I put it up for a vote on Wednesday 18 November, and I am happy to meet with any colleagues individually, or to organise if they want to meet with some of these police officers that I have talked about to get firsthand the dangers, the risks and the commitments that we see them proudly delivering for the South Australia Police. It is our turn to get this right.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

Motions

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:58): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the development of the suicide prevention networks around South Australia and encourages the rapid expansion of this successful initiative;
2. Calls on the Weatherill Labor government to enhance its efforts in the field of suicide prevention, both in programs and funding, and as a matter of urgency progress the development of its 2016-2020 State Suicide Prevention Strategy;
3. Urges the Weatherill Labor government, in the development of its 2016-2020 State Suicide Prevention Strategy, to note—
 - (a) the establishment of a Ministerial Suicide Prevention Council by the Western Australian government;
 - (b) the commitment by the Victorian state government of \$4.9 million to suicide prevention programs specifically for the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and Questioning (LGBTIQ) community;
 - (c) the establishment of a suicide register by the Queensland state government to enable better research into the causes and prevention of suicide, and the direction of funding to programs which will reduce the rates of suicide in areas discovered as 'hot spots';
 - (d) the implementation of suicide prevention training programs for front-line police officers and public transport employees by the New South Wales state government; and
 - (e) the development of a dedicated Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy by the Tasmanian state government.

This motion, relating to suicide prevention in South Australia, is one that I am not going to speak on at any great length today. I think my passion in relation to these matters is well known to members of this chamber. However, it is important, I think, that such a motion be brought to this chamber because I get, I suppose, ongoing encouragement from people right around this parliament and in the general community to continue to do the work that I have done, and particularly, I think, following on from the motions that were carried in this house and the other place, which were moved by myself and the member for Adelaide respectively, that resulted in the development of the government's first state suicide prevention strategy.

I want to acknowledge the development of the suicide prevention networks around the state, and I look forward to the continuing expansion of this successful initiative—an initiative that I think invests in the fabulous efforts of volunteers in many communities, people from all walks of life who also have a great concern and passion for preventing suicide. I also, I suppose, in this motion emphasise that I ask the government to enhance its efforts, both in programs and funding, as it contemplates the development of a further suicide prevention strategy for 2016-2020.

I understand that the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist and other elements of the health department are in the early stages of that work towards a strategy and that there is some hope that there will be one agreed to by government by the end of next year but, among other areas relating to the work of suicide prevention, I would urge the government and the members of cabinet particularly to take some leadership in this area and perhaps give it a bit more impetus than has been the case in the past.

I have also, as part of this motion, asked that the government note the excellent initiatives that are taking place in other jurisdictions. I have been privileged, at the last two National Suicide Prevention conferences and in some other visits that I have made to other parts of Australia and New Zealand and to the United Kingdom, to witness a great range of initiatives that are relevant to the local jurisdictions and to particular communities within them.

Certainly, this motion highlights the establishment of a Ministerial Council for Suicide Prevention by the Western Australian state government. It has been demonstrated that that body,

alongside the Mental Health Commission that exists in Western Australia, has provided quite a bit of leadership and direction in the suicide prevention sector in that state.

Earlier today in question time, I asked a question of the minister representing the Minister for Mental Health about the Victorian program of just under \$5 million for suicide prevention programs specifically for the LGBTIQ community, and I thank the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation for his response as he was referring that off to the minister. It is an area that the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse offered to consider funding at estimates some 14 or 15 months ago, but I am not aware of any initiatives in that area.

As the minister said here in his answer to me today, it would be a good idea for the government to have a look at that work that is being undertaken in Victoria, and has been sponsored by governments of both flavours, and is particularly successful in the peri-urban rim around Melbourne. I had the privilege to speak with one of the young women running that program a few years ago.

The motion also highlights the need for the government to note the establishment of the suicide register by the Queensland state government to enable better research into the causes and prevention of suicide, and the direction of funding to programs which will reduce the rates of suicide in areas that have been discovered as so-called 'hot spots'. I have also mentioned in this place before the very worthwhile implementation of suicide prevention training programs for front-line police officers and public transport employees by the New South Wales state government. These people are right on the front line when dealing with incidents of suicide in many cases. I think it is something to be commended that those people are given training to deal not only with the death in those circumstances, or an attempted suicide, but also with the other people who are impacted around such a situation.

The motion is also aimed at urging the government to note the Tasmanian government's development of a dedicated Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy, because there is no doubt that we do have an opportunity with the young people of today. While the young people of today communicate differently to many of my vintage, they have not grown up with the stigma about discussing suicide and mental health issues that most of us did. They did not grow up with that sort of taboo on talking about these matters, which gives us an opportunity to develop some different strategies around that, and I commend the Tasmanian government for doing so.

Last Friday, I was pleased to attend the fourth of the Suicide Prevention Network of Networks events conducted by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist. Two of these have been held in Adelaide about 12 months apart and the other two were of a more regional nature, one in Mount Gambier and one in Clare. I was pleased that last Friday, here at the Festival Centre, I was able to meet the new Chief Psychiatrist and also the new officer who has been appointed to assist in the rollout of the Suicide Prevention Strategy. I am delighted that that position has now been filled. It only took about 14 or 15 months after the promise was made in the lower house at estimates, but we have to rejoice in the fact that that person is now in the position.

I do want to say that is a pity that, of those four Network of Networks events, on only one occasion was the government represented by a member of parliament. In fact, last year the member for Taylor in another place (parliamentary secretary) represented the government, and I was very pleased about that, but on the other three occasions there has not been anyone there representing the government. I do not blame other members in this chamber because they may not have known that it was happening, but I think that is poor, because I think the great people who are working as volunteers in this area are looking for leadership. The leadership provided by the Hon. Helen Morton MLC in Western Australia and the Hon. Michael Ferguson MHA in Tasmania, as ministers in those jurisdictions, has been very well received.

I do say again to the current minister here that he needs to step up to the mark. He has been completely unseen and unheard in this sector. It is not too late. He needs to come on board. I know that there are many others in the government who support the work I have done, some of whom have urged me to continue moving motions like this.

Another area I have not mentioned directly in this motion but one I think is increasingly important for us to take notice of is the area of postvention; that is, a focus on the people who have

been impacted by suicide and attempted suicide and who are, in many ways, at greater risk of having further instances of that in a particular family.

Only yesterday, in a conversation with a colleague in this parliament, I learned of a situation where suicide has impacted a family at three different generations. I have certainly come across it where it has been more than once in the one generation and maybe in two generations, but I have not heard of that before. It is an area we must continue to focus on because it has been proven over and over again that many of the people in those families who have suffered from suicide will be very vulnerable and at risk of taking their own life.

With those words, I commend the motion to the council. I urge all members to continue to work hard. I am very grateful for the terrific support I have received from many members in this chamber and the other place for the work I do in this area. I will indicate to members later this year when I wish to call this to a vote. I seek the support of the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (PROTECTION FOR ASSISTANCE ANIMALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:13): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Over the past few months, the issue of dog attacks has been raised with me by a number of constituents, and I have become increasingly concerned about the lack of recourse for owners when their assistance animal, in particular, has been attacked.

I would like to take a moment to note that I will be talking predominantly about assistance animals in terms of guide dogs as it directly relates to the complaints I have received. However, that being said, this bill recognises that assistance animals includes disability dogs, guide dogs or a hearing dog and provides protections to them also.

The impetus for this bill has come through two disturbing dog attacks that have been brought to my attention where people have found themselves powerless in having any enforcement action taken against the owners of the attacking dogs.

The first complaint that I received was that an unsupervised German shepherd attacked an assistance dog. The force of the attack was so significant that it actually sent the visually-impaired owner plummeting to the ground. Whilst this attack would in and of itself be traumatic and terrifying for the person, who had, I understand, no sight at all, it was made worse in that the vision-impaired person fell onto a main road.

Thankfully, the drivers of oncoming vehicles were able to take evasive action; no further injury occurred to the individual and no motor vehicle accident eventuated. That being said, the potential for serious injury to all involved, including to the assistance animal, was in this case indeed substantial. I believe that the assistance dog was also mauled by the German shepherd for some considerable time, and I understand that this resulted in substantial out-of-pocket expenses for the owner.

Another attack—which I do not have extensive details of, but an outline from the individual concerned because they were too traumatised to give all the details—was significant enough to require the assistance dog to undergo substantial veterinary treatment, which of course was also at a substantial cost to the owner.

In both cases—and I am aware of a number of others—I am informed that the relevant councils were notified and, in one instance, SAPOL was called for urgent assistance. Unfortunately,

in both instances, no further action was taken. From the information I have received, the owners were informed that neither SAPOL nor the councils had the legislative power to impound the offending dogs or to take any further action.

Currently the Criminal Law Consolidation Act has provisions that punish a person who intentionally injures a working animal and this includes assistance animals, of course. This cannot be taken to mean a person who negligently or recklessly allows their animal to cause death or serious harm to working animal. I am advised that, when the legislative changes brought in as a result of the attacks on police dog Koda were introduced, the wider dog community believed that all forms of attack on assistance animals would be covered by these provisions. They are not. They were greatly dismayed to learn that these provisions did not apply to dog attacks on assistance animals.

The Dog and Cat Management Act provides for a range of control measures to manage aggressive dogs and dog-related injury, including control orders and, where applicable, destruction orders, for dangerous, menacing and nuisance dogs. Specifically, the Dog and Cat Management Act imposes a \$2,500 fine and a \$210 expiation fee against persons who own or are responsible for control over a dog where the dog attacks, harasses or chases other persons or animals owned by another person. I am somewhat baffled as to why the relevant councils did not think that these provisions would apply in these cases.

Our Family First offices have received numerous complaints in recent years about the lack of enforcement of the Dog and Cat Management Act in cases such as these. I am aware of numerous dog attacks that have occurred around Somerton Park, in particular, which were reported to both police and the council. Sadly, the information I have is that no action was taken. These attacks required police attendance and ambulance attendance. These were not minor incidents. In one instance, it has been alleged that these dogs were actually mauling an elderly couple.

On further investigation, we have come to be aware that often council officers, through no fault of their own in most circumstances, simply lack the resources, the training, the investigative skills or, indeed, the enforcement powers to sufficiently effect the provisions within the act. Whilst these provisions exist in the Dog and Cat Management Act, in the cases I have mentioned and a number of others regarding assistance animals, it is clear that, for various reasons, effective controls and management are not being exercised. Given the seriousness of attacks on assistance animals in particular, we believe these provisions should be elevated from the Dog and Cat Management Act to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Turning to the bill itself, the concept is in a similar vein to the legislation that we passed in this place in 2013 after the cowardly attack on police dog Koda. Essentially, the bill I am introducing today will hold owners or responsible persons liable for attacks by their dogs that cause serious harm or death to an assistance animal where it is reasonable for them to have proceeded otherwise.

Serious harm is defined as harm that endangers the life of an animal, results in severe injuries to the animal to the point of it being cruel not to destroy the animal, or causes serious and protracted impairment of a physical or mental function or harm that results in the animal being unable to satisfactorily perform its previous work. This is consistent with the definition currently in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I would just like to read part of the email that I received:

As a guide dog user I deeply appreciate the difference having one has made to my daily life. It is one thing to fight an attacking dog when you have sight but another when your vision is greatly impaired and all you can perceive is a very distressed Guide Dog being attacked and not knowing if you may also be injured.

That is the end of the email, but you can imagine how horrific those circumstances would be, especially for someone without sight or with very little sight. This bill recognises that attacks on assistance animals are significant and potentially more dangerous than other attacks. Accordingly, this offence should be investigated by police where appropriate.

An assistance animal is a unique and extensively trained animal that assists a range of people with vision, hearing, medical, behavioural or cognitive impairments. The cost and time invested in training an assistance dog is enormous. I am advised that training an assistance animal for a vision-impaired person costs between \$25,000 and \$30,000, and the working age of the animal is from two to 10 years old. Any loss of the use of an assistance animal, whether that is permanently or for a period of time, can have a significant impact on the individual's social inclusion and their

personal independence and can, quite obviously, cause great distress to the owner and, indeed, those associated with the owner.

Should an animal have to be retired or even euthanased due to an attack, a visually-impaired person can wait anywhere between 12 months and 18 months for a suitable replacement animal. On the lesser end of the injury scale an animal may need to undergo training to overcome the traumatic effects of the attack. This, of course, is costly, potentially leaving the owner out of pocket and without the assistance animal for the period of time of recovery and retraining.

Accordingly, this bill provides that the court may make an order for compensation for veterinary or other costs incurred in treating the animal. We believe these provisions satisfactorily cover the issues such as veterinary, training or other associated costs should the assistance animal be injured. Unfortunately, there will be times when the owners of the dogs may not be identifiable. However, for the most part, we believe this bill provides appropriate protection to ensure that the problems these two constituents encountered become a thing of the past.

We believe this bill is not only reasonable but also necessary as it provides assurance of liability and compensation to some of our community's most vulnerable people in instances where their assistance animals have been injured. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

Motions

FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:21): I move:

That this council—

1. Commends the work of No FGM Australia in raising the awareness of the health and other risks to Australian women and girls of the illegal practice of female genital mutilation and its concerns that—
 - (a) there is a lack of awareness among Australian health and child protection professionals about FGM;
 - (b) no data is collected about prevalence of FGM in South Australian residents; and
 - (c) girls most at risk of FGM are those who come from FGM-affected communities and that in Australia, three girls a day are in the high-risk category;
2. Notes that the World Health Organisation has described FGM as a violation of the human rights of girls and women and constitutes an extreme form of discrimination against women;
3. Notes that FGM has no health benefits and can cause severe urinary, fertility and childbirth complications;
4. Notes the review and recommendations of the Australian government's 2013 Review of Australia's Female Genital Mutilation Legal Framework Final Report; and
5. Notes that Australia's first FGM prosecution is taking place in New South Wales for alleged offences on two young girls who were at the time aged only seven years old.

Just by way of some introductory remarks on this motion, which is in relation to female genital mutilation, I was invited by members of No FGM Australia to meet with them recently, which I did last week. I would like to thank Ms Khadija Gbla and Marijka Ryan for their time and for bringing this matter to my attention.

Prior to meeting with them I had been aware of the matter particularly through the work of the former federal member for Adelaide, the Hon. Trish Worth who, way back in the mid-nineties had been raising the issue of female genital mutilation and the fact that it was a reality for some women and girls living in Australia. I was certainly aware that we had amended our laws in Australia, so I spoke to the parliamentary library just to get a read on what the situation was, and I am grateful for their assistance. The detail they provided to me was that most of the jurisdictions amended their laws in the mid-nineties and have done that through their state laws.

In South Australia we have a couple of acts which cover this issue: the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, in particular at clauses 33, 33A and 33B, and also the Children's Protection Act 1993 at 26A and 26B. There certainly is legislation which not only prohibits the practice from

taking place in South Australia but also has pretty severe prison penalties for people who take others overseas to have the practice done there.

Part of me was wondering what these particular ladies were going to say to me, given that we have laws which stand against the practice and have been on our statute books for quite some time. The matters that they raised with me are clearly that we do have laws—the first items there in the motion, paragraphs 1(a) to (c). Their advice to me is that there is a lack of awareness which leads to risk for women and girls in Australia having to undergo this practice for cultural reasons. I say cultural. I understand that it is cultural and not religious—indeed, it is not part of either Muslim or Christian practice—and yet it is much more prevalent in some communities than others.

Part (a) of the first part of the motion relates to the lack of awareness among Australian health and child protection professionals about FGM. No FGM Australia's advice to me is that Families SA lacks awareness about it as do health workers, that information is not on official forms or in official policies, either for child protection or in health.

Part (b) says that there is no data collected, and that has been confirmed in correspondence that No FGM have received. I would like to quote to back up part of their concerns. They received a letter via email on 1 May this year and the subject of the letter is 'Data on FGM'. I will quote a few sections of it from the SA Health department to No FGM Australia reps, as follows:

It is not possible to provide you with data about the number of women and children who have undergone FGM living in South Australia since there is no robust collection of data of this type.

It goes on:

The issue of FGM data has been a concern across Australia for some time. As part of the National Summit convened by the Australian Government in 2013 in which all States and Territories participated, research and data collection was proposed as an initiative to build the evidence needed to support women and girls affected by FGM in Australia.

One of the projects funded was for the Australian Paediatric Surveillance Unit (APSU) together with the Division of Paediatrics and Child Health of The Royal Australasian College of Physicians, (RACP) to conduct a survey on FGM in children. This survey is current and relies on health service providers and others voluntarily participating. The project is led by Professor Elizabeth Elliot. The project will evaluate the prevalence of FGM in girls under 18 years of age seen by paediatricians or other health practitioners in the last 5 years, and includes information about the practitioners' knowledge, attitudes and clinical practice regarding FGM in Australia.

In relation to part (c) which refers to the demographic of girls who are most at risk of FGM, No FGM Australia says that they are from those communities who practised this barbaric practice in their countries of origin. In the documentation that they have provided to me, which is available on their website www.nofgmoz.com, they state that for women born outside Australia, Australia has over 83,000 women and girls who have migrated to the country (and I assume they mean Australia) who are likely to be survivors of FGM or be at risk of FGM. This includes 5,640 girls who are under the age of 15; this group is at high risk of FGM; and 36,236 women of child-bearing age, between the ages of 15 and 49. They also say that women born outside Australia who are likely to be survivors of FGM are estimated to give birth to about 1,100 girls every year. That is about three per day and these girls are also at high risk of FGM.

They have identified the countries of origin which include a number of African countries and there are some also from Asia. I say that with caution because I would not wish this to become seen as a racial issue. I note from the debate in the mid-1990s that there were concerns raised that particular communities were potentially seen as targets or that it might be seen as some stigmatisation. I think the ultimate concern in this matter is always the welfare of women and children, and I think it is probably just a matter of reality that the population at highest risk is from this particular community.

Point 2 of the motion is in relation to the World Health Organisation, and they have been pretty clear about their views on these matters. The national review that I have already mentioned, which was performed in 2013, has some comments that I think outline the case that the World Health Organisation has put. Page 6 of the Australian government's Review of Australia's Female Genital Mutilation legal framework, the final report, dated March 2013, states:

2.2 Background

Female genital mutilation is an abhorrent practice. It intentionally alters and causes harm to female genital organs for no medical reason and can have serious and long-lasting consequences, including infertility, an increased risk of childbirth complications, and maternal and infant mortality during and shortly after childbirth.

That particular statement is from the World Health Organisation, and the document is at www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs241/en/. The report goes on to state:

The World Health Organisation estimates that female genital mutilation affects about 100-140 million women and girls worldwide, and each year it is estimated that an additional three million girls are at risk of being subjected to the practice globally.

In recognition of the seriousness of female genital mutilation, in December 2012 the United Nations General Assembly unanimously passed a resolution, co-sponsored by Australia, banning the practice of female genital mutilation and encouraging member states to intensify efforts to eliminate this harmful practice. The Prime Minister, the Hon Julia Gillard MP, has indicated that Australia will stand firm with the international community and support all necessary measures to stop female genital mutilation on a global scale.

That really just refers to points 2 and 3 of the motion and that it is globally recognised that this is an appalling practice and that the WHO has condemned it.

Point 4 refers to the review and recommendations of the Australian government 2013 review. I understand that a summit was held and that interjurisdictional representatives were there. The consensus was that there was a lack of reporting between jurisdictions, and there were a number of recommendations that were aimed at improving these matters. I think they do echo the matters that are on No FGM's agenda of concerns.

They also suggested that there be legal harmonisation between the states and territories; which is the jurisdiction that contains the laws in relation to prohibiting female genital mutilation from taking place either in Australia or overseas. It talks about information sharing and other methods for detection. So, it has been recognised nationally that this is a problem and clearly the matter needs to continue to be advanced.

The final point of the motion is to note that there is actually a case. One of the other matters that was found by the summit in 2013, and the report, is that there is a very low number of prosecutions in relation to this matter, which is not to say that they do not take place. It may well be that they are going undetected because of this lack of awareness among our health and child protection authorities.

That case is proceeding through the courts in New South Wales. Anecdotally—and we are dealing with a lot of anecdotal advice on this matter at the moment until these cases are uncovered and taken to court—the person who performed the act was a retired health worker (which is reasonably common where these cases take place) and it took place between the years of 2010 and 2012. Honourable members can avail themselves of the media coverage of that matter, which is continuing to proceed through the courts.

No FGM Australia has been diligent in trying to get as much information in relation to South Australia as they could. They made a freedom of information request to SAPOL. The reply is dated 22 June 2015. They sought: 1. Reports of girls at risk of FGM; 2. Reports of girls who have already been subjected to FGM; information to include date of report, location of report, outcome of report. They say they would like to know how many reports have been made to SAPOL since the 1993 FGM legislation was introduced, so that covers 22 years. The reply states that a search has been undertaken and South Australia Police has not received any complaints relating to FGM since the legislation was introduced, which, I repeat, is no indication that it is not taking place. More than likely it is taking place but is undetected.

According to No FGM Australia in 2011 there was a total of 66,570 people in South Australia who potentially are affected by the practice. Girls most at risk of FGM are those who come from FGM affected communities. They do say that there is anecdotal evidence that girls have been taken from Australia for FGM and they say themselves that women in South Australia are exposed to a high degree of ignorance of FGM by healthcare professionals.

I understand that healthcare professionals and child protection workers are required to make mandatory notifications of the situation, but I understand that there is very little understanding among those workers of their obligations in relation to this particular issue. That in itself, I think, is cause for

huge concern. I am grateful to Khadija and Marijka for raising this issue with me and coming to see me. I did want to raise this with the parliament in the hope that we could give some greater profile to the concern that this practice may be taking place in South Australia, so for that reason I have brought this motion to the Legislative Council and commend it to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:38): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the release of the Victorian Law Reform Commission's landmark report recommending a controlled licensing scheme to produce medical cannabis and congratulates the Andrews government in Victoria for indicating they will take steps to legalise cannabis cultivation for medical use;
2. Recognises the significant body of research supporting the benefits of medical cannabis to treat serious medical conditions including cancer, multiple sclerosis, HIV/AIDS, epilepsy and chronic pain;
3. Notes that more than a dozen countries, including Canada, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Spain and parts of the United States, already permit the use of medical cannabis;
4. Notes the cross-party work led by Greens leader, Richard Di Natale, via the Regulator of Medicinal Cannabis Bill, which could become operational as early as next year; and
5. Calls on the Weatherill government in South Australia to follow the lead of the premiers of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland by acting on medical cannabis reform to ensure that South Australians do not continue to suffer needlessly.

Today I move a motion which notes the release of the Victorian Law Reform Commission's landmark report recommending a controlled licensing system to produce medical cannabis. I congratulate the Andrews government in Victoria for indicating that they will take steps to legalise cannabis cultivation for medical use. I note that there, Daniel Andrews, the Labor Premier, has said in fact it was the proudest moment of his political career to date when he announced that report. I understand why he would say that because he is saving families in Victoria from the suffering that they are enduring.

The motion also goes on to recognise the body of research that exists supporting the benefit of medical cannabis, with particular relevance to conditions including cancer, MS, HIV/AIDS, epilepsy and chronic pain. It notes that more than a dozen countries across the world, including Canada, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Spain and many others, as well as a large number of states in the United States of America, already permit the use of medical cannabis.

I also want to draw the council's attention to the work happening at a federal level, which is cross-party. It is not just bipartisan, not just tripartisan but indeed cross-party: National, Greens, Labor, Liberal, Independent and, I understand, Liberal Democrat as well. I draw the attention of the council to that work, because it will facilitate further action at a state level. Finally, I want to use this opportunity to urge the Weatherill government to follow their Labor counterparts both in other states and at a federal level and end the suffering and stop creating medical refugees, which is an issue I raised in question time today.

The cross-party work that is happening at a federal level is most exciting. Many members of the council would be of course aware of the role of the TGA in regulating drugs in this country, particularly for medical use. That option is not an option for medical cannabis, due to a range of factors. The cross-party group is led by Greens leader, Senator Richard Di Natale, who is a qualified GP and the Greens health spokesperson. He has worked with a range of other members of the federal parliament to introduce the Regulator of Medicinal Cannabis Bill, which can be law by next year.

That legislation at a federal level focuses on the licensing arrangements by creating a regulator for medicinal cannabis. It is needed to support state-based legislation and state-based action to legalise medical cannabis. It is heartwarming to see that the bill has the in principle support of current Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, but I would note it also had the unofficial support of previous prime minister Tony Abbott who, in correspondence to radio announcer Alan Jones, stated

that he thought, in fact, medical cannabis was already legal but certainly did not oppose it being legally available.

I note that there is a lot of hysteria about the idea of cannabis being used as a drug. Well, that is exactly what it is and, for medicines across the country, of course we see many drugs that are illegal in other forms used in a medical format, so in that way it is no different. In some ways, in terms of having a pharmaceutical backer to see it go over the various hurdles that we quite rightly have in place in this country, cannabis is not in the realm of having one of those companies or sponsors take it through our current processes, so the Regulator of Medicinal Cannabis Bill, should it become an act and should it become law, seeks to remedy that particular ailment that we face.

As Senator Richard Di Natale has said, there is no reason why Australia could not begin importing medical cannabis and making it available to patients next year, before moving to establish a local industry here. I note that there are indeed local industries here such as Tascann, which have indicated that they would certainly be willing, able and ready to assist with that production.

The Andrews government has taken the lead in this past week. They have become the first state in Australia to announce that they will legalise cannabis cultivation for medical use. It follows their report that they referred to the Victorian Law Reform Commission which has recommended a controlled licensing system to produce medical cannabis. That commission has also recommended licensing cultivators and manufacturers to produce the drug under laws similar to those governing that state's opium poppy industry.

Although Victoria is already participating in the New South Wales trial, specialist commissioner Ian Freckelton said that the commission formed the view that they should not wait for the trial to conclude in New South Wales before moving to legalise cannabis cultivation in Victoria. I quote the specialist commissioner's words:

We were satisfied on the basis of those whom we met, many of whom had utilised medicinal cannabis to their advantage, and on the basis of research evidence, that it is an appropriate time for this modest step to be taken to alleviate suffering.

The medical cannabis that will be available in Victoria in the near future will be available in a variety of forms. Those forms include tinctures, oils, capsules, sprays and vaporisable liquid, but they do not include the smoking of any form of cannabis. In WA, I note that the health minister, Kim Hames, wants officials to examine options for that state to link in with the trials soon to begin and currently in train in New South Wales. Although clinical trials could be legally established in WA, he has certainly directed his officials to investigate that state's participation in those trials.

I note that the Queensland Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, has stated that she could not sit on her hands watching Queenslanders suffer, so she has similarly approved involvement in those New South Wales clinical trials, as did her counterpart, the previous Liberal premier in Victoria (Denis Napthine) prior to the Andrews government coming to power. We also have Lara Giddings, the leader of the Labor Party in Tasmania, urging the Liberal Premier to allow Tasmanians to take part in the trial and urging urgent action on this issue.

Labor leaders around the country, and Liberal leaders around the country, are acting on this issue. You might wonder why they are acting on something that might be seen as controversial. I think those premiers and those leaders who have spoken to sufferers in their states, almost without exception, have had a change of heart, have found the political courage to act on this issue and have found that the public will support them. When you see the suffering that some families are going through and when you look at the evidence that over a dozen countries around the world are already doing this, how could you but say that you will help, particularly children, but also those who are sick and suffering—and sick and suffering needlessly. It may not be the silver bullet, and I certainly do not believe that medical cannabis is a cure all; it is not necessarily even the first course of treatment, but it should be in the suite of treatments that we allow sufferers access to.

The Fulton family of Victor Harbor are currently spread across the globe. Bobby Fulton, the mother to two girls who suffer from a rare degenerative diffuse lung disease, has travelled to Canada, where in that country it is possible for them to access medicinal cannabis treatments. They have gone through the processes there and they have secured prescriptions through that country's legalised system, and now they are waiting to be allowed to return to South Australia, but to continue

medicating their daughters. In the meantime, the father and the boys are still living in South Australia and the family is split up. The family pretty much sold up many of their possessions to get to Canada and to get this treatment, which they see as life saving for their children, and they are in a desperate situation.

In Canada, there have been TV programs and much media attention about this Australian family who has fled to Canada to seek this medical treatment—and the success story of the treatment. As I mentioned today, with the girls receiving the medical treatment for their conditions in Canada, there has been great success. They are currently living a much fuller, healthier and certainly less painful life in Canada, but there is the pain of not being able to return home. There is also the financial strain on this family of their having to flee their home country because their home country and their home state were doing nothing to help them alleviate their suffering.

As I noted today in question time, for example, Tabatha had a lump on her neck, weight gain and depression, and she had been on an oxygen tank. Within weeks of being able to access medicinal cannabis, those symptoms were alleviated and she was able to live a much better life.

In New South Wales, one of the first premiers to act was Mike Baird—and, again, I commend him for that. He is obviously a Liberal Premier so, as I have said, this is a cross-party affair—particularly because of his contact with the Haslam family, who many people would be aware of through the various television programs which focused on the now late Daniel Haslam, who was suffering from his cancer and was unable to eat.

His dad, a police officer, and his mum, a nurse, lived in Tamworth, a rural community in New South Wales. These are very conservative, rural people. They have become medical cannabis advocates and warriors. Indeed, Lucy Haslam is taking the fight right up to government. That family is the family who met with Mike Baird and changed his opinion on this issue.

That family was put into such dire straits that the father, who had worked as a police officer, was illegally securing cannabis in order that his son might not live wracked with pain and might be able to consume some food and keep it down. These are the dire straits that we are putting Australians in in this country, and these are the very sufferers who other premiers and other Labor leaders have taken leadership on.

Premier Mike Baird has enabled medical trials to commence in New South Wales. There will be three phases of those trials, the first looking at children with epilepsy. I note that, when the trials were first announced, there was some thought that, in fact, they would be open only to adults and deal only with conditions such as cancer. But very quickly he realised that those families who have children suffering from uncontrollable seizures, seizures which dozens of medications had failed to control, needed to be included in these trials. I commend these trials. I note that Victoria and Queensland are enabling their residents to take part in these trials, yet South Australians continue to sit by the sidelines. As Mike Baird said at the time he announced those trials:

Why are these people who are in the fight of their lives, why are they undertaking pharmacy in their backyards? Why don't we get the best minds in the country to see whether they can solve this, and let those with terminal illness spend time with themselves and spend time with their family.

I think that Premier Mike Baird has his priorities right, but in this state all we hear on medical cannabis is crickets from this government. We have seen inaction, we have seen sitting by the sidelines, we have seen rhetoric and words saying, 'Yes, of course we support these New South Wales clinical trials as an observer state,' but no money has been put up, there has been no work done to enable South Australians to participate in the trials.

Certainly, there has been no referral—as the Victorian government has done in their short time in office—to law reform commissions or reviews. There has been no investigation of how we could adapt our current laws to enable the provision of a medicine to those who are sick and suffering in our state.

What we have, as I say, are medical refugees like the Fulton family. What we have are girls like Charlotte whose father, Mark Elliott, has watched her suffer through dozens of seizures a week. He would dearly love to be able to attempt to medicate Charlotte and to see if medical cannabis might indeed work where the dozens of other medications have failed. He does not want to break

the law, so he will not do that, and so what he has to do is watch his daughter suffer through up to 40 seizures a week.

Yet, across the world, some patients have responded to this treatment. Of course, not all medications work with all patients and you need to do things in a clinical environment and through a regulated system. The regulator of medical cannabis that the cross-party federal parliamentarians are proposing provides the framework, but what we are still lacking in this state is the political will of the Premier.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:56): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that the first week of October each year has been declared Borderline Personality Disorder Awareness Week; and
2. Acknowledges that the Australian Borderline Personality Disorder Foundation, through ongoing advocacy from Ms Janne McMahon OAM, Dr Martha Kent and Associate Professor Andrew Chanen, has been fundamental in promoting understanding of the disorder in the community and working towards better treatment options and quality of life for those affected by the disorder.

I rise very briefly today to note that the first week of October each year has been declared Borderline Personality Disorder Awareness Week and to comment that that week has just recently passed in South Australia.

I note that there was a conference held at the Flinders University which I was unable to attend, but at which my staff member represented me. It was opened by former Greens senator Penny Wright and it certainly looked to be quite an outstanding event. I am not sure whether other members of this place were able to attend that conference, but I look forward to their contributions in which they make the council aware of that fact.

I speak today to raise awareness about borderline personality disorder. A week is a very fine way of doing so, and I note that the first week in October (1 to 7 October) is indeed on the federal health calendar as a nationwide event. Those members of the council who remember the debate on a very similar motion last year might remember that the Labor members of this place did not recognise this week and suggested that in fact BPD, yet again, be subsumed within the overall mental health awareness week. I note that the mental health awareness week is also currently in train but that the dates are slightly different and, while there is overlap, they are distinct areas that should both receive awareness.

At the time, the Labor members of this place sought to amend the motion, noting that they would be exploring ways for improving networking of South Australian borderline personality disorder experts, rather than recognising the week. This motion today is an opportunity for this council to yet again recognise Borderline Personality Disorder Awareness Week as the first week in October and to update all members and the South Australian community as to how awareness was raised around BPD in this week.

I look forward to Labor members coming back and telling us how the government has improved networking for the South Australian borderline personality disorder experts, what involvement they had with the conference that was held at Flinders University on 2 October and what updates they have on the proposal for a specialised unit.

The Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Stephen Wade and I have certainly renewed our calls for a dedicated specialised service for borderline personality disorder as part of our commitment to BPD awareness. We do so because we know that this is a diagnosis that affects somewhere between 17,000 and 68,000 South Australians and that there are major gaps in the service provisions throughout our state for this population, particularly in rural and remote settings but also in the metropolitan area.

We also wanted to pay tribute to those lives lost—some nine deaths at least in the last 36 months that we know of, many of which need not have occurred. Also there are those very sad

suicides, which, of course, have a flow-on effect of devastation, sadness and loss for the families, friends, loved ones and colleagues of those people who found themselves in the position of taking their own life.

We look forward to the Labor government contributing to this motion. I certainly am keen to hear about the work that is being undertaken. We know that those who are working very hard to raise awareness about BPD and to get adequate services in this state are looking forward to seeing what this government has to offer as a contribution, not just to this debate but, of course, to the disorder overall. With that I commend the motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Sitting suspended from 18:02 to 19:47.

ELDER ABUSE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.L. Vincent:

That the Social Development Committee inquire into and report on matters relating to elder abuse in South Australia including—

1. The prevalence of abuse (including but not limited to financial abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological abuse, social abuse, chemical abuse and neglect) experienced by older people in South Australia;
2. The most common forms of abuse experienced by older persons and the most common relationships or settings in which abuse occurs;
3. The types of government and/or community support services sought by, or on behalf of, victims of elder abuse and the nature of service received from those agencies and organisations;
4. The adequacy of the policies, resources, powers and expertise of specialist agencies (including South Australia Police, Office of the Public Advocate, Aged Rights Advocacy Service, Legal Services Commission, Public Trustee, Domiciliary Care South Australia) and other relevant service agencies to respond to allegations of elder abuse;
5. Identifying effective ways to improve reporting of and responding to elder abuse to assist in establishing best practice strategies for multi-agency responses;
6. Identifying any strength-based initiatives which empower older persons to better protect themselves from risks of abuse as they age;
7. The effectiveness of South Australian laws, policies, services and strategies, including the South Australian Strategy for Safeguarding Older People 2014-2021 in safeguarding older persons from abuse;
8. Innovation for long-term integrated systems and proactive measures to respond to the increasing number of older persons, including consideration of their diverse needs and experiences, to prevent abuse;
9. The consideration of new proposals or initiatives which may enhance existing strategies for safeguarding older persons who may be vulnerable to abuse or prevent such abuse, including with reference to international best practice;
10. Identifying ways to inform older South Australians about online scams to which they may be vulnerable; and
11. Any other related matter.

(Continued from 23 September 2015.)

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (19:47): I rise to indicate the government's support of this motion. In doing so, I would like to point out some of the actions currently in train by the government. In 2014, the Minister for Ageing, the Hon. Zoe Bettison, released the Strategy to Safeguard the Rights of Older South Australians, and then in June this year she issued an action plan to drive its implementation. The focus of this strategy is the prevention of elder abuse across the continuum, from building resilience and reducing risk in the community through to service responses to abuse and opportunities to strengthen supportive legislation.

The cabinet endorsed the plan, including a budget of \$753,000 over the forward estimates. The safeguarding strategy and action plan were developed over a number of years through close

consultation and engagement with the key stakeholders, including but not limited to SAPOL, Office of the Public Advocate, Aged Rights Advocacy Service, Legal Services Commission, the Public Trustee and Domiciliary Care, to name a few.

All these organisations are currently contributing to the implementation of the strategy. A public consultation on the strategy was also undertaken as part of the policy development. The work of the steering committee overseeing the strategy addressed many of the proposed terms of the proposed inquiry and as such could inform the Social Development Committee in an inquiry to build and leverage from the recent work. There are a number of elements in the action plan which will directly address or inform the proposed terms of inquiry. However, having only been released in June 2015, its implementation is at its very early stage.

The key actions of relevance currently underway include a prevalence research study being undertaken by the University of South Australia to establish a baseline for elder abuse prevalence in South Australia because one does not currently exist; the establishment of an elder abuse prevention phone line to commence operation in October, that is, this month, bringing South Australia into line with all other Australian jurisdictions; evaluation of the phone line during its first nine months of operation to identify support services sought and the effectiveness of service referrals; a community awareness campaign that is both media and web-based to raise the profile of elder abuse as an issue of growing concern; and also numerous research and resource development projects to identify and promote resilient strategies and factors across the community.

Given that the Social Development Committee inquiry is unlikely to commence before late 2016, it will allow the committee to make use of the outcomes of the activities currently underway to inform its findings and recommendations. I also point out that the committee may well like to see the impact of service provision to the elderly at a broader level, including services provided by the federal government and other corporate service providers, as this certainly impacts on the broader issue of elder abuse. As I said, the government supports the motion, and I look forward to the Social Development Committee conducting the proposed inquiry.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (19:52): I rise on behalf of the Liberal team to support the motion. I thank the Hon. Kelly Vincent for bringing this important issue before us. Elder abuse relates to any kind of harm inflicted on an elderly person occurring within a relationship where there is an expectation of trust. This abuse can take many forms including physical, psychological, financial, sexual and social abuse and can have a devastating effect on its victims.

Given our ageing population, it is not surprising that elder abuse is an issue of growing importance and concern in South Australia. Statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics suggest that the number of people aged over 65 could more than double in the next 50 years from 270,000 in 2012 to 580,000 in 2061—a 115 per cent increase. Clearly we must ensure that the rights of this growing segment of our population are protected through initiatives such as education support services and legislation.

It is currently estimated that between 3 and 5 per cent of people aged over 65 have experienced some form of elder abuse. Sadly, the vast majority of these cases go unreported, highlighting the need for concerted action. I acknowledge the comprehensive and well-structured terms of reference put forward for the committee by the Hon. Kelly Vincent and I would like to highlight two particular elements. Point 6 of the terms of reference asks the committee to identify:

...any strength-based initiatives which empower older persons to better protect themselves from risks of abuse as they age.

As the Liberal team, we strongly believe in the dignity of the individual and that the state should act to empower individuals in ways such as empowering people to protect themselves. While these strength-based initiatives are valued, they need to be realistic about the capacity of people to take action on their own behalf, particularly when ageing can also be accompanied by cognitive impairment. There are already over 340,000 Australians living with dementia and this number is set to rise to almost 900,000 by 2050. Conditions such as dementia limit an individual's capacity to adopt these strength-based initiatives. In any case, even if elderly individuals do not have cognitive impairment, they may not have the capacity to communicate their wishes.

One example of state action to empower older South Australians to protect themselves is the use of advance care planning. I commend the work the government has done in its Planning Ahead program which encourages elderly people to write an advance care directive laying down their instructions for their health, living and end-of-life care. I think it is important that we ensure there are mechanisms to monitor the implementation of advance care directives, including compliance with the orders.

Often there is, I believe, pressure on health professionals to override the stated wishes of the person who has made the advance care directive in deference to the wishes of friends and family and I do not consider that is appropriate. Point 7 of the terms of reference asks the committee to inquire into:

The effectiveness of South Australian laws, policies, services and strategies, including the South Australian Strategy for Safeguarding Older People.

The government's action plan promises to introduce a series of measures to curb elder abuse, some of which include:

- raising awareness in the workplace, particularly in financial, legal and health sectors;
- developing a new elder abuse prevention website;
- promoting a planning ahead message;
- empowering older people by informing them of their rights; and
- collaboratively producing a new age-friendly resource to help raise awareness of older people's rights.

I might just pause there and make a comment that I have had feedback from some organisations serving older South Australians that, whilst there are many older South Australians who readily embrace IT, there have been examples recently of government initiatives built around an IT response which actually significantly impair the access of older South Australians. In particular, I have heard concern expressed in relation to the commonwealth government's My Aged Care website. Whilst I think it is important to make sure that information is available in a range of formats, we need to be careful that we do not assume that the preferences of older South Australians will be the same as some other generational groups.

I believe it is important that the committee plays a role in monitoring the implementation of the government's commitments, and I acknowledge the comments of the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars that the likely timing of this committee inquiry may well give the committee a good distance from the implementation of some of the government's strategies so that assessments can be made of progress. On too many occasions, governments overpromise and under-deliver, and on an important issue such as elder abuse it is important that that not be the case in this area.

In conclusion, I reiterate the Liberal team's support for the motion of the Hon. Kelly Vincent which seeks to address this important issue. We look forward to the work of the committee, including the contribution made by members of our own team within that committee, and we look forward to the outcomes.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (19:58): In summing up, I would like to thank the speakers to this motion, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars for the government and the Hon. Stephen Wade for the opposition, and I also thank those who have indicated their support without necessarily making a contribution to the motion. I believe I am correct in saying that that is all parties. I certainly thank parliamentary colleagues for that support.

I particularly thank the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars for reminding the chamber of what is being done in the area of elder abuse prevention. I certainly would not want to make it seem as though, by putting this recommendation forward or calling for this inquiry, Dignity for Disability was somehow suggesting that nothing was being done because we certainly understand that the government is doing some quite comprehensive work in this area. However, as has been pointed out, point 7 of the terms of reference asks the committee to review existing government policy, including the South

Australian Strategy for Safeguarding Older People, which is the very policy that the Hon. Mr Kandelaars mentioned.

I believe it is important that these policies are regularly reviewed so that they do not languish or become outdated. Unfortunately, we do not have to think too hard to think of examples where that has occurred. While not wanting to deny that things are being done, I want to encourage the regular review of existing policy.

As was rightly pointed out, the time at which this inquiry is likely to start getting traction is likely to be mid to late next year. This will give us some distance from the beginning of that safeguarding policy, and hopefully it will give the committee the opportunity to review what has been done without jumping the gun and trying to review something that has not yet started.

I would also like to thank the Hon. Mr Wade for reminding us about the rate at which the South Australian population is ageing and that the needs of this community need to be taken very seriously, particularly because it is a growing sector. The Hon. Mr Wade also talked quite comprehensively about the need to give people the skills and resources to protect themselves. As a party, Dignity for Disability believes that we need both the resources and the skills to empower people to know their rights and their responsibilities and to recognise and speak out about abuse. We need measures to protect those who might not be able to do so or to protect people where the measures to enable them to speak up for themselves fail for any reason.

The Hon. Mr Wade also rightly points out—as I recall I did in my opening speech in calling for this inquiry—that information technology can be a barrier for some older South Australians because it is not necessarily part of their everyday life, and I certainly agree. That is not to say that all older Australians have trouble with technology. However, I think it is fair to say that, due to the fact that often they have not grown up with it or used it on a daily basis, as some of us in this chamber here tonight might, I think there is significant concern about the potential susceptibility of older Australians to things like telemarketers and online scams. That is certainly covered in the terms of reference.

I would like to again thank the speakers and my parliamentary colleagues from all sides for their support. Again, I would like to place on the record my thanks and Dignity for Disability's thanks to those advocacy bodies and individuals, particularly the Aged Rights Advocacy Service, the Council on the Ageing and Professor Wendy Lacey for their support and assistance in putting what I believe is a very comprehensive terms of reference together, which will hold the committee in good stead for its inquiry.

In closing, I would like to thank the chamber and my parliamentary colleagues this evening for assisting Dignity for Disability in sending a very strong message that humanity and human worth do not diminish with age. Thank you.

Motion carried.

NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (20:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the Centenary of the 1915 Nobel Prize awarded to father and son recipients, William Bragg and Lawrence Bragg; and
2. Recognises, with appreciation, their contribution to science and their connection to the state of South Australia.

It is an honour to move this motion to acknowledge the father and son team of William and Lawrence Bragg at the time of the centenary of the 1915 Nobel Prize and also recognise their contribution to science in South Australia and around the world.

I note that the member for Bragg in another place, Vickie Chapman MP, has given notice of a similar motion in the House of Assembly. Having contributed significantly to South Australia, the Braggs were honoured with the naming of the electorate (served by Ms Chapman) after them. The member for Bragg will speak again on this matter in the House of Assembly in November.

William Bragg was born in England in 1862 and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. After graduating with first-class honours in 1885, he emigrated to South Australia in 1886 and became Professor of Mathematics and Physics at the University of Adelaide. He married Gwendoline Todd in 1889 and their son, William Lawrence, was born in Adelaide in 1890.

Lawrence studied at St Peter's College and then started at the University of Adelaide at the age of 16, studying chemistry, maths and physics. The family returned to England in 1908, when Lawrence graduated university and William was appointed Cavendish Chair of Physics at the University of Leeds. In 1914, at the age of just 24, Lawrence was appointed fellow and lecturer in natural sciences at Trinity College, and that same year was awarded the Barnard Medal. Sadly, it was around this time that William's other son, Robert, was killed in the Gallipoli campaign.

William and Lawrence began work together in 1913-14 and made significant contributions to the science world. Together, they founded a new branch of science: the analysis of crystal structure by means of x-rays. This was named Bragg's Law, a law which makes it possible to calculate the positions of atoms from within a crystal by using the x-ray to shoot light into the crystal and see how that light reflects off the crystal surface. William and Lawrence were jointly awarded the Nobel prize in 1915 as a result of their work, and to this day Lawrence remains the youngest ever Nobel laureate in physics.

During the First World War, William was put in charge of research on the detection and measurement of underwater sounds in the use of locating submarines. In 1917, William was appointed a Commander of the Order of the British Empire and in 1920 he was knighted. The Order of Merit followed in 1931.

Lawrence eventually moved to the University of Manchester after being appointed as Langworthy Professor of Physics in 1919. During both World Wars he worked on sound-ranging methods for locating enemy guns. He also worked in the study of proteins, aiding Francis Crick and James D. Watson in their discovery of the structure of DNA. Lawrence was knighted in 1941, received the Copley Medal, the Royal Medal of the Royal Society and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. In 1921, he married Alice Jenny, with whom he had two daughters and two sons.

In 2014, I was fortunate enough to travel to the University of Manchester to meet with some eminent suicide prevention researchers who are based there. While walking through the grounds, because I was a little bit early, I was surprised to find a static tribute in the grounds dedicated to the father and son scientists from Adelaide. This was part of a series of tributes to people connected to the University of Manchester who had been awarded the Nobel prize. I was pleased to learn recently from the University of Manchester that another plaque dedicated to the Braggs will be unveiled at that university in November.

Currently, in Adelaide, there is a bust of Lawrence Bragg placed on North Terrace outside the University of Adelaide and I am pleased to say that on 2 December, to celebrate the centenary of the awarding of the Nobel prize, a bronze bust of William will be placed on North Terrace to accompany the one of Lawrence. The Braggs remain significant figures in South Australian history as well as international history, and I look forward to the celebration of the upcoming centenary of their award. I advise members that I intend to seek a vote on this motion on Wednesday 18 November. I commend the motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. S.G. Wade:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the health, social and financial impact of Transforming Health.
2. That the committee consist of three members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at two members and that standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

to which the Hon. T.T. Ngo moved to amend at the end of paragraph 2 by inserting the following: 'and federal government funding cuts to the South Australian health system'

and to which amendment the Hon. T.A. Franks moved to amend by inserting 'and state' after 'federal'.

(Continued from 23 September 2015.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (20:09): I am briefly concluding my remarks that I commenced at the previous meeting of this house. I think I will just limit my remarks to noting that, since we last met, the government has abandoned its plans for the Modbury Hospital. In March, the government told residents of the north-eastern suburbs that in the future they would have their cataracts removed, their laser corrections done and their glaucoma treatment done locally at the Modbury Hospital. It was a proposal that was immediately condemned by many in the ophthalmological profession and yet it took the government eight months to back down on that decision, to accept the fact that the plan was ill conceived and not properly consulted.

What that does, in my view, is justify the benefits of the committee. The government has for eight months stonewalled on criticism of its proposal and steamed ahead in spite of that. In the end, they have been forced to backflip on this key plank of their health reform plan. One can say, considering that that proposal was only one of a plethora of elements of the plan which have been the subject of very intense criticism, that one wonders how many more planks will fall over, how many more elements will need to be withdrawn when they are put to proper scrutiny. I am reminded of the advocacy of the Hon. Kelly Vincent. Paraquad SA, which I was pleased to support, was highlighting the deficiencies in the government's proposal in relation to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and in particular the rehabilitation facilities.

In so many areas of this proposal there are so many unanswered questions, I believe that a select committee is turning out to be the only tool that the people of South Australia have to insist on openness and transparency on what is, after all, one of the most fundamental areas of human services in our state. In concluding my remarks, I look forward to further consideration of the motion.

Hon. T.A. Franks' amendment to Hon. T.T. Ngo's amendment negatived; Hon. T.T. Ngo's amendment negatived; motion carried.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (20:13): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. T.A. Franks, the Hon. T.T. Ngo and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I move:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on 18 November 2015.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the committee to consist of four members and that the Hon. J.A. Darley be appointed a member of the committee.

Motion carried.

WINSTON CHURCHILL MEMORIAL TRUST

The Hon. J.S. LEE (20:14): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the 50th anniversary of the formation of the Winston Churchill Trust in Australia in 2015;
2. Congratulates and pays tribute to the committee and volunteers at Churchill Fellows Association of South Australia for their commitment to honour Sir Winston Churchill's legacy in South Australia; and

3. Recognises the achievements of Churchill Fellows for their outstanding research and contribution to the Australian society.

It is a great honour for me to take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding leader, Sir Winston Churchill, and acknowledge his incredible legacy in the form of the Churchill Memorial Trust that provides significant opportunities for many South Australians and individuals around the world.

Arguably one of the greatest wartime leaders of the 20th century, Sir Winston Churchill was the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1940 to 1945 and again from 1951 to 1955. Churchill was also an officer in the British Army, an historian, a writer and an artist. He won the Nobel Prize in Literature and was the first person to be made an honorary citizen of the United States. As British Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill rallied the British people during World War II and led his country from the brink of defeat to victory. This motion serves to honour the memory of a significant political leader who, after his death, continues to bring positive benefits to Australians.

The principal purpose of the trust is to preserve and honour the memory and legacy of Sir Winston Churchill by the award of travelling fellowships, known as Churchill Fellowships. The Churchill Fellowship is a merit-based program that benefits individuals who have determination, drive and dedication in their specialised field. It does not discriminate a person by their background. There are no prescribed qualifications required in order to apply for a Churchill Fellowship. The subject of the proposed project is very broad, as long as the applicant can demonstrate that a project can deliver a benefit to Australia and a willingness to share the research findings with the Australian community is displayed.

Churchill Fellowships provide financial support to enable Australian citizens from all walks of life to travel overseas to undertake a comparative study, analysis or investigation of a project or an issue that cannot be readily undertaken in Australia for the enrichment of Australian society.

Currently, the average Fellowship fund is about \$25,000 per person. Churchill Fellowships are unique, for there is no other similar study program in Australia quite like it. The awarding of the scholarship is merit based. The applicants will be selected based on past achievements or demonstrated ability for future achievement in wide-ranging sectors. Ultimately, the Churchill Fellow will return with substantial skills and knowledge from overseas, and it aims to reward proven achievement of talented and deserving Australians with further opportunity in their pursuit of excellence for the betterment of Australian society.

Let us go back in history and look at how this important trust was established. After World War II, many honours were conferred on Sir Winston Churchill from all over the world and many physical memorials were created in the form of statues and buildings. In 1962, the Duke of Edinburgh asked Sir Winston Churchill, then aged 88, what type of memorial he would like to be established in his name so that the world could remember him. The concept of a unique form of memorial to be set up after his death pleased him very much.

As a leader who embraced fairness and equal opportunities for all, Churchill suggested that something like the Rhodes Scholarship, but available to a wider selection of people. Back in those days, 50 years ago, scholars often could not afford to travel overseas because accommodation, transportation and living expenses would be very expensive. This led to the concept of travelling fellowships bearing Sir Winston Churchill's name to provide opportunities to enable ordinary people from participating countries to travel overseas to meet professionals and experts, to learn and to explore new frontiers.

The concept was developed jointly by the English-Speaking Union of the Commonwealth and of the United States. Australia was among the countries that laid plans for a nation-wide appeal on the death of Sir Winston Churchill to set up a national Churchill Trust. Although Churchill had thoroughly approved the project when it was first cleared with him by the English-Speaking Union in the 1950s, in order not to upset Sir Winston in his declining years about planning for actions, it was kept secret at Lady Churchill's request until Churchill had passed away.

The planning for the appeal to raise funds for the establishment of the Churchill Trust in Australia nevertheless continued under the codename 'operation G'—G for gratitude—under the leadership of the then councillor, later Sir William Kilpatrick. The master plan was so well executed that, immediately on Churchill's death on 24 January 1965, a nationwide appeal for funds was

launched by Sir Robert Menzies with councillor Kilpatrick as the chairman of the appeal committee. There was an overwhelming response by the commonwealth and state governments and by Australian companies and individuals. The trust was established following the most successful one-day fundraising campaign in Australia's history.

The Returned and Services League brilliantly planned and executed a nationwide doorknock on Churchill Memorial Day on Sunday 28 February 1965. The very willing national response of Australia's returned servicemen in conducting what was the greatest one-day doorknock in Australian history showed the admiration and respect that the Australian fighting men and women of World War II held for Sir Winston Churchill.

On the appeal day in South Australia, 30,000 collectors called on 600,000 homes. All money collected on the day was banked on that day. Banks opened especially for the appeal day. South Australia's goal was \$180,000 while, Australia-wide, the objective was \$2 million. In South Australia alone, \$428,000 was collected and approximately \$4.5 million was collected Australia-wide. This is probably the most successful fundraising event ever in Australia, as remarkable as the man it honoured.

In fact, for those who want to think about the dollar values in pounds, the one-day doorknock raised £911,000, which is equivalent to about \$1.822 million, and nation-wide, £2,206,000 was raised. In today's dollars, I was told by the trust that this figure would be in the order of about \$54 million; so you can get your calculator out if you like to make sure the sum is correct.

The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust was established to administer not only the total funds raised by the 1965 appeal but also the Churchill Fellowship award scheme. The trust has its national office at Churchill Office, Canberra. The board of directors are responsible for the management of funds invested and the conferring of Churchill Fellowships. All directors serve in an honorary capacity.

Those funds collected in 1965 were widely invested, and have enabled over 3,000 fellowships to be awarded across Australia, of which over 300 are from South Australia. Churchill Fellowships have been awarded in just about every field imaginable.

Since the first fellowships were awarded in 1966, it is recorded that more than 4,000 have been awarded nationally, with 109 fellowships being awarded nationally this year in 2015 with a value of more than \$2.7 million. In the period between the Churchill trust's inception in 1965 and 2015, 359 South Australians have been awarded Churchill Fellowships.

In Australia, the trust is overseen by a national board. There is a regional committee in each state and territory that conducts the selection process, and panels all consist of volunteers. I wish to place on the record my appreciation to all the past and present presidents, chairs and committee members for their incredible contributions in serving the trust.

In South Australia, the Churchill Fellows Association of South Australia is an incorporated association run by a properly constituted management committee. The association is made up of Fellows who are passionate about their field and are prepared to share their knowledge with all Australians.

The objective and purpose of the association is to offer advice and support to applicants, mentor new Fellows and promote the common interests of Fellows and the trust. Throughout the year, the Churchill Fellows Association hosts a number of events. These platforms allow people to meet other Fellows, share their passion and develop a network with other Churchill Fellows from around Australia and across the world.

This year, on Friday 21 August, I was very privileged to be invited as a special guest to attend their 50th anniversary dinner. The event combined an AGM where they welcomed new Fellows as well as celebrated Churchill Fellows who had achieved their 25th anniversaries. The dinner provided me with the opportunity to meet with so many outstanding and inspiring Churchill Fellows and learn about the vast experience from the recipients of the Churchill Fellowships.

I wish to put on the record my special thanks to all the contributors and acknowledge the wonderful work of the current committee members: the regional chair in South Australia, Ms Alexandra Cannon, who is also a member of the national board; Mr Chris Fennell, a member of

the national board; Mr Graeme Adcock, president of the South Australian branch of the Winston Churchill Fellow Trust; Geoff Sauer, secretary of the SA regional committee; and Mr Peter Elder, treasurer of the SA trust.

I would also like to put the names of the committee on the record: Maxie Ashton, Brenton Banham, Julie Dini, Baohong Hou, Christine Morris, Annie O'Connell, Allison Russell, Pat Toolan, Gillan Weiss and Maria Tomasic. I would like to thank all of the committee members for supplying me with a wealth of information in my preparation for my speech today as well.

The annual dinner was an outstanding evening. It promoted the achievements of the trust over the last 50 years and highlighted the work and dedication of many Fellows. There are so many Fellows from diverse backgrounds. I have personally met so many of them and would like to mention and particularly highlight a few dynamic leaders within our community.

The first person I would like to mention is Mr Ian Tolley OAM, a citrus grower and nurseryman of Renmark who studied citriculture and problems of citrus growing in the USA and the East. Mr Tolley, based in the Riverland, operates Tolley's Nursery. After a lifetime of fieldwork and research, last year he published a book called *Commonsense Citrus: a Hands-on Guide to Propagation and Planting*. He has more than half a century of experience of citrus growing at all levels, and he was one of the first Churchill Fellows who was granted the scholarship. Congratulations to him.

The second worthy mention is one of the first Churchill recipients, Dr Maurice Sando OBE, Director of Anaesthesia and Respiratory Resuscitation at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Dr Sando studied intensive medical care (particularly, assisted breathing) at various hospitals around the globe, including Canada, USA, Europe and the UK. Dr Sando studied medicine at the University of Adelaide and, after working as a resident medical officer at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in 1954, travelled to England to undertake further study at St Bartholomew's Hospital in Kent. These are worthy mentions in terms of the Churchill Fellows.

As it is the year of the 50th anniversary, I would also like to pay tribute to the 2015 Churchill Fellows. The first worthy mention is Ms Jodie Zada. I think this name probably may not ring a bell for many of you, but it certainly rings a bell for our Deputy Clerk and Black Rod, as Ms Jodie Zada is actually the wife of Chris Schwarz. I also acknowledge that Chris was also at the 50th anniversary dinner that evening.

Jodie has been awarded a Churchill Fellowship for 2015. She will travel to the USA and Canada in April 2016 to complete her research into family inclusive practices in the mental health treatment of Defence Force members. This might also be of particular interest to the Hon. John Dawkins, with his passion for advocating for mental health issues. The other worthy mentions for the 2015 Churchill Fellowships are as follows:

- Dr Marion Eckert, who will be doing a special study on a cancer survivorship monitoring tool for South Australia. Dr Marion Eckert will be travelling to Austria, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.
- Ms Donna Mayhew will travel to the UK and Canada to investigate interagency information-sharing practice and protocols and their effect on safeguarding.
- Ms Necia Mickel will investigate the role of the built and landscape environment in improving wellbeing and recovery outcomes for veterans suffering stress, including post-traumatic stress. She will be travelling to Germany, the Netherlands, the UK, Canada and the USA.
- Ms Penelope Griggs will investigate exceptional visual arts events that attract tourism and opportunities for local artists. She will be travelling to the UK, Austria, Spain, Italy and France.
- Ms Heather Smith will be doing a robust governance structure investigation in community energy schemes. Ms Smith will be going to Japan, Germany, Denmark, the UK and the USA.

- Mr Tyson Grubb will investigate the use of low-cost drones for improving environmental research with reduced funding. He will be going to China, the USA, the United Arab Emirates, Switzerland and the UK.
- Ms Gina Dal Santo was awarded the Churchill Fellows' Association of South Australia Fellowship to develop a national centre for cheese education, creating an artisan cheese industry. This will be looking at the USA, France and the UK.
- Last but not least, Dr Edward Bullitis will investigate services and practices relevant to homeless individuals exhibiting premature ageing, something probably the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars and the Hon. Kelly Vincent will be interested to look at for our Social Development Committee.

As you can see, there is quite a wideranging field of studies and investigations. Congratulations to all of the 2015 Churchill Fellowship awardees.

In closing, I would like to say that Sir Winston Churchill was well known as a champion of freedom and civilisation. His legacy and reputation stands strong today. I am truly honoured to move this motion today in respect of the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust. The work of the South Australian branch of the trust has given so many meaningful opportunities to individuals and industries that truly benefit South Australia. Congratulations to all the distinguished fellows and scholars of the Churchill Memorial Trust. Happy 50th anniversary. I wholeheartedly commend this motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

RECLINK AUSTRALIA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (20:34): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that Reclink Australia has been outstanding in delivering sport, recreation and arts participation opportunities to some of the community's most vulnerable and isolated people, at risk youth and those experiencing disadvantage, including mental illness, disability, homelessness, alcohol and other drug issues and social and economic hardship; and
2. Applauds the inaugural Adelaide Reclink Community Cup fundraising football match between players from community and mainstream media (the Adelaide Anchors) and local musicians (the Rockatoos) held on 16 August 2015.

I rise tonight, proudly, in my Adelaide Anchors scarf to note the work of the Adelaide Reclink Community Cup and their inaugural match held at Coopers Stadium in Norwood on Sunday 16 August. It was the first of such events to take place in Adelaide but it has been running interstate, in Melbourne and then Sydney, for 21 years now. It is a wonderful event and Reclink Australia is, indeed, a fine organisation.

Reclink Australia uses sport and the arts to enhance the lives of people experiencing disadvantage and it targets some of the community's most vulnerable and isolated people—those who are experiencing mental illness, disability, homelessness, substance abuse, addiction or social and economic hardship. It has a network of 300 or so member agencies around the country. It also encourages participation in physical activity in a population group that is often under-represented in mainstream sport and recreational programs. In the past 12 months, Reclink Australia has provided more than 100,000 individual opportunities to participate in over 10,000 sport and arts activities around the country, and the Reclink Community Cup is a very crucial fundraiser for that very valuable work.

In Melbourne and Sydney, the music and football loving communities have got to know and love the Reclink Community Cup but in Adelaide we have just had our first taste of it. I note that the Hon. Kyam Maher will be following me and making this a cross-party affair and, hopefully, the first of many Reclink community cups to come in our fair city.

The cup is played with passion and intensity that befits a take-no-prisoners battle between bitter rivals. It is a match between musicians and media. In Adelaide, those teams are known as the Rockatoos (the musicians) and the Adelaide Anchors (representing community and mainstream

media personalities). I have chosen to support the Adelaide Anchors, not least because I like to suck up to the media, and that is what I told them in the change room as I awarded them their guernseys.

Certainly, there was an attraction in saying to Michael Owen on the field as he ran past, 'Go you Anchor' (which, if you say it really slowly, has a double meaning that I could not possibly say in this place), but the man who is known as the rude reporter I think enjoyed every single second, not only of the match (and I am sure the Hon. Kyam Maher will have more to say on that) but, indeed, the whole spirit in which the Reclink Community Cup is played.

Some of Reclink's most famous programs would be very well known to members of this council. One is the now-defunct Choir of Hard Knocks, which shot to fame after it was broadcast on ABC TV. Reclink still operates a number of community choirs to this day as well as arts, craft, education and sports programs and teams. It is one of the most wonderful causes of all time, and I have to agree with one of the organisers, Koral Chandler, who says:

Reclink is my favourite cause of all time. They engage disenfranchised and underprivileged members of the community back into the community by using sport and music, two things that I believe to have huge benefits for humans through some experience of my own.

Certainly, sport and music are wonderful things. When you mix a politician in there, I think, quite honestly, you cannot go wrong, and I hope to see many more politicians involved next year. As I say, I was happy to hand out the guernseys to the Adelaide Anchors team and I know that the Hon. Kyam Maher was very honoured to play for the Rockatoos.

Unfortunately, the Rockatoos were victorious on this occasion, but I know that that will be corrected next year. I will stay true to my team now that I am sucking up to all of the media in South Australia by supporting the Adelaide Anchors. I know that, like in Sydney and Melbourne, next year we will be victorious. I have to say that the Adelaide game was an aberration. I did think that, given it was being played on a Sunday, the journos would have held up better than the musicians. I was wrong. The fact that the game was played with two balls by the end and that confusion reigned, I think possibly had something to do with the victory of the Rockatoos, but I am sure the Hon. Kyam Maher will correct me if I am wrong.

I note that other politicians were involved and I commend the member for Fisher, Nat Cook, who volunteered and worked very hard behind the bar to make the day a success. Also, minister Penny Wong, senator for South Australia, conducted the coin toss with her young daughter in the centre of the oval. Next year I am promised by the member for Reynell that she will indeed play for a team. I am not sure if it will be the Rockatoos or the Anchors. I will be putting in a pitch for the Anchors and I am sure the Hon. Kyam Maher might have some thoughts on that.

I note that at least a third of both the teams were women. There was criterion that of the 40 players in the team that at least 12 women had to be on the ground from each team at any one time. I note there were slightly different rules for the women, but I think that the talent certainly shone through for both men and women playing that day.

There were streakers. They were the most entertaining streakers I have seen at a football match in a long time and they were a welcome part of the match. Graham Cornes was the umpire and I think members of both teams quite enjoyed abusing the umpire in the great spirit of the Reclink Community Cup, in that sport was the winner on the day.

The work of sponsors, the Grace Emily Hotel and the Wheatsheaf Hotel, should be commended and also the other sponsors: Radio Adelaide, Three D, Fresh 92.7, Coopers, Channel 9, Norwood Coopers Stadium, Scene Change, XL Security, Pirate Life, Musitec, Foodland Norwood, Young Henrys, the Media and Entertainment Arts Alliance, Active Bodies Physiotherapy, Adelaide Vintage Watch Restorations, Against the Grain Publicity, The Salt, Rip it Up, St Johns and Music SA. It was a wonderful day which showed the power of sport and music to change lives.

It was enjoyed by all of the 1,100 who turned up on the day. The Beards were certainly standout musicians and I know that Max Savage—I am not sure what the name of the configuration of his band was for the day—also played at the half-time gig. Music was integral; sport was perhaps not the winner but certainly was enjoyed by all.

I encourage all members to support Reclink as an organisation. It does some wonderful work and it gets to people and empowers people in a way that any other mechanism might not. Through music, arts and sport you can certainly transform lives. The AFL shows the power of football in this nation to have a transformative effect and certainly the Reclink Community Cup brought that to the masses.

The joy of football and the teams and their training and the camaraderie and, of course, the good works that they would do at the end of the day engaging people who have often been disenfranchised from our society. With those few words I commend the motion and look forward to the contribution of the Hon. Kyam Maher.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (20:43): I rise today very proudly in my Adelaide Rockatoos top in strong support of the motion moved by the Hon. Tammy Franks. I agree with almost everything she said in her contribution, except for her support for the wrong team on this occasion.

As the Hon. Tammy Franks pointed out, Reclink, established in Victoria in 1990, is a not-for-profit organisation whose work with people experiencing disadvantage by providing opportunities to participate in sport, arts and other recreational programs is to be commended. The work it does in assisting people who may be experiencing difficulties in their lives cannot be overstated.

Reclink's mission statement says 'Respond. Rebuild. Reconnect.' That statement resonates. People experiencing bad luck or hardship do not want to be patronised or pitied but want opportunities to participate in our community in positive ways—and that is exactly what Reclink does.

Reclink's work can be as simple as facilitating a running group, games of basketball or singing groups, as the Hon. Tammy Franks has outlined. By supporting people to become engaged in social activities, participants are encouraged and supported to transition to mainstream sports or arts activities that are happening in their community, and also open themselves up to opportunities to get involved in employment and education. According to Reclink's 2014 annual report, there were more than 7,600 participants taking part in almost 900 different events.

Supporting the work of Reclink is the phenomenally successful participation and fundraising event the Reclink Community Cup, which as the Hon. Tammy Franks told us, took place in Adelaide for the first time this year. What is now the Reclink Community Cup had its genesis in Melbourne in 1993 when punters from the Espy Hotel and the Tote played a game of footy against each other. Organised by Jason Evans and some of his, no doubt, dodgy mates, these two iconic pubs and live music venues set the suburbs of St Kilda and Collingwood against each other, and in the process raised \$500 in that first game in 1993 for the Sacred Heart Mission in St Kilda.

In 1997, this social game went to the next level when the Rockdogs, made up of Melbourne's music community, played the Megahurtz, made up from players from well-known community radio stations 3RRR and 3PBS. That game raised \$6,000. In 2009, Reclink became the organisation that this social footy game supported. Since then, the Reclink cup has gone from strength to strength.

In 2011, the first game was held in Sydney with the media team the Sailors playing the musos the Walers, and it attracted a stellar cast of players including federal MP Anthony Albanese who has apparently consistently demonstrated why he is more well known as a rugby league fan, than he is an Aussie rules player. However, I am informed that, in the Melbourne game, local state MP Martin Foley has proven himself a bit of the star.

This year the Reclink Community Cup game for the first time also moved to be played in Perth and Adelaide. The Perth game, the last game of the year, saw the media, the Newshounds, take on the musos, the Bandgropers. As the Hon. Tammy Franks has told us, the inaugural community cup held in South Australia this year builds on the long-term success that Reclink has forged, using sport as a mechanism for people to participate and connect.

The musician's team for the game was the mighty Rockatoos taking on the other team, the Anchors, or as the Hon. Tammy Franks has pointed out, when you say it very quickly, it does not altogether sound like the Anchors. The South Australian community cup brought together members of South Australia's media, musical and political community: names such as Koral Chandler, Adam

and Ben Hooper, Trevor Dragani, Michael McGuire, Jay Bangers, Amos Gill, Phil Jarvis, Michael Owen and many more.

The community cup was held at Norwood on The Parade at Cooper's Stadium, home of the Norwood Redlegs, in front of a crowd of more than 1,100 people. I must thank the member for Fisher, Nat Cooke, who was taking money off people as they came through, and many MPs, like the Hon. Tammy Franks and Senator Penny Wong, gave of themselves on that day for a great cause.

The final score in the game was the Rockatoos 13.4 (84) to the Anchors 10.4 (64). The result was hardly surprising. After all, the Rockatoos fly up and the Anchors go down, and that is exactly what happened that day. As the Hon. Tammy Franks has said, I was fortunate enough to pull on my boots and play half the game for the mighty Rockatoos in the forward pocket.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What's that?

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: How many kicks did you get?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I got a few; I will get to that. The Hon. John Dawkins asked, 'How many kicks did I get?' In fact, I remember distinctly, very early on in the game, in the opening minutes of the game, I had the ball, no-one around me, about 30 metres out, almost straight in front, ready to kick the opening goal, and I kicked it straight out of bounds, but the game carried on. I played in the forward pocket and, unfortunately though, I was not able to contribute to the Rockatoos score in a meaningful way as I was held goalless by the nuggetty back-pocket defender, Michael Owen, my direct opponent for half of that game.

My personal highlight of the game, however, came in the dying minutes of the final quarter. I just happened to be in the right place at the right time to take a mark on the 50-metre line and there was not anyone else from the opposition between me and the goal except for Michael Owen, but with the ball under my arm I ran at Michael Owen. It was the old conundrum: the unstoppable force meeting the immovable object. With the strength of all 69 state MPs I was able to put my arm out, push Michael Owen aside, run into an open goal and give someone else the ball so that they could kick a goal. It was a fantastic game that was enjoyed by all.

Following the game I enjoyed a couple of cheeky beers with my new teammates and got to live out one of my dreams and join the formed for that night all-star band on stage as a back-up singer for a couple of songs. However, when *Eagle Rock* was played, I did not do what I might have done in my younger days as is traditional with that song and went down and joined the crowd.

The game was played in a great spirit. People thoroughly enjoyed what they did and they remembered what they were there for. I would particularly like to thank Koral Chandler for the role she played in organising the event in South Australia. Can I just say that Koral and her band, The Goodbye Horses, have been nominated for four South Australian Music Awards: Best Female, Best Songwriter, Best New Artist and Best Music Video. Not bad.

Last year Koral played in the Sydney Reclink Community Cup and was astounded at the power of that game to bring people together to do something good that was bigger than the sum of the people playing in the game. Koral, after that game in Sydney last year, got in touch with Reclink and dedicated herself to putting on the event we saw this year. It raised more than \$16,000 and had a small army of volunteers all working for this cause. It was a stunning result and a true credit to Koral and her team of organisers.

Plans and preparations are already underway for a bigger, better Community Cup next year with a curtain raiser followed by the big game. Reclink Australia's CEO, Mr John Ballis, hailed the event as a major success and hopes to make this a regular fixture on the South Australian sporting calendar. I know I enjoyed the opportunity to put on the Rockatoos football top, take to the field and support this organisation and help raise funds to ensure Reclink can continue to do what they do.

I, in particular, want to pay tribute to Jason Evans, the bloke who helped start this game back in the early 1990s and is still heavily involved to this day. He came over to Adelaide for this event. He was the coach of the Rockatoos who inspired his charges but more importantly made sure everyone knew what they were playing for—the inclusion and social justice that Reclink represents.

I look forward to future Community Cups and the opportunity hopefully to once more don the Rockatoos top for this worthy cause. I have told my teammates I am prepared to do whatever it takes, including learning an instrument, perhaps the triangle, to claim to be somewhat of a musician to take part next year. I thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for moving this motion and look forward to supporting it when it comes to a vote.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.L. Vincent.

Parliamentary Committees

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REVIEW

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars:

That the report of the committee, on its Annual Review into Public Integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, be noted.

(Continued from 1 July 2015.)

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (20:52): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars that the report of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee on its Annual Review into Public Integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption be noted. A key function of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee is to consider the operation of South Australia's integrity bodies. I wish to record my thanks to the committee chair, the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars. The content of the report that has been tabled has been agreed to by all the members of the committee.

The committee found at this early stage in the life of the ICAC and the Office for Public Integrity that they appear to have had some positive impact on the anti-corruption endeavours in this state. However, as time passes, a more comprehensive assessment of the worth of the ICAC will be possible. We must never forget that, as a parliament, we must constantly assess the performance of the institutions we create and resource. This is especially the case for those such as ICAC that have powers that infringe upon the rights of the individual.

There may come a time when the need to safeguard the rights of the individual outweighs the results we are achieving with such a powerful organisation. Constant vigilance is required and this is in essence one of the most important roles of the committee.

With the passing of recent amendments in respect of serious and organised crime whereby parliament was asked to declare certain organisations illegal based on criminal intelligence, the role of the committee in the life of the parliament and the state has become even more important.

It is my view that it is untimely for the government to revisit the committee's terms of reference in this context. Parliament must have the assurance that its integrity structures and the organisations that are vested with great power are working for the best interests of the people of South Australia and not against them.

All institutions are at risk of hubris and the bureaucratic tendency to advance their own interests ahead of the community's interests. Parliament must not allow those bodies to operate with impunity and in secret at the expense of citizens' rights—in other words, hide behind the unhappy phrase 'operational matters'. They must be held accountable if we are to continue to have confidence in continuing to invest them with wide powers to conduct their tasks. If parliament does not choose this committee to undertake this task then other structures may be necessary.

I joined the committee upon the retirement of the Hon. S. Wade from his position on the committee. I thank him for the encouragement he provided to me to take his place on the committee and his wise counsel on matters relating to the state's integrity structures. I also acknowledge the work of the other members of the committee. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

*Bills***CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (POPPY CULTIVATION) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 July 2015.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (20:57): I rise to speak on the Controlled Substances (Poppy Cultivation) Amendment Bill 2015. In South Australia cultivation, processing and dealing with opiate poppies is currently prohibited. The purpose of this bill is to provide a licensing scheme for poppy cultivation and processing in South Australia.

The bill aims to prevent the cultivation and processing of alkaloid poppies for criminal and improper purposes. The bill also aims to regulate poppy cultivation and processing for therapeutic and research purposes. The government is keen to support legislative change which will allow for new and economically valuable crops to be grown by South Australian farmers.

It is my understanding that the Mackillop Farm Management Group and the grain producers association have expressed their support for the legalisation of opium poppies in South Australia as it offers farmers an opportunity to explore more markets by growing a different crop.

Tasmania has been growing and cultivating alkaloid poppies for nearly 50 years. In Tasmania, to grow alkaloid poppies farmers must have a licence and a contract with a poppy cultivation company. My understanding is that this bill ensures that this will also be the case in South Australia.

In Australia, there are three pharmaceutical companies that can legally cultivate the crop. They are TPI Enterprises, Tasmania Alkaloids and GlaxoSmithKline. In 2013, Victoria, then followed by the Northern Territory in 2014, legalised the cultivation of alkaloid poppies.

This bill will legalise the cultivation of alkaloid poppies for opiate straw, which is then used to produce painkillers, including Panadeine and Nurofen Plus. A licensing system will be created. My understanding is that the licensing system, under this bill, will ensure that access to poppy fields is restricted to those who have a licence to grow poppies, and their employees, who receive an employee identification certificate to carry out activities in the business.

In Tasmania, the Poppy Advisory and Control Board in 2012 reported an industry gross value of around \$100 million, with farm gate returns of between \$70 million and \$90 million in recent years. It has also been estimated that poppy cultivation has supplied approximately 1,000 jobs in Tasmania.

When regulating a bill like this, it is important to make sure that as much control as possible is exercised and that careful consideration is given at every level so that poppy production occurs for the right purposes. We are obligated to ensure that the community is protected from the production of harmful narcotics.

The passage of the bill will hopefully lead to the creation of new jobs in manufacturing and provide benefits for farmers who will be able to take advantage of this development and introduce a new industry in agriculture.

I thank the Hon. Mr Ridgway for introducing this bill and for his understanding when he was pushing for it to be voted on a few weeks ago. I told the honourable member to wait so that the government could consult with stakeholders. I would just like to leave him with a quote: good things come to those who wait.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (21:02): On behalf of Dignity for Disability, I am pleased to speak at the second reading of this bill today and support the initiative of the Hon. David Ridgway in introducing this bill. I thank him for that effort. I also appreciate the briefing that he and his office provided on his bill, and I welcome the agri-industry opportunities that it might bring to South Australia in terms of employment.

It has been pointed out by previous speakers and media articles that poppies have the potential to have significant medical uses and ramifications. I hope that endorsing the benefits of one

crop for legal propagation for medical purposes prompts further positive debate on the use of other crops, such as medical cannabis.

I find it very disappointing that South Australia continues to drag its feet on endorsing other crops, such as medical cannabis, for people who could benefit from it by gaining relief from illness, pain and disability where no other pharmaceutical substitution has been found to be of any real benefit. So, I certainly welcome this bill.

I welcome what seems to be a very advanced and sensible debate on the use of this crop for medical purposes. I hope that this will prompt further discussion on how we can have a mature and balanced debate on other crops, including medical cannabis, and how it can be used to further alleviate the suffering of those in our South Australian community. With those comments, I certainly support the bill.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (21:04): Can I quickly sum up and thank the Hon. Tung Ngo for presenting the government's position on the bill and, of course, the Hon. Kelly Vincent for her brief remarks in relation to the bill. I think we have unanimous support in the Legislative Council for this bill to allow South Australian farmers to access the opportunity to grow opium poppies. As has been said, it has been a 40-year industry in Tasmania.

Two years ago the Victorian and Northern Territory governments passed legislation to allow their farmers to grow it. I think it is an opportunity for us to signal to our rural community that we are open to a range of options to give them a variety of crop rotations and if it is a new industry that can put more money into our regional communities then it is absolutely the right thing to do. So, I do appreciate the support.

I will quickly touch on medical cannabis, which the Hon. Kelly Vincent spoke about. I think Steven Marshall, who might be in the gallery with some friends tonight, has mentioned that we certainly support the trial of that. If you look at how opium poppies are used, they are not something that people can just grow and use, it is actually contracted to a pharmaceutical company which turns them into drugs that people can use.

If we are ever to look at growing cannabis for medical use then it would have to be under a similar regime, where a farmer is licensed to grow it and is contracted to a pharmaceutical company to turn it into an oil, or product, or tablet, or whatever consumers would like. So, we are certainly not opposed to it.

I was a little fearful, early in the process, that there may have been some amendments to this bit of legislation to bring cannabis into it and I am pleased that there were not because this is, as I said, a well established crop of some 40 years in Tasmania. It is a great opportunity for South Australian farmers. I am delighted the minister rang me yesterday to tell me that caucus and cabinet had supported the bill. I was a little disappointed when he said he had rung the media prior to ringing me, which I guess is always the risk with government ministers who are desperate for media coverage.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Positive media.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Positive media. The honourable minister, Mr Bignell, was probably a bit desperate for a bit of positive media. He has had a little bit of negative stuff in the last few months. Nonetheless, I am delighted the government has supported it and I hope it will have a speedy passage through the House of Assembly. The shadow parliamentary secretary, Adrian Pederick, will be handling the bill, but I have asked minister Bignell to speak to the Government Whip, and I have spoken to our whip, to try to expedite the passage of the bill through the House of Assembly because PIRSA really needs to have a direction from the parliament as soon as possible so it can get all the regulatory framework in place so that farmers who wish to grow the crop next year can do it. In Victoria in the first year, they dragged their feet and missed the optimum sowing time and the crop was a failure. This year, they got in at the right time and the crops look pretty good.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: What, those who wait miss out?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: That is right. Well, I do not know about those who wait, but it is about getting it right. So, I hope we see it pass through the House of Assembly relatively quickly. I have had some off-the-record discussions with PIRSA and they are very keen to make sure they

have the regulatory framework in place so that it will give that opportunity to our farmers in the next cropping season. With those few words, I thank everybody for their support and we look forward to a new industry in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

Third Reading

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (21:12): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

CAMPANIA SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 2015 is the 40th anniversary of the Campania Sports and Social Club;
2. Acknowledges the wonderful work that this club has done over the years in the promotion of Italian culture, food, language and support of Italian Australians and the broader community; and
3. Pays tribute to the achievements and social inclusion activities of this club, and others like it, which promote harmony and contribute to a better and more diverse South Australia.

(Continued from 1 July 2015.)

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (21:12): Tonight I rise to speak in favour of this motion, congratulating the Campania Sports and Social Club on its 40th anniversary and paying tribute to the achievements and social inclusion activities of this club, and others like it, which promote harmony and contribute to a better and more diverse South Australia. I also wish to acknowledge the mover of the motion, the Hon. Jing Lee, for bringing this to the Legislative Council.

Major planned migration to Australia began in the late 1940s, following World War II. During the following decades, hundreds of thousands of migrants came to Australia in search of new opportunities and peace for themselves and their families. When they arrived in Australia, they quickly set about making a new life for their families, getting jobs, studying, grappling with English and learning the new ways of doing things.

In those days, we did not have government-funded settlement services. Migrant communities quickly recognised that they would need to work together to support each other as they made their way in their new country. It was not long before they formed clubs and associations where they could help new arrivals and provide opportunities to practise some of their traditions and beliefs.

During the 1950s and 1960s, migrants came to South Australia from all parts of Europe. Apart from those from Britain and Ireland, by far the largest migrant community in South Australia was the Italian community. Indeed, the Italian community was twice the size of any other cultural group in South Australia and within the South Australian Italian community almost a third are Campani. Almost 10,000 people migrated to South Australia from the Campania region of Italy over just a few years. As with many other migrant communities, they did not let the grass grow under their feet. They very soon made arrangements to support each other and to help community members to participate in all aspects of Australian society.

One of the finest examples of a community organisation which has played a key role in this regard is the Campania Sports and Social Club. This club was first established in 1975 through the efforts of Cavaliere John Di Fede and a group of committed volunteers. Like so many other clubs, the Campania Sports and Social Club was made possible through the tireless efforts and sheer hard work of community members. They not only raised funds, but also physically helped to build the clubrooms. Over the years, the Campania Club has been a place where families and paesani have come together to share stories and celebrate traditions.

Equally importantly, the club is a place where members have helped each other at first to negotiate their way in their new environment and later to take their place in their adopted country and to help shape the future of our great state. Clubs such as the Campania Club have been the launching pad for many Italian migrants and their descendants who have gone on to excel in every aspect of South Australian society. Today, the contribution of the Italian community can be seen across the professions and the trades, in business and the arts, in sport and in politics.

Of course, the Campania club should be acknowledged not only for what it has done for its own members. The club should also be recognised for what it gives back to the wider community. The Campania Club has always been quick to respond to the needs of others. We can recall, for example, that the Campania Club stepped forward after the 1980 Irpinia earthquake in Italy, the 2004 Boxing Day tsunami and the terrible 2009 Victorian bushfires.

The Campania Club's 40th anniversary celebrations were held on 20 and 21 June this year. On the Saturday, the club held an open day with a free sausage sizzle and drinks with the aim of inviting the local Modbury North community to tour the club's facilities and participate in its activities. This is a great example of a cultural club opening its doors to the local community to increase the understanding and respect between different cultural groups in our community. On the Sunday, the official anniversary gala celebrations were held in the club's grand Benevento Hall. This was a great opportunity to acknowledge the club's pioneers and past presidents and to show appreciation to the loyal members by inviting them and their families to join in the official celebration.

Whole-hearted congratulations are due to all who have been involved in the success and growth of the Campania Sports and Social Club over the past 40 years. Special thanks are due to the club's leaders, from the early pioneers to the current president, Mr Robert Corsini. I also want to acknowledge the dedication, hard work and commitment of the thousands of volunteers who, over the past four decades, have given their time and passion to ensure that the club has not only stayed alive but thrived.

The social and economic contribution of the Campania community is very much recognised by the South Australian government. This is reflected in the Premier's recent mission to Italy. This mission was planned and undertaken with the community and the economy in mind. The Premier led the delegation of 20 South Australian business leaders, entrepreneurs and community leaders to engage with regional government officials, entrepreneurs, business associations and companies from the regions of Campania and Calabria. This mission was an opportunity to further strengthen South Australia's relationship with Italy and to open the door to new opportunities.

During the mission, the Premier underlined the important contribution of migrants and their families from the Campania and Calabria regions, who represent around 55 per cent of the total Italian immigration in South Australia. While in Benevento, Campania, the Premier spoke about South Australia's economic profile and highlighted the importance for Italian companies to consider South Australia as a hub in the new geopolitical area of South-East Asia.

The Premier also took the opportunity to invite Italian businesses and community leaders to visit South Australia to progress the opportunities explored during the mission. The Premier was welcomed in Rome by the Hon. Marco Fedi from Australia, and he took this opportunity to attend a religious celebration at the Sanctuary of Montevergine, performed by the Abbott His Eminence Dom Riccardo Luca Guariglia.

Of course, 2015 not only marks the 40th anniversary of the Campania Club. This year, we also celebrated the 60th anniversary of the Holy Mary of Montevergine Association of South Australia and the Society of Saint Hilarion. Later this year, the Premier will host a reception in recognition of these remarkable milestones which are being achieved by three outstanding South Australian Italian

organisations. These organisations have each made extraordinary contributions to the success of multiculturalism in South Australia.

In closing, may I say the 40th anniversary of the Campania Sports and Social Club not only represents a significant milestone in the settlement of Italians in South Australia but it also represents an example of a long-term commitment of Italian migrants, their children and, in many cases, grandchildren to promote, preserve and share their culture. The 40th anniversary celebrations have been a fitting tribute to their magnificent achievements, and I wish the club all the best in their future endeavours.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (21:20): I was not on the list, but I want to make a very brief contribution as someone who has spent a fair bit of his parliamentary career working in the seat of Florey and other parts of the north-eastern suburbs and who also worked for a couple of years at the office of senator Nick Minchin, which was situated at Modbury North, very close to the Campania club.

I have had the great privilege, I think, to go to many community events and some, I must say, Liberal Party events at the Campania club. I pay great tribute to those who have been behind that organisation, including my good friend Mr John Di Fede but many other people. They are always very welcoming to the general community, and I think that is something we should also say. Many other organisations in that part of Adelaide and beyond have had many great functions at the Campania club, and I think the mover of this motion has also hosted a wonderful function at that facility. I commend the Hon. Jing Lee for her motion.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (21:21): I would just like to make a few remarks in summing up. I would like to thank particularly the Hon. John Gazzola and the Hon. John Dawkins for their wonderful contributions. I believe the Hon. John Gazzola probably pronounced all the Italian names so much more beautifully and fluently than I did. Thank you so much for putting your contribution forward to recognise the 40th anniversary of the Campania club and your personal experience as well in relation to the work they do.

I would like to say that it is a great part of the parliamentary process that we can recognise the Campania club in its glory, in the way that it conducts its community service and for its contribution to South Australia and to multiculturalism. With those few remarks, I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

TRANSFORMING HEALTH

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:

That this council calls on the government to—

1. Stop the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital; and
2. Listen to the broader community regarding the Transforming Health changes.

(Continued from 3 June 2015.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (21:23): I rise on behalf of the Liberal team to support the motion of the Hon. Robert Brokenshire. This is not the first motion in this parliament on the government's decision to close the Repat. On 26 February, the Leader of the Opposition in the other place (the Hon. Steven Marshall) moved:

That this house—

- (a) reaffirms its commitment to the best possible standard of health care for veterans and war widows;
- (b) acknowledges the care provided by the Repatriation General Hospital during the 73 years of its operation;
- (c) recommits to the Repatriation General Hospital as a centre of excellence, maintaining its role as an acute care teaching institution with links to Flinders University; and
- (d) opposes any moves to close the Repatriation General Hospital.

The Leader of the Opposition in the other place has also given notice of a motion to recognise the Repat petition. That motion states:

That this house—

- (a) notes that more than 119,000 people have signed petitions opposing the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital, more than 88,000 of which have been tabled in this house; and
- (b) urges the government to heed the call of the petitioners and the veterans on the steps by reversing its decision to close the Repat.

I thank the Hon. Robert Brokenshire for bringing this matter before the council. This is a clear, straightforward motion which calls on the government to not close the Repatriation General Hospital and to listen to what the broader community is saying in relation to this and other aspects of its controversial Transforming Health plan. Hopefully, this will be the first motion to save the Repat that is passed by this parliament. There is no doubt that the Repat is an absolute South Australian icon.

The Repatriation General Hospital has played a critical role in the delivery of health services to veterans and the broader South Australian community for more than 70 years. Just five years ago, the Labor government recognised the depth of the South Australian community's respect for our veterans and their commitment to the Repat. In 2010, in response to the government's own Sustainable Budget Commission recommendation to close the Repat, the then premier Mike Rann quickly and clearly rejected that advice. In fact, the government gave the people of South Australia a cast-iron guarantee that the Repat hospital was 'here to stay', and that it would 'never, ever be closed by a Labor government'.

Jump forward to 2015, and the Weatherill government has walked away from that commitment. On 4 February 2015, the Minister for Health and the Minister for Veterans' Affairs announced the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital. How long is 'never, ever' for a Labor promise? About five years. 'Never, ever', as if it means nothing; as if the South Australian community can be treated as mugs.

Over the course of this year, as the community outcry has grown louder and louder, the government has tried in vain to cast people who oppose the closure of the Repat as people living in the past and being out of touch with the best way to deliver health services in the 21st century. The government has been forced to spend millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars to try to convince a sceptical public that its ill-conceived and ill-consulted plan actually holds water.

The government is trying to persuade the people that it knows best, that it has thought this through and that, while it spends millions of dollars to replicate the Repat, somehow, out of all the health facilities in the world, the Repat was the only one that could not be renewed. Despite all of this effort and expense, the government has been unable to convince the people of South Australia that closing the Repat makes sense.

The people of South Australia understand that there are many good, solid reasons to save the Repat. One reason is the high-quality outpatient services that are delivered at the Repat. Last year, the Repat provided more than 136,000 outpatient consultations across a broad range of specialist clinics, including heart disease, sleep disorders and arthritis. That equates to more than 2,600 South Australians getting help as a Repat outpatient each week, week in, week out.

The Australian Medical Association argues that, instead of closing the hospital, the government should build on its strengths in outpatient services so that it becomes an ambulatory care centre of excellence. I quote in part what the AMA told the government:

The AMA(SA) does not believe the RGH should be closed...The [Repat]...has the basis for becoming an ambulatory care centre of excellence...With its flat terrain, multiple access points and recent investment for rehabilitation facilities as well as developed and coordinated ambulatory care medical services, it seems foolish to waste such a potential resource.

Another reason to save the Repat is the state-of-the-art facilities that exist on the hospital site. Yes, some parts of the hospital need to be rebuilt or refurbished, but many parts of the hospital are almost brand new. In fact, in recent years many tens of millions of dollars have been spent on building and redeveloping state-of-the-art facilities on the Repat site. These investments have included: \$6 million for the new 4th Generation Clinics; \$10 million to rebuild Ward 18, the Repat's mental health facility for older South Australians; and \$20 million for a new state-of-the-art rehabilitation service with 20 new subacute beds and improved rehabilitation services.

More recently, in partnership with Flinders University, the ACH Group and the federal government, the state government invested in a new \$46 million ViTA centre on the Daw Park site. ViTA is a 120-bed facility and it only opened last year. While under the government's plan ViTA itself will remain, the closure of the Repat will mean we would lose the opportunities created by grouping a range of related services in one location.

The third reason for saving the Repat, and one I will return to later, is Ward 17. Ward 17 has been helping veterans young and old to recover from PTSD and a range of other mental health issues for over 50 years. It is a centre of excellence built around a team of health professionals that is second to none. Ward 17 provides inpatient care in a 24-bed ward and a supportive therapeutic environment for outpatients recovering from PTSD and a range of other mental health issues.

Last year, Ward 17 delivered more than 7,600 outpatient consultations. About 80 per cent of Ward 17's clients are veterans, serving members of the Defence Force and war widows. That said, one in five of its inpatient admissions are community clients. This includes emergency services personnel with PTSD and other South Australians with mental health issues.

For many of Ward 17's clients, the gardens and the outdoor areas of the Repat are vital for their recovery and wellbeing. Ward 17 also provides extensive teaching and training places and is highly sought after as an academic placement. From psychiatric registrars to social work trainees, Ward 17 is seen as a great learning environment. While the current buildings are indeed not fit for purpose, the quality of the service is built on the skill and commitment of the staff and the culture they foster. That quality and strength could be lost if the government closes the Repat and relocates Ward 17 to Glenside.

The amount of elective surgery undertaken at the Repat is another reason why it must be saved. A quarter of all orthopaedic and neurological elective surgery performed in Adelaide is done at the Repat. There are currently 240 beds at the Repat. Under the Weatherill government's proposals, if the Repat is closed, 55 rehabilitation beds will be added to the Flinders Medical Centre. That amounts to a net loss of more than 180 beds. That is a 22 per cent drop in the number of general hospital beds in the southern region.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Acute beds.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Indeed, the honourable member is right to point out that these are acute beds, beds which South Australians rely on when they are at their sickest point. The Australian Medical Association has warned that other hospitals do not have the capacity to absorb the extra workload because they are already overstretched. For example, waiting times for elective surgery at Noarlunga Hospital more than doubled in the four years to 2013.

The AMA considers that 'the reorganisation of elective surgery is likely to be problematic and disruptive, leading to increased delays in surgery'. The government's plan to disperse the Repat's specialist teams to other locations is simplistic, it risks the loss of what has been achieved and will most likely lead to significant increases in elective surgery waiting times.

As part of its Transforming Health plan, the government has been arguing that health services and outcomes will improve if emergency and elective surgery are separated. That is a credible argument, but it is also an argument why the Repat must not close. The Repat is already a specialist service for elective surgery: 83 per cent of Repat surgery is elective surgery compared with an average of 54 per cent in other metropolitan hospitals. The government wants to close the hospital with the highest proportion of elective surgery in Adelaide. It wants to close the hospital that is a paragon of the model that it espouses. It just does not make sense. In February, the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons said this about the government's plan:

The closure of [the Repat] has significant implications for Urology and Orthopaedic services in the south. We emphasise that the current surgical service is a prime example of a service model which has successfully improved efficiency by separating elective and trauma surgery, consistent with the model espoused in Transforming Health. The dismantling of this service...will in all likelihood result in loss of expertise rather than a transfer.

The Australian Medical Association has also commented on the risks associated with losing the Repat's surgical focus. It states:

The proposal to amalgamate orthopaedic services at [Flinders Medical Centre] could lead to blended trauma and elective lists. This is seen by medical experts as a major precursor to increased infection rates for patients undergoing elective surgery and a backward step. It will also increase delays in receiving elective surgery as trauma patients take priority over the limited operating theatre time available.

The closure of the Repat, as I said, goes against the government's own rationale. The Daw House Hospice, and the palliative care services delivered from the Repat, is another reason to keep the Repat. For more than 25 years, the hospice has provided palliative care to terminally ill patients and their families in a quiet and comfortable non-hospital environment. Daw House also serves as a base for the provision of palliative care services out into the broader community through home-based services, grief counselling and the like.

These services support the delivery of world-class postgraduate palliative care training, in particular, through the nearby Flinders University. All of this will be at risk if the Weatherill government pushes ahead with its plan to close the Repat and relocate the hospice to the top floor of a building bang smack in the middle of Flinders Medical Centre, one of the busiest hospitals in the state. This brings me to the form and design of the Daw Park site.

The Repat is blessed with a low-rise campus in a garden setting that supports the recuperation and rehabilitation of its patients. This is another reason not to close the Repat. The Repat is an easy to access hospital that specialises in the care of older people and people with rehabilitation needs. Both of these groups are more prone to mobility issues and benefit from the fact that most of the Repat services are a short, ground-level walk from a car park. There are six car parks around the Repat campus which can be easily accessed through eight entry gates.

The Repat is centrally located. It is only four kilometres from the Flinders Medical Centre and less than eight kilometres from the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It has good public transport connections to both of these hospitals and to the city centre. Unlike other hospitals, where patients and visitors often get lost in a rabbit warren, it is easy to find your way around the Repat. The Weatherill government wants to rebuild many of the Repat facilities at the Flinders Medical Centre. People already find Flinders congested and confusing, and getting a car park close to the main building is often very difficult.

Given all of these solid reasons to save the Repat, and they are but a few, we can see that that reason has fuelled the passion of the community's opposition to the government's plan. It appears that the government has been caught unaware. It has underestimated the commitment of the South Australian community to the veterans and to the Repat that supports them.

Back in February, within weeks of the government announcement that it wanted to close the Repat, more than 13,000 people had signed an online petition to save the Repat. When this petition was brought to the attention of the health minister during question time in the other place on 12 February, he mocked and dismissed it as being an online petition and indicated that he would be prepared to take notice of the community's concern if 13,000 people signed a paper petition. So, the government—the minister—had thrown down the gauntlet.

Shortly afterwards, the fight to save the Repat went into overdrive. Marches and rallies were held more frequently, people kept raising the issue on talkback radio and in letters to the newspapers. Then, spontaneously, in one of the most extraordinary protests in our state's history, a band of veterans and their supporters set up camp on the steps of parliament. This group of veterans ended up camping out for 161 days, including every long day and night of what turned out to be one of the longest and most bitterly cold winters in living memory.

By the end of the protest, the number of people who had signed a Save the Repat petition had jumped from 13,000 to 120,000, with the bulk of those signatures (more than 88,000) being on hard copy paper petitions. The minister had taunted campaigners to collect 13,000 signatures on paper; in reply, Repat supporters collected more than six times this amount. It has been an amazing effort by hundreds but, in particular, I want to highlight the team on the steps.

One of the most humbling elements of my life as a parliamentarian is to witness the actions of the occasional strong, everyday Australian who never chose public life but who cares enough that they are compelled to act—people like Belinda Valentine and Augustinus Krikke and his team of

Elvis, Gibbo, Ki, Gary and others. The team has had many faithful supporters: Ginny and John, Belita, Jan and many more.

Krikke and his team impressed me in a number of ways: their quiet determination, their steel-like persistence and their passionate commitment to the Repat services for all South Australians, not just veterans. But what impresses me most and even challenges me is their fundamental rock-solid belief in democracy. As I said, they did not choose public life but they cared enough to act.

They are playing their part, convinced that surely a democratic government will listen to the tens of thousands of South Australians who joined the campaign to save the Repat. Some may call their belief in democracy naive. Minister Snelling and the Weatherill government certainly have responded with a fixed stare which dismisses the community. The Weatherill government plays with new democracy gimmicks to try to avoid real community engagement. They suddenly refused to review the Repat decision.

For my part, I have much more confidence in Krikke's old democracy. The campaign to save the Repat grows and evolves. The Port Wakefield sculptures are being progressively rebranded; community petition stalls operating at country field days and metropolitan shopping centres continue to receive strong support; and Professor Warren Jones is acting as a lightning rod for health profession and community concern and is drawing out information that the government would rather we did not know.

It is eight months since the government announced its decision to close the Repat. In February the decision was regretted by the community; in October the decision is despised. Last week the government backflipped on its muddle-headed eye hospital proposal. Now it is time to announce that the Repat will stay open. I strongly support the motion and commend it to the house.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (21:41): I rise on behalf of the government to speak against this motion. Let me remind this house of the extensive discussions and engagement that the government has undertaken with regard to Transforming Health. From June 2014 the Clinical Advisory Committee worked together to develop quality principles and 284 clinical standards considered essential to provide a health system that meets the needs of South Australians.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Wait. From October 2014, the government released a discussion paper for wide consultation and held over 39 community events. It received more than 2,000 submissions, and over 5,000 community members and staff were involved in the consultation process. The government also held a Transforming Health summit in November 2014 which more than 600 people attended and agreed that transformation was needed to deliver the best quality health care, first time, every time.

Finally, in February this year the government released a proposal paper for feedback. Feedback received included submissions from staff and clinicians; the community; unions; consumer representative organisations; research, training and educational providers; and non-government organisations. I am keen to know whether any honourable members have used this opportunity to submit feedback about these reforms.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Yes.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: And whether honourable members got—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: I did.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Very good of you, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire—and have any positive suggestions about how the state can make the health system better.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Keep the Repat open!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Maybe some honourable members opposite are too busy scaremongering and spreading misinformation to cause anxiety in the community. As you can see, the government has received a large amount of feedback and expert advice not only in formulating

Transforming Health but also on the implementation and rollout of delivering Transforming Health. People elect governments to make decisive decisions.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Decisive decisions!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Correct. It has been two years since the government released the discussion paper for wide consultation on the health system in South Australia. The government—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has the floor.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: The government has made its decision and now must get on with the job of making these changes so that people can adapt and be certain about the changes.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Sounds like Jack's office.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: No, no, no. The Repatriation General Hospital or the Repat—let me get back to the Repat—is a veterans' hospital. It was established in the 1940s by the commonwealth. The Repat was transferred to the South Australian government in 1995. The Repat was built to cater for veterans coming back from the wars of the last century. These days veterans come back from serving for Australia with different health needs than what would have been the case 70 years ago.

With any major decisions made by government of course you will have a certain percentage of the community against it—that is a fact. Any decision you make, you will have people for it, and against it, but that is just normal, but it is important at the end of the day to understand the government makes sound decisions after consulting with the public and stakeholders. So you have to make decisions after you make wide consultation with the public.

The government consulted extensively with the Veterans Advisory Council (VAC), which is made up of outstanding South Australians, before a decision to close the Repat was made. The VAC was established in April 2008 to promote the wellbeing of veterans and provide advice to the state government about matters concerning the veteran community.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: They camped out here for 156 days.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: So you are questioning the VAC's decision. The VAC is chaired by former Governor of South Australia, Sir Eric Neal AC, CVO, and comprises 16 members of the veteran community. Membership is finely balanced by experience, gender, service, rank, corps and conflict to create a body truly representative of the veteran community in South Australia. Sir Eric Neal is a person that I am sure is respected by all sides of this chamber.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.T. NGO: He is a very good man and that is why I am a bit surprised that some members here are questioning his judgement. I was very fortunate to have worked with Sir Eric Neal for a few years when I was an adviser to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. He is an honourable man and one of the purest people I have ever met.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: He is, and your government is dishonouring him.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: That is why he is so—

The PRESIDENT: Can the honourable member—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Sorry, Mr President, I am a bit frustrated.

The PRESIDENT: Yes I know you are frustrated but you are also very loud. Allow the member to finish.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: That is why he is so respected in our community. I take this opportunity to quote a transcript from a radio outlet on 15 May 2015, and I quote:

Veterans Advisory Council Chairman Sir Eric Neal says that most veterans use other public and private hospitals and not the Repat. He says that the Council has agreed its focus should be on ensuring the best available healthcare for veterans. He says while the PTSD treatment provided by the hospital is exceptional, other services are not up to standard.

The direct quote from Sir Eric Neal went like this, and I quote:

The real issue is that the veterans' community have spoken with their feet; nine out of ten veterans do not use the Repat Hospital, and these are the facts—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Nine out of 10, that is correct.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Statistics, statistics and damn lies.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: The Hon. Robert Brokenshire is questioning Sir Eric Neal here. He continued:

...and these are the facts that are really missing from the debate.

Another quote from Sir Eric Neal on the same transcript is as follows:

Ward 17 is a special case. As far as the rest of the Repat Hospital are concerned, putting it bluntly the veterans' view is that it's past its used-by date in terms of architecture, building construction, technology.

Those are quotes from Sir Eric Neal, one of the purest men I have ever met.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: Shameful that you used him then.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Now the Hon. Stephen Wade is questioning Sir Eric Neal's excellent judgement as well.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: No, I am questioning your use of him politically.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: This is all in the public here. In an opinion piece, dated 1 May 2015, in a popular online newspaper in South Australia known as InDaily, Sir Eric Neal ran an article entitled 'Sir Eric Neal: Why I support Transforming Health'. He has put it in writing here. The article states:

The words 'We will remember them' and 'Lest we forget' have real meaning. 'Lest we forget' should, and must, not only relate to those who gave their lives, but also to those who were physically and emotionally wounded by their service and who require medical care, sometimes for the rest of their lives. It explains why the Veterans' Advisory Council is generally in support of the State Government's Transforming Health Plan, at the heart of which is to ensure that the best care is delivered first time, every time to all South Australians including veterans.

He continued:

This will involve the relocation of some, but not all, services currently provided at the Repatriation General Hospital to other hospitals. The Veterans' Advisory Council is more concerned that veterans receive the absolute best medical attention in the best location rather than seeking to preserve, in its entirety, a World War II facility that is outdated, even though for some it has emotional ties.

The government takes the advice from Sir Eric Neal and members of the VAC very seriously. These men and women have served our country honourably. Therefore, I urge honourable members to be sensible about this very issue and not to play politics with our veterans community.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: The government are.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: No. The veterans community deserves to be respected and they certainly deserve the best quality health care. I urge honourable members not to support this motion and not to play politics with this issue.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (21:53): I speak on behalf of Dignity for Disability in support of this motion and in so doing I want to for just a few minutes step away from the Repat as one example and talk about the process that has been undertaken in this Transforming Health proposal since February. I want to do that because unfortunately the protest over the decision is just one example of how this Transforming Health proposal has not been well received by the general community.

Other examples include the Flinders Medical Centre neonatal intensive care unit which was originally proposed for closure using data that would later prove to be wildly inaccurate. When this data was proved to be inaccurate regarding the number of babies who would be affected by this closure, the Minister for Health in the other place (Hon. Jack Snelling), then came out—I am paraphrasing here—and told the community not to worry about it because it would not happen for a number of years yet. Following further community protest, the decision was reversed.

There has also been a wide lack of clarity around how a number of the proposals will work in practice. A recent example is that of the apparent lack of a physical education unit once spinal injury support services are moved from Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I have been approached, as I understand the Hon. Mr Wade has also been approached, by Paraquad SA, the peak body in South Australia representing people with a spinal cord injury usually following a motor vehicle accident, who have told us that it seems to them from their reading of the plans that there will be no physical education unit once these services are moved to The QEH.

For the record, a physical education unit, to put it briefly, is basically a gym where people can go to use special equipment and get special professional support to regain muscle strength that they may have lost following, in this example, a motor vehicle accident, and also learn new skills, such as how to use a mobility aid, such as a wheelchair, effectively.

Paraquad SA came to Dignity for Disability and said they were very concerned about the lack of a physical education unit under this move. The most obvious reason being that if people cannot get access to rehabilitation following an accident or injury through another means then they are going to have less independence which is likely, in turn, to translate to greater dependence on taxpayer dollars in the form of disability support.

Lo and behold, a government spokesperson comes out a few days later in the media to say that, not only will there be a physical education gym at The QEH under this move but there will be one on every ward. If this is true, Dignity for Disability says this is fantastic because we should, of course, not be losing any services but be providing something better if we are truly going to transform health. However, I am yet to see any proof, apart from this statement in the media, that this is, in fact, the case. So, I again, on behalf of Dignity for Disability, implore the government to provide clarity to the general community about how these measures and proposals will operate in practice.

Another example is the very evident lack of hydrotherapy pools currently in South Australia, particularly for people undergoing rehabilitation. Again, I was informed by Professor Dorothy Keefe on radio that we will, in fact, have more hydrotherapy pools under Transforming Health and, again, I say fantastic, but I need to see the proof. I need to be able to tell my constituents, who rely on things like physical education units and hydrotherapy pools to regain and maintain their independence, their strength and their lack of reliance on taxpayer dollars, that these services will be in place for them. I have yet to see the proof of that. So I again implore the government to provide clear, plain English explanations to the general community about how these new proposals will work in practice.

In listening to the Hon. Mr Ngo's contribution, I was interested that he asked members for feedback. He wanted to make sure that we had all submitted through the formal channels before getting up and making statements in the media and in this place about Transforming Health. I have double-checked and I am pleased that I can clarify with the Hon. Mr Ngo that Dignity for Disability certainly made a submission on Transforming Health back in February, but if he wants further feedback on how the government can save money in the health budget, I am happy to again put on record a number of proposals that Dignity for Disability has put forward in our time in parliament on exactly how to do that:

- More support for people with chronic pain so that, where possible, they are able to work and contribute to the community, at the very least get out of bed and leave their homes.
- For the health and disability budgets to work together to put in place holistic support for people who have acquired additional disability-related needs while in hospital and need support either through the form of disability support workers or handrails to be installed in their home in order for them to be able to return home. Rather than doing this, we have seen situations where people languish in hospital beds, racking up a hospital bill of \$450,000 for one person, which I am sure I do not need to tell anyone here would be enough to build them a home to go home to.
- Allow people with disabilities to have their support workers visit them in hospital so that they can at least get a shower during a hospital stay.

- Appoint a mental health commissioner who has lived experience of mental health challenges and will communicate with families and individuals about what social supports will enable them to stay out of hospital by remaining connected to the community.
- Provide more support for people with borderline personality disorder so that we do not lose 10 per cent of these community members through suicide and the economic and community contribution that they would be able to make by remaining with us.
- Funding support for people with HIV through Positive Life.
- Recognise epilepsy as a disability in South Australia and provide expedient access to neurologists so that people can get an adequate diagnosis so the epilepsy does not remain so uncontrolled that they are unable to work and contribute to the community.

There is one final suggestion—and there are many more that I could put on the record:

- Work together with the federal government to reinstate funding to the Intensive Home Based Support Service (IHBSS), which supports people experiencing a mental health crisis in their home, and, as an evaluation shows, saves on average 10.3 days in hospital per consumer and therefore roughly \$800 per day per person for a mental health-related stay in hospital.

Those are some suggestions on how the government could save money in the health budget, and I would certainly welcome their implementation. We have put them forward in our formal submission and we will continue to raise them in this place.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (22:02): I thank all my colleagues for their contributions. I do not hold the Hon. Tung Ngo responsible for the government's message or response because he himself is a very good man, but I will hold, and I trust the parliament will hold, this government responsible for what is a deplorable, disgraceful and totally unsatisfactory situation when it comes to closing the Repatriation Hospital. They have done nothing to listen to the people. They are making a grave mistake for the future health needs of this state. Transforming Health is also a problem and that is why we need to look at that further.

I encourage all members to support this motion and condemn the government for what will be one of the worst decisions in the history of this parliament. As a member of this parliament for 20 years, I never thought I would have to move a motion in relation to a government, be it Liberal or Labor, closing the Repatriation General Hospital. It is an absolute disgrace and I condemn the government with all the energy I can muster.

Motion carried.

MEMORIES OF LEMNOS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Organisation of Hellene and Hellene-Cypriot Women of Australia (SA) for its efforts to commemorate the centenary of ANZAC with the Memories of Lemnos and the Australian Nurses and the ANZAC centenary ceremony on Sunday 19 April 2015, at Keswick Barracks;
2. Recognises the service given by Australian nurses on the Greek island of Lemnos during the Gallipoli landing;
3. Recognises Greece for supporting Australia's war effort through its support for Australian nurses stationed at military hospitals based on Lemnos island during the Gallipoli campaign; and
4. Considers a permanent memorial specifically commemorating the Australian women who served as nurses on Lemnos island be incorporated in the soon to be constructed Anzac Walk.

(Continued from 1 July 2015.)

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (22:04): I rise to speak in support of the motion that this council congratulate the Organisation of Hellene and Hellene-Cypriot Women of Australia to commemorate the centenary of ANZAC with the Memories of Lemnos and the Australian Nurses and the ANZAC centenary ceremony on Sunday 19 April 2015 at Keswick Barracks; recognise the service given by

Australian nurses on the Greek island of Lemnos during the Gallipoli landing; recognise Greece for supporting Australia's war effort through its support for Australian nurses stationed at military hospitals based on Lemnos island during the Gallipoli campaign; and consider a permanent memorial specifically commemorating the Australian women who served on Lemnos island be incorporated in the soon-to-be constructed Anzac Walk.

This motion specifically acknowledges the outstanding contribution of women during the Gallipoli campaign, as well as the generosity of the people of Greece as they allowed the British and Australian personnel to operate hospital facilities on their islands during the allied assault on the Dardanelles. The Hellene and Hellene-Cypriot Women of Australia recognised this joint contribution made by Greece and Australia in their ANZAC Day address earlier this year and the important contribution made by the 96 Australian nurses who served in the two Australian field hospitals on Lemnos.

The majority of the women arrived on the island over two days. The barren island afforded little protection from the extremities and the remote location made sourcing fresh food difficult. For many of the nurses this was their first trip out of Australia and they demonstrated great resilience as they worked in poor conditions to build and maintain under-resourced hospital facilities through which thousands of soldiers would pass.

Gallipoli was the first major campaign fought by Australian forces in World War I. As the closest land hospital to the Gallipoli campaign, Lemnos was the main assembly point for the allied Gallipoli invasion force and the site of the major land-based nursing stations during the campaign. Lemnos, therefore, was not only a safe transit harbour of military significance, it was also a place of healing and respite for soldiers from the horrors and disease of the Gallipoli peninsula. One would like to think that these early encounters between the Australians and the Greeks sowed the seeds for our strong and lasting relationship with the peoples of Greece, especially in South Australia.

Remembering the contribution that Greece made in support of Australia's war efforts by commemorating the work of the nurses of Lemnos in the soon-to-be constructed Anzac Memorial Walk is, in my view, a respectful way to remind generations to come of the compassion and resourcefulness displayed by so many individuals, both Australian and Greek, who for a short time lived life side by side, but especially the work of the nurses who provided care and love to the wounded and dying men broken by the conflict on the nearby peninsula. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (22:07): On Saturday 19 April 2015, the Treasurer, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, attended the Memories of Lemnos: Australian Nurses and the ANZAC Centenary commemorative event organised by the Organisation of Hellene and Hellene-Cypriot Women of Australia (South Australia). The event highlighted the service of Australian nurses based on the Greek island of Lemnos during the Gallipoli landing in 1915.

Lemnos' role in the Dardanelles campaign should not be forgotten. It was the principal assembly, embarkation and supply point for the Gallipoli landings. The landings at Gallipoli were practised on Lemnos prior to deployment and the island's harbour was a major staging post for naval operations in the Gallipoli campaign, including Australia's submarine campaign. The vast majority of ANZAC troops spent time on Lemnos, whether preparing for the landing, resting or recuperating at its rest camps, or recovering from the horrors of war in its field hospitals.

Lemnos was the location of the major nursing stations for the Gallipoli campaign, with 130 Australian nurses, led by Matron Grace Wilson, the first major overseas deployment of Australian nurses to a war theatre.

By the beginning of August 1915, the 3rd Australian General Hospital was landed on the island as a medical facility. The island was intended initially to deal with light cases only, those classified as likely to be well within 28 days, but the rush of wounded from the early August offensive at Lone Pine and The Nek, and the flood of sick that followed in late August, September and October necessitated its development as an intermediate military medical base.

The Australian Red Cross was represented on the island through its aid depot and in the distribution of aid parcels to nurses and soldiers. A number of major Australian figures visited the

island, such as Albert Jacka VC and Generals Birdwood and Monash. The armistice concerning the Allies and the Ottoman Empire was signed in Mudros Harbour, Lemnos in 1918.

Lemnos is the location of two major commonwealth war graves, with 148 Australian graves. Lemnos and ANZAC represent the beginning of Australia's lasting connection with Greece. World War I marked Australia in a way that is almost impossible to fathom in current times. Of the 337,000 service personnel deployed overseas, over 210,000 became casualties. That is almost two-thirds. On average, 38 members of Australia's armed forces died every day during the 1,560 days of World War I. These are staggering statistics.

Gallipoli was not our bloodiest campaign—sadly, that would come later—but it was our first. The landings at what would become known as Anzac Cove and the events that followed until the withdrawal eight months later are recognised as defining moments of nationhood for Australia. What then is the legacy we take from Gallipoli and ANZAC? For me it is that what we value becomes our legacy. ANZAC is not about loss. It is not about war. It is about courage, endurance, sacrifice and, above all, mateship.

As Australia's official war historian, Charles Bean, said, 'Men would rather die than let down a mate.' One of the best examples of this commitment was Sister Rachael Pratt, who nursed the wounded in Turkey, France and elsewhere. In 1917, while Germans attacked a casualty clearing station, Rachael worked despite the shrapnel that had pierced through her back and lodged in her lung until she collapsed.

Rachael was awarded the Military Medal for conspicuous gallantry under fire. She never recovered fully from her injuries, suffering chronic bronchitis for the rest of her life. She never recovered from the trauma, which is understandable. Sadly, eventually Rachael was deemed totally and permanently incapacitated and admitted to a hospital for the insane. Sister Pratt died in Heidelberg Repatriation Hospital in 1954.

The government is committed to commemorating the centenary service during the centenary of the ANZAC period. I commend the Hellene and Hellene-Cypriot Women of Australia (SA) for their work in commemorating the role and achievement of Australia's nurses involved in the Gallipoli campaign and the centenary of ANZAC. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (22:14): I rise to sum up and thank the Hon. Andrew McLachlan and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars for their wonderful contribution towards my motion and in supporting the motion to recognise the Organisation of Hellene and Hellene-Cypriot Women of Australia (SA) for their effort to commemorate the centenary of ANZAC with the memories of Lemnos and Australian nurses and the ANZAC centenary ceremony. It is through this important parliamentary process that we recognise their work and historic perspective about what they do and what they have achieved. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

FRASER, HON. J.M.

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. T. T. Ngo:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the positive contribution to Australian society that former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser has made;
2. Acknowledges Malcolm Fraser's policy in promoting multiculturalism and acceptance of refugees that has laid the groundwork for a peaceful and diverse Australia of today; and
3. Notes, in particular, the leadership former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser demonstrated in dealing with the resettlement of about 200,000 Asian and Middle Eastern migrants and refugees, especially more than 50,000 displaced Vietnamese, during and after the Vietnam War.

(Continued from September 9 2015.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (22:15): I rise today to support the motion, acknowledging the positive contribution by the Rt Hon. Malcolm Fraser, moved by the Hon. Tung Ngo. Mr Fraser was a giant of the Australian Liberal Party and indeed a giant of our nation. It is very humbling to see Fraser's legacy

under a Liberal Coalition is being recognised by a Labor member, the Hon. Tung Ngo. In his speech, the honourable member spoke about the dark times of the Vietnam War, the conflict within the Australian Labor Party at times, and he acknowledged that he has been a direct beneficiary of the Liberal Fraser government's multicultural policy.

Although Fraser may not have been a popular politician during that time, he went against the odds to win two of the largest electoral landslides in Australia's history and was able to enhance the social framework of Australia's modern society through his bold immigration policies. As a migrant to this country, my family and I have certainly benefited greatly from the Fraser immigration policy.

Prior to the Hon. Tung Ngo's moving his motion about Mr Fraser, I had the opportunity to acknowledge Mr Fraser in my matters of interest speech on 6 May 2015, when I spoke about the commemorative event organised by the Vietnamese Veterans Association and the Vietnamese community of South Australia for the 40th anniversary of the fall of Saigon, which was held in conjunction with the remembrance and tribute ceremony in honour of our former prime minister. This event was well supported by the Vietnamese community as they paid tribute to a visionary leader who gave them security, hope and opportunities in Australia. Today, I am honoured to provide a lengthier contribution on the significant contributions that Mr Fraser made to our nation.

As we know, the federal parliament moved a condolence motion on 23 March 2015 after the sad news of the passing of Mr Fraser. The Parliament of South Australia also moved a condolence motion, and I recall the words spoken by the Liberal leader, Mr Steven Marshall in the other place, when he described Mr Fraser:

He was a man of principle who followed through with his convictions and did not ask for forgiveness. He did not go gently into that good night but continued to rage, advocating and lobbying for the causes that he believed in right up until the end of his days. I believe that the history books will be kind to the legacy of the Hon. Malcolm Fraser. He was a prime minister who keenly understood the times in which he served, valued and enhanced Australia's place on the international stage and was a true friend of our multicultural communities. His imprint upon our nation's history will forever be remembered. Vale Malcolm Fraser.

I wish to thank the Vietnamese community for sharing their rich cultural heritage, skills and knowledge in enriching our state. We do not need to look very far to find hardworking refugees and migrants who have been elected and appointed to public office positions, such as the Hon. Tung Ngo in this chamber and also His Excellency the South Australian Governor, the Hon. Hieu Van Le.

As Australians, we ought to be very proud that Australia was one of those countries that offered its compassion and opened its doors to Vietnamese refugees during the fall of Saigon. The Liberal Fraser government was responsible for Australia's first comprehensive refugee policy. Between 1975 and 1982, Australia welcomed about 200,000 immigrants from Asian countries, including nearly 56,000 from Vietnam alone.

Furthermore, more than 2,000 Vietnamese people who arrived by boat without documentation or official permission were granted entry under policies initiated by the Liberal Fraser government. In proportion to the Australian population, we took in more Vietnamese refugees than any other country. The immigration program focused on resettlement and multiculturalism and, in 1978, the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs was established.

Mr Fraser devoted 28 years to parliamentary service, eight of them as prime minister of Australia. His first great achievement was to win office and to steady the country after the chaotic years of terrible management under Labor prime minister Gough Whitlam. Fraser had a heart and sympathy for hardworking country people. He introduced a system of deferring taxation of farmers in drought. They could buy special security from pre-tax income which could be held against bad times and then sold when they would incur tax. Bob Hawke, under Labor government, abolished these bonds in one of his acts, but they came back under the Howard Liberal government.

Fraser's stubborn determination made him an effective negotiator. As prime minister, during his visit to North America, he negotiated access for Australian beef that was to be worth billions, and aged cows suddenly found a place in the American market for hamburger mince.

Fraser was the author of the remarkably successful program of Vietnamese settlement which is the centrepiece of this motion. Gough Whitlam, in 1975, called the huge exodus from Vietnam the 'boat people', but Mr Fraser called them 'refugees', which reflected what they were. There was

nothing in Fraser's administration of Australia that was not consistent with his being a nice guy who was as much at home in the public bar as he was at the Melbourne Cup, and whose every act was aimed at making Australia a better place in which to live.

Mr Fraser was immensely hardworking, as prime ministers must be and are. He was also competent. His years in the Lodge were not marked by the blunders and debacles that we have known under the Rudd Labor government. Fraser would have known how to install insulation without burning the house down. He was also a strong believer in prudential management.

I just want to talk about some of the key principles of respecting community differences from the Galbally Report, which was commissioned by prime minister Fraser in 1977. The four guiding principles of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants form the foundation to ensure:

- equal opportunity and equality of access to services for all members of society;
- that everyone should be able to maintain their own culture and be encouraged to understand others';
- that the needs of migrants, while they should ideally be met by mainstream programs and services, should be in the short term especially targeted in order to ensure equality of access and provisions; and
- that services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients, with an emphasis on self-help to enable migrants to become self-reliant quickly.

It is thanks to prime minister Fraser that the commonwealth has, since 1978, developed a major orientation program for new arrivals and introduced innovative English language instruction, promoted multicultural education in government and non-government schools, boosted the child migrant education program, extended the provision of special welfare services to migrants by substantially increasing the number of grant-in-aid social workers, established a network of migrant resource centres, and established the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs.

Sadly, after more than three decades since Mr Fraser introduced our first comprehensive multicultural policy, during the past 12 months, one in five people living in Australia was a target of racial discrimination. That is about 4.6 million people, which is an increase from one in eight in the previous year. One in five living in Australia has been a target of verbal racial abuse.

Verbal abuse is the most common form of racism. Nearly half of all Australian residents from a culturally and linguistically diverse background have experienced racism at some time in their life. Seven in 10 teenagers have experienced racism, and three in four Indigenous Australians regularly experience racism.

Australia has a culture of denial when it comes to racism. It is based on the findings of the report, 'Denial of racism and its implication for location action' by Jacqueline Nelson of the University of Western Sydney. Denial of racism in South Australia perpetuates racist behaviour.

Half of us, believe it or not, are positive about the cultural diversity of Australia. This is after more than three decades of what Fraser implemented. While five in 10 of us are positive about cultural diversity, four in 10 are ambivalent about cultural diversity, and one in 10 have racist attitudes. One in seven people living in Australia are against the concept of multiculturalism. Three in 10 people do not believe that immigrants make Australia stronger, and one in three believe there are some cultural groups that do not belong in Australia.

How does racism in Australia actually affect us? Cross-cultural tension affects everybody in our society. A range of health problems, including high blood pressure, heart disease, depression, anxiety, low birth rate and premature birth can all be caused directly by people's personal experiences of racism. This will impact on our health system in Australia and South Australia.

It also affects people's employment and housing opportunities. For example, to get as many job interviews as an Anglo applicant an Indigenous person must submit 35 per cent more applications; a Chinese person, 68 per cent more; an Italian person, 12 per cent more; and a Middle Eastern person, 64 per cent more applications, just to get a job.

Racism can lead to violence, as seen in Melbourne and Sydney during the past decade. The Tourism Forecasting Committee says the number of Indians applying for student visas to Australia has plummeted by 48 per cent due to racially motivated attacks. This is a potential economic loss to Australia of up to \$78 million.

I call on the federal opposition leader Bill Shorten and the Labor Party to stop taking instructions from his union masters and the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, trying to reject the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement. They will be sabotaging our economic future and will be turning their back on one of the greatest opportunities our country has ever been offered. Australia has nothing to fear and everything to gain. The Labor Party and the trade union movement must act in Australia's best interest, otherwise it will damage the relationship we have with one of our largest trading partners and damage our economy.

With the challenges of racism and the many issues faced by the CALD communities, I would like to reaffirm my commitment to support our multicultural community to grow and expand. The key elements of multiculturalism set by the Rt Hon. Malcolm Fraser should be the recognition and appreciation of the fact that the Australian population derived from a wide variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and that these backgrounds are important to the way Australians see themselves.

Multiculturalism should not just be concerned with the passive toleration of diversity. It should see diversity as a quality to be actively embraced, and a source of social capital and economic dynamism. It encourages groups of people to be open and to interact, so that all Australians must learn and benefit from each other's heritage. Multiculturalism is about diversity and not division. It is about interaction and not isolation. It is about cultural and ethnic differences set within a framework of shared fundamental values which enables them to coexist on a complementary rather than competitive basis.

With those few remarks, I would like to once again thank the Hon. Tung Ngo for moving this important motion. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (22:29): It is with deep sadness that I rise to speak to this motion introduced by the Hon. Tung Ngo and to pay tribute to the contribution of former prime minister Malcolm Fraser. Mr Fraser was a politician of principle and conviction, a leader of compassion and a voice for human rights and decency.

I have to admit that, as a primary school-aged child, I do not think I would have ever seen myself not only in a parliament but in a parliament saying those particular words, having grown up under prime minister Malcolm Fraser, who was not one of my favourite politicians as a young child. I took particular umbrage to the fact that he was married to a woman called Tammy.

As a Liberal, he was not the brand of politics I aspired to. I have to say that I have lived to see those attitudes change in myself, but unfortunately to have seen the attitudes of Australians change, particularly towards refugees, in that time.

Malcolm Fraser's legacy will remain one which promoted multiculturalism, cultural diversity and compassion and acceptance of refugees who were fleeing war and persecution. Prime minister Fraser adopted a humanitarian policy, which saw an intake of around 200,000 migrants from Asian countries, with nearly 56,000 Vietnamese refugees settling in Australia. They call Australia home, and they have contributed greatly to our nation.

I remember, again as a child, this time in high school, that a friend of mine had come from Timor-Leste. She and I had been very close for some time, and I had never even questioned why she was in Australia, but of course she was a refugee. It was not until a teacher asked her to tell our class how it was that she had come to be in Australia that any of us in that class gave it a second thought.

She told us a story of fleeing gunfire, fleeing violence and, indeed, she told us a story where all of the men in her family had been killed. Until that point, I had never wondered why there were only women in the household when I went to visit. Suddenly, it dawned on me that all of the men had been killed, and that is why they had come to Australia and not only made their home in our country but, of course, she had taken her place in our classroom.

Under Fraser's leadership, the immigration department gained a dedicated refugee branch to help process and resettle Indochinese refugees. A special humanitarian program allowed the department to resettle people who fell outside the strict legal definition of 'refugee' but who were nevertheless in desperate need of protection. Most importantly, Mr Fraser rejected mandatory detention of refugees. Refugees found refuge in Australia and were re-homed.

Evidence from the immigration department released at the time shows that, under Mr Fraser, the department did not detain Vietnamese boat arrivals and would only place them in quarantine for a short period if necessary. A United Nations representative who inspected these facilities in 1979 reported that officers in charge showed 'a high degree of compassion, interest and preparedness to help' those asylum seekers.

Thanks to Mr Fraser's leadership, the immigration department demonstrated what controlled immigration should mean: asylum seekers processed in accordance with international refugee law. This is, of course, in stark contrast to the current regime and approach to dealing with people seeking asylum here in Australia, which has been described in a recent *New York Times* editorial as 'inhumane, of dubious legality and strikingly at odds with the country's tradition of welcoming people fleeing persecution and war'.

In recent years, Australia has been detaining asylum seekers for longer and longer periods, at a cost to the taxpayer of up to \$400,000 per person each year. This is according to the National Commission of Audit. It found that the cost of detention and processing has increased from \$118 million a year in 2009-10 to \$3.3 billion in 2013-14.

Since its election to government in 2013, the federal Coalition government has reduced the annual refugee intake from 20,000 per year in 2013 to the current number of 13,750 per year at a time when the world is facing a global refugee crisis on a scale we have not seen since the Second World War.

I would note that there are some glimmers of hope and I think in recent weeks the response to the global humanitarian tragedy and the crisis unfolding in Syria offers some hope. Many, of course, leave Syria in the middle of the night with nowhere to go. They are trapped between a brutal president who is dropping bombs on his own people and the brutal and militant ISIS forces.

We know that in times of need Australians do not turn their backs. We have seen thousands of Australians across the country come together for the Light the Dark vigils organised by GetUp! to reflect on the plight of refugees from around the world and, in particular, the Syrian people who are fleeing war, drought and persecution. Indeed, we have seen the federal government grant refuge to these refugees.

We are fortunate to live in a country that is strong enough to offer safety to these men, women and children. Malcolm Fraser said life wasn't meant to be easy. I would point out that leadership is also not easy, and true leadership on refugees is probably one of the most difficult parts of our current contemporary political discourse. Yet, that leadership has never been more needed.

It is not just happening in our parliaments but it is also happening in our councils, and I want to note the work of the Adelaide Hills Council which recently passed a motion moved by the mayor, Bill Spragg. It reads:

That council:

1. Encourages the Federal Government to temporarily halt the sale of Inverbrackie and re-open the facility to provide accommodation for Syrian Refugees.
2. Authorises the Mayor to write to the Prime Minister of Australia informing him of Council's decision and also that Adelaide Hills Council is a Refugee Welcome Zone. Copies of the letter be sent to the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection and Mr Jamie Briggs, Member of the House of Representatives for Mayo.

I note that that was carried unanimously by the Adelaide Hills Council and I commend them for that. I note other councils in this state have recently declared themselves refugee welcome zones, and I can only hope that that leadership grows. It is a grassroots leadership but it also, I hope, is echoed in the chambers of our parliament. I note that councillor Nathan Daniell, of the Adelaide Hills Council, stated:

This is a great idea and indeed a compassionate one which would allow us as a community to extend a hand to those most in need, Syrian refugees fleeing war and persecution. Earlier this year the Council declared itself as a Refugee Welcome Zone and this motion reflects that commitment in a positive and practical manner.

I know that Australia can become a compassionate and humane nation as it once was when I was growing up and thought that Malcolm Fraser was perhaps not the best prime minister. As I say, on reflection, he was pretty damn good, particularly on refugee issues.

I think Australia is a compassionate and humane nation. We were part of the setting up of the United Nations and we have a proud human rights history. I hope that we can have a proud human rights future. We are strong enough to help those most in need and we are strong enough for those who come to us seeking asylum. We should look to our former leaders such as former prime minister Fraser to take that strength from as we go into the future. With that, I commend the motion.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (22:38): I rise to support the motion. The late Malcolm Fraser was a complex character who, for much of his political career, excited passions of admiration and loathing, perhaps in equal measure, but in whose later years became a truly great Australian in the eyes of many of his former detractors.

My connections with the late Malcolm Fraser were limited. Like many here, I vividly remember the days of the dismissal in 1975. I was only 16 and not yet able to vote, but I did as Gough asked and I maintained my rage. I participated in my first federal election in 1977. I declined to vote for Malcolm Fraser, or any of his party, a practice which I have kept up for most of my life.

A few years later, in the early 1980s, I recall attending political rallies against Malcolm Fraser as a young university student. I do not recall the subject matter but at the time I was certain that he was the worst prime minister Australia has ever had. That mantle has since been passed on to subsequent prime ministers—but I digress.

At the height of the Franklin River campaign in south-west Tasmania in 1983, while my wife was being arrested for the heinous crime of trespassing on public land, Malcolm Fraser was supporting states' rights while his opponent Bob Hawke promised to protect the wilderness. Hawke won and Fraser lost and, like many conservationists, I cheered loudly. Fraser's lip famously trembled during his concession speech and the cartoonists went wild.

Let's fast forward 3½ decades. Malcolm Fraser has resigned from the Liberal Party and can be seen sitting next to a Greens candidate in a public forum urging South Australian voters to re-elect Senator Sarah Hanson-Young. According to the ABC news report of 8 July 2013:

Former Liberal prime minister Malcolm Fraser has thrown his support behind Greens Senator Sarah Hanson-Young, saying neither of the major parties deserve a majority in both houses of parliament.

Mr Fraser says while it is unusual for him to support a particular person in the Senate, he feels strongly about Senator Hanson-Young's stance on asylum seekers.

The former Liberal party leader told a forum in Adelaide that he supports her bid for re-election, but not her party as a whole.

I just add that he did not know the rest of us as well, otherwise he might not have said that. The article goes on:

He went on to describe Senator Hanson-Young as 'a resolute and fair-minded voice on an issue which is important to Australia and where the major parties have let Australia down very, very seriously'.

If you had told me, as I cast my first vote back in 1977, that this is what the future held, then I would not have believed you. Certainly the Greens did not exist (at least by that name) and neither, for that matter, did Senator Sarah Hanson-Young.

Back in 1975, it would have been regarded as fanciful that 'Kerr's cur' would become a beacon of humanity and a champion of compassion and human rights, particularly in relation to the matters referred to in this motion, such as his attitude and policy to refugees, including more than 50,000 displaced Vietnamese during and after the Vietnam War.

I will just mention briefly one connection that my family has with the late Malcolm Fraser. In the late 1960s, during Australia's escalating involvement in the Vietnam War, Malcolm Fraser was the minister for defence. At the same time, my grandfather, Bill Leng, was the deputy secretary for

the Department of Defence and he accompanied Malcolm Fraser on a number of trips overseas, including to Singapore and Vietnam.

According to family folklore, they were memorable trips and my grandfather, being a very discreet man, maintained his public silence to the grave. He offered only a few hints of the shenanigans that transpired. As the saying goes, 'What happens on tour stays on tour.'

My grandfather died 19 years ago and they have now named a new street in the Canberra suburb of Coomb after him, which has quite excited my family. But, at the end of the day, I expect that the life and times of the Hon. Malcolm Fraser will excite the interest of historians and political commentators long after the life of a humble public servant is forgotten. I commend the motion.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (22:43): I rise in support of the motion. I thank and congratulate the Hon. Tung Ngo for bringing this motion to the attention of the chamber. The motion is that this council acknowledges the positive contribution to Australian society that former prime minister Malcolm Fraser made; acknowledges Malcolm Fraser's policy in promoting multiculturalism and acceptance of refugees that has laid the groundwork for a peaceful and diverse Australia of today; and notes, in particular, the leadership former prime minister Malcolm Fraser demonstrated in dealing with the resettlement of about 200,000 Asian and Middle Eastern migrants and refugees, especially more than 50,000 displaced Vietnamese during and after the Vietnam War.

The Rt. Hon. Malcolm Fraser had a very great concern for human rights and in ensuring human dignity. Unfortunately, as has been said by other members of this chamber, many of his achievements have been overshadowed by the events of 1975. Malcolm Fraser considered his proudest achievement was the resettlement of Vietnamese fleeing their country to escape the brutality of war and the fall of the country to communist forces.

To his great credit he overcame the Whitlam Labor opposition to the resettlement of fleeing Vietnamese and we now enjoy a dynamic Vietnamese Australian community which continues to greatly contribute to the life of this state. His efforts cemented the vision of a multicultural Australia. In other words, Fraser consolidated a multicultural approach towards immigration, making this observation in 1981:

The less constructively a society responds to its own diversity the less capable it becomes of doing so. Its reluctance to respond, fuelled by the fear of encouraging division, becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy—the erosion of national cohesion is the result not of the fact of diversity but of its denial and suppression.

Malcolm Fraser's biographer, Phillip Ayres, says of him:

[Malcolm Fraser] thought that the best Conservative would be 'like Churchill—a radical determined to destroy evil, and wherever he found it, by constructive legislation.'

All his life Malcolm Fraser retained his reforming and idealistic vision until the end. His biographer goes on to say that along with his particular individualism went a social conscience and that his social individualism was similar to that of Menzies.

I thought I might finish my submission on this motion by quoting a *Sydney Morning Herald* article. It reports the comments of a Dr Nguyen who was a medical officer with the South Vietnamese Army when he was captured by northern forces and detained in a concentration camp for three years and starved by his communist captors. He was released in 1978, and tried unsuccessfully to flee the country several times before finally escaping in 1980 in a small boat with his fiancée and her 13-year-old brother. The threesome braved rough seas but eventually made it to Australia. In a speech at his 30th anniversary in 2011 he said:

I was so lucky to be in this wonderful country. To me and all other Indochinese refugees, the then PM Malcolm Fraser and the two ministers for immigration of that period, Mr Michael McKellar and Mr Ian McPhee were real heroes who reversed Whitlam's policy and gave us a chance to resettle in Australia.

He added:

Of all the prime ministers of Australia Malcolm Fraser is great, if not the greatest, in the area of human rights, of compassion and of social justice. What he did was never done before by any prime minister. There was nobody who could match him in those areas like Aboriginal land rights, his strong stand against apartheid and his promotion of multiculturalism and especially taking in the Vietnamese refugees. To us he is a real hero. He set a shining example for us all in terms of compassion towards other human beings.

I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (22:48): In 1975 after the Vietnam War we saw an influx of Vietnamese escaping the new Communist Vietnamese government. It was reported that over the years 2 million Vietnamese refugees have fled Vietnam, mainly by boat. Earlier this year I introduced this motion on behalf of many ethnic communities in Australia, especially the Vietnamese community, to thank the Rt. Hon. Malcolm Fraser for his leadership when he was in both opposition and government in promoting multiculturalism.

His policy of accepting many refugees from Vietnam laid the groundwork for successive governments to follow. Recently I spoke about the plight of Syrian refugees and urged the Australian government to take Syrian refugees and not disadvantage other refugees living in camps around the world. I also spoke about Australia's proud history of accepting refugees and Australia's reputation of being a kind and generous nation. Refugees do not forget this generosity. They remain loyal and repay Australia in many ways.

I also thanked our former prime minister the Hon. Tony Abbott MP for taking on an extra 12,000 Syrian refugees on top of the yearly intake of 13,750. It is regrettable that Mr Abbott is no longer prime minister. I would have liked to see him to be given the opportunity to greet some of the Syrian refugees who will be arriving in Australia very soon.

Seeing Syrian refugees escaping their war torn country brought back memories to many Vietnamese living abroad about their own circumstances 40 years ago. I will read out a post from one of my many friends on Facebook. I think it sums up the similarity of the current refugee situation in Europe and Vietnam 40 years ago.

This post is from Mr Jackie Tran. Jackie has a master's degree in journalism and now runs his own photography company. On his Facebook page it looks like he is now travelling around Australia and the world, taking lots of wedding photos for many couples. I also notice that he has taken many photos of up and coming models. Indeed, he is a very lucky young man as he always seems to be surrounded by beautiful people. Let me read out Jackie's post on 3 September 2015 at 10.46pm as follows:

We all saw the heart-breaking and haunting photo of the drowned toddler on the beach today. To the millions of Vietnamese people living abroad, this is nothing new. For us, we all know far too well the dangers as refugees at sea, walking the fine line between hope and death. Clinging to whatever hope remained as we fight off hunger and dehydration or watching your boat sink slowly into the waves.

This year, over 2,500 refugees died trying to cross the Mediterranean to reach Europe alone. For the Vietnamese people—it is estimated by the UN Human Rights Commission that between 200,000 to 400,000 of us died on the high sea in hope of reaching other countries as refugees over two decades. I do not want the Syrian people or anyone to break this tragic record.

Back then, many countries around the world came together to bear the burden and granted asylum and resettlement to our people, for which we are eternally grateful for. To this day, the Vietnamese people living abroad repay that debt by immersing ourselves in our adopted countries and help shape modern society by playing key parts in the community, in politics, military figures and pioneers to name a few.

We were given that chance. The same chance, should be given to the Syrian people and other refugees too genuinely seeking asylum. They can and will also be great contributors to their adopted countries, if given the same chance. I cannot bear to see more images of drowned refugees at sea, for I picture my own people decades ago suffering the same fate.

I will use this opportunity to thank the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Andrew McLachlan who have contributed to this motion acknowledging former prime minister the Right Honourable Malcolm Fraser for his work in promoting multicultural Australia.

The PRESIDENT: The purpose of summing up, Hon. Mr Ngo, is just to sum up and thank everyone, not to repeat the first speech, which you did.

Motion carried.

Bills

WATER INDUSTRY (THIRD PARTY ACCESS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

LIQUOR LICENSING (PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN LIQUOR) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

LIQUOR LICENSING (ENTERTAINMENT ON LICENSED PREMISES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FIREARMS OFFENCES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 22:56 the council adjourned until Thursday 15 October 2015 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS**

63 **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (3 December 2014). (First Session) Since 1 January 2014—

1. Were any persons employed or otherwise engaged as a consultant or contractor, in any department or agency reporting to the Minister for Investment and Trade, who had previously received a separation package from the state government; and
2. If so—
 - (a) What number of persons were employed;
 - (b) What number were engaged as a consultant; and
 - (c) What number were engaged as a contractor?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): The Minister for Regional Development has provided the following advice:

1. Yes
2. During 2014 PIRSA engaged one person as a contractor who had previously received a separation package in 2009 from another state government agency.

Minister Rau's answer will cover the local government portfolio.