

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 25 May 2016

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:16 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to welcome the SDA warehouse delegates. It is good to see you here. You have come to see another fine performance from the Minister for Police.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: He better be on his best behaviour today then.

The PRESIDENT: And so should you.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:17): I bring up the 24th report of the committee.
Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

The University of Adelaide—Report, 2015

By the Minister for Police (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Dangerous area declarations issued for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 March 2016
pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953

Road Blocks issued for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 March 2016 pursuant to the
Summary Offences Act 1953

Ministerial Statement

KHAPRA BEETLE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries entitled Khapra Beetle.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

Parliamentary Committees

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:19): By leave, I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. T.A. Franks be appointed to the Statutory Authorities Review Committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

Motion carried.

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:20): By leave, I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. D.G.E. Hood be appointed to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee in place of the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire (resigned).

Motion carried.

Question Time

GEORGE'S CORNER

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Road Safety a question about the intersection of Nelshaby Road and the Augusta Highway.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am sure the minister is aware of the tragic accident that occurred this week at the Augusta Highway and Nelshaby Road intersection. Unfortunately, this latest accident is the most recent in a long history of fatalities and injuries which have occurred at this intersection. The RAA has the Augusta Highway on its priority list. The highway carries up to 10,000 vehicles per day and it has been reported that there is an average of 29 crashes per year which result in death or injury.

The Port Pirie and surrounding communities have been calling on state government assistance for over a decade to make this intersection safer. It has been confirmed by the federal member for Grey, Mr Rowan Ramsey, that neither minister Brock nor the state government has ever put this intersection forward for funding under the federal Black Spot Program. My questions are:

1. Why has the state government not suggested or prioritised this intersection for funding under the federal Black Spot Program?
2. Will the minister give an assurance to the house today that this intersection will be finally recommended by the state government for black spot funding?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have some information that I am in the position to be able to share with the house and particularly with the honourable member regarding the question. On 23 May, only a few days ago, at approximately 8.55pm, a fatal crash did tragically occur at the intersection that the honourable member refers to, which is commonly referred to as George's Corner. A sedan travelling east on the Spencer Highway intended to make a right turn onto the Augusta Highway to return to the Rangeview Caravan and Cabin Park at about 70 metres south of the collision site. There is a range of details that I am able to share with the honourable member regarding the accident, if he is particularly interested, which I do not intend to go into now as I would rather get to the point of his question.

This is a government that has been absolutely committed to investing in road safety. Many members of the public would be aware that, over the past few years, the MAC road safety fund, which is an amount of approximately \$3.5 million, has been spent on improving the Augusta Highway including improving the intersections and access to the service station in Snowtown, improving the access points at the Mambray Creek rest area, and hazard protection and removal of works at critical locations.

An important point for the honourable member to be aware of is that the location of George's Corner was not identified as a priority for works when assessing safety improvements on the Augusta Highway as part of the safety review of the highway. It is worthy of note that when it comes to statistics

regarding the intersection to which the honourable member refers in his question, I am advised that since 2006 there has only been one fatality on that road. I am advised there have only been two serious injuries since 2006 and one minor injury, with a total number of crashes since 2006 of five. Of course, one fatality is one too many. But the suggestion from the honourable member that somehow there has been a litany of fatalities at this intersection in recent times, as I understand it, is not a reflection of the facts.

There are a few other points that I am keen to make, but none more important than the fact that DPTI, as I am advised, will indeed be installing a right-turn lane from the Augusta Highway into Nelshaby Road at the location in 2016-17, which we expect to be in October-November this year, subject to weather, when this section of the Augusta Highway will be resealed. So yes, this is an area that is of attention. There has been a number of looks into this site which have resulted necessarily in the upgrade that I have just referred to, but the suggestion from the honourable member that this has been a site, as I said, that has been subject to numerous serious injuries or fatalities in recent times isn't reflected in the facts that I have been advised of.

Nevertheless, the government is looking at this site. The recent accident is, of course, a tragedy. I am sure all members of the house would be concerned by it, but this government remains committed to making sure that we go about prioritising road safety investments which are substantial in a methodical way that is based on evidence to ensure that we are getting the best bang for our buck as taxpayers when it comes to road safety.

GEORGE'S CORNER

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (14:26): Supplementary: can the minister reassure the house, given that he just said there were also, I think, over \$3 million that went to road improvement there from MAC, that now the government is privatising MAC, that the money that MAC has been putting into road upgrades and road safety will be an additional supplementary increase from Treasury, or how does he intend to offset the fact that MAC is probably the only one putting extra money into road safety and road infrastructure improvements?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question, I know he shares a passion for what happens to regional roads in the state of South Australia. There are multiple sources of revenue, as I am advised, with respect to works undertaken from DPTI regarding regional roads. The \$3.5 million investment that I referred to from the Motor Accident Commission road safety fund, as I am advised, is an alternate source of funding, but it works very much hand in hand and in complement with other expenditures that are being undertaken from DPTI in respect to upgrades and road infrastructure.

TENNYSON DUNES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:27): I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation regarding the remnant dune system between Grange and Semaphore.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Honourable members may recall that an 11 hectare site which is often referred to as the Tennyson Dunes was declared a conservation reserve by this minister Hunter in September last year. This initiative had bipartisan support as it was a commitment from both major parties prior to the election—and I am assuming that the Greens supported that as well.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have an indication of yes from the Leader of the Greens. However, this is not the only section of remnant coastal dunes on that part of our metropolitan coast. Sections of the same dunal system which are north and south of the conservation reserve are potentially under threat, depending on the type of construction of a shared pathway for the coastal park. I understand that proposed amendments to the management plan for those corridors by the City of Charles Sturt received 157 objections with only one in favour. I also understand that were

these fragile remnants located outside the metropolitan area they would receive some protection under the Native Vegetation Act given the significant native vegetation contained therein.

A letter from Professor Chris Daniels to Ms Valerie Wales, who is of the Tennyson Dunes Support Group, dated 17 June 2014 refers to 22 hectares of primary dunes in that region, and he advocates for their protection. I quote from his letter:

The effect of bisecting the Dunes system centrally and along its length, with a raised cycle pathway will have the effect of:

- 1: subdividing the park...
- 2: Shared paths between cyclists and walkers, roller bladders, skate boarders and pram pushers will lead to collisions and injury...
- 3: There are very easy options for running the cycle path out of the dunes in the Tennyson Dunes section and then returning the cycle path to the coast, north and south of the Dunes. Hence all users can be serviced safely.

He then goes on to say:

There are significant risks associated with running a pathway through the dunes, which will simultaneously do significant damage. There are excellent and safer alternatives.

My questions are:

1. Has the state government undertaken an EIS or similar process for this project?
2. Is the expertise of Professor Daniels continuing to be sought regarding this specific matter?
3. Has the government considered whether any liabilities may arise from diminution of the dunal system, which may result in property damage during storms?
4. Who does the minister advise aggrieved constituents to contact in government, given that the local member seems to be in lock step with the City of Charles Sturt?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions, although there is some confusion in her mind, I suspect, in terms of the drafting of the questions. There is a number of issues to be dealt with here. One of them is in fact Tennyson Dunes itself. It is a very important biodiverse area, which we recognise generally as Tennyson Dunes. There are other remnant dunal systems which abut Tennyson Dunes, of course, and which are of a significantly lower biodiversity value and which do not have anything like the biodiversity value of the Tennyson Dunes system itself. Of course discussions then about the bicycle pathway or the coast park impinge on that discussion, whether we are talking about the low biodiversity section or the high biodiversity section, where there are different views.

I do understand, of course, that there are differences of views in the council area, a difference of views from local government, from residents and particularly from people who have for a long time been associated with Tennyson Dunes. I always pay a lot of attention to their views because they volunteer their time and their efforts to make sure that that fantastic section of the coast is looked after. They are a very important natural coastal reminder of the original dunes system that was once common along the Adelaide metropolitan coastline, but no more, but in recognition of their significance and to protect this area for the future I dedicated the Tennyson Dunes as a coastal conservation reserve under the Crown Lands Management Act, 2009 on 13 September 2015.

A Tennyson Dunes working group, including members from the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, the City of Charles Sturt and the Tennyson Dunes Group will be providing advice to me on the overall management of the Tennyson Dunes conservation reserve. Habitat restoration work at Tennyson Dunes is undertaken by the department in liaison with community groups and the City of Charles Sturt. This continued investment in the dunes, initiated by the Patawalonga and Torrens catchment water management boards and Coastcare in the 1990s, now continues. Additional resourcing has now been made available through the Adelaide Living Beaches program as well, I am advised.

The Tennyson Dunes Coast Park Concept Report was developed late last year after consultation with the Tennyson Dunes Group and the City of Charles Sturt. The concept plan proposes a shared use discovery trail be developed that promotes the unique environment and aesthetic values to be found in this dune reserve. Stakeholder engagement commenced in January of this year, and was completed, I am advised, on 8 April. The goal of this phase was to listen to key stakeholders on their views for potential routes of the pathway through the Tennyson conservation park.

I expect to receive a summary of that stakeholder engagement shortly. Once I receive and consider those views, I would be happy to update the honourable member and the chamber on this very important issue—and it is a very important issue—so that we get it right. By way of extra information, Tennyson Dunes has been nominated, I understand, to the South Australian Heritage Council for consideration as a potential entry in the South Australian Heritage Register as a state heritage place. As per the agreed South Australian Heritage Council schedule, the department will seek to undertake an assessment of the state heritage values of the dunes. If the South Australian Heritage Council determines that the dunes are of state heritage significance, they will provisionally be entered in the South Australian Heritage Registrar. That is a decision for the council, not for me.

Should the dunes provisionally be entered in the register, owners of the land and members of the public will have a period of three months to provide written representations to the council on whether the entry in the register should be confirmed as required under the act, and the council (the Heritage Council, not the local government council) will consider the available evidence and any submissions received before determining whether the provisional entry should be confirmed or removed from the register.

TENNYSON DUNES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:34): By way of supplementary question arising from the minister's answer, given that he intimated in his response that the area that is not part of the coastal reserve system does not have the same level of biodiversity values, what assessments can he advise the council have been undertaken for him to have reached that conclusion?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:34): It is a conclusion that has been arrived at by the department and conveyed to me in their advice. I would say, if the honourable member is interested, I can ask for that information to be provided to her, but it would be information, I assume, that has been provided through DEWNR and the NRM board.

MUNICIPAL AND ESSENTIAL SERVICES PROGRAM

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation in relation to the delivery of services to Aboriginal communities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On 13 April 2015, the minister welcomed an agreement with the commonwealth under which the state would receive \$15 million of federal funding to support the delivery of municipal and essential services at Aboriginal communities outside the APY lands. In last year's announcement, the minister stated that over the course of the next 12 months, the state government would 'work closely with the Aboriginal Lands Trust' and others 'to ensure that these services are properly planned and delivered in an effective manner'.

The announcement included a number of positive remarks from Mr Haydyn Bromley, the presiding member of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, who welcomed the idea of bringing together the Aboriginal Lands Trust, Aboriginal community leaders and service delivery experts with the goal of ending the fragmented approach to service delivery. In recent days, Mr Bromley has criticised the government for failing to include the Aboriginal Lands Trust in the planning and delivery of these federally funded services.

As reported by the ABC, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has, without any discussions or negotiations with the trust, entered into agreements with councils,

contractors and other parties to deliver these federally funded services to trust communities. My questions are:

1. Does the minister support the way the Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure has excluded the Aboriginal Lands Trust from the planning and delivery of these services?
2. What will he do to ensure that the government honours the commitment that he gave last year to work closely with the Aboriginal Lands Trust to ensure that these services are properly planned and delivered?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, the delivery of services, whether they be health, education or municipal services, to Aboriginal communities, particularly remote Aboriginal communities, is exceptionally important to South Australia. In nearly all areas of service delivery in South Australia there is always room for improvement, and certainly we seek, not just we as a state government but the federal government and other service providers, whether they be Nganampa Health in the APY lands or other service providers right around South Australia, to make sure that we are providing the services as effectively as we possibly can to Aboriginal communities, particularly remote Aboriginal communities where there are significant challenges, not just through distance but also in terms of cultural and language barriers.

Certainly, I meet very regularly with the Aboriginal Lands Trust, a number of times a year, and in discussion with the Aboriginal Lands Trust regularly pass on any views they have to a whole range of areas and government agencies and service providers. I have done that in the past and I will continue to do that. I will continue to raise anything that is raised with me by the ALT with those different areas of government concerned. I have done that in the past and I undertake to continue to do that.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, Mr Wade.

MUNICIPAL AND ESSENTIAL SERVICES PROGRAM

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:38): Has the Aboriginal Lands Trust raised concerns with the minister at the way the DPTI has excluded them from the process?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:38): I am happy to go back and check records, if I can, of the many meetings that I have had with the Aboriginal Lands Trust. Certainly, concerns have been raised, points have been put forward across a whole range of areas. I am happy to come back to the honourable member in relation to the municipal services area, which I think the question was directly about, and bring back a reply.

ABORIGINAL CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister advise the chamber on how the government is supporting constitutional recognition for Aboriginal people?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for her important question. The issue of constitutional recognition of Aboriginal people is certainly not a bipartisan but a multipartisan approach that has long been taken in South Australia and Australia generally. We took the step a couple of years ago, under the former minister for Aboriginal affairs, to recognise Aboriginal people as the original custodians of the lands and waterways of South Australia, and we changed our Constitution Act to reflect that, which was a very significant thing that we did in South Australia and that enjoyed very broad multipartisan support.

Certainly, the push for recognition in the federal constitution enjoys similar bipartisan support, which is regularly needed when you are changing the constitution. Only something like eight of the 44 or 45 referendums to change our constitution have been successful, so that support across the political spectrum is incredibly important. I am very pleased that on Monday, the South Australian government became only the second state or territory to officially sign on as a campaign partner with Recognise.

Recognise, which is the lead campaign for this area within Reconciliation Australia, is helping Australians understand the importance and meaning of constitutional recognition for Aboriginal people. I would like to thank Recognise for the very important work that they do and have been doing to ensure the success of this campaign, and hopefully the success of a referendum. I would particularly like to thank Tanya Hosch, an Indigenous woman from South Australia, who is the co-director of Recognise.

Our constitution is not just a practical document; it is a powerful symbol of democracy and a statement of our common values and beliefs which remain fundamental to modern Australia. It does not just provide a framework for how society operates now; it also shows where we have been as a nation, and where we are going.

What struck me this week after we signed on as an official campaign partner were the comments made on ABC radio by University of South Australia Professor Irabinna Rigney, a leader in the South Australian Aboriginal community, who described the constitution as the 'birth certificate of the nation,' and I think that is a good analogy. A birth certificate rightly describes where you have come from, and I think describing our constitution as the 'birth certificate of a nation' is a good analogy. It is unusual that it does not describe where this land has come from or make mention of 40,000 years of continuous habitation of the oldest living culture in the world.

Enshrining the recognition of Aboriginal people in our constitution will make the important statement that Aboriginal people matter to this nation and its people, and that they matter to our history, our values, our conscience and our spirit. It is a glaring omission in historical terms, but, much more importantly, it amounts to an erasure of the tens of thousands of years of Aboriginal history that preceded European settlement. The government believes that by continuing to exclude this recognition in our constitution, it sends the wrong message for reconciliation. That is why it is important, as we have done in South Australia, to correct this omission in our nation's founding document.

I especially want to commend, from the announcement this week, Mr Adam Goodes, a South Australian, Adnyamathanha and Narungga man, an AFL legend, former Australian of the Year, and an ambassador for the Recognise campaign. Life after football has presented Adam with many opportunities, and he has chosen to give back very strongly with the Recognise campaign and to fight for recognition in the constitution. I commend him for using his public profile for this greater good in advancing this cause.

I look forward to federally doing what we have done in this state: the recognition of our first peoples in our constitution. I know that there is a very good aim to have this referendum in May next year, which will be the 50th anniversary of the 1967 referendum, which included Aboriginal people in our national census for the first time. I am committed, as I know the South Australian government is committed, as are those on a state and federal level right across the political spectrum, to making this recognition happen.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Ms Vincent.

ABORIGINAL CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:43): Thank you, Mr President. How does the minister respond to Aboriginal people who may believe that a treaty is a preferable solution, rather than the Recognise campaign, and how significant a number of people does he believe that is?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is a very good question. Like any sort of views about any sort of topics,

there are no uniform views amongst the whole of a particular community. I think striving for a treaty or for steps beyond recognition is a reasonable and genuine ambition of many people, but I do not think it is mutually exclusive. I do not think to end up at a treaty means you cannot have recognition of our First Peoples in our constitution. I see that as certainly maybe a step along the way, but I do not agree with the proposition that it is a treaty or nothing. I think they are not at all mutually exclusive.

In my engagement with Aboriginal people and Aboriginal communities, I found overwhelming support for recognition throughout South Australia. I know there have been something like I think about eight opinion polls that have gauged general support and support amongst Indigenous Australia for constitutional recognition. It has consistently run at about 85 per cent support. So, although I agree that it is not one homogenous view about exactly what the words might be or whether this is the exact right way or only way to go, I firmly believe that this does not exclude taking other steps later on. I support the overwhelming majority of Indigenous Australians who support constitutional recognition.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Ms Franks.

ABORIGINAL CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:45): Noting the Andrews government has entered into talks with First Nations people, will the Weatherill government be doing the same with South Australian First Nations people with regard to a treaty?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. We will always look to ways that we can have better and deeper engagement with Aboriginal South Australians. I think one of the ways we are leading the nation is with our Aboriginal Regional Authority Policy that sets up a framework for Aboriginal communities in geographical areas to be represented by a regional authority that can deal with government from one geographical area, almost on a leader-to-leader basis.

I know that already the Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority regularly has meetings with a number of ministers on a leader-to-leader basis: leaders of the Ngarrindjeri nation with the state government. I have noted it, and I will get more information about what Victoria is doing, but I think that, in directly negotiating and giving Aboriginal communities more of a say, I am pleased with the direction our regional authorities policy is going. But I certainly will inform myself more on what Victoria is doing.

PRISONER SUPPORT AND TREATMENT

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Correctional Services regarding prison services and support for and treatment of offenders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: As members would be aware, yesterday the Ombudsman released a report about the shackling of a prisoner experiencing mental illness, known as Prisoner A, taking the total to three shackling incidents that have now been investigated in the minister's department.

Last Thursday, I also asked the minister questions surrounding prison and correctional services programs and characteristics of prisoners. While the minister provided a range of general information, he undertook to come back to me with some specific answers. I also asked a range of questions of the minister regarding prisoners with mental illness and cognitive disabilities, specifically on 13 April, and I am awaiting a response.

Given that it has come to light since that there are more than 200 people in prison who are scheduled for release but cannot be released due to a lack of suitable housing, I remain concerned and anxious to receive a response to know that the government is working urgently to rectify this. I also have some other questions arising from the minister's comments in *Hansard* last week, where he admitted that 48 per cent of people exiting the system in South Australia reoffend.

He said, 'Our prisons are becoming increasingly full,' and he makes no apologies for that. I recall that he referred to a reduction in crime in the state. He also expressed a desire to rehabilitate our prisoners and expressed support for programs on prisoner release. So, my questions are:

1. Does the minister concede that it is not appropriate to shackle a prisoner with mental illness to an emergency department hospital bed, particularly to the extent that they sustain significant injuries from that restraint?
2. Is there any truth in the claim that softer restraints were offered but not used?
3. What action is the minister taking to prevent the further shackling of prisoners with mental illness to beds in emergency departments across our hospitals?
4. Given the high rate of mental illness among our prison population, why does South Australia not have a specialised mental health service within the corrections department?
5. Could the minister please outline what programs for prisoners Corrections does provide in relation to education, vocational training, life skills, rehabilitation, mental health and other supports?
6. What programs does Corrections fund for non-government providers to deliver services to prisoners, former prisoners and their families?
7. What percentage of the prison population in South Australia is known to have a disability?
8. What percentage of the prison population in South Australia has a known mental illness?
9. What categories of crime have reduced in South Australia in the past decade, as outlined by the minister last week and by what percentage? And does the minister have any answers to the questions I asked on previous sitting days?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for all 36 of her questions!

The Hon. K.L. Vincent: Nine.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: Nine, okay. But I will do my best to answer those questions, some more specifically and some in sentiments generally. Regarding the honourable member's request regarding previous questions that she has asked that I have taken on notice, I am very keen to ensure that, as a minister, I bring back questions on notice as quickly as I possibly can, and I will endeavour to make sure that that objective is honoured in respect to the questions that I have taken on notice, and regarding the ones you refer to last week.

Of course, accuracy remains absolutely paramount when it comes to doing that and, of course, I would rather prioritise accuracy over speed. Regarding a few specific parts of the question to which the honourable member refers, I think the most hot button issue goes to the Ombudsman's report regarding the way we deal with people who enter our hospital system whilst in custody that received attention last night on the ABC news.

First and foremost, I can inform the honourable member in the chamber that I have instructed the department to come back to me as soon as possible, not with a response regarding what recommendations are being taken on board and being acted upon, but which ones are not and why not. I want to make sure that our predisposition is to take on board the Ombudsman's recommendations, and action them as soon as possible. That process is in train, they are instructions that I issued to the department a while ago; they are currently undertaking that piece of work, and are coming back to me.

I do want to make clear, though, what the government's view is, and my view is, regarding the restraint of people coming into prisons, who are people in custody. The number one priority for Corrections has to be safety. It is, of course, an unfortunate fact of life that people who are apprehended and who are in custody are there for a reason. We have a very substantial and detailed

process that someone has to go through before they find themselves incarcerated, and if they are incarcerated they are at risk, and the last thing that would be in the interests of that prisoner would be for the state to relax standards regarding community safety, and security, which would then put at risk an incident occurring, an incident to take place, and then there to be a community outcry as to why we are even providing these people with quality health services in the first place.

The number one priority for the government, and for me, is to ensure that when people come out of a secure environment in a prison and come into a hospital, that they are secure and that every other person who is working in that hospital, or is an ordinary member of the public in that hospital, that their safety is in no way jeopardised. That is a priority that we will not be departing from. I do not make any apologies for that whatsoever.

That has to be the first order principle. Of course, though, in the context of the Ombudsman's report, and of course with a view to the humane treatment of prisoners whilst they are receiving medical care, we constantly have to be looking at ways we can improve restraints, and on that basis I can inform the honourable member that the department is working closely with New South Wales Corrections, as we speak, in the development of a soft form of restraint that is suitable for use in non-secure locations, such as hospitals.

Now, if these technologies become available, that are appropriate and that are affordable and do meet all the necessary security criteria, then of course it will be something that we actively look at. The department of corrections in South Australia is working closely with the New South Wales department to be able to come up with appropriate restraints that might not result, necessarily, in injuries taking place to those people who are restrained.

I certainly will not be supportive of such an introduction of new technologies unless safety absolutely remains at the top of the priority list regarding the procedures that take place when a person leaves a hospital. Regarding rehabilitation more generally, which was another component of the honourable member's question, of course the department already does a lot of work when it comes to rehabilitative services and programs when people are in our custody. For instance, I am advised, 4,874 hours of offence-focused programs have already been delivered. This was 4,425 hours above the prescribed target and that is in addition to another 90 program commencements, which is above the target of 65.

In terms of the breakdown for the year 2014-15, 2,148 program hours were delivered in making changes programs with 48 program commencements; 142 program hours delivered to the domestic violence treatment program with eight program commencements; and over 2,500 program hours of other criminogenic programs. So already the department undertakes a lot of work when it comes to rehabilitation. The point of the remarks which I have made previously and to which the honourable member referred earlier is that we cannot accept the status quo as being good enough. We have to be a government that constantly strives for continuous improvement. I have been quite candid about the challenges that we face in Corrections. I have been quite candid about the fact that it is incredibly expensive to incarcerate someone full stop. This is not a problem that is exclusive to South Australia.

We do have prisons that are increasingly becoming full, we've got a growing prison population that was in the order of 9 per cent last year, and it does put enormous strain on the system. There is no point in hiding away from the problem. I have been incredibly up-front and transparent about the challenge that the government faces in this respect, which is why we have to place a greater emphasis on what we do with prisoners while they are in our custody. We have to take upon ourselves the responsibility to try to invest in rehabilitative programs, not just during people's incarceration but we should be contemplating about what we do post people's incarceration.

We will be a government that continues to focus on this. I want to try to make sure that we are providing as much effort and policy ingenuity that we can in addressing this approach, because hopefully it will ultimately result in a safer community and also a saving to the South Australian taxpayer. Regarding some of the other more specific tenets of the honourable member's question, I am more happy to take them on notice and respond accordingly.

PRISONER SUPPORT AND TREATMENT

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:57): Given that I think no-one in this chamber would deny that safety should be a paramount concern, can the minister elaborate as to whether the risk that the prisoner poses is weighed up when the decision to shackle them is made? Of the three cases that I mentioned in my explanation, did those three prisoners commit a crime that was violent or in another way was deemed to result in a risk to public safety; and, given that the minister is concerned about community safety and safety for prisoners, is there a need for a specialised facility for prisoners experiencing mental ill health, as I understand there is interstate?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. I do not have specific details regarding the three individuals who you cite and, even if I did, I would not be at liberty to talk about specific prisoners in light of basic confidentiality issues. But what I would say generally is that I am advised that of course DCS are making assessments around risk when it comes to the transferring of patients to and from prisons. Risk assessments are something that the Department for Correctional Services are constantly undertaking when it comes to all decisions that they make around appropriateness for prisoners to be transferred to and from facilities.

We are currently working through the recommendations of the Ombudsman's report. I've explained already that my predisposition is towards adopting those recommendations. If we're not going to adopt those recommendations, I will ask for very clear reasons why that cannot be accommodated. Of course I hope the Hon. Ms Vincent shares my absolute conviction to ensure that safety is the number one concern, but if we acknowledge that as the priority, then everything else should descend from there, but we are constantly looking at ways to ensure that we are providing for humane treatment of prisoners to and from their escort from prison including while they are in hospital. But, again, the safety of the general public has to remain paramount.

PRISONER SUPPORT AND TREATMENT

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:59): Supplementary: I welcome the minister's commitment on two occasions to seek a can-do brief from his own department. Could I ask him whether that review will include not just the Ombudsman's report in relation to this case but also the reports in relation to the case of the dying prisoner who was restrained in hospital for 14 days, the pregnant woman who was shackled during her labour and also the case publicly reported in relation to Jacqueline Davies? I don't think it is in the Ombudsman's report, but I think it is true to say that the Ombudsman is reported on the ABC as having said that there have been only minor improvements in the treatment of mentally ill prisoners since those reports were tabled.

I appreciated that they were reports of a previous ombudsman and they were sent to previous ministers, but I would seek a commitment from the minister that the reports that he receives will relate to all recent ombudsmen's reports. I also seek an undertaking that either a copy of the report from the department or a ministerial statement might be made to the house on the outcomes of his deliberations.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question and, no doubt, his honourable intent, when it comes to his pursuit of the issue. To be clear, what I have asked my department for is a response to the Ombudsman's report that has only been released recently. My request for them, and the work that is being undertaken at the moment, is only specifically into the most recent Ombudsman's report. I have not asked for work to be undertaken in respect to previous ombudsmen's reports. What I can undertake right now, rather than committing to a ministerial statement, is to familiarise myself with the earlier reports that the honourable member refers to and make an assessment on the worthiness of some work being undertaken from that accordingly.

PRISONER SUPPORT AND TREATMENT

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:01): Supplementary: across how many prisoners were those hours of treatment that the minister outlined in his original answer delivered? For example, if

4,500 hours—which I think is the number that the minister mentioned—were delivered across the 3,000 prisoner population, that works out to 1.5 hours per prisoner per year. Is that calculation correct or, if not, how else is it divided to ensure that it actually does rehabilitate people?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:02): Again, I thank the honourable member for her interest in this subject and the supplementary question. I will have to take that specific question on notice. What I would say is that the figures I referred to, I am advised, form just part of some of the rehabilitative and rehabilitation programs that are undertaken. It should not be automatically assumed by the honourable member that the hours that I refer to represent the entirety of all the work that has been undertaken by the department. Nevertheless, I am happy to take the specific nature of your question on notice and provide an answer in due course.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Police a question regarding the reduction in operating hours of local police stations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: On Monday of this week, the City of Salisbury unanimously passed a motion in relation to SAPOL's Organisational Reform Program following a lack of any response from the police commissioner to their calls to retain the current operating hours for local police stations. The motion read:

1. The report be received.
2. That a submission to be submitted to the SAPOL Organisational Reform Program by 27 May 2016 outlining council's concerns with the proposed reforms summarised as follows, and requesting the Commissioner not proceed with the proposed reforms in relation to the Salisbury, Holden Hill and Golden Grove police stations:
 - (a) lack of details of the specific usage data for the Salisbury, Holden Hill and Golden Grove police stations, particularly in relation to after-hours demand, that demonstrates that the local community will not be adversely affected by proposed changes in opening hours;
 - (b) likely detrimental impacts on community safety, as the presence of an operating police station impacts the real and perceived safety of a community and the relative importance of a police station isn't uniform across all offence groups and the importance of police stations in reporting crime increases for more serious crimes;
 - (c) A reduction in customer service availability, particularly for members of the community who are unable to attend a Police station during normal working hours;
 - (d) A lack of rationale aligning SAPOL operating hours to other government agencies, given the unique nature of services provided by SAPOL;
 - (e) Assurances are required of the numbers and extent of officers returning to frontline duty, should the proposed reduction in operating hours and the expected improvement to community safety; and
 - (f) The need to maintain meaningful connections with the community via a locally-based policing presence that is accessible to the community.

My question is: does the minister consider that the significant concerns raised by the City of Salisbury are valid?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in the Salisbury police station, which I think he has mentioned on more than one occasion. Let me be clear about what it is that the police commissioner is undertaking here.

The police commissioner is the person, as we all know, who ultimately is responsible for the South Australian police force, and he is undertaking a thorough organisational review of the way SAPOL conducts itself. I know that some members opposite are seeing this as an opportunity to score some political points. I would be incredibly concerned about such an approach, because what we want is for SAPOL to be no different from any other modern organisation in the community.

I do not take the view that somehow SAPOL should not be treated like everybody else. We expect all departments within government, as with all organisations in the private sector, to be constantly reviewing themselves to make sure they are able to deliver the services the community reasonably expects, and SAPOL should not be immune from examining itself to ensure it is doing it. So, when the police commissioner undertakes an exercise in doing that, that is thought through, evidence based and methodical, we should be supporting the police commissioner in undertaking that exercise.

Of course it is appropriate, and is my expectation, that the police commissioner will take into account the public's view when it comes to this issue, which is exactly why the police commissioner has written to all members of parliament and has written to local government, asking them to submit any views or thoughts they had about policing in their local communities, particularly in the context of police station hours, which is exactly why the Salisbury council, to which the honourable member refers, is able to submit its views, its thoughts, its questions and its concerns to the police commissioner for him to be able to take into account during the course of his considerations.

But, the prism through which I hope, trust and understand the police commissioner is making all his decisions is, first and foremost, community safety. Community safety has to be the priority that the police commissioner puts to the top of the list. So, if the police commissioner, having had the opportunity to get feedback from the local community and of course from other members of SAPOL, then decides to amend police station hours over here or adjust them over there, I very much hope that he enjoys the support of the entire parliament. If it is well thought through, if it is evidence based, if its objective is community safety and if its objective is delivering more front-line services to the local community in Salisbury, then I would very much hope that is something that the Hon. Mr Dawkins, along with every other member opposite, would seek to endorse and support, rather than trying to score political points. It is a review that is being undertaken.

I wait for the police commissioner to conclude that exercise. Once he does, of course the outcome will be made public, but I endorse the police commissioner going through the process of considering what is going on with police station hours. It is a worthwhile exercise, and it is important for everybody to remind themselves that no-one is being arrested by an officer who is sitting behind a desk, so if the objective is to take someone out from behind the desk and put them on the front line—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: Sometimes someone walks in and decides to confess at 3 o'clock in the morning, then, sure—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: Otherwise, we want police officers out on the beat. We are a government that has seen a massive—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: We are a government that has seen a massive—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, sit down. The Hon. Mr Brokenshire, that is quite disrespectful, with such a loud voice; it is not even a little interjection.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Yes, I know, because I get frustrated.

The PRESIDENT: That's right; you take your frustrations out somewhere else. Allow the minister to answer the question without your interjection.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: I know the Hon. Mr Brokenshire is frustrated. He has been frustrated ever since he lost the police portfolio, and we have been fixing up the mess ever since. We have been a government—not yours—that has been increasing police numbers, that has delivered more services to the community and made our community safer. We just want to make sure that as police numbers go up, so too does the efficiency, the expeditiousness that we would

reasonably expect of our police force, which is why we support the police commissioner in his police station hours review.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Dawkins.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:10): Will the minister acknowledge the local concern in the Salisbury community that assurances are required of the numbers and extent of officers returning to front-line duties should the proposed reduction in operating hours and the expected improvement to community safety occur?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:11): What I can assure the honourable member is that I have zero doubt about the fact that when the police commissioner is making the decisions that he is currently in the process of making, the thing he is putting at the top of the list is community safety. When he makes decisions around the allocation of SAPOL officers to be at this station over here or to be on that task force over there, every decision that he makes is done so with the community and public safety in mind. That is something that I have a lot of confidence in, and I would very much hope that everyone in this chamber supports him in those efforts.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:11): Supplementary: will the minister acknowledge local concern about the lack of details of the specific usage data for the Salisbury, Holden Hill and Golden Grove police stations, particularly in relation to after-hours demand that demonstrates that the local community will not be adversely affected by proposed changes in opening hours?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:12): I understand that SAPOL, through its organisational reform effort, has been engaging actively with local government, including the local government organisation that the Hon. Mr Dawkins refers to, in providing them with the information that they need to be able to make a contribution that they would reasonably be able to hope to regarding the police station hours review. I would encourage them to make a submission. Obviously, the Hon. Mr Dawkins is conscious of the fact that they already have.

I am sure that the Salisbury council, if it wants additional information from SAPOL is more than capable of asking for it. If SAPOL is in a position to be able to provide the information, then I would applaud any efforts on their behalf to do so. It is very much an interaction that should be occurring without ministerial interference from the local government organisation to which you refer or SAPOL themselves. If the Salisbury council has strong views about its local police station, I would actively encourage them—and if they already have, I applaud them in their efforts—to make a thorough detailed submission to the police commissioner for him to take into account once he makes the decisions that he is likely to make.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:13): I can assure the minister that the council has made representations before going further.

The PRESIDENT: We do not want any assurances, Hon. Mr Dawkins, we want a question.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Supplementary: should SAPOL and the commissioner be immune from responding to organisations such as the second largest local government body in South Australia? Because he has not responded.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:13): I am sure that the police commissioner has not responded to every submission that has already been made by local government organisations, because he is in the process of considering. The police commissioner is a police commissioner who readily makes himself available to the community and available to the media. I do not see this as a police commissioner who is trying to shirk or avoid public accountability through direct public engagement, and I am sure that if it is appropriate to do so, he will respond.

What we need to understand is that the police commissioner is in the process of undertaking a review, he is taking information as it comes in, and if it is appropriate for him to respond, I am sure he will. But I have every confidence that the police commissioner is taking these views into account, which is why he has initiated this process in the first place.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:14): Based on the minister's answer regarding his comment about 9 per cent growth and the fact that he has previously said that it is compounding 9 per cent growth—that is, his government's budget to police—does the minister agree with rank and file police officers that this review is about cuts to at least \$150 million of the budget, and that there will be a reduction therefore in services to the public, and why would the commissioner be cutting services and shutting police stations with respect to hours and other initiatives if he did not have to face the cuts, and how then can the minister say there is a 9 per cent compounding growth in the budget?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. I particularly welcome the opportunity to reiterate the fact that I am advised of, that over the life of this government we have been increasing the police budget by an average of approximately 9 per cent per annum. I have never referred to compounding. You are at liberty to try to interpret my statistics as you will or however you like, but I have referred to the fact repeatedly, and I will continue to refer to the fact, that we have been a government that has been increasing the SAPOL budget.

So when you get up and start talking about cuts, they are a total fabrication, because we have been increasing SAPOL's budget and we will continue to increase SAPOL's budget going forward. Unlike when SAPOL was under the control of the Hon. Mr Brokenshere, there are more police on this police force than ever before. It is something I think we should all be proud of. They are doing an outstanding job. We have seen a very substantial—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshere: I'll put my record against yours.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: We have seen a very substantial reduction in crime since you were in office—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: Well, in respect to the record of this government—

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

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: In respect to this government's record versus the previous government, I would refer to the fact that certainly on some accounts there has been a 38 per cent reduction in crimes regarding property, in comparison with the last government. That speaks to thousands upon thousands fewer victims under this government than what was otherwise the case when Mr Brokenshere was relevant.

The PRESIDENT: A supplementary, the Hon. Mr Brokenshere.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:17): Can the minister confirm to the parliament whether the police commissioner faces cuts to his budget, or is the minister saying the police commissioner has no cuts to his budget?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Brokenshire, I know this is an issue close to your heart, but it is totally unacceptable to behave the way you are doing when a minister is trying to answer a question.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Throw me out then.

The PRESIDENT: I don't want to throw you out. I just want you to behave in the manner that is expected.

WHALE MIGRATION

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister inform the chamber about what measures are in place to ensure that whales are protected during their migration through South Australian waters?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:18): I might try to pre-empt the supplementary from the Hon. Mr Brokenshire about what a great successful whale minister he was back in the day, protecting whales.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: He was the worst water minister we ever had.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I'm not sure the Hon. Mr Brokenshire was the worst water minister we ever had, Mr Ridgway. I am sure there are other Liberal ministers who were the worst water ministers in the world, other than Mr Brokenshire, but—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If you want to waste question time, feel free to do it. But there are some members who actually want to ask a question who are going to be prevented from doing so because of the behaviour of some members of this parliament. Allow the minister to answer the question.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, sir, for your protection from this rowdy lot opposite. We are indeed fortunate here in our state that every year we get to witness the migration of the southern right whale along our coastline.

Whale season in South Australia, I am advised, generally runs from June through to October. During this period, we are visited primarily by southern right whales, but also occasionally sperm whales, humpbacks, blue whales and orcas—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —as they move into the warmer waters off the South Australian coast to calve. Whales can be sighted along our coastline earlier, and this year is apparently has been no exception to that rule that is often broken. According to the Whale Centre whale sighting log, whales have already been seen in the Upper Spencer Gulf as early as late April. It is timely, then, that we remind South Australians and visitors about restrictions and temporary closures during whale season.

This includes the temporary closure of the Great Australian Bight Marine Reserve until 31 October 2016, in order to ensure the safe passage for southern right whales as they make their way north to their breeding areas, and to allow the animals to rest undisturbed whilst nursing their young. It is important, I am advised, that female whales are undisturbed while they nurse and raise their young calves, especially since female whales do not feed while they are doing this so will need to minimise their energy expenditure.

This is also why it is important that boat users keep their distances from migrating whales in the Upper Spencer Gulf. In particular, a boat must not move closer than 100 metres to a whale, or 300 metres if the whale has a calf or shows signs of distress. Of course, jet skis are not permitted within 300 metres of any marine mammal. It is everyone's responsibility, if they are in a boat, to maintain legal distances. If a whale happens to move within 300 metres of a vessel, then the person in control should maintain the vessel's position or move slowly away. Under the National Parks and

Wildlife Act, anyone found guilty of harassing a marine mammal faces fines up to \$100,000 or two years' gaol, I am advised.

I am also advised that the Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources has 144 wardens or staff involved in compliance activities across the state. Primary Industries and Regions SA also has a further 40 fisheries officers located in regional centres along the South Australian coast. I am told that DEWNR officers are often the first to respond to reports—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: I still love you, Peter.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I don't think I will get that on the record, Mr President.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: Minister Hunter almost threw up.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: No, I am very keen on manly expressions of passion. If the Hon. Mr Brokenshire wants to learn how to do that better, I am sure he can talk to the Hon. Kyam Maher and get a few lessons.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: What does that mean?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, he is a compassionate man. I am told that DEWNR officers are often the first to respond to reports of compliance issues, or whale disentanglements or strandings. It is important to note that the public, along with researchers and tour operators, play an important role in the protection of our whales by acting as eyes and ears to provide immediate and crucial information to authorities.

More details about restrictions and regulation can be found on the Natural Resources Eyre Peninsula website, www.naturalresources.sa.gov.au/eyrepeninsula. These regulations are in place to ensure the protection and safety of both the whales and the people using and enjoying our waters. This is in line with our marine parks system that the state Labor government established here in South Australia with absolutely no help from the Liberal Party, who do not believe in marine parks or protecting our marine environment.

The creation of our marine parks network continues to be one of the most significant conservation programs ever undertaken in this state, and the network is integral to protecting nursery areas and other critical habitats that ensure strong and healthy marine life populations into the long term. I encourage everyone to respect these rules and take some time this whaling season to watch and appreciate these beautiful animals as they grace us with their presence once again this year.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to welcome the Long Stay Visa for Parents Action Group here today. Good to see you here.

Matters of Interest

GREAT AUSTRALIAN BIGHT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:23): I rise today to draw the attention of members of this council and this parliament to the wonderful work being done by the Great Australian Bight Alliance. Members may be aware that BP was responsible for the world's biggest oil spill accident—the Deepwater Horizon tragedy of 2010—with some 800 million litres of oil spewing into the Gulf of Mexico for 87 days. That same company now wishes to drill in the Great Australian Bight.

I was proud and pleased to join with other South Australians this past Saturday at Hands Across the Sand down at Glenelg beach. It was not the only Hands Across the Sand across the world, and in South Australia alone there were similar events in Kangaroo Island, Ceduna and Port Lincoln, as well as interstate and, as I say, overseas.

That event was treated to a wonderful performance of whale sounds from Bunna Lawrie, a Mirning man and a song man, from Whale Rock on the Nullabor Cliffs. He is probably better known to members of this place as a former member of the band Coloured Stone. He had the privilege of

introducing his young son to play didgeridoo for the first time in public that day, and they did so calling the southern right whales, which the Minister for the Environment has just spoken of, that we are so rightly proud to have swimming in these oceans in the Great Australian Bight.

Of course, it is not just southern right whales that are in this environment: it is dolphins, it is sea lions, it is 1,500 different types of algae and 612 fish species, and it is some of the roughest and most remote country in the world—70-metre sheer cliffs, hundreds of kilometres long. How would you ever clean up an oil spill in this environment, when BP are the very people responsible for the Gulf of Mexico and that devastating oil spill, which to this day still sees dolphin mothers giving birth to stillborn dolphins, which to this day still reels from the tragedy that was the Gulf of Mexico spill.

I commend the work of the Wilderness Society, and particularly Tammy-Jo Sutton and also Peter Owen. I commend them also for standing up and doing independent modelling that would show the devastating impact of an oil spill if it were to occur in the bight, an impact that would not only hurt our environment but also, of course, the industries of aquaculture and, importantly, tourism. It would affect not just Kangaroo Island; it would indeed come to the shores of Glenelg, as that mock spill did that we saw on Saturday. That would be a real spill on the shores of Glenelg if BP were to have a similar spill, as they did in the Gulf of Mexico. It would go down as far as Victoria, depending on the time of year and the particular weather conditions, according to that independent modelling.

BP has no right to drill in the Bight. I stand with Sea Shepherd, who will be sending one of their boats out this year in winter to draw the attention of the world to the importance of the Great Australian Bight and the wonderful sea creatures that are there. I also stand with the Wilderness Society and commend them for their work, and in particular the Sea Shepherd's Geoff Cann, who could not be there on Saturday morning. Having done all of the great organising work for the event, he actually fell ill and lost his voice, but his voice was heard loud and clear across the world and down at the Glenelg at Hands Across the Sand this past Saturday.

While I am on my feet, I shall also draw the attention of the chamber to the fact that the Victorian parliament yesterday made a formal apology to those who had been convicted of homosexual acts, where that had been criminalised in that state. I drew attention in this place yesterday to the fact that we have a legislative review designed to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sexuality, gender identity and historic injustices, and I wrote to the Premier in February 2015, well over a year ago, asking him if he too would make such an apology.

He only needs to look at Premier Andrews' powerful words yesterday to see how important this apology will be, not just to those men who are now in their 60s, 70s, 80s and sometimes 90s, who lived their whole lives with these convictions over their heads, who lived their whole lives as criminals just because of their sexuality. The power of words is in the Premier's hands to deliver a similar apology here in South Australia. I call on the Weatherill government to apologise for convictions that are now spent for acts of homosexuality. It should never have been a crime and we should apologise for that injustice.

VISITOR VISAS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:29): I rise to speak about an important matter concerning many ethnic communities. These communities are calling on the federal government to allow their overseas parents to spend a longer period in Australia while they are visiting their children.

Almost 30 per cent of Australian residents were born overseas. Our prosperity, security and wellbeing as a nation depends on how successfully these migrants integrate within society. A common feature within ethnic communities is traditional joint family living arrangements. Coming from a Vietnamese background, I know from experience that strong family ties are formed between parents and children in these intergenerational households. Many migrants are therefore unprepared for the impact of the transition from a joint to nuclear family. When they settle in Australia, the loss of their support network can be extremely difficult, resulting in a destabilising effect on family cohesion and functionality.

Migrants are learning to manage work, household tasks and childcare as well as battling the isolation caused by resettlement. Having their parents live in the home for a longer period to assist with childcare would lessen the pressures faced by these migrants. In many cultures, children have a duty to care for their parents. When migrants are unable to fulfil this duty due to their parents being

left in their homeland, they can experience immense anxiety and guilt. This is disruptive to their work and social life, yet, in reality, migrants simply cannot regularly return to their homeland to take care of their parents.

Furthermore, there is an inherent expectation in many cultures that grandparents have a meaningful relationship with their grandchildren. Traditionally grandparents impart cultural knowledge and values. Their presence in the family home would help Australian-born children of new migrants to establish a personal identity.

Currently applicants outside Australia who meet certain criteria may be granted a multiple-entry visitor visa for a period of three years with a maximum continuous stay of 12 months. The visa holder must depart within 12 months and remain outside of Australia for at least six months before re-entering. I support amending the visitor visa scheme to allow eligible parents of Australian citizens or permanent residents a continuous period of stay longer than the current 12 months, and reducing the minimum period of stay outside of Australia. Waiting six months before re-entering is too long.

So far, the Long Stay Visa for Parents petition has gathered over 27,000 signatures in a short period. We should recognise the economic benefits of the proposed changes. The petition proposes compulsory health insurance for visiting parents. This would inject millions into the insurance industry in Australia. Visitors will also boost our economy, particularly in the tourism, food and hospitality industry.

Australia is a nation built on a strong migrant spirit and is known for its compassion. This change will strengthen our Australian family values. I commend Mr Arvind Duggal, founding member of the Long Stay Visa for Parents Action Group, along with the committee members Mr Rocky Kailay and Mr Daniel Connell, for campaigning on behalf of the Indian community about this matter over the past 18 months. I also thank Mr Bharat Kainth, secretary of the United Taxi Association for discussing this important matter with me on behalf of the association. American writer, Jenji Kohan, once said, and I quote:

Home is where your family is. Wherever you are, it's about the people you are surrounded by, not necessarily where you lay your head.

This is a sentiment shared by many migrants. Along with the migrant community in Australia, I urge the federal government, whether Labor or Liberal, to support this change.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:34): I rise to express concern at the government's downgrade of Modbury Hospital under its controversial Transforming Health plan. The government's focus on reducing the number of hospital beds to the national average is a key strategy in their budget savings plan. They plan to close around 670 hospital beds, which is equivalent to the size of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Key to that strategy is closing three hospitals—the Repat, Hampstead and St Margaret's. As a result, Modbury will take on 32 rehabilitation beds.

Labor had a choice and Labor chose to slash front-line services, rather than reduce the waste and bureaucracy in SA Health. That decision will undermine the quality and accessibility to health care in the north and north-eastern suburbs for years to come. Since 1973, Modbury Hospital has faithfully served the local community in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, providing a wide range of emergency and surgical services. Under Transforming Health, these crucial services will be lost, changing Modbury from a general community hospital to a centre for rehabilitation and day surgery. Modbury will no longer deal with life-threatening emergencies; they will be diverted away from Modbury or stabilised before transfer.

In an emergency, when minutes and even seconds can be crucial, patients and ambulance services will be forced to make critical decisions in chaotic circumstances. Choosing between the risk of being turned away at Modbury and using vital time to go further to Lyell McEwin where relevant treatment may be available, patients may well be forced to make life or death decisions which they simply do not have the medical knowledge to be able to undertake. We are very concerned at the downgrading of the Modbury emergency department and the establishment of two tiers of emergency departments in our metropolitan hospitals.

These concerns are broadly shared in the medical community. The AMA, SASMOA, the Royal Australasian College of Physicians and the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine have all expressed their opposition to some or all of the changes. Very recently, the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons head, Sonja Latzel, spoke of the risk to patients with potential airway blockages. The Ambulance Service is needing to operate a shuttle service for patients between Lyell McEwin and Modbury. Would that money not be better spent funding a full service emergency department at Modbury? Diverting patients to other hospitals will lead to fewer admissions to Modbury Hospital. In the longer term, I fear, the hospital may become unviable and will close.

Modbury will no longer have comprehensive medical and surgical services. Complex and emergency surgery will be undertaken at Lyell McEwin. The existing eight-bed high-dependency unit will be closed. Without a high-dependency unit, any patient who is seriously ill or who deteriorates in the emergency department or anywhere else in the hospital, will need to be transferred to a HDU or an ICU in another hospital. The closure of that unit will see a further loss of important specialist staff. As the availability of these and other specialist staff declines, so will the emergency department's capacity to diagnose and treat a range of cases. Without support, in the event of complications, patients with multiple conditions may need to be transferred to another hospital to undertake minor procedures.

In terms of the training space, there will be an overall loss of availability to teach and train medical students, specialist trainees and nurses. My understanding is that, even this year, Modbury will not be having interns. These changes are deeply concerning, particularly for local residents where appropriate medical treatment may depend on chaotic transfers between hospitals. Patients will be forced to travel further for treatment, placing a heavier burden on already strained emergency services and neighbouring hospitals. The changes at Modbury pose a risk to the efficiency of the whole health system, with alternative hospitals being forced to deal with the transfer of patients from Modbury.

The Lyell McEwin Hospital, where a majority of emergency cases are expected to be transferred, is already struggling to meet the increasing demand. For the past six days, the Lyell McEwin emergency department has spent at least an hour every day operating at code white. That is not just over capacity, that is seriously over capacity. It is clearly not enough to rely on already stressed emergency departments to accept the load from Modbury where there is not an adequate reallocation of resources to help with this influx of patients.

In conclusion, I put it to the council that the downgrade of Modbury Hospital is a breach of trust by this government. The government promised to protect Modbury Hospital, but it will no longer be a general community hospital, it will be a regional rehabilitation and day surgery centre. The people of the north-east have yet again been let down by this Labor government and the members who they elected to represent them here.

The PRESIDENT: Hopefully, the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, you have relieved yourself of all your frustrations and you are going to give us a very productive five minutes.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:39): Thank you, Mr President, and my frustrations will remain for as long as we do not get proper answers from ministers when we ask questions in the parliament. I will not apologise for challenging those ministers when they have made cuts to budgets and will not admit the facts.

On a happier note, I rise on this matter of interest to congratulate a very hardworking, diligent group of locals from my own region, namely, the Fleurieu Peninsula. I speak of the Southern Fleurieu Historical Museum: they do an absolutely magnificent job at Port Elliott on the showgrounds site, and I encourage all members of parliament, when visiting our magnificent Fleurieu Peninsula, to visit the museum. It is an amazing opportunity to explore how agriculture and rural and regional areas of the Fleurieu Peninsula developed.

Of particular excitement to me was that in early May I was invited, both as a member of parliament and also as a dairy farmer, to the opening of the Legendairy permanent museum for dairy in South Australia. It is full credit to Mr Deanne and Anne Perry, Mr Des Hunt, and a friend of mine and a great dairy farmer in his own right, although he always milked Friesians, and I could not

understand why he did not join our family and milk jerseys. But, other than that, he was a very good dairy farmer, very skilful when it came to the knowledge of show cattle and the confirmation of cows, and also a tireless worker in our region. I refer to Mr Colin Ekers and his wife Kate.

Colin was the driving force behind the opportunities for Legendairy being funded through Dairy Australia, to be the headquarters for the dairy history of South Australia. Deanne and Anne Perry, and all the other hardworking volunteers in the Southern Fleurieu Historical Museum deserve to be congratulated for a Legendairy exhibition and for all the exhibitions in the museum. It was opened by our President of the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association, David Basham, and it was great to see his daughters and wife supporting him, his mum and dad and other relatives, because he is the fifth generation to dairy farm down the road from us, on the Goolwa Road the other side of Mount Compass, but importantly the Bashams were one of the original dairy farming families to supply milk to the Port Elliott area. In fact, Port Elliott was one of the first areas to dairy in South Australia, and that was another reason the Port Elliott showgrounds were chosen for this site.

It is interesting that in all the years I have been in dairying that you see technology improving all the time. You see breeding improving and the general management processes and procedures around dairying, but when you go to look at this site it gives you an easy reflection on just how hard was the dairy industry in those early days when they did not have the computerisation, the technology and things like artificial insemination to help with the breeding of your herd. All of that history is there on site. A lot of hard work has been done by these volunteers, and I am pleased that all dairy farmers in South Australia, through their levies to Dairy Australia, were able to contribute financially to assist with this display.

But, not all the money was provided. Money was directly provided from the Southern Fleurieu Historical Museum and sponsors, and these volunteers have worked tirelessly to raise money to be able to build these facilities and allow future generations to see the important history of agriculture, tourism and the general opportunities we have on the great Fleurieu Peninsula, but in this instance particularly to be able to show people how important is the dairy industry. Whilst at the moment we face unprecedented challenges, I hope and trust that we will all get through those and that we will see further growth in exhibits into the future and further stories of the history and successes of the dairy industry in South Australia being shown through the museum Legendairy at Port Elliott.

REGIONAL CARE THAT MATTERS

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (15:44): Our regional areas are often hardest hit by changes in the economy and obviously services can be more difficult to deliver effectively to regional areas. However, there are a number of programs that support regional South Australia's employment, training and communities that do wonderful work for the people of regional South Australia. I would like to focus on one such program today: the Regional Care That Matters scheme.

We know the importance of having the right people working in important areas such as aged care and looking after those who are vulnerable in our community. We also know that, with an ageing population in South Australia, our reliance on high quality aged-care providers is only going to increase. Selecting the right people and ensuring that the training is meeting industry needs is critical to providing a flow of workers to the aged-care sector. It is vital that graduates are provided with the right training to enable them to gain the skills that they are going to need to provide care for residents in aged-care facilities and other care centres. However, working in aged care is certainly not for everybody. An innovative program to help those who may be interested in working in the aged-care sector gain early industry experience and insight was developed in 2013.

Regional Care That Matters is a program funded under WorkReady, which supports participants to gain industry experience and provide opportunities for participants to gain a realistic insight into what it might mean to work in the aged-care industry through things like workshops and on-the-job exercises and experiences. Participants will also be supported to enter accredited training, with the aim of gaining employment through industry partners in the project. Extension of the program is currently being negotiated. This was part of a \$2.1 million funding that was provided to support employment and career services projects, delivered in partnership with the seven regional RDAs. The funding will ensure that jobseekers in regional South Australia are put in the best position to find and gain employment.

The program also provides an opportunity for aged-care providers in the Barossa region to work together to address issues, such as identifying strategies to maximise training opportunities in the region, and also exploring new and emerging medical technologies in the aged-care industry. Facilitated by the Barossa Lower North Futures, and supported by Regional Development Australia Barossa, the project delivers training through TAFESA, with the involvement from Barossa Village, Tanunda Lutheran Home, Country Home Services, Wheatfields and Carers Link.

In its first year, it provided training and support to 75 participants, and placed 30 graduates into employment in the Barossa region, and in December 2015 Barossa Lower North Futures reported a further 20 people graduating through the program, ready to add to the 30 the program had already given to the aged-care sector in the Barossa.

The Regional Care That Matters program is one example of the strength of industry partnering with training providers to ensure training meets the needs of industry and that graduates can transition into employment in their local area. With \$20,000 in funding through 2015-16, the Regional Care That Matters program has had a real impact for people in the Barossa, both those who access services from the aged-care sector and those who have been given the opportunity for training and gainful employment through this particular scheme. Regional Care That Matters is a program that shows that the South Australian government is creating real change and responding to community needs.

FRIENDS OF PARKS INC.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:48): I rise today to talk about the 23rd annual general meeting of Friends of Parks Inc., which was held on Monday 16 May at the Volunteer Centre, Belair National Park, and hosted by Friends of Belair National Park. I particularly also want to mention the president, Duncan MacKenzie OAM, who represents Friends of Gluepot Reserve, for his hospitality on the day, along with that of the secretary, Pam Smith, from the Friends of Community Partnerships and Volunteer Programs Unit. Also I should note the presence of Mr Dene Cordes PSM, who is generally regarded as the founder of the Friends of Parks organisation in South Australia and who developed the network of Friends groups significantly in his work in the department system, under probably several different titles, but certainly in the department responsible for the environment at the time.

It is very interesting to cover the wide representation of various groups around South Australia that the Friends of Parks Inc. includes. They include the Barossa Goldfields Historical Society, BirdLife Australia, Friends of Gluepot, the Friends groups from Butcher Gap, Coffin Bay, Little Dip, the Simpson Desert parks, Torrens Island, Four Wheel Drive South Australia, the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia, Conservation and Wildlife Management (SA) Inc., Walking SA, Walking Trails Support Group, and Wildlife Photographers Australia.

They also include other Friends groups from areas such as Mount Monster, Gawler Ranges, Granite Island, Innamincka, private bushland, Canunda and Beachport Parks, Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park, Flinders Ranges, Belair, Onkaparinga, the Riverland parks, Mound Springs, Conservation and Wildlife Management (SA), also the Moorook Kingston-on-Murray Community Association, the Friends groups from Black Hill and Morialta parks, Shepherds Hill, Sturt Gorge, Southern Eyre Peninsula, Aldinga Scrub and Cobbler Creek. The last two particularly I have had a bit to do with during recent years as well as, of course, my considerable work with the Friends of Para Wirra. Other groups are, of course, Friends of Kaiserstuhl, Scott Creek Conservation Park, the Scientific Expedition Group Inc., Friends of Innes National Park, Friends of the Coorong, the National Parks Heritage Committee, the Friends of Parks KI Western Districts, the Friends of Old Government House and the Nature Foundation SA.

I would also like to bring to the attention of members that the Friends of Parks Inc. will hold its 30th Friends of Parks forum, 'Urban biodiversity rocks' on Friday 14 October to Sunday 16 October this year at the Cove Civic Centre, Ragamuffin Drive in Hallett Cove. I can recommend the Friends of Parks forums for anybody interested in conservation and particularly in national parks. I have had the pleasure of attending some in various parts of South Australia over the years. I particularly remember ones at Meningie and Sandy Creek. I do recommend to members if they get a chance to attend this and learn. As it is being held in a metropolitan setting, it will certainly will emphasise, as it says, urban biodiversity.

TORRENS TITLE SYSTEM

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:53): I rise today to speak about the Torrens title system. The Torrens title system is a register of landholdings kept and maintained by the government. Having a central register enables the state to guarantee an indivisible title to the landowners and, with some qualification, land boundaries. Land ownership is transferred through registration of title instead of using the former English common law system of deeds. Its main purpose is to simplify land transactions and to certify ownership of the title.

The Torrens title system was the creation of Sir Robert Richard Torrens in South Australia in 1857. The operation of the system is outlined in the Real Property Act, which also created the position of registrar-general, who is responsible for the administration of the act and the Lands Titles Office.

It has become a time-honoured institution created in South Australia and is now world-renowned. It has been adopted by many countries, including New Zealand, much of Europe, Canada, the Dominican Republic, Ireland, Israel, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vanuatu. Of course, it has been adopted by all Australian states. Several states of the USA have had a limited implementation. Cook County, Illinois, which takes in the greater part of Chicago, had a Torrens system from as early as 1897. The Chicago fire of 1871 destroyed all Cook County real estate records, and to overcome the consequential problems, the Illinois legislature established the first Torrens title act in the United States.

In instances overseas where the government gives no guarantee, the landowner is usually required to have private insurance as a safeguard. Without the government guarantee, the basic principle of the Torrens system is lost. Unfortunately, under pressure from continuous lobbying by the powerful land title insurance companies, the Illinois legislature repealed their act in 1992, bringing back the need for landowners to privately insure their properties. A similar fate was also seen in other states.

Any privatisation of our system may require a need for owners of land to privately insure their interest, which would be an abomination of the Torrens system. Under the Torrens title system, the state guarantees absolute ownership of the estate in the land, and included rights of compensation where land is lost due to fraud, which eliminates the need for private insurance. The act also provides for a duplicate certificate of title to be issued to the landowner or mortgagee of the estate. The need to produce this certificate with a transaction prevents fraud and helps secure the integrity of the register. Any changes to the requirement for a duplicate certificate of title should be thoroughly examined to ensure that there will be no unintended consequences.

The principle of indefeasibility of title provides ultimate security and peace of mind to landowners. It supports all real estate related industries, including financial institutions. It sets confidence and security of knowledge of all registered estates and interests in land. It establishes a foundation for lending institutions to determine the lowest possible interest rates for mortgages and other changes on land. It is indeed a cornerstone of our society.

Motions

RETURN TO WORK ACT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:57): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into—
 - (a) The potential impacts on injured workers and their families as a result of changes to the Return to Work Act including tightening of the eligibility criteria for entry into the Return to Work Scheme;
 - (b) Alternatives to the overly restrictive 30 per cent WPI threshold for ongoing entitlements to weekly payments;
 - (c) The current restrictions on medical entitlements for injured workers;
 - (d) Potentially adverse impacts of the current two year entitlements to weekly payments;
 - (e) The restriction on accessing common law remedies for injured workers with a less than 30 per cent WPI;

- (f) Matters relating to and the impacts of assessing accumulative injuries;
 - (g) The obligations on employers to provide suitable alternative employment for injured workers;
 - (h) The impact of transitional provisions under the Return to Work Act 2014;
 - (i) Workers compensation in other Australian jurisdictions which may be relevant to the inquiry, including examination of the thresholds imposed in other states;
 - (j) The adverse impacts of the injury scale value; and
 - (k) Any other relevant matters.
2. 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.

I rise today on behalf of the Greens and in conjunction with the Hon. John Darley of the Xenophon Team to move a motion to establish a select committee to inquire into the current workers compensation scheme in South Australia, and the impact that these new laws are having on injured workers and their families.

I believe the new scheme is inappropriately titled 'Return to Work'; it should be titled 'Harder to Return to Work', because it is now effectively the case for many injured workers in this state that it is indeed harder to return to work without the support that they need. Much is made by the government of the positive new reforms under this new act, and I acknowledge there are some positives. But, to borrow a political phrase that is familiar to many in this place: you can put lipstick on a pig but it is still a pig, and this is a pig of an act. It is an offence to the pigs, in fact, to call it such a thing, but I am sure that you understand my meaning.

In 2004, the Greens stood strongly against the retrograde elements of this new act. I also recall the member for Ashford in the other place calling this, 'A draconian piece of legislation.' That member called it for what it was. The member rightly called it out, and indeed she was joined by others, such as the then president of the Law Society, Morry Bailes, who also expressed his grave concerns, particularly with regard to the 30 per cent whole person impairment threshold.

Today, I am proud to stand here as a Greens member of this place, a party that has a solid industrial relations record and a strong record in standing up for workers' rights and particularly for injured workers. I note that, as I stand here today, injured workers, their families and legal representatives can find a voice with the Greens, because over the past 12 months we have been listening to them. My office has received numerous contacts from injured workers across this state who currently have no formal way, no public way, of sharing their frustrations with this new unfair worker's compensation scheme.

I would like to read out a letter from a mother whose son has suffered severe injuries from being assaulted when he was working as a security officer. He was only 20 years of age at that time, and this young man's injuries are so significant that he may never return to work. Still, his injuries are defined as to be 'not serious' under these current state government retrograde laws. The letter reads:

To the Honourable Members,

I am writing to you regarding the devastatingly negative impacts that the Return to Work changes will have on severely injured workers. I am referring in particular to the new criteria stating that an injured worker has to have 30% whole person impairment to continue to have their medical and treatment costs and wages supplement payments carried on.

In October 2010, my son, who was 20 years old at the time, was working as a security guard at a family restaurant.

There was a robbery involving 4 offenders. My son was doing car park checks at the time, as per his job requirements, and had almost reached the front door when a car raced up and 4 men got out very quickly. One had a gun and another had a metal golf club. This was at approximately 2.30am.

My son did what he had been trained to do and that was to comply with the offenders—and he also put his hands up in a submissive way above his head.

They surrounded him and the one with the metal golf club proceeded to hit my son over the head several times, yelling at him not to call for help.

My son then put his hands over his head to try to protect himself and they continued to bash him over the head and hands/wrists with the metal golf club until he passed out. Amongst other injuries, they shattered the nerves in both of my son's hands/wrists and squashed my son's carpal tunnels in both hands/wrists.

Two of the offenders then picked my unconscious son up and dragged him into the 'pokies' section of the family restaurant and held him up in front of staff and patrons of the venue.

The one with the golf club just kept hitting my son over the head with the metal golf club and when that one bent he went to the stolen car and got another one and returned to continue his horrific assault on my son, who was at this time still unconscious and being held up by two of the other offenders. My son's employer informed me that the video shows the offender with the golf club walking to the door that was behind him and then running up and hitting my son over the head continually until one of the offenders said, 'Aren't we were to rob the place?'

The one with the golf club yelled at the staff and patrons that they had better do as they were told unless they wanted what they were doing to my son to happen to them.

The offenders eventually took money trays and dropped my son, who collapsed on the floor and partially came to enough to crawl to a wall and then collapse against it with blood pouring down his head. The offenders left and then an ambulance was called for my son. As you may be able to imagine, my son has some horrific injuries.

Some of the injuries from this brutal and totally unnecessary assault include:

1. He suffers from severe constant headaches caused by the offender permanently damaging, squashing and splitting the 'occipital nerve' in his head;
2. He suffers severe memory loss. Things that he could easily remember before the assault he can't remember now at all. He has major problems remembering simple things;
3. Both of his hands/wrists are almost useless and anything he tries to do causes him severe pain. He does try to do things but the pain can become too much for him. He is in constant severe pain. He has had several operations on both wrists/hands to try to repair some of the damage, but this has not helped;
4. He now has to wear glasses, which he didn't have to before the assault at work; and
5. He suffers from dizziness and balance problems caused by the assault at work.

My son also suffers from severe anxiety, especially if he has to leave his bedroom. In the 3 months following the assault at work, my son used a bottle to urinate in so that he didn't have to leave his bedroom and even now he still barricades himself in his bedroom at night or during the day and tries not to go to sleep during the night.

Some of the things I now have to do for him because he has trouble doing them for himself and if he attempts them he ends up in bad pain are:

1. He has major problems writing and this causes bad pain;
2. Showering: he has major difficulties doing this, so I have to do it for him. He can't shave or clean his teeth or wash his hair. I also have to help him in the toilet at least once a week, as when he attempts this his hands become too painful to continue and do this himself;
3. We have had to purchase a liquid soap dispenser for washing his hands which he has major trouble doing;
4. We have had to have the taps changed in our home, as my son has trouble turning the taps on and off and often leaves them running. We have also had to install hand rails in the toilet and bathroom.

All these changes have been paid for by this family—not WorkCover:

5. He has major difficulty in doing up his shoe laces or putting his socks and shoes on. We have purchased shoes that have Velcro rather than laces, but he still has difficulties doing them up due to the pain this causes;
6. Changing the sheets on his bed is or doing any household chores is extremely painful and he has major difficulties opening bottles or cans, milk cartons, packets or tissues;
7. We have had to install a "Pura tap" so that he can flip the handle with his arm to get himself a drink and he has to use light cups or glasses that mostly have handles as he has almost no grip;

8. He can only drive for short distances without causing major pain in an automatic car with power steering and uses a ball on the steering wheel as he has difficulties using his left hand. We do a lot of driving for him.

9. He has major difficulties washing or wiping up and isn't even able to use a knife and fork together, so he uses a fork only with a rubber tube on it for easier grip;

10. He has major difficulties and has a lot of pain if he tries to help with dinner preparation, pick up heavier saucepans, do his own washing or hang it or take it off the line;

11. He has major problems doing up buttons and zips, so he only wears T-shirts and elastic waist trousers/shorts, etc;

12. He has problems carrying boxes, bags, bottles, etc and tries to use his arms to do this. When using his hands it causes a lot of pain;

13. He has major problems doing his own car repairs or change a tyre due to the pain this causes so we have paid for RAA just in case;...

15. We have had to change the door handles to lever action so that he can use his arms to open the doors and had to purchase a foot pedal dustbin to put new toilet rolls into in the toilet. He can't use the toilet brush, as he can't grip it and it is too painful to do so;

16. He can no longer go to the gym, go kayaking, rock climbing, fishing, camping etc as he did before he got hurt; Any exercise using his hands/wrists now causes severe pain in his hands/wrists.

17. He has broken up with his long-term girlfriend, whom he expected to marry, due to his injuries.

WorkCover sent my son to their specialists to be assessed as to his capacity to work and they have all stated in their reports that my son is not capable of working and his prognosis is grim at best.

Yet with all of this and more, my son does not meet the 30% whole person impairment, which would have allowed him to continue to receive money for his treatment and medications and his wage income, which is now only \$355.00 per week, due to the actions of his employer, who went into liquidation shortly after my son was injured at work. My son's medications alone cost approximately \$18,000 per month and most of them are not covered by the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. This is without taking into account the treatment costs and any future operations my son may need.

It is a daily struggle to look after my son and these changes to the WorkCover scheme, which is so detrimental to severely injured workers like my son, are only putting much more pressure upon us. My son's employer paid in good faith for the WorkCover levy so that if, God forbid, something horrible happened to his employees like the assault that happened on my son whilst he was working, they would be covered. This has now been taken away from injured workers like my son and it is simply not right.

I have been informed by medical professionals of several other severely injured workers who will not meet the 30 per cent whole person impairment. One in particular is a person who was crushed terribly at work. The injured worker had their back operated on several times which included having their back fused. This severely injured worker can't even get themselves out of bed unassisted and has no prospect, like my son, of ever being able to work again and yet has been assessed as having a 29 per cent whole person impairment and therefore also does not meet the 30 per cent WPI.

Others that have been severely injured who will need treatment and medication for years to come and also don't meet the 30 per cent whole person impairment will also be cut off. I am respectfully requesting—no, imploring you—to help to get the 30 per cent WPI, which is way too high down to at least 15 per cent, WPI, and I urge you to urgently support any bill that seeks to do so. I can't stress enough how this 30 per cent whole person impairment is and will enormously detrimentally affect injured workers when all they were doing was their job. We need to look after those like my son who have been devastatingly affected by severe injuries while working.

It is not just security officers who suffer from workplace injuries, of course, and my office has been informed of cases of nurses and ambulance officers who have been subjected to violence and suffered serious injuries in their workplace. Some workers have suffered severe spinal injuries as a result of their work, and nurses who have been spat on, exposed to bodily fluids and sexually assaulted at work, yet their injuries are seen as insignificant under the current laws because the 30 per cent whole person impairment threshold is just too high. I would like to read out another case of a registered nurse, who wishes to remain anonymous:

In 2005, I was working on the ward when a patient I was caring for had a sudden collapse and fell back on to me. We both fell onto the floor. I took all his weight on to me but on the way down I fell against a rail. The patient was okay, he received immediate retreatment and made a good recovery. Unfortunately, because of how I had fallen, I sustained a lumbar spinal injury and was off work for four months. During this time I underwent orthopaedic and neurological reviews and a multitude of investigations which included nerve studies, CT scans and MRIs and X-rays.

I required significant pain and nerve therapy. I was unable to sleep, not able to work and not able to eat. I had to attend the physiotherapist on a daily basis for three months and then weekly for a further three months. As part of my return to work plan, I undertook administrative duties starting at three hours a day and eventually grading up to 8 hours per day. Finally, over six months after my injury, I returned to working on the wards but given the scale of my injuries I could no longer work as a midwife, a career pathway that I had loved for 30 years.

Ten years later, I continue to require ongoing pain management and physiotherapy. I will never fully recover. All I can do is to try to manage the pain as best as I can. To support my own rehabilitation I have personally invested in swimming and water-based exercise and ongoing therapies. I have a recommendation for spinal surgery but have elected not to have it because I know that if I have the surgery it would be the end of my nursing career and that is not financially viable. I have had to reduce my hours and I have great trouble sleeping because of the ongoing pain, not to mention the psychological impacts of having your career cut short and your pathways so limited by workplace injury.

It is cases like these that have compelled the Greens and the Xenophon Team to take action and stand up for injured workers, something the Labor Party, you would think, will strongly support.

Today, of course, I am moving this motion alongside my colleague the Hon. John Darley, and we are seeking support not just from the Labor members but from all members of this chamber to establish this inquiry, because these injured workers and their families deserve to have a voice and to be given the same hearing police officers have been afforded. We want them to have the opportunity to front up and share their concerns about how their lives are being impacted by this draconian piece of legislation. That, of course, will be no easy thing for people in this position to do, and they deserve a scheme that will support them.

I would like to put on record my congratulations and acknowledgement of the fight that the Police Association of South Australia took up on this piece of legislation in South Australia, supported and led by Mark Carroll and fronted by injured workers, Brett Gibbons, Alison Coad and Brian Edwards, who stood up not just for their own rights but for all police officers injured at work. They did so bravely in a different way than we see police officers being brave in this state. They did so by telling their personal stories and, in fact, there is often nothing braver than putting your personal story out into the public forum to be tested and scrutinised, and I commend particularly those three members of the Police Association for giving so courageously. We have seen, in that case, the police minister respond, and the championing of that case by Family First's the Hon. Robert Brokenshire.

We have a responsibility as members of parliament not just to stand up for those who protect us in the police force and for the injured workers in the police force but for all injured workers in this state. We have a job to do here and that is to ensure that a workers compensation scheme in South Australia treats all workers fairly and equally. A worker should be entitled to access compensation and rehabilitation depending on the injury they have sustained, not depending on the occupation they work in. Just like police officers, by virtue of the role that they play in the provision of essential front-line services, nurses, midwives, ambulance officers, firefighters and personal care assistants are often exposed to situations that can cause serious injuries and, like police officers, they should be protected.

Construction workers are in the business of building our nation; they deserve the same protection. Teachers are in the business of moulding our children and nurturing our future; they deserve protection. Regardless of your occupation and regardless of your workplace, you should be afforded fair workers compensation if you are injured on the job. We cannot have workers compensation in this state that discriminates based on the occupation that a person works in.

We have seen the stories of the police officers which have highlighted how unjust the new return-to-work scheme is. When we hear stories of other workers in other occupations, I have no doubt that members of this place and the government should be fully convinced that we have made an error of judgement with that 30 per cent whole person impairment definition. Under this Labor government, at this stage, we will have a two-tier system which treats workers in the front line of the police force differently to workers who work in security or in the ambulance services or, indeed, any of the other occupations across our state.

I have highlighted two cases in particular today, but there are many others that will be heard by the passage and rolling out of an inquiry into the workers compensation scheme. I would note that examples of a whole person impairment definition of 15 per cent includes a 35-year-old worker who has had a total hip replacement, walks with a limp, has difficulty putting on shoes and socks, and has difficulty doing activities with their family who is only calculated at 15 per cent WPI.

Also at 15 per cent, a 35-year-old worker who fell from the second floor of a building while working on a construction project, has a compression fracture of the spine and is unable to walk without crutches or braces, and is now unable to perform most of the activities of daily living. Also a 25-year old worker with disc herniation surgery who, after reaching maximum medical improvement, is diagnosed with low chronic back pain and their symptoms are persistent, with back and thigh pain and numbness of their foot while at rest. That worker is unable even to do their usual recreational activities and some of the household activities that you would typically need to undertake in your home. That person is calculated at only 13 per cent whole person impairment.

Another worker, a man injured in a work-related motor vehicle accident, had his left leg amputated below the knee. He now needs a prosthesis to enable him to walk. He is calculated at 28 per cent whole person impairment. That does not pass the front bar test, it does not pass the sniff test. Somebody who has lost half their leg due to a workplace injury should actually qualify for ongoing support. When we hear these stories, as we heard the stories of those in the police force, I think South Australians will be horrified at what has turned out to be—as I recall the member for Ashford saying when we debated this piece of legislation—a draconian piece of legislation.

The Labor Party comes from a strong tradition of standing up for workers, and they should be standing up for injured workers in this state. Workers united will never be defeated is a long-held catchcry. Workers injured should never be treated differently, and they will not be divided—the Greens will see to that. With those few words, I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:22): I am pleased to be co-sponsoring this motion, together with the Hon. Tammy Franks, a fierce advocate for injured workers in this state. Just yesterday we were invited to attend a briefing hosted by the Deputy Premier, looking at the performance of the return-to-work scheme. Unfortunately, due to another commitment, I was unable to attend that briefing, but my adviser did report back to me with the findings. I have to say that I was not in the least bit surprised by what was presented.

There is no question on the face of it that the material produced points to a well-functioning scheme. If you ask the Deputy Premier or the CEO of ReturnToWorkSA, they will report that the new scheme is on target, injured workers have never been treated better and the unfunded liability is no longer a problem for the state government. As with most things in this place, it does not take much to realise that this is far from the full picture. There is absolutely no question that the changes to workers compensation laws in this state have had a devastating impact on injured workers and their families.

It is all well and good to say that the new scheme is operating well for those workers who actually manage to qualify, particularly as seriously injured workers, but what about those who do not? What about those who only manage to have a whole person impairment of 26 or 27 per cent, or, worse still, 29 per cent? What is their long-term outlook? And, what about those injured who have sustained psychiatric injuries as well as physical injuries, but fail to qualify as a seriously injured worker because the act does not allow the two to be considered in combination?

If you do not meet the 30 per cent threshold and are cut off from income maintenance payments but remain unable to work, where does that leave you? It beggars belief that a 35-year old worker who has had a total hip replacement, walks with a limp and has difficulty putting on shoes and socks and doing general activities with their family could be assessed as having a 15 per cent work performance impairment, or that a 35-year old worker involved in a fall from the second floor of a building whilst working on a construction project, which results in a compression fracture of their spine, could also be assessed as having the same 15 per cent whole of body impairment.

These are, I might add, real examples. A 25-year-old worker who underwent disc herniation surgery and was diagnosed with chronic low back pain and suffers from persistent back and thigh pain and numbness of the foot while at rest, leaving him unable to take part in recreational and household activities, was assessed as having a 13 per cent WPI. It beggars belief that a person could sustain the sorts of injuries that the Hon. Tammy Franks has outlined and not be entitled to ongoing support past the two-year mark despite their inability to return to work, and it beggars belief that in assessing the degree of impairment resulting from any of these injuries no regard is to be had to any impairment that results from consequential mental harm.

Of course, the scheme is going to look healthy if injured workers are being thrown off because of unattainable thresholds and tests. Yesterday's overview by the government and by ReturnToWorkSA is an appropriate reminder of why this inquiry is necessary. It is absolutely critical that we examine the impacts that the changes themselves have had on injured workers. We need to consider the ramifications of those changes in the context of the effects they are having on those persons who no longer qualify for entry into the scheme, and we need to consider the fairness of such a scheme. In closing, once again I am pleased to be co-sponsoring this motion. Like the Hon. Tammy Franks, I urge all honourable members to support it.

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

ADELAIDE UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:26): I move:

That this council congratulates Adelaide United Football Club for claiming the A-League premiership and championship in season 2015-16.

Adelaide United Football Club, the Mighty Reds, very recently completed the greatest achievement of the club's 13-year history. Adelaide United not only finished top of the table and therefore crowned premiers, but also completed a sweep of the finals series to finish champions of the league. Of course, the double has been done six times previously in A-League history, but Adelaide United had lost two grand final appearances and no premiership since the inaugural A-League season of 2005-06.

The Reds began the season with a new coach, after Josep Gombau stepped down for family reasons in July last year. Guillermo Amor, the club's technical director, was appointed in his stead. Despite high hopes due to the club finishing third in the previous year's A-League and qualifying for the Asian Champions League, Adelaide United were dead last after round 4 and remained there for the next four matches. It was not until Amor's ninth match in charge that the club secured their first win, against Perth Glory.

As we now know, the Reds went on to a record streak of 13 straight clean sheets and were unbeaten in their last 10 matches, culminating in a finish on top of the ladder, one point clear of Western Sydney. Such a dramatic turnaround so late into the season only adds to the drama of the win. Unlike most soccer competitions, the A-League also runs a finals series, in keeping with Australian sporting tradition. Having finished top, Adelaide United were granted a bye before hosting Melbourne City in a semi-final, which the Reds won convincingly 4-1. This set up a one versus two grand final against Western Sydney at Adelaide Oval.

This was a spectacular event, with over 50,000 people in attendance, and it does go to show that, with the right facilities, soccer can attract big crowds in the traditional Aussie rules heartland of Adelaide. It is noteworthy that this was at an oval ground and many fans were well away from the action yet still purchased tickets to be part of this event. It could be time for the government to look at improved facilities for Adelaide United—if nothing else, a better stadium deal to make it worth their while.

The match itself was truly exciting, with four goals in total, and the roar of the crowd for the three Adelaide United goals being something to behold. The Reds were overwhelmingly the best side on the day of the finals series, and clearly for the entire second half of the season. They hit their straps at the right time, and full credit must go to coach Amor for doing that. Often, goalkeepers do not get the credit they deserve. It is a thankless job, but we have the best goal keeper in the league in Eugene Galekovic, our captain. A club record 13 clean sheets is truly impressive, and it is great that he is now getting all the accolades that he richly deserves.

Adelaide United now qualifies directly for the group stage of next year's Asian Champions League beginning in February. This is a big stage, and it is a credit to our club here in Adelaide that this is the Reds' sixth appearance, famously finishing runner-up in 2008, leading to an appearance in the Club World Cup. Some of these matches will be broadcast to audiences in the many hundreds of millions. It is exposure that clubs like ours and a state like ours would never have if we were not for this competition, and these are population sizes that Australians can barely comprehend.

It is for this reason that I think that this government cannot pass up the opportunity to utilise this exposure and advertise this state and its unique features to these audiences. With a growing Chinese middle class, for instance, there are many tourism opportunities with deals in place to bring these people to South Australia's iconic branding. Adelaide United kits give the most premium opportunity to do that during the 2017 Asian Champions League campaign.

I acknowledge that there was a deal done for this year's campaign for the qualifier against Shandong Luneng which cost the government \$15,000 for what I think is invaluable exposure. I believe this was to be extended to the tune of \$100,000 in the event of Adelaide United's qualification. Given that the club has now qualified directly for the group stage, I call on the government to renew this deal. I honestly believe that \$100,000 is a small amount to spend, given the hundreds of millions of potential tourism and investment dollars waiting to be tapped into in Asian markets.

A deal such as this has been one of my bugbears for the past four years. It makes sense to me and many at the club, and I am not sure why the government has been hesitant to continue the deal it signed this year. My irritation was exacerbated by the fact that the Northern Territory government swooped in a few years ago to sign a shirt sponsorship deal with the Reds, to the embarrassment of the Weatherill Labor government. I congratulate Adam Giles and the CLP in the Northern Territory for recognising the potential and doing a good deal with Adelaide United. There is absolutely nothing wrong with Adelaide United seeking this particular sponsorship. As the state government would not come to the party, it was their prerogative to get the best deal they possibly could.

It meant playing matches in the Northern Territory, and it also meant that the Brolga, which has been a highly successful emblem of Northern Territory tourism, was prominent on the shirts of a South Australian sporting club—the one soccer team that we have in this state—whose matches are being broadcast around the world. To me, that is unacceptable, and I implore the government to do something about it, to support our successful sporting clubs who punch above their weight and to make sure that we as a state get the recognition that we can through potential television audiences of hundreds of millions in Asia.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the directors of the club who have ensured its on-field strength and long-term survival and have poured many dollars of their own into this venture. In particular, I commend patron Fay Gerard and the stellar stewardship of the chairman Mr Gregg Griffin, as well as the other owners, Mr Robert Gerard AO, Mr Bruno Marveggio, and Dr Richard Noble. These people deserve full credit for getting the club to where it is today. There are many more unsung heroes, like CEO Grant Mayer, Sponsorship and Corporate Business Manager John Colalancia, and the many others in the back office. To those volunteers who assist with the football operations both on match day and on the training track, I say a wholehearted thank you on behalf of the people of South Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

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

Bills

WATER INDUSTRY (COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (16:34): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Water Industry Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (16:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is an important bill, given that we have seen so much occurring, unfortunately for South Australians, regarding burst water mains and the issues around lack of compensation for loss or damage. I seek leave to conclude my remarks on this at another date.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Motions***FLINDERS UNIVERSITY**

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:37): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Flinders University for celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2016;
2. Highlights the contributions made by Flinders University and its alumni throughout its 50-year history; and
3. Acknowledges the significant establishment and achievements of the University of South Australia, nationally and on the global stage.

I am delighted to rise today to move this motion, which congratulates Flinders University of South Australia on its 50th anniversary. Flinders University enjoys a strong reputation for its excellence in teaching and research. It has a longstanding commitment to enhancing educational opportunities for all and a proud record of community engagement over the last 50 years. As a whole, universities across Australia make a strong contribution to Australia's economic prosperity and social wellbeing. Universities have more than one million enrolled students. Universities in Australia employ over 100,000 staff. International education is Australia's largest service export.

Universities are significant contributors to the local communities, by providing local employment opportunities, research, industry collaboration, building vital infrastructure, and through local community and sporting grants. Australia's regional universities play a vital role in supporting regional economies. University research stimulates innovation and delivers solutions for economic, social and demographic challenges facing the nation, and the rate of return on publicly funded research is generally between 20 to 60 per cent.

As honourable members can see, universities are certainly a big contributor to South Australia. According to a study of Adelaide marketing material, South Australia is one of the only Australian states to have all its public universities listed in one or more of the three major international university ranking systems, with the University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the University of South Australia consistently being recognised for their academic excellence and providing a range of opportunities that equip students for jobs anywhere in the world. Flinders University is ranked number 46 in the world's top 150 universities under 50 years by Times Higher Education 2016, placing Flinders University in the top 2 per cent of universities worldwide.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Flinders University is the home of South Australia's Scientist of the Year 2012, 2013 and 2015. Some 90 per cent of research was rated world-class or above by ERA rankings 2015. It has over 100 partner institutions across 33 countries. There are nine offshore programs that are rated number one in Australia, across 11 international student barometer categories for international student experience.

South Australia ought to be very proud to have such a high ranking university in our state, and therefore it is very important to use this motion today to highlight Flinders University's achievements and put it on the public record for this parliament and for honourable members to acknowledge and recognise.

Since its establishment in 1966, Flinders University has made a significant impact for South Australia and for South Australians in innovative research, in high quality teaching and in community engagement. The university has led the way in providing access to higher education for individuals who did not traditionally aspire to university. Flinders University has attracted students from over 100 countries and its alumni have built careers and lives and reached communities across the world.

Flinders University's achievements are underpinned by a network of strong external links that have developed with its stakeholders and with the communities it serves. It is committed to being a university that is outwardly engaged, continuing to build supportive and valued relationships, which will be vital for the future.

I would like to place on record special thanks to Vice Chancellor Prof Colin Stirling and his office for providing me with comprehensive information about Flinders University to be included in my contribution today. With a 50 year history, Flinders University has many exciting stories and shares a rich heritage with South Australia. It is indeed a great honour to share some of its achievements here.

In the 1960s the University of Adelaide was the only university available for individuals interested in tertiary education. As more and more South Australians were seeking higher education opportunities, the Bedford Park land, owned by the government, was allocated to the university to establish a second campus, which then ended up being the development of a second university for South Australia. Flinders University was born out of the rapid population and geographic expansion of the 1950s and 1960s. It has always reflected emerging social, cultural and economic trends for our state.

The university was opened by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth The Queen Mother, and Chancellor Sir Mark Mitchell. Flinders University came into existence as a separate university on 1 July 1966. The Bedford Park campus and its fundamental principles were radical in the context of Adelaide's society in its day. Its urban design and architecture, and the interaction with the Australian landscape, presented a fresh face to the world and created a distinct identity for Flinders University.

Flinders University is named after the English navigator Matthew Flinders, who explored and surveyed the South Australian coastline in 1802. Matthew Flinders once wrote to a friend that he was 'not content to rest unnoticed in the middle order of mankind'. He also wrote 'since neither birth nor fortune favour me, my actions shall speak to the world'. This spirit of Matthew Flinders that I mentioned formed the ethos of the university. Flinders University as an institution has never been content with the status quo. It has demonstrated in the last 50 years that it has always looked for ways to make South Australia, and the world, a better place by making a positive difference. The Flinders University crest includes a reproduction of Flinders' ship, *The Investigator*, and an extract from his book, *A Voyage to Terra Australis*.

In their inaugural year, Flinders University employed only 90 staff and accepted 900 enrolments, conducting less than 10 courses; 50 years on, Flinders has now more than 2,679 academics and staff, about 26,000 students, with 21,000 or thereabouts Australian students, 4,000 international students, 300 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and 90,402 alumni based in 118 countries. Just 20 years ago, Flinders was one of the most centralised universities in Australia with its teaching and research activity almost exclusively confined to the Bedford Park campus, yet today Flinders is quite different. It is thinking and operating very differently from the days of its establishment.

The university is growing in terms of student numbers, geographical reach has expanded and their investment in building and facilities has become more strategic. For example, in 1966 the campus was 30 acres of open, hilly land, but now the campus footprint stretches from Bedford Park to Tonsley to Adelaide CBD, as well as interstate to Darwin and regional centres around Australia. In particular, there are 10 regional centres in South Australia, including the Barossa, Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier, Renmark, Victor Harbor; and also in Victoria and Alice Springs in the Northern Territory. Flinders is the fastest growing university in the state as it has increased many locations to include campuses all around the state as well as interstate and internationally.

The Tonsley facility is a state-of-the-art facility, housing the Tonsley Flinders School of Computer Science, Engineering and Mathematics, the Medical Device Research Institute and Centre for NanoScale Science and Technology, alongside some of Adelaide's biggest businesses and industries on the site of the former Mitsubishi Motors factory at Clovelly Park. It is certainly worth a mention and is a great achievement for Flinders University. Tonsley houses 150 academic staff and 2,000 students at the state-of-the-art \$120 million building; and the redevelopment has delivered a collaborative and high-value industry education and residential precinct, something certainly to be proud of.

I also want to highlight the new \$63 million student hub and plaza. From the beginning, the plaza and union building were places for the university community to come together to celebrate, relax, work and play. Looking toward the future, Flinders University has rejuvenated the heart of its Bedford Park campus to keep it contemporary, and to continue to meet student and community

needs. A comprehensive engagement project was undertaken to determine what was required. Fifty years on, Flinders University gets a new heart, which is a revitalised student hub and plaza which was officially launched on 18 March this year. Professor Colin Stirling, the Vice Chancellor, said during its opening:

This inspirational environment will support and stimulate collaborative learning activities by providing comfortable spaces equipped with the latest technology, offering students a modern, rich and rewarding learning experience.

Flinders' Indigenous connections are at the heart of the new Hub and plaza. As I mentioned before, it has a successful track record of attracting students with 300 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students enrolled in its courses—something to certainly be proud of as part of the push to engage more and more Aboriginal students and their communities in the future of its delivery of education excellence.

With a strong emphasis on collaboration between disciplines, Flinders is known for its research strength within biomedical and clinical science, culture, policy and society, health and human behaviours, molecular science and technology, engineering, water, and the environment. The strength of Flinders research can be illustrated in the following statement by Chancellor Stephen Gerlach AM. He mentioned that:

Education is a catalyst for changing and improving societies in which we live. Their newly acquired knowledge and expertise will have far-reaching effects as they are brought to bear in the various communities in which they choose to live and work. We should never lose sight of our role in providing the foundations on which future generations grow and prosper.

Throughout Flinders University history, they have had many highlights and breakthroughs in their research facilities as many academics are disciplined in finding more answers or advances within their relevant fields. I would like to highlight a number of individuals who are continuously pushing the boundaries in their research in representing the university on a global stage.

For example, Flinders University is exploring international research opportunities in clean technology and marine bioproducts following a recent group mission to China's Shandong province. The 17-member delegation, including experts in the fields of marine science, clean technology, nanotechnology and cancer pharmacology, flew to China in March 2014 to meet with key research and commercial organisations in Qingdao and Yantai with a view to participate in China's development of a blue economy, which is the sustainable development of marine resources.

I also want to make particular mention of Professor Tracey Wade, the wife of my esteemed colleague the Hon. Stephen Wade, who is collaborating with researchers worldwide in a global effort to identify genes that cause eating disorders. Professor Wade is one of those three Australian investigators working on this important project and ought to be acknowledged.

The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The Hon. Steven Wade interjected there, but I will not make further remarks. There are so many more profound researchers, but due to time constraints I am unable to mention every one of them. I would like to congratulate every one of those researchers for making their contribution in advancing their research. Flinders certainly is dedicated to building and strengthening relationships with governments and educational institutions in the Asian region and to advancing their international connections.

For example, in 2014, Flinders strengthened their ties with Indonesia. They have also met with Chinese political and business leaders, and signed a memorandum of understanding with Malaysia and Vietnam. These memorandums of understanding allowed parties to participate in research collaboration, and also for staff and students to do exchanges. Short courses were offered on many occasions. Flinders already has a strong and established relationship with China where Flinders teaches three postgraduate courses in partnership with Nankai University, Tianjin, one with Capital Normal University in Beijing, and offers two undergraduate degrees in conjunction with the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Flinders has also identified Indonesia as one of the priority nations by the Australian government for development of stronger and more comprehensive relationships and therefore

Flinders is well placed to make a significant contribution to the Asian century strategy. International students make up approximately 12 per cent of Flinders' current on-campus student population and in 2015 had 4,100 international students from more than 90 countries. The International Student Barometer has highlighted that international students at Flinders University are among the most satisfied university students in Adelaide. It has ranked Flinders as one of the best universities for international student services and arrival support for new students from overseas.

I have personally met with and engage with many international students who are studying at Flinders University and have witnessed first hand the experience they have gained from Flinders University. International students are great ambassadors for the university and there are now more than 3,500 Flinders alumni in China and Hong Kong. I would also like to pay tribute and acknowledge some of the notable distinguished individuals who have held public office roles and have had a long association with Flinders University. The first one I would like to mention is Eric Neal. As we all know he served as South Australian governor for five years. He made great contributions to our state in his role as the Governor of South Australia. Eric also helped establish Flinders University as a world-class establishment when he was chancellor from 2002 to 2010, and it is great to pay tribute to his work.

Dr Brendan Nelson, the former federal opposition leader and member of the Australian House of Representatives from 1996 to 2009, is also a Flinders alumnus and has a distinguished service in public life. Dr Andrew Southcott, the federal member for Boothby since 1996, has been a great member for Boothby. I would like to take this opportunity to thank him for his work as the Liberal member for Boothby and wish him and his family a wonderful future life after politics. I would like to also highlight that Nicolle Flint, the candidate for Boothby, is also a graduate and a current research PhD student at Flinders University.

I believe that she is currently doing a doctorate at Flinders University. Nicolle Flint, our candidate for Boothby, is a smart, capable and tenacious candidate. I recall when she was giving her speech in her preselection she said that she wanted to give back to Boothby where her family has lived and where she has worked and studied. She said, 'It is because of Boothby I have the education, training and skills to be a strong representative for the people of Boothby and for our state.' I wish Nicolle Flint all the best in her campaign. I think she will make a wonderful future member for Boothby.

The other very distinguished public office holder in terms of a long association with Flinders is Felicity-ann Lewis, the former mayor of the City of Marion. She is certainly one of the highlights. And, of course, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who all of us know so well, is certainly an alumnus of Flinders. She was a former minister and former member of the Legislative Council. She certainly served the Liberal Party and parliament with distinction.

I have just been given a piece of paper. The Hon. Ian Hunter, although it was not part of the notes, a minister in our house, is also an alumnus of Flinders. I am sure he will probably make a few congratulatory remarks on this motion later. In terms of the arts sector, some of you may or may not know that Scott Hicks and his wife, Kerry Heysen-Hicks, the film producers, are also great alumni of Flinders University.

Of course Scott Hicks is best known as the screen writer and director of *Shine*, an Oscar winning movie of a pianist, whose work was nominated for an Academy Award as well as winning the Emmy Award. Some of you may already know Gary Sweet, the Australian film and television actor. He certainly had a long association with Flinders. Nuala Hafner, the Australian media personality and television presenter, was a graduate of Flinders.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Robert Simms, Senator.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Okay; I am sure we will hear about Senator Robert Simms when the Hon. Tammy Franks speaks to this motion, which is wonderful. Along with acknowledging the alumni of the university, I pay tribute now to all the leadership team, the advisers, the lecturers and the staff of the university for making an amazing contribution over the last 50 years to ensure that the university remains internationally competitive, that it has the reputation of being the world-class research institute that it has established today.

As institutions and universities embody social, economic and intellectual resources, which combine to generate benefits on a local, national and global scale, they equip students with the

knowledge and skills that allow them to make greater contributions to society. They generate and disseminate knowledge, which enhances productivity and improves living standards. On this very note I congratulate again wholeheartedly Flinders University on its celebration of its 50th anniversary and commend the motion to the chamber.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON TRANSFORMING HEALTH

The Hon. S.G. WADE (17:04): I move:

That the second interim report of the committee be noted.

The fate of Ward 17 symbolises the disaster that is Transforming Health. It highlights the flawed and disingenuous way that the government has used selective information and carefully structured processes in an effort to camouflage its controversial and unwarranted health cuts plan. It demonstrates repeatedly that the health plans that Labor is rolling out across Adelaide are not ultimately driven by a commitment to improve health outcomes, but by political expediency and Labor's inability to manage the state's budget and in particular the health budget.

In its first interim report, the committee exposed serious flaws in the way that the government had gone about deciding where to build the new centre for post-traumatic stress disorder services, in effect the rebuild of Ward 17. In that first report, the committee found it had been premature for the government to identify a site for the facility when a decision about the future use of the Repatriation General Hospital site at Daw Park had not yet been made, and that in doing so it was closing the door on opportunities to significantly improve the delivery of PTSD services and other health services on the Daw Park site as part of a veterans' and ageing health precinct.

The committee's first report also highlighted that the government had used its decision to withdraw health services from the Daw Park site to make it impossible for the ministerial expert panel to recommend that the government consider building the new Ward 17 at the Repat. For example, the government said that no SA Health services could remain on the site. What was galling for a number of members of the expert panel—10 of whom gave evidence to the committee—was the way the government tried to give the impression that the panel had been able to examine and seriously consider the possibility of rebuilding Ward 17 at Daw Park and the way that this pretence was portrayed in the panel's final report.

Equally galling for those members was the claim contained in the expert panel's final report to the minister that the decision to recommend that the new Ward 17 be built at Glenside had been unanimous. Evidence to the committee from some panel members, and documentation subsequently provided by SA Health, made it clear that this was not the case. The expert panel did not reach a unanimous decision as to where the new PTSD facility should be built. Its final report and the government's public statement should not have misled the community of South Australia that it was.

In the recommendations of the first interim report, the committee laid out a credible pathway that, if followed, would have enabled the government to get the process of identifying the best site for the new Ward 17 back on track. It had the opportunity to restore the veterans' and broader South Australian communities' confidence in a process where options were being properly considered. The government failed to adopt the recommendations contained in that report. It refused, in particular, to press the pause button, broaden the options, engage the commonwealth and review the decision. As it was, many South Australians, including many in the veterans' community, are not convinced that the correct site has been selected and feel that the process used to settle on the Glenside option was rushed, flawed and driven by the government's political imperatives to break its promise to never ever close the Repat.

Since the government made its announcement on 2 August last year, I have had the opportunity to discuss the proposal to move Ward 17 to Glenside with a number of men and women who hold senior roles in South Australian veterans' organisations and members of the veterans' community generally. Some of those discussions occurred within the context of the committee, some in others. Some of those veterans leaders have suggested to me that the veterans who camped on

the steps of Parliament House for 161 nights last year were an unrepresentative fringe group when it comes to the Repat and were out of step with the bulk of the veterans' community.

One of the ways I responded to that suggestion was to remind the leaders that the *Sunday Mail's* annual Your Say SA survey report published in November last year found that 75 per cent of South Australians do not support the closure of the Repat. I simply put it to those leaders that I have no doubt that opposition to the closure would be higher, not lower, among South Australian veterans. The fact of the matter is that the small group of veterans who slept on the Parliament House steps under the dignified and courageous leadership of Augustinus Krikke I believe truly represented the views and hopes of the vast majority of South Australians, including the vast majority of the veterans' community, who want the Repat to stay open and for Ward 17 to be rebuilt on that site.

Reflecting on the courage and determination shown by Augustinus Krikke and his team leads me to reflect on that wider veterans' voice. I think that voice was not as strong as it might have been as a result of some confusion over the veterans consultation mechanisms and how they were tasked in advising the government on veterans' health matters.

Some evidence to the committee from veterans' health leaders suggested that the government had not engaged with the Veterans Health Advisory Committee on the issue of closing the Repat and relocating Ward 17 because the role of advising the Minister for Health on such matters had shifted to the Veterans Advisory Council instead. Not only is addressing veterans' health the Veterans Advisory Council's core business, the Veterans Advisory Council informed me that it had not taken over this responsibility. There seems to be a lack of clarity on the roles, and I feel that the voice of veterans would have been weaker as a result.

The committee also looked at how conflicts of interest were managed within the expert panel. I stress that the recognition and management of conflicts of interest does not impute any impropriety; the whole point of recognition and management is to avoid impropriety. There is no doubt that some members did have interest to manage. Veterans' leaders are busy people, and we all know that if you want something done, ask a busy person. Accordingly, some members had links with more than one organisation, and those organisations had more than one set of interests. Those interests might have related to moving Ward 17 to Glenside or in relation to the sale of the Repat hospital site.

Although the committee was told that possible conflicts of interest had been recorded at an early meeting of the expert panel, no such record was produced by SA Health during the hearings. The committee asked SA Health to provide it with a copy of all the documentation pertaining to expert panel conflicts of interest. In its reply, SA Health advised that no such documentation exists.

It is disappointing that in the haste to get an outcome from the expert panel, SA Health did not take the time to properly document and manage this important aspect of the panel's work. Likewise, the committee was bemused at the lack of documentation that SA Health provided to support the operation of the panel. We believed, as a committee that it was important for the transparency of the decision-making process that such documents be kept.

Since the committee's second report was tabled back in February, the Public Works Committee of the other place has examined the government's plan to build its new PTSD facility at Glenside. The committee's report, which was tabled in the other place last week, included a minority report from two members of the opposition.

I would encourage council members to read that minority report, as it reinforces a number of the concerns that the select committee of this place identified in relation to how the government is planning to manage veterans with PTSD who also have other comorbidities. At the moment, those veterans are able to have those comorbidities dealt with onsite at the Repat in most cases. In future, if the new facility at Glenside goes ahead, those patients may well have to be shuttled back and forth to Flinders or the RAH, or quite possibly find that they will not be admitted to Glenside in the first place.

Indeed, during its appearance before the Public Works Committee, SA Health indicated that older veterans with PTSD who have other serious medical disorders might be sent to the older persons' mental health unit at Flinders instead. The select committee received evidence that around 75 per cent of the clients of Ward 17 have comorbidities.

Given that, and given that the majority of Ward 17's clients are Vietnam veterans, I am very concerned that the government's plan may well see the majority of Ward 17's existing clients lose access to specialist PTSD services. This is an appalling, unjust outcome. As a nation, we failed Vietnam veterans when they first returned home; we should not be letting them down again. This was, I understand, the first time in more than 4½ years that a Public Works Committee report included a minority report. Clearly, it is not something that is produced often or lightly.

In conclusion, I believe the committee has provided this council, the government and the community with a clear, balanced assessment of the pros and cons of the changes to post-traumatic stress disorder services. If the government continues with its current course, these reports will stand testament to their political, policy and health service delivery failure. I commend the motion to the council.

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

Bills

RESOURCE OPERATIONS OMBUDSMAN BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December 2015.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:16): I rise on behalf of the government to oppose this bill. The government recognises that coexistence and collaboration provide diversity and resilience to the state and the regions in the long term. Multiple and sequential land use thinking is currently being implemented across South Australia through the development of the Multiple Land Use Framework.

This government recognises that farming and resource operations are land uses that contribute significantly to the state's economy. The impact of resource operations on farming land is recognised and considered under the Mining Act 1971 and the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000 as part of the regulation of exploration and production of resources.

The existing resources acts provide significant rights to the owner of land, which includes a right to object to any unreasonable access to land and provision of compensation for any economic loss, hardship or inconvenience suffered. This includes avenues of administrative and legal review through government departments, the Warden's Court and the Environment, Resources and Development Court. The current acts provide well-defined procedures for access to land, security of tenure and predictable regulatory processes.

It is the government's belief that creating an additional layer of regulatory burden through the processes outlined in this bill would be detrimental to the resources sector and the broader South Australian economy. The appropriate way to ensure coexistence between these important industries is through prioritisation of genuine collaboration and transparent engagements and, if required, an examination of processes contained in the existing acts. It is for these reasons that the government does not support the bill at this time.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Mr Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:21): I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak to the Resource Operations Ombudsman Bill 2015. It is my understanding that the Hon. Mr Brokenshire only intends to progress this bill to a second reading vote at this stage, and I will indicate from the outset that the opposition will not be supporting the Resource Operations Ombudsman Bill.

The intent of the bill is to establish an office of the resource operations ombudsman to provide for an independent dispute resolution mechanism in an advisory role regarding issues related to mining operations, particularly on agricultural land. The bill specifies 'resources operations' as mining operations in accordance with the Mining Act 1971, which includes prospecting, exploring and

mining, and also regulated activities in accordance with the Petroleum and Geothermal Act 2000, which includes the exploration for and production of petroleum (oil and gas). This bill also includes a specific clause on 'fracturing operations'. The functions of the Resource Operations Ombudsman Bill as outlined in the bill are:

- to assist owners and occupiers of land in negotiation with resource companies;
- an independent complaint handling process, and investigate and resolve complaints relating to the conduct of resource operations;
- to identify and review issues arising out of the complaints and to make recommendations for improving compliance with legislative, regulatory and other requirements relating to the conduct of resource operations;
- to monitor compliance with orders made by the ombudsman associated with the provision of an independent complaint-handling process;
- to provide education and advice on the rights and responsibilities of those conducting resource operations and persons affected by the conduct of resource operations and procedures for resolving complaints; and, finally,
- to prepare and publish standards relating to the conduct of resource operations and to promote the adoption of such standards.

It is my understanding that this bill provides the resource operations ombudsman with the investigatory powers of royal commission investigations and could be commenced on receipt of a complaint by the ombudsman's own initiative. Mr Brokenshire stated in his second reading speech that, in seeking to establish a resource operations ombudsman, he does not want to change the intent, purpose or effect of the Mining Act.

He wants to provide an umpire through an ombudsman for those people (essentially primary producers) who are affected by the actions of miners. However, I understand that the majority of the functions proposed for the resource operations ombudsman (as above) are technically available to small business primary producers via the Small Business Commissioner. 'Small business' is not defined under the Small Business Commissioner Act, and the federal government has recently extended the definition of 'small business' to include those who turn over up to \$10 million per annum. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of landholding primary producers could be supported by the Small Business Commissioner.

There are a number of duplications in the role that the Hon. Robert Brokenshire is proposing and the Small Business Commissioner. The duplicated functions of the Small Business Commissioner are as follows:

- Receiving and investigating complaints by, or on behalf of, small businesses regarding their commercial dealings with other businesses, state or local government agencies or bodies.
- Facilitating the resolution of such complaints through measures considered appropriate by the commissioner. These include measures such as mediation services and/or making representations on behalf of small businesses.
- Disseminating information to small businesses to assist them in making decisions relevant to their commercial dealings with other businesses and their dealings with state and local government bodies.
- To provide independent advice and recommendations regarding small businesses to the government of the day. This may include comments or recommendations on various matters related to small businesses.
- The Small Business Commissioner Act 2011 also provides a legislative framework for the Minister for Small Business to prescribe industry codes.

- The Small Business Commissioner has the authority to monitor, investigate and, where it is prescribed, enforce noncompliance with an industry code that may adversely affect small businesses.

Utilising the Small Business Commissioner in this instance, rather than the Resource Operations Ombudsman, would avoid duplication of services and be a much more efficient use of government resources and expertise.

My understanding from reading the bill, the only major difference between the functions of the resource operations ombudsman and the Small Business Commissioner is that the resource operations ombudsman would be able to provide assistance to all landowners and the functions of the Small Business Commissioner specifies support for small businesses. However, Mr Brokenshire's second reading speech states that the purpose of the bill is to assist primary producers in dealing with mining companies. Clearly, the majority of primary producing landholders would be classified as small businesses.

As you can see, there are a number of duplications. We understand the intent of the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's bill, but where it looks like we have a duplication with the Small Business Commissioner, the opposition is well aware of the, if you like, arm wrestle between mining and agriculture. We see it particularly at times when there are high commodity prices. The community has some concern about the proposed mining operations on Yorke Peninsula and the local member, Steven Griffiths, the member for Goyder, has some concern as well as to how you have that interaction specifically with a mining operation.

Clearly, there are some concerns in the Limestone Coast area with the fracture stimulation that could be used to extract gas from the shale that is underneath the aquifer. We understand those sorts of tensions and the opposition is working towards coming up with a policy and some clarity for both industries as we approach the next election, but we think at this time—and I know it will be a bit of a disappointment to the Hon. Robert Brokenshire—from the Mining Ombudsman's perspective, there is a duplication with the Small Business Commissioner.

We understand his intent. As I said, we have concerns and I think I have put on the record here that I am still the only member of parliament whose entire income was reliant, prior to entering politics, on accessing water out of the aquifer in the Limestone Coast area for my farming operation, so I know very well how important security over those assets and those aquifers is.

When we have had some discussions with the government of the day, I am not sure they fully appreciate the connection between the land, water and farming families. Clearly, there has to be quite a lot more work done. While we have depressed commodity prices, the pressure is not so great. We do not have mining companies wanting to dig up areas currently where we had mines that were profitable 150 years ago. They are no longer profitable, but at the time of higher commodity prices, the prospective miners see an opportunity that they might be able to get extra value out of a lot of those areas in the Barossa, Adelaide Hills and Yorke Peninsula. I have seen them out on the other side of the Adelaide Hills around Strathalbyn. There are areas where we are likely to see that pressure and I am sure, at some point in the future, that world oil and gas prices will also return to a point where some of the deep gas reserves that we have will be attractive to oil and gas companies as well.

I think we do need to have a clear pathway and a clear framework for both agriculture and mining, and the oil and gas industry, to work side-by-side. They are very important industries for us. I think over the long term probably agriculture has returned more, since this state was founded, than the other two industries, but nonetheless they are still very important industries, and we need to have a framework where the two or three different industries can work side-by-side for their mutual benefit and the benefit of the state. But this evening we are not prepared to support the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's bill at this stage.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (17:30): I thank honourable colleagues for their contribution to this bill. I am hoping I will get a clearer direction with the next bill, the Right to Farm Bill, to get it to the second reading stage vote only, so I will be careful and calculated with what I have to say. Both the major parties have indicated that there are issues, and that is a good recognition for a start. The idea of the ombudsman was someone with absolute expertise that could assist mainly farmers, but

from time to time, even miners, but mainly farmers because sometimes farmers end up spending thousands of dollars just to get advice when they get a notice delivered to them saying that exploration is about to start on their property.

I will be very gentle in my remarks. I just say two things: I am surprised somewhat that the opposition is saying that the Small Business Commissioner is the place to go for this, because I can remember that the opposition opposed it. The Hon. John Darley, I am sure, voted for the Small Business Commissioner, and so did Family First, and certainly the government was very proactive on that, but the opposition opposed the Small Business Commissioner, just for the reinvigoration of the record, and now they are saying that the Small Business Commissioner is the place for the farmers to go, but the farmers are not telling me that.

Notwithstanding that, I will not be giving up and I say to all the rural property owners, primary producers and the farmers, that we will keep working on this because we do need to have a balance between the mining sector and the farming sector, and with that I still commend the bill to the house, and I trust that when we get to the next bill we will get support from the major parties to the second reading.

Second reading negatived.

RIGHT TO FARM BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December 2015.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:33): Firstly, can I say happy birthday to the Hon. Mr Brokenshire—he's turning 35 or something?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: That's why I'm particularly lively today, sir.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Broadly speaking, this bill seeks to prioritise farming activity over any other land use in the state's planning system as a means of addressing these various restrictions and impediments to farming activities. This approach requires careful consideration.

Whilst the government recognises the significant contribution that the farming industry makes to the state, there are other legitimate land uses, and while they may conflict with farming activities, they cannot be ignored. It must also be recognised that there can also be conflict between different farming activities, and the right to farm concept may inadvertently introduce further conflict between sectors.

On this basis, the government will continue to consider these issues and is open to work through ways in which to best address the various restrictions and impediments to farming activities that this bill seeks to remedy. Accordingly, while the government will not stand in the way of the progress of the Right to Farm Bill 2015 to its second reading only at this stage, for the reasons mentioned the government will continue to consider its ultimate position with respect to this bill.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:35): I rise to speak on behalf of the opposition to the Right to Farm Bill 2015. I think, as the Hon. Mr Ngo has just spoken, this is the conclusion of the second reading debate, and I think the Hon. Robert Brokenshire is only wanting to complete the second reading stage this evening. So I will give him some joy in indicating that the opposition will be supporting the second reading, although there are a number of questions that his bill does raise. While I do not expect him to answer them tonight, maybe whenever we get to the committee stage of the bill he might like to throw some light on what he thinks.

He has introduced two similar bills over the last four or five or six years I think, maybe longer, maybe seven or eight years, and we have supported them in the expectation that at some point in the future we may have won an election and may have been able to form government, notwithstanding that we got 53 per cent of the vote, nonetheless that is a debate for another day.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: There is something about a level playing field that appeals to me, but I understand that that is not—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Do I look like I am a sore loser? I just like a level playing field. I am getting distracted.

The PRESIDENT: You are.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I did indicate to the Hon. Robert Brokenshire at the time while, I think, we were supporting the second reading—and in fact we may have even supported the third reading on the previous occasions, I cannot recall; the government did not—that we would work with Mr Brokenshire to recognise the value of farming. I have always been a keen supporter of whatever initiatives recognise the contribution that agriculture makes to our economy. I also recognise the contribution that people make without being impacted by what their neighbour does. I have always had this view, as a former farmer, that you should almost be able to do, within reason, whatever you would like on your property as long as it does not impact on the way your neighbour goes about his or her daily business.

When you look at things from that perspective there are a whole range of activities that impact on farming. Agriculture has been the backbone of our economy in South Australia since we were settled. I think our primary industry sector employs nearly 44,000 people and contributes about \$18 billion to our state's economy almost every year without fail, although there are ups and downs a bit with rainfall. Unlike other industries that may come and go, agriculture will always be there and is of vital importance to South Australia and Australia, for that matter.

It is my understanding that ultimately the bill seeks to ensure that properly conducted farming activities are adequately dealt with under planning and development laws and are given protection from certain liability, a principle which the Liberal Party supports. However, there remains some ambiguity in this bill and areas which need to be clarified as we work through the committee stage of the bill. I have spoken to both Primary Producers SA and Grain Producers SA who echo this sentiment, and in fact GPSA gave me quite a detailed submission. I think everybody is supportive of the sentiment, but I think a couple of areas need some clarification.

The intention of the bill is to protect normal farming activities from liability and prosecution. Specifically in clause 3 of the bill, a protected farming activity includes those prescribed by regulations to be implemented under this bill or generally accepted standards and practices. This is a very broad definition. The minister—well, former minister, but nonetheless a member of this great chamber—might like to consider perhaps at clause 1 of the committee stage, not this evening, what he sees as 'normal farming activities', because there is a range of farming activities. As members know, I grew a horticultural crop, cut flowers and flower bulbs. Most of my neighbours thought I was not normal doing that, and I can see you nodding in agreeance, Mr President. I recall when there was the potential of a locust plague, and we had all these meetings around what we would do, all the farmers, primarily cropping, broadacre farmers.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: I haven't heard this story yet.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You haven't heard the story? This is a new story.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It's a clean story. So, we had meetings in about October on what we had to do if locusts turned up, who you would notify, what was going on and what the response would be. I looked at my crop—we were all worried. Cereal crops are green in the October/November period and start to turn, and once they are dry and ready to harvest the locusts will not eat them. But of course I had a gladioli crop that was going to be bright green in the middle of summer. I said, 'Okay, what happens if locusts turn up in January when you guys have all finished harvest?' They said, 'We don't care, we'll all be down the beach, fight your own bloody fight.' It was a little bit of tongue in cheek, but I suspect that it was because I was not a normal farmer, I was doing something different from them.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: You were growing dollar notes.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Well, it might have been a profitable business, Brokey, but nonetheless it was an interesting concept when you talked about what was normal. I remember other farmers who were wanting to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway is spilling his heart out to us all; at least have the decency to listen to him.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I had a number of police officers' sons work for me because they loved getting some school work, yes. I recall that some neighbours just over the Victorian border were going to grow grapes, and the outrage among their farming neighbours that they could not use some of the volatile sprays that you cannot use around grape vines. So, there are always these issues. The comment was, 'But we don't grow grapes here; it's not normal.'

So, I am really interested to know what is the definition of 'normal farming practices'. Also, when you talk about 'a protected farming activity', which includes those prescribed by regulations. We had a briefing with the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's team the other day, and they said that parliamentary counsel is working on drafting some regulations. I would be really keen to look at those regulations, because that definition of farming clearly is important.

Also, I noticed that you have your mining ombudsman bill that we voted against, but in this bill there was no mention of mining activities, fracking or wind farms at all, so I guess you were hoping that would be covered by your ombudsman bill and not by this, but I think that, if you are going to have a bill that talks about normal farming activities and protecting farming activities, you should consider including components around some of those other industries that conflict with farming. You were dealing with the mining ombudsman bill, but it was just a narrow focus.

It is interesting, when you look at the Hon. Robert Brokenshire's second reading speech, there are a couple of issues there that I thought were interesting, especially when he talked about food security and the work that the government had done protecting the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale.

I take the opportunity to remind members that land at, I think, Seaford Rise, had been rezoned for some decades. The Liberal Party went through the State Bank era and chose not to put that land on the market. It was a Labor government that did—I think minister Conlon or minister Holloway was the one at the time. Current minister Bignell was silent during that whole period. He would say, 'Oh, but it was rezoned years ago.' Well, it was, but it was government-owned land and it was a Labor government that sold what some people in the McLaren Vale area would say was prime grape growing country. They sold it for housing development.

It is interesting that you have a government that wants to protect McLaren Vale and the Barossa, yet it was clearly a Labor government decision to allow that land to be sold. That is where we now go to this right to farm and the protection. It has been the actions of this government that have given us most concern and not any previous governments.

It is interesting also to note, in a little briefing we had, how misinformed sometimes ministers can be. We have seen minister Bignell talk about Qantas, saying that we should boycott Qantas because Qatar are cheaper. Qantas is the biggest employer in aviation in South Australia, so you have to be a little bit careful. Just recently he also said that we should be boycotting Murray Goulburn and Fonterra.

It is interesting that Murray Goulburn especially—I have just had a meeting with them and they are briefing the minister right now—actually buy South Australian milk. They package South Australian and Australian milk, and they support Australian and South Australian dairy farms. Some of the information stating that their farmers have been asked to pay back money that they have already received is totally inaccurate. That is not the case with Murray Goulburn, yet the minister was on his feet in the chamber of the House of Assembly yesterday saying that farmers were going to have to pay back money they had received over the last 10 months.

That is not accurate, and I do hope that tomorrow the minister goes into the House of Assembly and apologises for that because it creates an unfair impression. Sure, the dairy industry is going through a very tough time, but you actually need a minister to be making statements in the

house that are accurate and not inaccurate. So, I do hope he goes back in tomorrow and corrects that record.

I am getting a little distracted. I indicate that we will be happy to support the bill. There is another issue too for the Hon. Robert Brokenshire to consider. When we talk about buffer zones, obviously you have buffer zones for herbicides. A whole range of new specifications have been put out by the APVMA for various herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, and various distances away from houses and other crops. I am wondering how you are going to incorporate that into the bill as well, because that is clearly important.

We are probably not going to see it in a lot of the areas now, but in a town situation where you have land that is rezoned for potential urban development up against a rural property, who bears the buffer zone? Is it the developer who has it on his side where the houses go, or is it the poor old farmer, the primary producer, who has to say, 'Well, actually I'm going to get complaints from all the townies because I'm going to be there in the middle of the night. I'm going to create dust or the spray or the smell from my sheep or cattle.'

I know we have had some issues where the EPA will not allow people to establish intensive animal operations within a certain distance of towns because of the smell of pigs, chickens, feedlots and the like. I actually think there is a whole range of issues. I am very keen to work with the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, but right now, not seeing the regulations and in the absence of some of those definitions, we are very happy to support the second reading of this bill, but we do want to see a lot more detail before we are prepared to support a third reading. With those few comments, we support the bill.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (17:47): I thank my colleagues who spoke and also those colleagues who have talked to me about general support for the second reading. This is a birthday present for me today, and it makes me very happy, because we actually have got some consensus about the fact, the principle that we need, of right to farm legislation. I would suggest that as South Australia works through growing its agriculture and value-adding to that agriculture we can lead the nation if we can work collaboratively together as crossbenchers and as major parties to be the first state in Australia to actually enshrine a right to farm legislation.

As I said to my colleagues earlier, all but two states, I am advised, in the USA have right to farm. One of those has even gone far enough to have it in its constitution. I have had clear indications that both the government and the opposition can see the wisdom in further developing this, so I have indicated to the house that I am only taking it to the second reading. I have had discussions with the government, and the government is wanting to progress the general principles of this now. The opposition has indicated that they want to, and I congratulate them all for that.

I look forward to seeing this as a statement now, that we need to address the very principle of right to farm and that we can see some progressive work occurring in the next few months to come up with a solution that ultimately—either through this bill going into committee, with welcoming any members who want to put amendments, etc., and working through the committee stage here, or indeed through the development of a bill based on these principles—the parliament can agree to. With those words, I am very pleased after, as the Hon. David Ridgway said, me banging on about this for probably nearly eight years, that we are now making some progress. It is a small step forward, but it is a very positive step, and therefore I commend the second reading to the council.

Bill read a second time.

SUPPLY BILL 2016

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 May 2016.)

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (17:53): I rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill 2016. The Supply Bill 2016 provides for \$3.444 billion to be appropriated from the Consolidated Account. This will provide sufficient appropriation to meet the government's expenditure requirements from 1 July 2016 until approximately the end of September 2016, and will ensure that government services

continue until assent is given to the Appropriation Bill 2016. These funds will be administered by the Department of Treasury and Finance to agencies, in accordance with the Supply Act and financial controls and governing public accounts. Today, I would like to take the opportunity to cover a number of issues, the first being the state government's brief analysis of the 2015-16 Mid-Year Budget Review; secondly, a discussion on the comparison of payroll tax effort in South Australia versus other states; and, finally, I would like to look at a number of initiatives that have been undertaken through the Attorney-General's portfolio.

On the expenditure side of the budget, the general government operating expenses are projected to increase moderately by 0.7 per cent in real terms over the four years of the forward estimates. The constrained growth over the forward estimates is largely driven by savings measures the government has introduced in previous budgets. General government operating expenses as a percentage of gross state product are projected to decline over the forward estimates from 17 per cent to 16.2 per cent.

The Mid-Year Budget Review projected that all three fiscal targets set out in the state budget will be met. Fiscal target 1 projected a net operating surplus by the end of the forward estimates, with the 2015-16 Mid-Year Budget Review projecting a surplus of \$355 million in 2015-16, increasing to \$978 million in 2018-19. Fiscal target 2 projected that, once surplus is achieved, operating expenditure growth will be limited to trend growth in household incomes. In the Mid-Year Budget Review, the government's target of limiting expenditure growth to trend growth in household incomes in years of operating surplus was projected to also be met.

Fiscal target 3 projected that the achievement of the level of general government sector net debt is to remain affordable over the forward estimates, with a maximum ratio of net debt to revenue of 35 per cent. The net debt to revenue ratio projected in the Mid-Year Budget Review was predicted to remain below 35 per cent across the forward estimates. The net debt to revenue ratio peaks at 34.8 per cent in 2016-17, with the recognition of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital in the state's balance sheet for the first time, and declines thereafter in 2017-18 and 2018-19. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a chart from the Mid-Year Budget Review for the fiscal targets across the forward estimates. The chart is essentially of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

Fiscal targets outcomes—2015–16 MYBR estimates

	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19
	MYBR	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
Target 1: net operating balance surplus				
Target	To be in surplus by the end of the forward estimates			
2015–16 MYBR estimate (\$m)	355	500	897	978
Target 2: operating expenditure growth				
Target	<4.5%	<4.5%	<4.5%	<4.5%
2015–16 MYBR estimate	1.8%	3.4%	2.1%	2.3%
Target 3: net debt to revenue ratio				
Target	<35%	<35%	<35%	<35%
2015–16 MYBR estimate	20.6%	34.8%	32.7%	29.7%

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: The chart shows that, for fiscal target 1, as I said earlier, the Mid-Year Budget Review shows at 2015-16 a net surplus of \$355 million, with that increasing in the next year to \$500 million, in 2017-18 to \$897 million, and in 2018-19 to \$978 million. On target 2, expenditure growth is estimated in the Mid-Year Budget Review to be 1.8 per cent for 2015-16, 3.4 per cent in 2016-17, 2.1 per cent in 2017-18, and 2.3 per cent in 2018-19. The net debt to revenue ratio in 2015-16 is 20.6 per cent, 34.8 per cent in 2016-17 with the RAH coming on the books, 32.7 per cent in 2017-18, and 29.7 per cent in 2018-19.

The government's key funding priorities have been able to deliver significant stimulus measures while projecting to meet its fiscal targets. Some of the projects the government is and will

invest in are the Torrens to Torrens on South Road; the north-south corridor Darlington upgrade; the Northern Connector, a 15.5 kilometre road west of Port Wakefield Road linking the Northern Expressway, the Port River Expressway, the South Road Superway and Salisbury Highway connector. This project will improve freight access to Port Adelaide and industrial areas in Adelaide's north and north-west and improve road safety and efficiency.

There are also the last mile freight access road projects which are expected to improve freight access in a range of locations across the state through junction upgrades, overtaking lanes and safety improvements. We are also improving critical road infrastructure with shoulder sealing and audio tactile line marking. Sites for this work include the Copper Coast Highway between Paskeville and Kadina, Farrell Flat Road between Clare and Farrell Flat, the Riddoch Highway between Willalooka and Padthaway, and also Keppoch and Naracoorte.

Other projects include work on the Adelaide Festival Centre precinct which includes upgrades of the Festival Plaza and the Adelaide Festival Centre, and a new car park; additional prison beds at Mobilong, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier prisons; environmental projects that will improve the long-term health and resilience of the Riverland flood plains; and ongoing works on health facilities include the new RAH and development of other hospitals.

The 2015-16 budget delivered a \$985 million package including tax reforms and targeted investments in growth industries and infrastructure to grow the economy and create jobs. The 2015-16 Mid-Year Budget Review delivered a further \$518 million in additional economic initiatives including the bringing forward of tax cuts for business to encourage investment and jobs, and for the construction of 1,000 South Australian Housing Trust homes over the next three years.

I will now discuss the issue of payroll tax and how South Australia compares in relation to payroll tax efforts versus other states and territories. Just as some background, the Commonwealth Grants Commission measures tax effort ratio. The Grants Commission assessment of a state's revenue raising capacity is used in determining the distribution of GST to the states and territories. The commission publishes the tax effort ratio for each jurisdiction for each of the taxes it assesses. This is the ratio between the actual revenue a state raises from a tax and the revenue the commission calculates it would have raised if it had applied the national average policy for that tax.

A tax effort ratio of 100 implies that a state raises the same amount from a tax as the commission calculates it would collect if it applied the average policy. That is, a ratio of 100 per cent implies that a state's tax effort is at the national average. For example, if a state raises \$1.2 billion from a tax, which the commission calculates \$1 billion would have been raised under the average policy, it would have a tax effort ratio of 120. If it had only raised \$800 million, it would have had a tax effort ratio of 80. In the case of payroll tax effort ratio, the Commonwealth Grants Commission in determining the payroll tax effort ratio considers the actual revenue a state raises from payroll tax and compares this to the revenue it would raise if it applied the average payroll tax policy, that is, the average tax-free threshold and average tax rate.

To determine the amount of revenue a state would raise under the average policy, the commission uses the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data on wages paid by businesses in each state. It makes an adjustment to remove wages from businesses that have a payroll lower than the average tax-free threshold across all jurisdictions. This gives the value of wages in each state that would have been subject to payroll tax under the average policy.

The national average tax rate is then determined by dividing the total payroll tax collected by all jurisdictions by the total average wages that would have been subject to payroll tax. This average tax rate is then multiplied by the value of wages that would be subject to payroll tax in a given state to determine the amount of payroll tax a state would be expected to raise under the average policy.

South Australia's payroll tax effort in 2016, as published by the Commonwealth Grants Commission's most recent report and the basis for the distribution of GST for 2016-17, was 87.7, the lowest payroll tax effort ratio of any jurisdiction. Victoria has the second lowest ratio of 92.3. This implies that the South Australian jurisdiction raises 12.1 per cent less revenue from payroll tax than the Grants Commission expects it would have if it applied the average tax rate and the average tax-free thresholds. Mr President, I seek leave to table a chart detailing the tax effort ratio of each Australian jurisdiction, and seek to have that incorporated into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Payroll tax effort ratio

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Ave
Payroll tax effort ratio	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2014-15	101.6	102.2	92.3	104.6	87.9	106.8	116.7	103.7	100.0

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: This chart clearly shows that the payroll tax effort for 2014-15 for New South Wales is 101.6, Victoria is 102.2, Queensland is 92.3, Western Australia is 104.6, South Australia is 87.9, Tasmania is 106.8, the ACT is 116.7, and the Northern Territory is 103.7. A state's payroll tax effort can be influenced by a number of factors, including wage levels, proportion of businesses with wages below and above the average tax threshold, tax rate, tax-free threshold and marginally by changes to other states' policies.

It is worth assessing the impact of the recent Victorian government's budget announcement on payroll tax for 2016-17. In its 2016-17 budget, the Victorian government announced it would increase its payroll tax-free threshold from \$650,000 (currently \$550,000) by \$25,000 per annum over the next four years to 2019-20.

While it is not possible to determine with certainty the impact this will have on the payroll tax effort in the future, given the current differences between Victoria and South Australia's effort ratio it is expected that South Australia would still be assessed by the Commonwealth Grants Commission as having the lowest payroll tax effort of all jurisdictions. Again, I seek leave to table a chart detailing South Australian state and territory comparisons of payroll tax rates and tax-free thresholds, and seek to have that incorporated into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

State and Territory comparison of payroll tax rates and tax-free thresholds

Jurisdiction	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	ACT
Rate	5.45%	4.85%	4.75%	5.50%	4.95%	6.10%	5.50%	6.85%
Tax-free threshold (\$)	750,000	550,000 ¹	1.1m	850,000 ²	600,000	1.25m	1.5m	1.85m
Threshold phase-out range (\$)	n.a.	n.a.	1.1m to 5.5m	850k to 7.5m	n.a.	n.a.	1.5m to 7.5m	n.a.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: This chart shows that, in the case of New South Wales, the rate for payroll tax is 5.47 per cent, Victoria is 4.85, Queensland is 4.75, Western Australia is 5.5, South Australia is 4.95, Tasmania is 6.1, the Northern Territory is 5.5, and the ACT is 6.5. The tax-free thresholds in each jurisdiction are New South Wales, \$750,000; Victoria, \$550,000, but that is moving upwards; Queensland, \$1.1 million; WA, \$850,000, as at 1 July 2016; South Australia, \$600,000; Tasmania, \$1.25 million; NT, \$1.5 million; and ACT, \$1.85 million.

Now, I will move on to other initiatives involving the Attorney-General. Particularly, I would like to talk about the Surveillance Devices Act, which was recently passed in this place, and the ReBoot program. The Surveillance Devices Act was assented to, I am advised, on 18 February 2016. It was the third time the bill had been put before this place and it was finally passed.

Part 2 of the act restricts the use of devices such as optical surveillance devices—that is, hidden cameras—to covertly record the private activities of others. For example, the act would prevent a nosy neighbour from using a camera to record the activities that occur in an adjoining property, providing important privacy provisions to South Australians.

Exceptions have been provided for those acting in the public interest or those acting in one's own lawful interest. Restrictions have also been made in regard to the communication of footage obtained, so that one cannot publish covert footage or information obtained. This will help prevent

scenarios where information communicated to the public unjustly causes harm to the interests and reputations of individuals or organisations.

Exceptions have been made for media organisations or for those who obtain a judicial order if the release of the information or material would be in the public interest or in one's lawful interest. Part 2 of the act also restricts the use of listening devices, tracking devices and data surveillance devices in a similar way, again providing important privacy provisions for South Australians. Parts 3 to 5 of the act provide powers to police to use modern surveillance technology in a responsible way and allow for cross-border recognition of surveillance device warrants. Police have long been asking for reforms in this area.

The passing of the Surveillance Devices Act provides an important update to law in South Australia to ensure that the use of surveillance devices is properly regulated, not only for law enforcement but also for private citizens. I would now like to talk about the ReBoot program, which the state government is trialling. The government provided funding in August 2015 to the not-for-profit organisation Helping Young People Achieve to deliver an intervention program for young offenders. This program is run in conjunction with the Red Cross and the Youth Court to rehabilitate young South Australians who have come into contact with the justice system.

Over the course of the trial to date, 29 clients have been referred to the program and there are currently 14 active participants. Fifteen young people have been matched with a mentor and there are seven pending referrals. Meetings have been held with the family conferencing team in the Youth Court and the judiciary to maintain an awareness of, and engagement in, the ReBoot trial. There has since been a spike in referrals from family conference teams.

As part of the program, young people referred take part in an Operation Flinders wilderness camp. The first of these camps will take place next month in June. It is essential that the government focuses on rehabilitating young offenders so that they can lead productive lives. The ReBoot program is intended to assist in the rehabilitation and provide support for young South Australians.

Finally, one thing we do need to recognise is the impact on the state government as a result of commonwealth government cuts. The \$5.5 billion in cuts to commonwealth funding to South Australia for health and education over the next two years is not sustainable. Notwithstanding the commonwealth cuts, the state upheld its commitment to additional education funding for the full six years of the national education reform. South Australia is embarking on a major transformation of its health system to deliver the best and most efficient health care possible. That said, efficiencies will not be sufficient to address the funding gap for health created by the commonwealth government cuts.

In conclusion, South Australia faces significant challenges with the imminent closure of the Australian automotive industry, particularly the closure of GM Holden's manufacturing plant at Elizabeth in 2017. No help to those opposite in trying to defend the automotive industry. When you get the federal Treasurer essentially begging the industry to leave this country, that is exactly what they have done. What a tragedy that is!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: It is just amazing that those opposite still cannot recognise their failure to stand up for South Australia.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: On a point of order, the Hon. Mr Kandelaars ought to be well aware, as no doubt you are, Mr President, that this is the Supply Bill about the state government's supply acquisition to cover until the budget is completed—nothing to do with the federal government, and he ought to be brought back to that fact.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dawkins, I would have had a bit more sympathy if you had said this 20 minutes ago. He has about one line left.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: I didn't want to—he tempted me!

The Hon. T.T. Ngo: He's got two more lines.

The PRESIDENT: Two more lines, the Hon. Mr Kandelaars.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: We are getting to the end.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: We are going through a significant transformation in our economy. The state government continues to work with industry suppliers, employers, unions and employees and the community to deal with this challenge. I commend the Supply Bill to the council. It will ensure the ongoing operation whilst the Appropriation 2016-17 is dealt with by this parliament.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A.L. McLachlan.

Resolutions

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ROYAL COMMISSION

The House of Assembly informs the Legislative Council that it has appointed Ms Digance, the Hon. T.R. Kenyon and Mr van Holst Pellekaan as its representatives on the Joint Committee on the Findings of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission.

The House of Assembly informs the Legislative Council that it has passed the following resolution:

That the House of Assembly concurs with the resolution of the Legislative Council contained in message No. 92 that it be an instruction to the Joint Committee on Findings of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission, that the joint committee be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents presented to the joint committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the parliament.

Further, the House of Assembly agrees with the proposal to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint committee is examining witnesses unless the joint committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the joint committee is deliberating.

Bills

RETIREMENT VILLAGES BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 18:20 the council adjourned until Thursday 26 May 2016 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***C.S. HARE CENTRE**

In reply to **the Hon. K.L. VINCENT** (23 February 2016).

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I am advised:

1. All the new facilities in the High Dependency Unit are disability accessible and compliant, meeting all building codes and regulations.

2. The capacity for the Department for Correctional Services to respond to complex needs prisoners has increased since 2011.

The High Dependency Unit will provide inpatient mental health assessment and treatment services (and a continuum of care), for prisoners presenting with multiple and complex needs.

The new health centre will meet all the primary health care needs of prisoners.

Port Augusta Prison now also includes a Complex Needs Unit (opened in 2012-13) to manage prisoners with complex health and mental health needs.

C.S. HARE CENTRE

In reply to **the Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN** (23 February 2016).

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I am advised:

\$14 million investment of the \$46 million Northfield development and the recurrent costs are \$5.3 million per annum.

The initial design for the stage three health centre and high dependency unit at Yatala Labour Prison involved redeveloping the E Division building, however the complexities associated with those works necessitated that a new build solution was considered more appropriate.

The new build provided a purpose-built solution that better suits the operational requirements from safety, security and clinical perspectives.

However, all contractual arrangements regarding practical completion were met so no additional cost to government.

The projects practical completion was in late 2015 and beds came on line in February 2016.

The program met all time frames following re-scope and the minister opening of the unit was with the time frame of that project.