

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 21 September 2016

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

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and the community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Ministerial Statement

SMALL BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

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): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement made in another place by my good friend the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith MP.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (14:19): I lay upon the table the 29th report of the committee. Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Emergency Services a question about the emergency services levy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Go, Ridgie, better than yesterday, bring down the government.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Can you chuck him out right now, please?

The PRESIDENT: It is a little bit early in the question time for this, the honourable Leader of the Government, so allow the Leader of the Opposition to ask his question.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: He's a bit late for the Fringe. The Labor government has increased the emergency services levy three years running.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: A massive increase.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: A massive increase, as the Hon. Robert Brokenshire says. The government is gouging South Australian households, businesses, and community organisations, such as charities, schools and sporting clubs, with over \$90 million of additional taxes every year. The government has also continually, and in my view inappropriately, sought to hide behind natural

disasters to continually raise the ESL. My question to the minister is: can the minister rule out any further increases to the ESL following the recent floods?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for the opportunity to talk to the opposition, and the public more generally, about the importance of the ESL and the importance of our being able to ensure that our emergency services volunteers have the resources they need to be able to service our community.

Only this morning, the Hon. Ian Hunter and I had the opportunity of engaging with CFS volunteers and representatives of DEWNR, who have just received additional funds to the tune of \$4 million per annum, which will enable them to employ an additional 22 people who will be able to go about the business of putting out fires but also, importantly, undertaking incredibly important work for preparedness of bushfires through burn-off at times of the year that are appropriate.

We want to be a government that mitigates the risk of bushfire as much as we can, but just as importantly we want to make sure that we are a government that is resourcing our volunteers, who frequently put themselves in harm's way, with all the resources and kit that is available to protect them.

A good example of this, of course, is burn-over protection. Only last week, I released the report into the Pinery bushfire. Yesterday, I tabled that report. I am sure that members of the opposition have been poring over that document since it was publicly released, but within it specifically is reference to the importance of burn-over technology in protecting volunteer firefighters for events such as Pinery.

With the emergency services levy this year we were able to facilitate and fund an increased expenditure towards the introduction of burn-over technology which will see a more rapid introduction of that technology and which will ensure that more volunteer firefighters who find themselves on the fire front this year, hopefully not dealing with a tragic fire like Pinery but if they were to confront such a tragedy or such an event they will have more protection than would otherwise be the case if we weren't administering the ESL in a productive and efficient manner.

The government does not have any intentions, as it stands currently, to increase the ESL. The increase to the ESL through this budget was incredibly modest: the ESL increased from a total funding of \$279.3 million last financial year to \$292.4 million this financial year. This represents a modest increase, but an important one nevertheless.

What it does is it provides the government with the ability to ensure that our emergency services volunteers, who have our support 100 per cent, are able to have the protection that they need. The question for those volunteers is which government is more likely to support them? I attest that it is this one because our track record is second to none when it comes to making sure that they have all the equipment and kit they need to keep themselves safe while they keep us safe.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): A supplementary: will the minister rule out a further increase to the emergency services levy in the next state budget?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: He has already answered the question.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: No, he hasn't.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: State budget.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: State Budget. Who is answering the question? The man sitting down, not on his feet, or the minister?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, if you want to answer that question—have you answered the question or not?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:25): Mr President, I regret to say that I have already answered the question.

The PRESIDENT: That is all you need to say.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: But I am happy to repeat the fact that this government remains committed to making sure that those people who go out on the front line, put their lives in danger to protect others, that we as a government will make sure that they have all the protection they need in the form of new equipment, in any shape or form that is reasonably available, to make sure they keep themselves safe while they keep us safe. We remain committed to that. I certainly hope they take that into account when they go to the ballot box in approximately 18 months' time.

RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Water and the River Murray on the subject of reservoir management.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I would like to take this opportunity to thank the minister for his commitment to me yesterday that he will provide me with the protocols—you read the *Hansard*, minister—that his agency, SA Water, uses.

In an interview on ABC Radio yesterday, the minister, in response to questions from Mr David Bevan about this matter, said, 'Everybody will be criticising SA Water if they didn't pump water through winter when pumping was cheap and electricity was cheap.'

My question for the minister is: can he expand on that statement and provide the chamber with a quantum of how much it would cost to pump water in winter—I think it was actually in autumn when it was pumped from the river—compared to if the water was pumped either this spring or summer, what the difference in costs would be on a relative basis?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. At the outset, I should say that she has misunderstood the explanation that I was giving, in terms of the pumping costs. SA Water pays for electricity on the spot market, as I understand it, so that they can actually time the pumping to match the lowest price on the spot market of electricity.

It is not a question of: do you pump it in autumn or do you pump it in spring, or whenever, it is a matter of the amount of time that you take to pump. The longer the time you have the greater the amount of time you can spread your pumping purchase price over the period when electricity is the cheapest on the spot market. They don't have a contract for this. They play the spot market and therefore can utilise the lowest cost of electricity to do the pumping.

If you actually shorten the period from which they can do that pumping, then they have to pump much longer and they have to disregard, in many ways, the cheapest available electricity because they have to pump over a period of time that is out of their control. That's the key difference. The longer the time they have to pump into a reservoir, the more spread over the cheap electricity times they can utilise. If you stop that and say, 'No, instead of over three months, you are going to pump it in 30 days,' then they would have to utilise the electricity at a higher rate, obviously, which is spread over much more increased prices in terms of the electricity.

So, I can't provide her with any differential other than that because the spot market changes on a minute by minute, hour by hour basis, and SA Water purchases its electricity when it is cheapest to do so. That's why they plan to pump ahead of time, so that they have enough water in the reservoirs to meet—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: So they can let it out when it floods.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —the needs of residents. The ignorance of the Hon. David Ridgway in this matter—thank goodness he will never be in charge, he will never be in government to be in

charge of very important water policies. He hasn't got the first clue about how to run a business. No wonder he is here in the chamber—not the first clue. No wonder he failed as a businessman.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, just one second. You don't refer to the President as 'him', if you don't mind.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: I apologise, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I forgive you.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: But I know it was a cash business that you ran.

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, he should pay all due deference to you, as I do, as our most illustrious President. That would be the appropriate way of addressing your eminence. All I can say is the Hon. Mr Ridgway has not got the faintest idea about how to run a business. God help us all if he gets his hands on the Treasury benches.

RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:29): Supplementary question arising from the Minister's answer: I refer to his SA Water officer, who was on radio today, who said, and I quote:

...what we try and do is to minimise the amount of pumping that we need to do from the Murray...it is expensive to pump that water across and we try and do that late summer, early autumn...when power prices are low and get water into the reservoirs then...

Can the minister explain how his officer thinks that it is cheaper to pump in late summer and early autumn, and yet the minister said it has nothing to do with the time and the seasons?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:30): The honourable member has expressed her ignorance in this matter. The two of us have not made any difference. He says, 'We pump when the electricity is cheapest.' That is exactly what we do. The longer period of time you have to pump, the cheaper the price schedules that you can actually go for. So you do not pump for 12 hours a day, you might only pump for three hours when the prices are low and you can spread that out over three months. What is so hard to understand about that?

RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:31): Further supplementary: so is the minister saying that it makes decisions about—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Don't put words in my mouth.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I haven't even got there yet.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member—

The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: We don't need any help from you, the Hon. Mr Wade. The Hon. Ms Lensink has the call. I want to hear her question in silence.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you for your protection, Mr President. Minister, you can choose to tell me whether I am correct or wrong or not, I am sure. You have not even heard what I have to say. Is the minister saying that part of SA Water's decisions about when it pumps and whether it is pumping critical human needs water from the River Murray into the reservoirs are based on spot prices, and it uses those opportunistically as part of its decision about volumes that it is going to pump into the reservoirs?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:32): Well, Mr President, I never rise to these tricky lawyer tricks that the Hon. Michelle Lensink is picking up from the Hon. Mr Wade, and others, about 'is the minister saying this'. Just listen to what I am saying and take no more from it than at face value. I have said in this place previously, SA Water has a very complicated system of analysis of when they pump, how much they pump, on projections—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, these are experts, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. I do not think you will ever understand it. These are experts who are employed to do this, based on an exquisite level of complicated modelling, and they usually get it right. In their defence, if you are trying to deal with climatic conditions of such variability that we have in South Australia, and which will become even more frequent due to climate change, if they only get it right 99 per cent of the time, then I think they are doing a pretty good job.

RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:32): Further supplementary, and I thank the honourable minister for his explanation: when would he like to provide me with a briefing on these exquisite models? Does he need me to write to him or can we do an office-to-office negotiation?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:33): I am happy to accommodate the Hon. Michelle Lensink however she pleases.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would just like to welcome the previous Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Rev. Dr Lynn Arnold. Welcome.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Question Time

POLICE SEARCH AND ARREST POWERS

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Police questions relating to police search and arrest powers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The 2014-15 annual report of the Police Ombudsman was tabled in the other place yesterday. The Acting Police Ombudsman found that some police officers were exercising their powers of arrest and powers to search premises, persons and vehicles with mere curiosity, speculation or idle wondering, rather than on the basis of reasonable suspicions. After citing three recent examples of what he perceived to be misuse of this power, the Police Ombudsman goes on to say that, in his view, what amounts to a reasonable cause to suspect is not always understood by operational police, and this area of law requires ongoing attention from the Commissioner of Police.

I am advised that this is the second year in a row that the Police Ombudsman's report has made such a recommendation. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that the Police Ombudsman has raised concerns in the past, what has SAPOL done in the last 12 months to make sure the police are operating within the law in exercising search and arrest powers?
2. Given that the Police Ombudsman has described the search powers as a serious intrusion against individual liberty, what further steps will the government take to protect the rule of law?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:35): Someone said to me this

morning, 'Are you worried about the report in the paper today from the Police Ombudsman?' I said, 'No, not at all,' because it is a fine example of the system working. I am entirely satisfied, and indeed, the annual report from the Ombudsman indicates this, that the issues that are referred to in the report in this morning's *Advertiser* are indeed isolated events.

In fact, I am advised that in the annual report from the Ombudsman there is a reference to the fact that there are no systemic or cultural issues that exist within SAPOL to suggest that this is a problem of major concern, or one that speaks to a systemic or a cultural problem. Rather, they are idiosyncratic examples of where people may have had a bad day, or there may be some personality issues to do with individual officers, rather than something that represents a greater problem within SAPOL.

That said, that of course doesn't mean we should not be trying to learn from where there have been errors. That has been something that the police commissioner has already committed to and something that he wrote in correspondence to the Police Ombudsman himself. Of course, this morning I have already spoken to the police commissioner regarding the annual report and, again, he was very quick to assure me that the instances that are referred to are few and far between.

SAPOL deal with in excess of a million interactions per annum. It is not surprising, when you have such a large police force doing such an extraordinary amount of work, that there will be incidents take place where appropriate procedures and protocols have not been followed, but it is important we learn from them, make sure that the appropriate training regimes are in place and that those training regimes are reviewed to ensure that, where police force officers utilise a substantial authority that is invested within them, they do it in a way that is appropriate and consistent with both the law and, of course, public safety.

POLICE SEARCH AND ARREST POWERS

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (14:37): Have the police officers referred to in the Ombudsman's report been disciplined?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:37): I have been advised, generally, by the police commissioner this morning that any individual or individual case that is examined by the Police Ombudsman, where it is found that a police officer has used their powers inappropriately, or has not and complied with the law, that SAPOL take that incredibly seriously.

They understand the importance of the public trust that is vested within them, which enables the legislature to be able to pass laws and provide them with the powers they need to get on with policing business. They understand how important and fundamental public trust is to the retention of those powers and authorities and, therefore, they take it very seriously when someone doesn't utilise them appropriately. To answer your question, that means that, where it is found that a police officer hasn't acted appropriately, they are disciplined accordingly through internal disciplinary procedures.

POLICE SEARCH AND ARREST POWERS

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:38): Could the minister advise whether the three cases of misuse of power, in the view of the Police Ombudsman, were found to be police disciplinary matters when followed up by the police?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:38): I am not in a position to answer the question in respect to the specific cases that are referred to by the Hon. Mr Wade, but I am happy to seek information regarding that, and, if it is appropriate for me to share it, I am happy to do so.

FUTURE INDUSTRIES INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Can the minister update the chamber on the University of South Australia's new Future Industries Institute and how it is expected to accelerate the growth of South Australian industry, and is the minister aware of any alternative plans?

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 would like to thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in the contribution being made to South Australia by our academic institutions. Recently, I had the opportunity to speak at the launch of the University of South Australia's \$60 million Future Industries Institute located at the university's Mawson Lakes campus. This institute is set to accelerate job creation and economic growth in this state through supporting innovation and collaboration between researchers and industry.

UniSA Deputy Vice Chancellor, Professor Tanya Monro, has rightly described the Future Industries Institute as a game changer for research and development in our state. Professor Monro has said that the University of SA's Future Industries Institute was established with a completely new research culture in mind, one deeply engaged with industry and with the end goal of building economic growth through relevant innovation and industry participation.

The institute aims to create an effective and sustainable collaboration between universities and businesses, which will ultimately lead to job creation and economic growth for South Australia. The establishment of the Future Industries Institute has enabled UniSA to bring together its research strengths and activities into a single institute that covers energy and advanced manufacturing, environmental science and engineering, minerals and resource engineering, bioengineering and nanomedicine.

The institute has some of the most advanced facilities in Australia, with highly skilled researchers working on a range of new technologies and processes. The potential for transformation in this sector is why the South Australian government has contributed \$7.5 million from this year's state budget to support industry engagement activities at the institute. The state government's contribution will support a number of things: mobility grants which will fund salary and on-costs for the placement of up to 12 months of researchers for business and vice versa; access to major equipment and research infrastructure with the funding that will provide for a team of dedicated staff to work with industry in providing expert advice, training and analysis; and research and development vouchers to provide support for projects of up to 12 months, focused on addressing industry problems.

The government recognises the need to diversify the state's economy and assist in the transition towards industries of the future to ensure that we remain competitive in a global environment. As we transition towards high-tech related industries, the Future Industries Institute is exactly the type of institution that will assist South Australian researchers and companies to capture the immense opportunities that exist across these sorts of industries of the future.

There is increasing momentum around innovation in South Australia and we have good reason to be optimistic about how the economy is diversifying. The University of South Australia has grown, diversified and transformed the higher education landscape in SA, and the establishment of the Future Industries Institute is indeed a game changer.

The honourable member also asked whether I am aware of any alternative plans to what has been put forward by the government in terms of our plans for transforming the economy. The answer, quite frankly, is no. The supposed alternative government has absolutely no plans. The SA Liberal Party has absolutely no plans whatsoever. We have gone through their document before, the grand sum total of their ambition, their 2036 plan, which is a bunch of motherhood statements.

We have heard in here before that it makes no mention of things that are so important to this state. There is no mention of northern Adelaide workers, no mention at all of the automotive industry, no mention of submarines, no mention of shipbuilding, no mention of naval, no costing, no details. It is completely light on. It is not an alternative plan. It is not an alternative plan, and that is because the Leader of the Opposition in this state, the member for Dunstan, has no vision and no plan whatsoever.

All we have heard recently from them are plans to ruin each other's careers. Those opposite have been leaking against each other and deliberately trying to do damage to each other. We saw, while the Leader of the Opposition was away, the leaking of the Wingard-Tarzia scheme for a \$10 million funding package to provide \$2,000 job grants. The government already beat them to the

punch with a scheme that was 10, nearly 11, times in size. This one 11 times in size was described by the Leader of the Opposition as an absolute drop in the ocean.

We have seen that grouping within the Liberal Party, the equivalent of the Tony Pasins and George Christensens of South Australia, led not very ably by the Hon. David Ridgway. The best the conservatives in this state have is the Hon. David Ridgway, and we all know that one leak was deliberately designed to do damage to the other side. That polo shirt collar popping, boat shoe wearing group of wets in this state, it was designed to damage them: the leader, the member for Dunstan, Corey Wingard and Vincent Tarzia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We are hearing a lot of interjections, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks, point of order.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I believe it will be the same point of order, that members should be referred to not by their names but indeed by their seats.

The PRESIDENT: Please remember that very important point.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank all honourable members who remind me of these things; it is very much appreciated. We are hearing interjections and I must say the Leader of the Opposition in this place, the Hon. David Ridgway, would probably do well to keep his head down. I noticed for a lot of that he was looking away, the leader of the far, far right of the Liberals in this state, because we have been hearing a lot about what he has been up to.

I would invite him, maybe by way of a supplementary to me, to answer a couple of questions, or at the very least in matters of interest today to actually answer a few questions. The Hon. David Ridgway would do well to answer:

1. Was he involved in any way in the leaking of the Liberal's job accelerator scheme?
2. Has David Ridgway in recent times—

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

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —been trying to recruit alternative candidates—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, refer to the Leader of the Opposition as the honourable.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Has the Hon. David Ridgway in recent times been trying to recruit alternative candidates to knock off sitting Liberal House of Assembly members?

3. Has the Hon. David Ridgway had any conversations with people outside parliament about them being parachuted into parliament and taking over the portfolio responsibilities of one of his colleagues in the Legislative Council?

4. The Hon. David Ridgway would do well to answer: is he involved in the ongoing undermining of his leader?

If none of this is the case, the Hon. David Ridgway can very simply clean this up: stand up, ask a supplementary and say no to all of those. He could say no to all of those. I dare him to do it. Just rule it out. His failure to answer will be very, very telling. His silence will be an admission of complicity. There are many people, not just his colleagues, who will be very keen to hear the answers to these questions. I invite him to set the record straight.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Are there any—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Vincent.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation, if that is alright with you, Mr Maher, before asking questions of the Minister for Emergency Services regarding the emergency caused by floods in Adelaide last Wednesday 14 September and broader questions regarding the accessibility of information relating to emergency management.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Mr President, you will be aware that, following work by Dignity for Disability with the State Emergency Management Committee (SEMC) and the emergency services minister, the State Emergency Management Plan, policies and procedures, were amended in 2015 to ensure that Australian sign language (Auslan) interpreters would be employed for relevant TV broadcasts pertaining to emergency information, such as bushfire or flood—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: And I am happy to slow down until everyone is listening but, until then, let's all put our hands in our laps, put our listening ears on and listen. Okay? I am not in the mood today.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Boohoo!

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: No, not boohoo. It's parliamentary procedure, actually, Mr Stephens. It's not about my feelings, it's about parliamentary procedure.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Just get on with it.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, the Hon. Ms Vincent has the floor and I think she deserves our respect to be able to give her contribution and question in silence. The Hon. Ms Vincent.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: I also understand that, at the July 2015 emergency management committee meeting, the Premier also deemed it desirable for an Auslan interpreter to be present at any live emergency/warning media coverage where the Premier or the minister or a senior executive is present. The State Public Information and Warning Advisory Group (SPIWAG) of the State Emergency Management Committee has been working with government agencies and service providers to develop a whole-of-government approach for the provision of Auslan interpretation services, and processes are being developed to provide contractual arrangements for the provision of these services.

However, last Wednesday, no Auslan interpreters were present on any TV broadcasts that warned of rising floodwaters across metropolitan Adelaide, nor in warnings not to drive, walk or move through these waters. Rapid Bay Primary School was, as you will recall, evacuated via a tractor or digger, while images of people surfing across Bridgewater Oval were, concerningly, broadcast. However, no Auslan interpreters, for deaf South Australians who rely on interpretation, were present to warn them about these issues and, therefore, they risked missing out on this information.

I also note that people requiring captions reported to me that they found the captioning on these news services inadequate and inaccurate in many instances. My questions are:

1. Given the Premier deemed, at the July 2015 State Emergency Management Committee meeting, that it was desirable that an Auslan interpreter be present at any live broadcast, why was this not the case?

2. Can the minister guarantee that Auslan interpretation will be used for television broadcasts for this coming fire season, given that we are facing a high-risk season following heavy rains this winter?

3. Can the minister provide an update on the introduction of other measures, especially captioning, to ensure that safety-related information can also be accessed by people who are hard of hearing but do not use Auslan?

4. Can the minister provide an update as to the production and distribution of accessible information about emergency preparedness for individuals in contrast to the information available once an emergency is declared?

5. What action has the minister taken to ensure that South Australia has an adequate number of qualified and accredited Auslan interpreters to service this need?

6. If no action has been taken, will he speak to the Minister for Higher Education and Skills in the other place about the need to recruit more Auslan interpreters to fill this need in this state?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for her question and her ongoing advocacy of South Australians who suffer from a hearing disability. The honourable member is right to refer to key dates last year regarding this particular issue. I am advised that on 25 June last year, at a meeting of the State Emergency Management Committee, an amendment was made to the State Emergency Management Plan to provide for the use of Auslan interpreters for declared emergencies. To be more specific and for the information of the Hon. Ms Vincent, under section 7.8 of the State Emergency Management Plan:

In addition to other methods of disseminating public information and warnings, the Control Agency is responsible to ensure that all live televised warnings, or major public information press conferences (e.g. attended by the Premier, State Coordinator and/or State Controller) issues for declared emergencies are supported with the use of an accredited Australian Sign Language (Auslan) interpreter.

In the event that securing an accredited Auslan interpreter would cause critical delay in the broadcasting of an urgent message to the community, the Control Agency will determine if the message should be broadcast without that support.

Critically, under the State Emergency Management Plan, what this provides for is Auslan interpretation services, as far as is reasonably practicable, to be provided in the event that there is a declared emergency. Last week was a significant weather event and it resulted in a number of South Australians being affected through storm damage and also flood damage, which is of course regrettable, but it did not constitute a declared emergency.

A declared emergency is something that is far more significant than that and something that, obviously, would represent a significant and imminent threat to life. Once that threshold is met then, of course, under the State Emergency Management Plan, or this particular amendment (which I know the Hon. Ms Vincent played a role in advocating for), Auslan interpreters would be made available.

Indeed, the government has established processes to provide for contractual arrangements for the provision of Auslan translation services for emergency incidents relevant to the CFS as well as the SES. Bookings require minimum notification times of at least one hour for those services to be able to get into the CBD and up to two hours plus travel time for services in metropolitan and regional areas.

What we have to try to pursue here is a bit of a balance. We want to make sure that when there are significant emergencies that present, in particular, a significant threat to life, or if there is a declared emergency, we go out of our way to make sure that we have Auslan interpreters. Whether or not that is something that is practical every single time there is an emergency services announcement is a separate matter.

If the Hon. Ms Vincent has concerns about the arrangements that exist within the State Emergency Management Plan, as always I am happy to sit down with her, or any other advocate who is concerned about this issue, and contemplate whether or not there needs to be further amendments made to that plan. As it stands, the events of last week occurred in such a way that the plan was complied with in respect of Auslan interpreters.

The advice I have received from my officials in Emergency Services is that the current arrangement is adequate and appropriate. Of course, if there is a view that the State Emergency Management Plan can be improved in any way, I am more than happy to take representations for that.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:56): A supplementary question. Just to clarify, is the minister's answer suggesting that last week the State Emergency Management Plan provisions in relation to

Auslan interpreters were not activated because it was not a declared state emergency? If so, have the new Auslan provisions been activated since the changes the Hon. Kelly Vincent has facilitated?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:56): As I described, the Auslan provision that exists within the State Emergency Management Plan is activated when there is a declared emergency. I can inform the house that since 25 June last year, the date I referred to, there has not been a declared emergency.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:57): A supplementary. Can the minister also outline any work he is doing to ensure that staff, such as camera operators, are trained to be aware that, for example, they need to keep the interpreter in the frame so that they are not cut out from view?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:57): Yes, I can answer that. I can advise that I am not doing any work in that respect. We do, of course, have the freedom of the press and, despite my best efforts in the past, I can assure members that I have never been successful in trying to persuade a journalist to ask a particular question or a cameraman to take a particular angle.

However, I would very much hope and encourage those who are present at press conferences, particularly those who are providing for live news feeds, that where Auslan interpreters are provided for, those wider camera angles take into account the fact that Auslan interpreters are used so that members of the community who have a hearing impairment can see the Auslan interpreter. I could be corrected on this, but I was of the understanding that the live feed that was taken from the one press conference held last week where there was an Auslan interpreter was indeed taken with a wide camera image.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:58): I heard that they were criticised for being cut out of the frame. A further supplementary, sir. Why was an Auslan interpreter included on Thursday, after most risk was over, if it were not a declared emergency? If it was never a declared emergency, why did the minister see fit to provide an interpreter for one such television broadcast and not another?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:58): As I said, the State Emergency Management Plan was complied with last week, and in its current form that does not provide for Auslan interpreters to be present at events that aren't declared emergencies. Regarding the later press conference where there was an Auslan interpreter, I understand that a decision was taken by the SES chief to have an Auslan interpreter there, and of course that was accommodated.

APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation questions about the recent audit into accounting policies and procedures of the APY.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I refer the minister to the report by Ernst and Young, co-commissioned by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, which was made public recently. Of concern was the finding that 52 per cent of transactions for the financial year 2014-15 were either non-compliant or unable to be determined. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister think it is appropriate for 52 per cent of APY expenses to be either non-compliant or not properly documented?
2. Was the minister aware of this questionable conduct before the report was finalised on 27 May 2016? If so, what has he done to improve or rectify the situation?

3. Can the minister explain why such a shocking lack of proper accounting standards in regard to public money would not justify the sacking of the executive and the appointment of an administrator?

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) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question. I know we regularly speak of these matters, and I think it is fair to say we share a desire for a common outcome. We might have slightly different ways that we want to get there. But I thank the honourable member and acknowledge that we want to see things improve. I think that is a mutual goal we both have.

In relation to his questions, and I am sure he will correct me by way of interjection if I have not got them in the right order or not answered the question, the first one: do I think it is acceptable, the results of the EY report into the 2014-15 year? No, I don't. Was I aware of these problems before the EY report? Of course, I wasn't aware of the exact nature of the problems and the percentages, that is obvious, because I did not have the report yet, but there was a very high level KPMG report into a small part of procedures at APY that pointed to the fact that there were administrative practices that were not up to scratch, which is why the federal minister, Senator Nigel Scullion, and I commissioned the EY report.

So, yes, I think broadly, all those who have been involved in matters to do with the APY and visiting the APY lands are aware that, firstly, it is very remote, it is very difficult, and there are many challenges, but certainly that KPMG report, which was the reason the further EY report was done, pointed to the fact that, yes, there were administrative practices lacking. I did not get all of the third question down, but I think, 'What has been done about it?' was the substance of the final question.

A number of things have been done about it, yes. Before the EY report was delivered, a number of things were put in place. There has been significant upping of the transparency and accountability requirements, for example. There has been implementation of strict delegations for approving payments and, certainly, for quite some time the current general manager is the only one to have approval for those delegations. They were spread much more thinly and widely since then. There has been an independent audit of spending controls from July 2014 to December 2014. There is a specific requirement that documentation that has not been provided previously now goes up on the APY website.

There are monthly reports that are given, I think, to the Alice Springs based accountants in relation to year to date spending. I think the Auditor-General noted in his 30 June 2015 report that it was evident from their review that DSD and the minister had implemented more stringent conditions on the release of grant funding than in 2014-15, and that they had also continued to facilitate processes that aimed to improve governance and accountability arrangements for APY. I agree with what the honourable member is asking. The past practices have not been good enough. If improvements don't continue then I completely agree with the honourable member that it is appropriate that an administrator be appointed.

APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:04): Supplementary: given that we are almost finished the first quarter of 2016-17, have you got a report being commissioned and will you act immediately after the end of the first quarter if these discrepancies have not dramatically improved?

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) (15:04): As soon as we get the next set of financial records I will undertake to talk to the honourable member about those so that we can have a discussion about: if improvements are not continuing, what comes next?

TENNYSON DUNES

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister inform the chamber of the progress towards developing the Tennyson Dunes section of the coast park?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her totally unexpected and most excellent question. On Friday last I released the path alignment for the Tennyson Dunes Discovery Trail. This 1.5 kilometre section of the proposed coast park that will run from North Haven to Sellicks Beach traverses 22 hectares of ecologically significant coastal dunes. This area is a designated conservation reserve, and the dunes are the last true remnant of the original Adelaide metropolitan coastal plains.

In September 2015, I made Tennyson Dunes a dedicated coastal conservation reserve under the Crown Lands Management Act 2009. The reserve is 12 kilometres north-west of the city, near locally historic Estcourt House, and holds rare and regionally significant plants, bird life, reptiles and invertebrates. The dunes provide the best remaining habitat in the Adelaide area for coastal reptiles, such as the painted dragon, and rare coastal plants, such as the cushion fanflower.

Tennyson Dunes were recently named Yaitya Worra, in Kurna meaning 'original sand', in recognition of the fact that they are the most significant pre-European coastal dunes left along the metropolitan coastline. These dunes are not only incredibly beautiful and ecologically and culturally important, but they also stand as a reminder of the original dune system that stretched uninterrupted along the Adelaide coast for 30 kilometres, featuring beautiful massive dunes ranging from between 200 and 300 metres wide and up to 15 metres high and stretching up to 200 metres inland at Tennyson.

In recent history the dunes were mined for their sands to feed the glass industry. In response to a concerted public campaign, commenced in about the 1970s, to save this last significant section of remnant coastal dune from development, the state government's Coast Protection Board purchased a considerable portion of the dunes.

Although Tennyson Dunes were saved from development in the 1970s, it was not until 1995 that the Tennyson Dunes Group was established. With other dedicated community groups (such as the West Lakes Kiwanis) and with state and local government support, the Tennyson Dunes Group has been actively involved in conserving and managing these dunes. Funded initially through Coastcare, the group has undertaken activities, including pest plant and animal control, fencing, car park and pathway maintenance and control, nursery construction, propagation of local native plants, revegetation, rare plant recovery, fire prevention, education, monitoring and interpretive signage and, importantly, raising public awareness of the dunes' value.

They have been, and continue to be, an integral part of the development of the trail. The trail will also allow visitors to enjoy a mix of coastal dune and sea view experiences. It will be a low-speed, shared use, environmentally sensitive path that helps protect the valuable coastal dune area, and will be disability accessible.

The process of the development of the trail has three phases: the first was a concept report with various options for the trail; secondly, a targeted stakeholder engagement process to identify the trail route; and phase three will be the development of a detailed route construction design and costing for the trail.

We have completed the concept report and the stakeholder engagement process and settled on the trail alignment. The stakeholder engagement process was undertaken earlier this year and involved YourSAy engagement, forums and a range of meetings with local government, residents, the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board, Tennyson Dunes Group and other community interest groups.

The objective of the stakeholder engagement was to understand preferences for the alignment of the trail and the reasons for those preferences. Based on the information collected via the engagement activities, several options were developed and negotiated, and a map of the final trail alignment and the results of the stakeholder engagement are available on the YourSAy website, I am advised.

All those who participated in the engagement process were sent a follow-up email advising them where to access the final documents and, while there were differing views of course, and

differing priorities for the trail alignment, the final proposal balances the environmental, the social and economic issues associated with constructing a coast park through a conservation reserve.

The final alignment minimises ecological impacts of the trail as it deliberately avoids areas known to be of ecological significance and allows for the greatest area of uninterrupted dune structure. It has also been designed to slow users through a longer and less direct alignment, helping to establish the area as a destination rather than a thoroughfare. This commitment to collaboration with stakeholders has ensured the best outcome for the environment and the community and the project's next phase will be a detailed design phase in collaboration with local stakeholders before construction begins.

On a completely unrelated matter, Mr President, I note that it's unlikely that the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. David Ridgway, will ever ask a minister again to rule something in or rule something out, given that today he has failed his first test and refused to rule out that he has been out there actively undermining his party leader and has refused to rule out that he has been out there—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, the Hon. Mr Hunter has the floor.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: And has refused to rule out that he has actively been out there trying to find a replacement for a frontbencher in the Legislative Council on the opposition benches.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Brokenshire.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question about South Australian government-owned water infrastructure.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Primary producers in the South-East right now are suffering unnecessary and severe floodwater inundation after the recent heavy rains because the South-East drainage system has been inadequately maintained and managed. Some farmers raised the alarm with government officials several weeks ago, advising that if the regulatory mitigation management practices were not implemented immediately, given the high wetting of the soil and the rainfall projections, that there would be significant damage to their farms. They let the relevant people know that the system was not up to the task of removing moving water from farmland, but they advised me that they were ignored. Now many are facing the reality of the excess water on their land, not only causing ongoing damage, but also advising myself that they may receive serious potential crop losses as a result. My questions to the minister are:

1. Now that the inadequacy of the system can no longer be ignored, will the minister finally admit that the government needs to inject more funds into the South-East drainage system to make sure that it is adequately maintained year in and year out? And this is rather than simply sending out a spokesperson's comments that the government puts in \$2.2 million a year. We are not interested in that, we are interested in the other \$5 million or \$6 million that they should be putting in each year. So, what is the minister going to do regarding, first, the proper management of mitigation, and, secondly, the ongoing maintenance, and now serious deterioration, of the drains?

2. Has the government sought legal advice to see whether they are liable for damage to crops because of the mismanagement of the system? And I want an answer on this please, minister. I ask you, Mr President, to ensure that the minister actually answers my questions for a change, instead of just reading some nonsense that the department has written for him.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:13): I thank the honourable minister for his most interesting question. It is totally full of fallacy, totally ignorant of the situation in the South-East—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —and I've got to say somewhere off in a fantasy land type trip of his own. The honourable member knows particularly well the government's position on this. The government puts in \$2.2 million every year into the South-East Drainage Board.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: It's not enough.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The honourable member says it's not enough, and that's fair enough, Mr President. If that's his view then he can put his hand in his own pocket and contribute some extra money himself. The state government contributes \$2.2 million every year to the South-East Drainage Board to manage the drainage system. It's fair enough, given the taxpayer support, for a drainage system that makes that area so much more productive in agricultural terms. Those people who get a direct financial benefit from that drainage system also contribute to the management of that drainage system. They get a direct financial personal benefit.

In consideration of the uplift to the state gross product that comes out of the agricultural produce in the region, that is why the state government puts in \$2.2 million. We recognise that we have a commitment. We recognise that we need to make that commitment, and we do it every single year, but those people who make a direct personal financial benefit also need to consider, if they want more spent on the drainage system, how they will share in that burden, because, after all, they get a direct benefit.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:15): Supplementary: has the government sought legal advice to see whether the government is liable for damage to crops and other losses to those primary producers that have received unnecessary flooding because of the mismanagement of the government?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:15): I reject the total premise of the supplementary question.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Another supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Arising out of the answer, I hope.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:15): Yes, it is definitely arising out of the answer. Was the \$100,000—because he is talking about money the government has put in—for the citizens' jury, that the minister put up, a complete waste of taxpayer funds?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:15): How can it ever be a waste of taxpayer funds to sit down and consult with and talk to local communities? Impossible. That is exactly what we should be doing. The honourable member just discards that as being totally irrelevant. Government should be out consulting and talking to our local communities. That is what we do day in, day out. It is only this government that actually takes the aspirations of our community to heart, certainly not their local members in the Liberal Party, who take those country seats totally for granted.

Having looked at the paper yesterday, clearly the Liberal Party is under severe attack in those country seats, which they absolutely take for granted. You have the Hon. David Ridgway in here yesterday, saying that government expenditure in Bordertown was a waste. That is what he was saying: government expenditure in Bordertown was a waste. It is only this government that has a commitment to going out into the community, particularly into regional South Australia, and listening to them and their concerns. The Liberal opposition in this place just take them for granted.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Approvals to Remove Track Infrastructure for the period 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016

*Question Time***RIGNEY, MR R.G.**

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: On 26 July, in answer to a question without notice regarding Mr Robert Gordon Rigney, the minister stated that a separate process would be initiated by the chief executive of the Department for Correctional Services to ascertain the mistakes that were made by individuals, the degree of human error that existed and who should be held to account. I ask the minister: has the process been undertaken, has it been completed and has anyone been held to account?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:18): Thank you to the honourable member for his question. I am able to advise that, unfortunately, Mr Rigney remains at large, and that remains an ongoing SAPOL exercise, to ascertain Mr Rigney's whereabouts and bring him back into custody.

I can also advise the chamber that only this week—in fact, it may have been late last week, but certainly in the last seven days—I have made inquiries of the department to ask where their internal investigation is at, regarding precisely what the Hon. Mr McLachlan has asked for. I have been advised since then that the internal review that is being undertaken by the department remains ongoing. Of course, some form of disciplinary action, where it is appropriate, may yet still be a live option to be imposed upon any individuals that have made mistakes.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, REOFFENDING REDUCTION

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister advise the chamber about the government's target to reduce reoffending and the efforts being taken to ensure the government achieves that target?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:19): I would like to thank the honourable member again for his important question. Last month, I was very proud to announce 10 by 20, which is the government's commitment to a 10 per cent reduction in the number of people who re-enter correctional services by 2020. This strategy is first and foremost about building a safer community through reduced reoffending. If we can reduce the rate of reoffending in South Australia, we will create a safer community with less crime, and that of course means fewer victims.

Currently in South Australia, 46 per cent of those released from prison will return to corrective services within two years. While it is true to say that it is better than the national average, I think we can all agree that it is a statistic that still remains too high. In order to be able to reach the target, the cabinet has appointed a strategic policy panel whose job it is to provide the government and myself with independent advice on the development of a three-year plan which will enable us to reach that target.

The panel is being chaired by none other than the highly respected Indigenous leader, Mr Warren Mundine AO. The membership of the panel includes a former premier (but just as importantly, a former CE of Anglicare), the Hon. Reverend Dr Lynn Arnold, who was here earlier today; the former South Australian police commissioner, Mr Mal Hyde; the deputy chair of Business

SA, Ms Nikki Govan; South Australian broadcaster, Ms Amanda Blair (and of course her passion for corrections is well known); former vice chancellor of Flinders University, Emeritus Professor Anne Edwards; and the victims of crime commissioner, Mr Michael O'Connell.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It is a high-powered panel.

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: It is a great panel. The panel of strong policy thinkers, business minds and community leaders will deliver a fresh set of ideas and evidence-based insights on how we can reduce the rate of reoffending in South Australia. All of the panel members have thrown themselves into the task. I have, obviously, engaged with the panel on more than one occasion since their employment and they are busily at work.

While in some sectors of the community there is still a perception of the old school 'lock 'em up and throw away the key' mentality, the business of corrections is changing internationally and for the better. I have said on more than one occasion that the days of the rhetoric of rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em are very much gone. As a community, we need to recognise that imprisonment is exceptionally costly and all too often leads to perverse outcomes. Continued growth in the prison system will lead to continued growth in the cost to the South Australian taxpayer.

In addition, while the number of people incarcerated grows, the majority of those within the prison system will eventually return to the community by virtue of their sentence concluding. We do not want them to find their way back into correctional services because that, of course, would mean that they have committed a new offence. We want to stem the growth of our prison system by preventing those who have offended previously from doing so again.

We have set this target because we want to reduce reoffending and we want to be accountable to the target. Our strategy will promote a whole-of-government and community commitment to offender rehabilitation and reintegration and be informed by international best practice. I know that other jurisdictions have targets in place and, as is the case with all forms of public policy, I know that ultimately we all have this commonality of purpose, a desire to reduce reoffending and keep our community safer.

The achievement of this target will not be an easy task. Our friends in New South Wales have set a far less ambitious target of 5 per cent by 2020, but I am confident that with the hard work of the staff within the Department for Correctional Services, particularly those people on the front line, we will be able to strive to attain this target. I would encourage all members of the community to engage in the discussion via the YourSAy website, and I welcome any ideas that exist within the community on how to achieve the target. Finally, I look forward to keeping this place informed of the progress of the panel and their findings later this year.

Matters of Interest

SARAGARHI REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:24): On Sunday I had the honour of joining the Guru Nanak Society of Australia and members of the Sikh community for the annual Saragarhi Remembrance Day, held along the Pathway of Honour next to Government House in Adelaide. As an Australian with Vietnamese heritage, I understand the need for ethnic communities to commemorate significant religious and cultural events such as the battle of Saragarhi. Indeed, I take an interest every year when Australia commemorates the battle of Long Tan.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the battle of Long Tan, which took place on 18 August 1966 in South Vietnam. The Australian troops of 105 soldiers were surrounded by some 2,500 Vietcong. After three hours of fierce battle, the Vietcong retreated. Eighteen Australian soldiers were killed during the battle and 24 were wounded. On the Vietcong side, 245 died and many more were left wounded.

The battle of Saragarhi occurred on 12 September 1897 and has been lauded by some military historians as one of the greatest last stands in history. The 36th Sikh Regiment, led by Havildar Ishar Singh, came under attack at an Army post station where 21 Sikh soldiers were surrounded by at least 10,000 Afghan tribesmen. These Sikh soldiers were given a choice to surrender, but they decided to fight to the death to protect their position.

Many heroic stories of bravery and sacrifice of each of those 21 Sikh soldiers unfolded on this historic day. I understand that at least 180 Afghans were killed and many more were wounded. The bravery of the Sikh soldiers caused a delay that was long enough for reinforcements to arrive and eventually reclaim the station. To honour the selfless commitment and courage of these Sikh soldiers, the entire regiment was posthumously awarded the prestigious Indian Order of Merit, the highest gallantry award given to Indians at the time.

The battles of Long Tan and Saragarhi respectively demonstrate the courage of the fallen soldiers, who faced enormous challenges, adversities and eventually made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. Each year we commemorate these hard-fought battles to honour their sacrifice. The lessons taught through history remind us of the challenges of modern society that we each face every day and how, through determination, friendship and perseverance, we can overcome these challenges.

I commend the Guru Nanak Society of Australia for arranging the only memorial plaque in Australia for the Sikh soldiers in the Pathway of Honour walkway, which was unveiled on 25 April 2011. I extend my warm thanks to its president, Mr Mahanbir Singh Grewal, for organising this annual event. The Guru Nanak Society of Australia plays an important role in the Sikh community, holding weekly religious worship and running the Punjabi school, where children are taught the Punjabi language, culture and religious duties. It also organises sporting activities, with huge support from the Sikh community as well as the South Australian government.

The pure heroism of the 21 Sikh soldiers teaches us a powerful lesson: to never give up in the face of great adversity. I am told that Signalman Gurmukh Singh, who was the last Sikh defender standing, continued to shout the Sikh battle cry, 'Jo bole so nihal, sat sri akal,' which translates to, 'Victory belongs to those who recite the name of God with a true heart.' It is important that we also discuss these historic events with our children and emphasise the importance of human endurance, that is, to try your best and never give up, despite daily struggles.

Each year, on 12 September, the Sikh community around the world pays tribute to the fierce bravery of the 21 Sikh soldiers as a reminder to us of upholding the values of loyalty, mateship, perseverance and valour until the very end.

QUEEN ELIZABETH II

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:29): It is a great honour to rise today to pay special tribute to Her Majesty The Queen for celebrating her 90th birthday this year. Queen Elizabeth II became queen on 6 February 1952 and was crowned on 2 June 1953. Queen Elizabeth II has been, since her accession in 1952, Queen of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and head of the commonwealth. She is also queen of 12 commonwealth countries that have become independent since her accession.

At the wonderful age of 90, she is the world's oldest reigning monarch as well as Britain's longest-lived. In 2015, she surpassed the reign of her great-great-grandmother, Queen Victoria, to become the longest reigning British monarch and the longest reigning queen and female head of state in world history.

There have been thousands of celebrations for the Queen's birthday around the world and in Australia. I had the greatest pleasure and honour to host a special afternoon tea in Parliament House to mark Her Majesty's 90th birthday. I deliberately chose the date of 9 September 2016 to host the event because I wanted to make the event memorable for my guests.

The Queen's 90th birthday event was held on the ninth day of the ninth month, which is September, of 2016, and also the numbers of the year 2016 add up to nine as well—so a triple nine for the 90th. The number nine in Chinese culture symbolises longevity and I thought it was the most appropriate date for celebrating the Queen's 90th birthday. For those who are interested in Western numerology, the deepest meaning of nine is that of service, humanitarian pursuits, altruism, philanthropy and sacred wisdom.

I am sure honourable members will agree with me that those words of service, humanitarian pursuits and philanthropy would fittingly describe the Queen's wonderful qualities because, as we know, she is one of the most recognised and respectable figures in the world.

For over 60 years, the Queen has reigned through war and hardship, turmoil and change. She serves her important role with great strength, compassion and dignity. I wish to thank all the guests, including recipients of the Order of Australia from the Queen's Birthday honours, who attended the afternoon tea I hosted here in Parliament House. The positive feedback and birthday messages to Her Majesty were meaningful and heartfelt.

I would also like to thank the parliamentary catering team, Creon and his team, and my staff, Haley Welch and Grace Paterson, for helping me organise the event. I would particularly like to thank the Hon. John Dawkins for joining me on the occasion, and I would like to especially thank Dr John Weste, the director of the parliamentary library, for his wonderful assistance in presenting key memorabilia pieces of the Queen at the afternoon tea event.

We used the Queen's birthday event to highlight our deep connection and the presence of the Queen throughout the Parliament House of South Australia. For example, there is the photo of the Queen and Prince Philip at the entrance of the Legislative Council chamber, highlighting the Queen opening the parliamentary session in 1954, and there is other memorabilia located in the Strangers' Dining Room, including a cabinet of the Queen's dining silverware that she used and dined with at the state banquet hosted by the then premier Sir Thomas Playford in 1954.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Great premier.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Great premier, yes indeed. It was great working with John Weste leading up to the afternoon tea. I really want to thank him for his contribution towards making it very special and for showing some of the really rare pieces that he found. For instance, in his search he found some original architectural designs of Parliament House that he was able to show. The paper colour was all fading away, but he was able to have it restored and it was presented at the afternoon tea, which really made it very special.

It is, indeed, a great honour to use the 90th birthday occasion to acknowledge the Queen's important role to the commonwealth, to Australia and to our state. The Queen has been a significant figure in shaping Australia, and is also a fantastic role model of strong leadership in our society. I wish to personally wish Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II a wonderful and joyous 90th birthday.

COUNTRY FOOTBALL

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:34): I very much look forward to what I am about to say. I want to congratulate the footballers in my home town for a magnificent premiership win on Saturday against Encounter Bay. The Great Southern Football League has an incredibly high standard. It has taken us 36 years to win our fourth premiership, and the club is coming close to 100 years as a football club.

The spirit and the enjoyment have been lifted immensely in our town and this augurs well for our future. I want to acknowledge the dedication of the senior coach, Peter Galbraith, and his assistant coaches, Simon Robinson and John Corbett, and the team manager, Mr Corey Young. On this occasion, after being privileged to captain the A grade side for the last eight years, I will also put on the public record my appreciation of my own son, Nick Brokenshire, for working with what is a champion team of great young men.

Importantly, the Mount Compass club has not won this premiership by spending a fortune, as has sometimes occurred in recent years in country football. They won it with 15 out of the 21 players in that A grade having come through our junior and senior colts. Three of the players between them have played over 600 games. They won it with no points, yet the team they won it against, Encounter Bay, were at maximum points to the extent where they had to bring in two senior colts to comply with the rules.

It was a good game by both teams, hard fought, but from the point of view of the whole community of Mount Compass and the district, after waiting for 36 years, we are very grateful and very proud of these fine young men. I hope that we can do a back-to-back next year.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: How much did they win by?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: They won by three goals, four, or 22 points. I just want to put a couple of other points on the record regarding football. There was one incident which put a

black mark on the day. On this occasion it was one of our players who, in the last quarter, was deliberately elbowed and knocked out. We saw the same thing occurring with a situation in the western suburbs on the weekend as well.

I, for one, will strongly support SANFL in any actions they take to ensure that deliberate assaults on the football field are treated the same as any other assault. Assault is assault, and it is an illegal criminal offence, irrespective of where it is carried out. I also want to support SANFL in their initiatives next year to look at random drug testing. We must keep drugs out of sport, and I know they are looking at developing a policy.

I also congratulate SANFL for the fact that they are looking to bring the salary cap down from where they started this year at \$4,000 per game per team to \$3,500 per game per team. We will destroy country amateur and metropolitan sport if the financial demands on clubs to buy players is too high. We need to bring people who have the passion for the colour. That is what I saw with the Bulldogs wearing the maroon and gold on the weekend. Those boys were there for the passion of that colour and the commitment to that colour and to our football club. That is what it needs to be.

If SANFL continues to pull down the cap, then it will mean that we have a lot more football teams in country South Australia, rather than seeing a reduction in those teams. Also, I want to acknowledge Mr Paul Zimmermann, who has done a great job this year as president, and his hardworking committee. They have been very professional. It is actually a business you have to run these days when you are running a football club. Over and above their own business and family commitments, they have been tireless in the way they have gone about their dedication and commitment.

I want to acknowledge the coach's wife, Tracy Galbraith who, along with the other wives and partners of the executives of the football club, has sacrificed so much to let these men do a lot of the development work over the last five years with these young players to get this premiership. It is sweet. We will be enjoying it. I look forward to the presentation dinner on Saturday night.

I will finish with this: sport is a paramount focus that we, as parliamentarians and governments, must have on all people but particularly young people. There were great achievements on the weekend, not only in football but also in netball. We are coming into cricket and tennis. When you have sport running well in your town, you have a healthy environment, you have a good community spirit and you are doing a good job for the young people of your district. I encourage all committees to keep working hard for the benefit across the sector.

WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (15:39): There have been many highs and lows for women in politics in recent months. The elections, both federally and in the Northern Territory, saw women increase their representation overall, but there have also been some unfortunate comments made, such as those by former prime minister John Howard, intimating that women will never be equal and they should just put up with their lot of not being equally represented in parliament. To that, I point out to him the fantastic outcome of the Northern Territory election.

The Northern Territory has 12 of its 25 seats filled by women, a 48 per cent overall representation. Even more significantly, Northern Territory Labor has announced its cabinet, which has the highest representation of women in any cabinet of Australia so far, with 62.5 per cent of the cabinet being women—five out of eight ministers being women—eclipsing the previous record of the Queensland Labor Palaszczuk cabinet with 57 per cent of ministers being women.

Further, Northern Territory Labor is the first government in Australian history to achieve an equal representation of men and women, with nine of its 18 seats being held by women. This is a historic victory for women's representation in Australia, and certainly proves John Howard wrong: it can be done. I congratulate all female candidates in the Northern Territory; 19 female candidates from across the political spectrum were in contention for seats in the Northern Territory, with 16 seats out of 25 having female candidates in the offing.

It would be remiss of me to not also congratulate the Country Liberal Party of the Northern Territory, with one of their two seats being held by a woman, Lia Finocciaro, for the seat of Spillet. They too have achieved parity of female representation.

The Northern Territory is a success story in representation for women after this election, and stands in contrast to our recent federal election. Federally, the representation of women is just 32 per cent, and, while we have managed to increase the number of women by four from 2013, sadly the representation for women in the Liberal Coalition has fallen. Of the 90 seats in the 44th parliament, 20 per cent (or 18) were held by women. In the 45th parliament a dismal 17 per cent of their seats are held by women, only 13 of 76.

Labor, meanwhile, can tell a happier tale for parliamentary women. In the 44th parliament 21 of our 55 seats were held by women, or 38 per cent, and today we have 27 women in our 68-seat contingent, upping our percentage to just shy of 40 per cent women. The trend is clear: Labor women continue to grow in numbers and strength, and we need to continue our efforts to reach parity.

Independents and minor parties, too, have helped to strengthen women in the House of Representatives, with Cathy McGowan and Nick Xenophon Team's Rebekah Sharkey helping to increase the percentage of women in the house from 26.7 per cent to 28.6 per cent.

The Senate tells a better story for women generally, with 30 of 76 seats, or 39.5 per cent of seats, being held by women. For the Liberal Coalition, women do much better in the Senate, where they represent 26.6 per cent of their party's offering but, pathetically, they have seen no growth since the 44th parliament.

The Labor women's contingent in the Senate suffered a devastating blow with the loss of the Hon. Anne McEwen, although I am sure that our senators there will continue the great work of representing South Australia. Anne was particularly passionate about workers rights, Indigenous Australians, women's representation, veterans affairs and higher education, and her passion, dedication and fierce commitment to Labor values were a great asset to the Senate and to the Labor Party. We are very saddened to lose her from that position.

Although the Northern Territory has achieved history, nationally we are still in need of greater representation of women. The average representation of women in Australian governments is 34.7 per cent. There is no excuse for it being less than 50 per cent.

After the Northern Territory, Tasmania fares best with a 42 per cent representation, while here in South Australia we have a mere 25.15 per cent of parliamentarians being women. Eleven of Labor's 32 representatives in this parliament are women, giving us a 34.4 per cent representation. Again, sadly, the Liberal Party stays true to its dismal track record and only has five women in its 29-member contingent, a dismal 17.2 per cent.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: How many have you got in here?

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: High quality women.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: There should be 50 per cent of high quality women in this place, sir. We need to look to the Northern Territory's historic vote and question why we are not achieving equity in our parliament. There is no excuse in 2016. Women have had the vote in this state for 122 years and it saddens me that in that time our achievement has only been around 25.5 per cent of parliamentarians being women. At the same time, the Northern Territory has achieved 48 per cent. It can be done; they have shown us that.

IMMIGRATION DETENTION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:45): I rise today to speak about the Nauru files. I do so cognisant of some numbers. I note that *The Guardian* has published some 8,000 pages that detail 2,116 accounts of sexual abuse, torture and humiliation inflicted on people in their care, inflicted on people in our name, inflicted on people who are not able to be named. I have been listening to Richard Flanagan's work and I have to commend him for bringing, yet again, this issue to the fore. His use of the documents that were leaked and then published in *The Guardian* have, in his words:

...woken me from a slumber too long. It has panicked me. The stories are very short, what might be called in another context flash fiction. Except they are true stories.

I want to tell you some of these stories now. They are not fiction, they are not a horror film, they are people's lives. We are spending \$1.2 billion a year on keeping human beings in these conditions. I will quote:

16 November, 2013...

Young person (redacted) reported to TSA CA that a Nauruan Transfield employee had grabbed his genitals just outside tent (redacted). A security guard had witnessed the young person pushing the man just following the alleged sexual misconduct. Young person's mother (redacted) also reported to be concerned about male cleaners walking in tent pathways without an accompanying female. CA informed shift leader and SCA CSPW.

5 June, 2014

(redacted) took her daughter (redacted) to use the toilet in area 3 in OPC3. Security lady did not allow them to go in and asked them to go to the toilet on the open space in front of area 3. When her daughter pulled down her pants and squatted, the security lady flashed the torch on her private part. (redacted) felt embarrassed and pulled her pants up. Then that security lady pulled the lanyard which was around (redacted). (redacted) put her hands in the air and cried 'don't touch me'. Later they tried to complain to the security boss, but he refused to reveal his staff's name. Statement taken in presence of cultural advisor (redacted).

August 24, 2014

CSO (redacted) was informed by cultural advisor (redacted) that (redacted) had allegedly been raped 1 month ago. The victim wanted to keep it quiet for fear of retaliation from other asylum seekers. She stated she wanted to talk with Mental Health services and did not want the police involved.

September 26, 2014

Six UAMs self harmed in UAM compound. UAMs also attempting to tear down tarps in the tent. IHMS called and 6 UAMs moved to RPC1 for treatment.

February 3, 2015...

At 12.40, child protection case manager, (redacted), was walking with Farsi interpreter, (redacted), past area 4. Interpreter greeted two women sitting in the smoking area of area 4. They stopped the interpreter by calling her. One woman (later identified as (redacted)) conversed with interpreter in Farsi. The interpreter relayed to case manager that one of the women is upset because she was on a bus this morning on her own, and a local guard 'touched her body'. The woman indicated through the interpreter that she wanted this passed onto her case manager, and said her case manager was '(redacted)'. It was then that the woman identified herself as (redacted), boat ID (redacted). (redacted) said that he would notify case worker of information. NB: risk rating and incident type changed by Wilsons.

This incident was not marked as critical and not cited as rape. I continue:

June 12, 2015...

I (redacted) met with (redacted) in the (redacted). During the discussion (redacted) disclosed that she had sex while in the community and that it had not been consensual.

26 June 2015

(redacted) 1 (SCA teacher) was supervising three students in a room of the RPC1 school, and was sitting on the floor playing cards with (redacted) 2. (redacted) 3 walked into the classroom and reached up and took down a bottle of cleaning fluid from the top of a cupboard where it had been stored. (redacted) 1 stood up and asked (redacted) 3 to give her the bottle, but he took the top off and ran out of the classroom. As he ran he attempted to drink the liquid. (redacted) 1 ran after him and knocked the bottle from his hands. Most of the cleaning fluid ended up on the ground and the front of (redacted) 3's shirt, however he did ingest up to a cupful of the liquid. (redacted) (education manager) immediately took (redacted) 3 aside to attend to his immediate needs, and CSO (redacted), who was present contacted IHMS. (redacted) 1 went into the classroom and did a sweep for any other potentially harmful items including chemicals and sharp objects.

I repeat—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks, your time is well and truly out.

SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION MINISTER

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:50): The sad reality of governments that have been in for a long time is the creeping arrogance of the ministers that is demonstrated. We see it here on a daily basis when parliament sits in question time from all ministers, but in particular in recent times perhaps the worst example has been the performance of minister Hunter where, when the most reasonable of questions might be asked by any member of the Legislative Council, the minister refuses not only to answer the question but then to engage in a diatribe on a completely unrelated and distant subject.

It is one thing to see that arrogance in the treatment of other members of parliament as perhaps being fair game, but sadly what we are now seeing from minister Hunter is that that

arrogance has now crept into his treatment of real people outside Parliament House in the management of his portfolios.

We see now not only journalists, community representatives and many others, but also being joined by Labor MPs, quietly, and staffers, commenting on minister Hunter's creeping arrogance, the fact that he has been out of touch on so many issues, and his unwillingness to engage with real people in terms of communicating the government's message in whatever portfolio he happens to preside. This comes from a person who claims that he is a scientist and takes all decisions on the basis of science, who claims to be intellectually superior to most other human beings and MPs, yet refers to the internet as 'that interweb thing'.

This minister has a sorry record for non-performance across all the portfolios for which he has had responsibility. He has lurched from crisis to crisis, whether it has been in terms of Clovelly Park contamination, management of the APY lands and Aboriginal affairs or, more recently, in relation to the performance of SA Water. This is the minister—I think perhaps the only minister—who has had two successful no-confidence motions moved against him on his performance in the space of a period of less than 12 months.

At the end of the Clovelly Park issue, and subsequent to that, Daniel Wills, the state political editor, commented as follows, in an article headed, 'What was a drip could well become a torrent':

Mr Hunter wore a lot of bumps and bruises over the Clovelly Park groundwater contamination scare for failing to rapidly grasp the level of community angst. He made the frustration worse with bureaucratic garble and the promise he made to co-design a new engagement paradigm.

Mr Hunter's big problem again is ignorance of the size of community frustration. Telling people stuck in traffic or having had properties smashed by flying bitumen that their concern is misguided is a sure fire way to attract accusations of being out of touch.

There has been a litany of headlines in relation to the minister's recent performance in terms of SA Water: 'Hunter digs himself deeper into disarray. Q. Which is sinking faster? A. This excavator. B. The career of our under-siege Water Minister'; 'Will Hunter fix this mess? That's just a pipe dream'; 'Hapless Hunter digging a deep hole for Labor'; 'Minister out of his depth on water torture', and many, many others to which one could refer. The *Advertiser* editorialised:

Water minister Ian Hunter is now in open defiance of Premier Jay Weatherill over his refusal to show any real concern for people affected by burst water mains.

This kamikaze-like behaviour has made him the subject of anger and ridicule—from both the general public and inside his party.

The *Advertiser* at the end of last year, in terms of their annual report card on the minister's performance, listing him at an almost equal low of 4/10, said:

He is said to have been a reluctant minister and looks it. Lost Aboriginal affairs in a reshuffle, and departed the portfolio leaving a mess to clean up. He also got into a tangle over comments about a possible state-based carbon tax and was forced to rule out a proposal in his own rubbish industry reform plan the day after it was published.

That does not even refer to the mess he made of the Clovelly Park contamination incident and the more recent problem in relation to managing leaks and SA Water and water management. Whilst it might be argued that it is in the best interests of the Liberal Party that minister Hunter stays in his portfolios for ever and a day, and long might he continue, I have to say and we have to say that we would like to put the state's interests first and that perhaps it would be in the state's best interests if Mr Hunter resigned, and if he didn't, if he were sacked.

ADELAIDE BEER AND BBQ FESTIVAL

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:56): It was a cool winter's evening when I had the pleasure of attending the second Adelaide Beer and BBQ Festival in the Brick Cattle Pavilion and Lawns at the Adelaide Showground. Despite the chill, warm fires, boutique beer and the sweet smell of barbecue smoke swept away any sign of winter blues amongst the enthusiastic revellers and beer crafting artisans. Over 10,000 people enjoyed the event, which ran over three days from 8 July to 10 July.

This year's event was host to the cream of South Australian, Australian and international beer and cider makers, with over 50 exhibitors, including Barossa Valley Brewing Company, Lobethal

Bierhaus, Kangaroo Island Ciders, Pirate Life, Young Henry's and, of course, the Royal Adelaide Beer and Cider Award winners, Smiling Samoyed Brewery, whose dark ale took out the trophy for the most outstanding beer in the show.

The August edition of the Society magazine reported that 42 brewers from around Australia submitted a combined total of 196 entries. The magazine also reported that South Australia-based breweries cleaned up at the awards, winning every trophy up for grabs, with the exception of one trophy.

Great local bands were showcased on the new mainstage, including talented local lads, and one of my favourites, the New Yorks, whose energetic performance contrasted beautifully with the moody tones of follow-up act Cosmo Thundercat. Other main stage performers included Gentlemen's Record Club, Koral and The Goodbye Horses, Wasted Wanderers, Shaolin Afronauts, Zen Panda DJs, The Montreals, Panama, The John Steel Singers and Oisima. The crafty container decks staged Luke Penman, Delta, Pero, Penfold, Aaron Byrne, Troy J. Been, Young Muscle DJs, Mr Paul Gurry, Mark Mackay, Todd C and Matt Oakley.

Meals were a quirky combination of some of Adelaide's best restaurants and visiting national and international barbecue legends, including barbecue ambassador Duncan Welgemoed (of Africola fame) and Rodney Scott, South Carolina's whole hog smokehouse legend representing Scott's Bar-B-Que. Restaurants including Golden Boy, Comida, Gilbert Street Hotel, Rosa's Argentinian Kitchen, Jack Ruby and, of course, Africola, were serving up exciting tasting plates perfectly paired with the various beers on display.

The cashless payment system using charged-up wristbands ensured quick and easy service with very few queues at brewer stands and a great way to keep tabs on expenditure. I first came across this system in Auckland during the Auckland City Limits Festival and am certain it is the way of the future.

The craft beer industry has come a long way in Australia, and South Australia is up there with the best. Craft brewers have taken backyard experimentation a long way from humble beginnings and are proof that boutique beer is on a par with wine when it comes to showcasing South Australian talent. Minister Maher has also acknowledged that there is an increasing interest in craft brewing. Minister Maher has said that this increase in interest is:

...presenting new opportunities for innovation across the sector and paving the way for small brewers in this state to enter the market.

This trend also brings greater opportunity to attract more tourism to the state and the regions in which South Australian craft beers are being produced. The Fleurieu can be seen as one of the areas attracting craft beer tours. Event organiser Gareth Lewis affirms that barbecue and beer are finely paired, with this event being the perfect opportunity to try it out. For those interested in the production as well as consumption of the fine brew, a number of master classes were scheduled on how to perfectly match beer and food, starting your own brewery and the future direction of the craft beer landscape.

I must say that I am a fan of the weekend barbecue, but the competitors in the barbecue tents were at a whole different level. A serious smoker can be the size of a small vehicle and crucial to developing the signature taste of each end product. 'Delicious', 'hearty' and 'unique' are some of the words that come to mind. The 2016 Beer & BBQ Festival was a resounding success. My congratulations must go out to festival organisers, ambassadors and exhibitors for a superbly presented event. I am confident that this expanding industry will see South Australia right at the head of the craft-brewing juggernaut.

Motions

MEMBER'S LEAVE

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) (16:01): I move:

That leave of absence be granted to the Hon. G.A. Kandelaars on account of family illness, until and including Thursday 8 December 2016.

Motion carried.

STATE LIBRARY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:01): I move:

That this council—

1. Expresses support for the State Library and notes the unique cultural, historical, educational and social benefits that the State Library brings to the state of South Australia; and
2. Notes that the proposed Weatherill Labor government cuts to the funding of the State Library of South Australia will result in job losses and the diminution of access to a wide collection of services to a diverse range of communities.

It would be no surprise to members of this council that the proposed cuts to the State Library have indeed caused great concern within the community. I have to echo the words of the PSA, who do not just fear for the jobs of their members but, indeed, fear that South Australia's cultural and historic records are at risk.

A library is far more than its collection of books, archives and documents. It is indeed a place that can bring out people such as Keith Conlon—well-known to members of this council and the South Australian public for his work through *Postcards*—in support, because he knows just how important the history of South Australia is to the future of South Australia. His show, *Postcards*, is an example of just how important the State Library is. The use of the—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The cameraman may not be filming, but I am not aware of that, and the cameraman is scanning around the room. I am sure you have been advised by the staff that you are only to focus on the person who is on their feet. I would like to be sure that that is the case. You are to be focused only on the person speaking. Thank you for that.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I draw the members of the council's attention to that work of *Postcards*. I have to say that sums up why this issue so important. The work of *Postcards*, of course, promotes South Australia. It promotes one of our key initiatives: to create a future for this state. The work that Mr Conlon can do through that program and through similar initiatives is only made possible by the expertise of those staff who work in our State Library, ensuring that these things happen.

The library is more than simply a collection of books. We have a strong, rich and vibrant culture in this state and much to be proud of. We were the first place in the world to grant women the right to stand for parliament, and although the Hon. Gail Gago has noted that we have not quite got to fifty-fifty yet, I am hoping that potentially we will soon. That is something to be proud of.

We were also the first state in the nation to pass legislation to prevent discrimination on the basis of race—again, something to be proud of—and the first to decriminalise homosexuality, which is again, I believe, something to be proud of. These are things that we should maintain a connection to, and the way that we maintain a connection to that history is through the valuable asset that we have in this state: our State Library.

We also have a strong and abundant Aboriginal culture and we are home to a diverse range of migrant communities. We have many valuable and exciting stories to tell. Many stories have not yet been told, but one that has, and that members would possibly be familiar with, would be the story that even Adam Goodes himself did not know of, his own family tree, which was brought to life through the program *Who Do You Think You Are?*, again facilitated by the work of the State Library. He was able to learn about his ancestry through the resources there.

In an age where we believe that everything is at our fingertips on the internet—or the 'interweb' as the Hon. Ian Hunter is known to say—it has never been more important that we nurture our children to be critical thinkers and learners. I say that cognisant of the campaign slogan that has been adopted as part of this campaign, which is, 'Google can bring you back 100,000 answers, but a librarian can bring you back the right one.' This is why the State Library is so important.

The cuts will, of course, impede the library's ability to offer vital community services. I note that recently on ABC radio, minister Jack Snelling attempted to claim that somehow budget cuts will not affect access to the State Library's resources. Indeed, he attempted to argue that they would increase access and enhance the offerings of the State Library. I did remark on Facebook that I

wondered what flavour the Kool-Aid was that the honourable minister had drunk that morning, because it beggars belief that one can have cuts to staff and cuts to the budget and somehow end up with a better product, given this is an institution that has faced significant cuts over previous years. Indeed, the current library budget is, in real terms, less than it was a decade ago.

These cuts, of course, translate to jobs. Those jobs are specialised and are a valuable asset to our state. Those jobs are the very jobs that Treasurer Koutsantonis has promised to protect. In this year's budget, Treasurer Koutsantonis, when he announced a 1.5 per cent cap over the next three years on public sector wage increases, noted that he was not asking the Public Service to take a pay cut, and that it was the jobs that we had to focus on.

Observing that savage public sector cuts over the past few years had actually seen us in the state that we currently are, he said that now is not the time to cut public sector jobs with that trade-off of the capping of the 1.5 per cent increase in enterprise bargaining. For once I agree with Treasurer Koutsantonis: now is not the time to be letting public servants go. Those are the words of the Treasurer and those are words that I support. I wonder if the Minister for the Arts has actually got the memo from the Treasurer, because they are singing from different hymn sheets on this.

It looks like we will be facing a loss of some 20 full-time staff positions and I know that there is great concern that the library will not be able to fulfil its service charter with cuts of this magnitude. For the information of members, the services that they currently provide include a free service for people learning English as a second language. That will not be replaced should the library go. Other groups which recently came out in a rally to support the library were those from Sister Janet Mead's Adelaide Day Centre. Those people were there to stand up for a library that supports them. It is not just the professors or the historians but also the family archivists who will suffer as a result of these short-sighted cuts.

I ask and call on the Weatherill government to take pause to reflect on the impact of this short-sighted strategy and to look across the border to Victoria where not only the arts but also libraries have been boosted in their funding, to look at our state strategic priorities and to invest in the very institution that will support the promotion of South Australia and that will showcase our history. If we want to see tourism boom then we need to be protecting the State Library.

We also need to be investing in a creative and clever economy because, if we are simply going to rely on brawn rather than brains, we are going to struggle to compete. This is an area where we should be investing and supporting these particular staff and also ensuring that the community's expectations are accounted for in the consultation process. I note that there has only been a three-week consultation process; that is certainly not enough for an institution as important as the State Library. That is partly why I have moved this motion here today.

I move this motion to draw the attention of members, not just of the opposition and crossbench but also members of the government, as to the importance of this institution and the short-sightedness of these particular cuts. They fly in the face of what Treasurer Koutsantonis has promised in the most recent budget and they need to be repealed before they are implemented. With those few words, I commend the motion to the council.

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

GREYHOUND RACING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on greyhound racing in South Australia, and in particular—
 - (a) the economic viability of the greyhound racing industry in South Australia;
 - (b) the financial performance and conduct of the industry and of Greyhound Racing SA;
 - (c) the effectiveness of current industry regulation, including the level of autonomy of Greyhound Racing SA;
 - (d) the sale and breeding of greyhounds, including the market conditions and welfare of animals;

- (e) the welfare of animals in the industry and the role of Greyhound Racing SA in establishing and enforcing standards of treatment of animals;
 - (f) financial incentives for reducing euthanasia and prosecutions of animal mistreatment;
 - (g) the adequacy and integrity of data collection in the industry, including the number of pups born, the number of dogs euthanased and injury rates; and
 - (h) 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.

(Continued from 27 July 2016.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:11): I rise to make some comments in relation to this particular motion and to let anybody who is interested in this issue know at the outset that we will not be supporting the inquiry. I would now like to outline some comments as to why and also to thank members of the public, the RSPCA and the GRSA for their contact. I have had some emails from members of the public urging me to support the inquiry, I have had correspondence with the RSPCA and a meeting with the GRSA.

I would also like to indicate that my colleague, the Hon. Terry Stephens, will be making some comments on this bill as well, as someone who I understand is quite familiar with the greyhound racing industry. I think it is a shame in some ways that this matter is not being debated in the House of Assembly because we have a number of country MPs who have a range of facilities and meets within their areas and I am sure they would like to make a contribution on this matter.

To quickly recap on the issue of greyhound racing which has led us to this matter today that we are debating: in February 2015, I think all Australians were shocked at the exposure of live baiting issues through the *Four Corners* program, which obtained footage from a number of facilities in the Eastern States. I have referred to these matters before in discussing my private member's bill, including that the CEO of GRSA, Mr Matt Corby, described himself as quite shocked by those matters.

We have had two bills brought to the parliament. There was our private member's bill, which was proposing to licence bullrings. We also had a government package, which included a bill to increase penalties for animal cruelty. That also referred to new arrangements between GRSA and the RSPCA, which I will refer to a little bit later. The New South Wales government, of course, is banning the greyhound industry in that state from 1 July next year.

The continuous message we have had from the South Australian government in relation to greyhound racing in South Australia is that it is a pretty clean industry. When the *Four Corners* exposure took place, there was no evidence at the time that there were systemic instances of live baiting taking place. Indeed, I think the RSPCA also made the comment that they did not have any evidence of that at the time.

I would like to acknowledge the people who have contacted me post that matter—indeed, it was a whistleblower who led to the drafting of our private member's bill—and other people have spoken to me since. I would have to say that it has not led to anything that has been verifiable or anything that we could take as a matter of breaking of the law, so I have kept an open mind on this matter. However, if there are issues that people say are taking place, we need to be able to take those to the relevant authorities.

I said at the time I moved the bill last year that my sympathies go to the many good and decent people who work in this industry who have unfortunately been tarred with the same brush as those who have undertaken malicious practices. Knowing a few people who are dog breeders, not in this area but in other areas, I understand that they are quite fanatical about the standard of care

they apply to their dogs. I understand that there are a number of people who take great care of their dogs who would have been equally horrified about the live baiting practices that they saw on TV.

I said at the time, which was in February last year, that it is time to restore confidence in the industry for the sake of all the honest and decent people who work in it. I still believe that is true, and that is why I think this inquiry is somewhat premature. We have had legislation passed in this place. We will be, and I will personally be, very interested to watch the euthanasia rates closely. I am pleased that the GRSA has today come out with those figures. I think they should have done that earlier. I actually urged them to publish their figures because, as I said to them, the fact that there were figures floating around in the order of 13,000 to 17,000 nationally gave me no comfort at all.

It has been my firm view for some time that the community standards in relation to animal welfare have changed significantly. I could not give you a period over when, perhaps the last five or 10 years, but certainly people view animal welfare as a much more significant issue than they ever used to. I think people find the unnecessary deaths of animals unacceptable, and therefore I am pleased that they are working towards zero euthanasia. They cannot reach it fast enough, as far as I am concerned, but they tell us that will be by 2018.

Indeed, the unnecessary euthanasia of animals is why this parliament has passed the Dog and Cat Management Bill so that not only are puppy farms banned but also to reduce the number of unwanted animals in the community. I am distracting myself, which is not a good thing. We will be watching these euthanasia rates very closely. As I said, they cannot reach zero soon enough as far as I am concerned, and I would urge them to continue all efforts in that regard.

As an aside in relation to the government's legislation which passed last year, I remember saying at the time—and I am pretty sure that the minister agreed with me—that one of the things which was critical in the package of reforms that the government came up with in light of the shocking practices of live baiting that were exposed is that the relationship between the GRSA and the RSPCA is absolutely critical to ensure that, if there are any practices of live baiting, or any other instances of animal cruelty occurring, there be protocols in place and that they be working effectively.

I think one of the disappointing things—and I am not going to point fingers at either of the organisations. I hope that they can sort out their differences because I think, in the interests of animal welfare, it would be most useful if they could work cooperatively to ensure that any animal welfare breaches are brought to court and that those people be removed from the industry and the relevant penalties, and gaol terms, if that is what is required, are brought to bear. While we have this stand-off between the two it is not assisting confidence, and these matters will continue to be brought to parliament's attention for sorting out.

I urge both organisations to do what they need to do. They both claim to support good animal welfare practices, and I understand that they both do, so I therefore urge them to try to do what they can to mend their relationship so that we can all have confidence that the best practices are being undertaken in South Australia. With those comments, I indicate once again that the Liberal Party will not be supporting the referral to a select committee.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (16:20): I too rise to speak opposing the motion. The South Australian racing industry was corporatised in 2000, and Greyhound Racing SA Limited is the controlling authority for greyhound racing in South Australia. Since corporatisation of the racing industry and repeal of the Racing Act 1976, the state government has not sought to intervene in the management and decision-making of Greyhound Racing SA.

The regulation and management of the greyhound racing industry is the responsibility of the controlling authority, Greyhound Racing SA. As part of its role to regulate and manage the industry, Greyhound Racing SA is responsible for animal welfare in the industry as set forth in the code of conduct and animal welfare policy. Greyhound Racing SA has been unwavering in the commitment given to the state government to address animal welfare issues and support the many hardworking participants who are committed and passionate about racing and the animals in their care.

On 16 February 2015, the ABC aired an episode of *Four Corners* titled, 'Making a Killing', which exposed the horrific practice of live baiting in the greyhound racing industry. The footage depicted greyhound racing participants in other jurisdictions using live bait to lure greyhounds around

trial tracks. The governments of the other jurisdictions for which evidence of poor treatment of animals was identified launched separate inquiries into their state greyhound racing industries.

One of these jurisdictions was the New South Wales Special Commission of Inquiry, undertaken by the Hon. Michael McHugh QC. Among other recommendations to change the industry in New South Wales was the recommendation that the industry be closed down. Premier Baird made a captain's call, and chose to close down the greyhound racing industry in New South Wales. This decision will affect many businesses and cost people's jobs, not just those in the greyhound industry but those who work in associated industries such as pet food suppliers or hospitality, to name a couple.

Whilst I do not agree that the decision to close the industry in New South Wales was the only avenue available to the government, it is obvious, through both the original *Four Corners* program on live baiting and the formal inquiry into the New South Wales jurisdiction, that the industry there has many problems.

Each state's racing industry is run independent to other states. The South Australian racing industry is by far the best run in Australia, and while evidence of criminal abuse of animals has been identified in the Eastern States there is no evidence of it occurring here. South Australians had their awareness raised of potential mistreatment to greyhounds in the past 18 months, and I have no doubt that should evidence of greyhound cruelty be discovered in South Australia it would immediately be identified and reported to police or the RSPCA by a member of the public.

The board of Greyhound Racing SA has operated differently to those in other jurisdictions. Largely independent, the board has been proactive in animal welfare and integrity matters. There has been no evidence of live baiting in South Australia, and the government has made it very clear to the greyhound racing industry that live baiting will not be tolerated.

Greyhound Racing SA and the RSPCA both strongly condemn this practice and rightly consider that it has no place in the sport. Since introduction of the amendments to the Animal Welfare Act 1985 concerning live baiting, there have been no prosecutions of breaches of this legislation in relation to live baiting.

Greyhound Racing SA has no tolerance for the mistreatment of greyhounds. It is leading the country in the rehoming of greyhounds post-racing and is a strong advocate for the reforms that the industry needs on a national basis. Greyhound Racing SA has stated that their current aim is to reach zero unnecessary euthanasia by 2018-19. This has been brought forward from 2020-21.

If this target is achieved, South Australia will be the first state to achieve full rehoming of locally bred greyhounds. The greyhound industry is subject to the Greyhound Rules of Racing, both at a national and local level. The number of greyhounds bred to race, euthanased, rehomed post-racing or injured, are not held by the state government. In South Australia, there is no requirement to report on euthanasia statistics by other groups involved with the euthanasia of dogs.

Today, Greyhound Racing SA voluntarily and publicly announced the details of how many greyhounds are rehomed and euthanased in South Australia. We welcome Greyhound Racing SA's announcement of the actual and projected industry numbers. We have learned in 2015-16, through the Greyhound Adoption Program and other rehoming programs in South Australia, that 418 dogs were bred, 639 greyhounds were rehomed and 482 euthanased.

There is a clear reduction in the projected number of euthanased dogs. The projections for the following two years indicate the number of greyhounds which will be rehomed increases from 639 dogs to 775 in 2016-17, and will rise the year after by another 75 dogs, making the total projected number of rehomed dogs to be 850 in 2017-18. When it comes to animals and pets in particular, it is always regretful whenever an unnecessary death occurs, or when an animal is euthanased.

We know this as, despite every effort to rehome each animal under its care, even charities, whose primary goal is to save animals, can be unsuccessful in rehoming every animal due to illness, behavioural issues and other factors. A 2013 study commissioned by the racing industry shows greyhound racing in South Australia generates direct expenditure of \$34.43 million, with value-added expenditure raising this amount to \$45.41 million. It also sustains the employment of 404 full-time equivalent positions.

There is no evidence that Greyhound Racing SA has failed to perform its duty in any way as the controlling authority for the greyhound racing industry in South Australia. They have put considerable effort into areas such as rehoming, and the South Australian Greyhound Adoption Program is one of the most successful in Australia.

The Greyhound Adoption Program will receive \$1 million in annual funding and is a great example of Greyhound Racing SA's vigilance in driving animal welfare initiatives and investing in its most important participant, the greyhound. In 2013, Greyhound Racing SA established the Prison Pet Partnership Program in the Adelaide Women's Prison. Greyhound Racing SA is about to establish a second program within the Mobilong Prison near Murray Bridge.

Greyhound Racing SA has invested in their You. Me. 6 Weeks program, a foster program designed to ready greyhounds for life after racing with advertising on television, radio, billboards and buses around Adelaide. Despite there being no evidence of live baiting in South Australia to date, Greyhound Racing SA has continued to direct funding to integrity and animal welfare. They have not been complacent.

They still continue to look for ways to improve animal welfare outcomes. Greyhound Racing SA has demonstrated that it has the controls in place to ensure the integrity of the industry in South Australia. It leads the nation and is an example to every other jurisdiction in the country of good animal welfare management. South Australian participants in the greyhound racing industry and the controlling body, Greyhound Racing SA, make every possible effort to ensure South Australia has animal welfare at its forefront and we wish them well for the future. The government opposes the motion.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:29): I rise today to speak against the motion moved by the Hon. Ms Franks to establish a select committee to investigate the greyhound racing industry in our state. Sport and recreation are central to the lives of many South Australians and participating in them is an expression of the freedoms which we treasure. Many depend on them for their income, whilst others marvel in awe at the physical feats of its participants whilst in the company of friends and family.

Behind the scenes, many volunteers and workers operate tirelessly for their communities through various sporting organisations to ensure that people are able to socialise and the community can be strengthened. Sport is very dear to my heart. Not only do my parliamentary secretary responsibilities cover recreation, sport and racing but I am also an active and proud supporter of these integral industries.

The South Australian greyhound industry has a proud and extensive history. From the many trainers right across the state who dedicate themselves to their dogs, the magnificent meetings where crowds gather in celebration and support of the sport, greyhound racing is truly a welcome part of our social fabric. It is of the utmost importance that recreation be conducted in a way that dignifies both humans and animals. What occurred in regard to live baiting and animal welfare in New South Wales was horrendous and action needed to be taken to ensure that best practice was pursued; however, what has subsequently been inflicted on the entire industry is nothing short of disappointing.

Governments should support sporting associations in their efforts of cracking down on those individuals who wish to bring their sport into disrepute through negative behaviour and practices. The role of government should not simply be to cast aside an entire industry for the actions of the few who do not act with the best interests of the sport in mind. Greyhound Racing South Australia is a responsible member of the South Australian sporting community and has proven itself more than capable of ensuring that it runs a safe, competitive and lawful sport within our state, and it should be further encouraged and supported in this endeavour.

This focus and commitment was redoubled after the *Four Corners* revelations of last year and is ongoing. Of particular note is that GRSA has invested heavily into the Greyhound Adoption Program so that dogs are well cared for. It is wonderful to know that many dogs are going through this process and are finding new homes with loving owners. GRSA has also undertaken to limit the breeding of greyhounds for racing. Whilst New South Wales has thousands of dogs being put down

every year because they are unsuitable for racing, limitations in breeding have meant that the industry in South Australia does not find itself following a similar practice.

Additionally, GRSA has also appropriated half a million dollars annually towards integrity and welfare initiatives, furthering its ambition to promote and exercise best practice. These and many other initiatives mean that the South Australian industry has been able to insulate itself from the negative aspects of the industry in New South Wales. The industry should be given the time and space it requires to continue to be sustainable in a way that maintains community confidence and support. On past performance, I have every confidence that they will more than succeed in this endeavour.

All this motion seeks to do is to ban greyhound racing outright; it does not endeavour to properly improve the sport through a calm and considered process of reform. A select committee would be an inappropriate way of treating an industry that is constantly striving to improve itself. Instead, it will demonise and attack the very people who have dedicated their lives to following best practice in both raising and racing greyhounds. The New South Wales government's decision to ban greyhound racing in that state from 1 July next year will cause a great disruption for many who rely on the industry to support them financially, as well as affecting those who look forward to the many social opportunities which greyhound racing provides for them, their families and their communities.

The decision to ban has left many trainers shocked about the very sad reality that they will lose their livelihoods. There is also the problem of 19,000 greyhounds in New South Wales now looking for homes. I welcome minister Bignell's support for the greyhound industry and indication that the state government has no plans to follow the lead of the New South Wales government and ban the sport. It is a sport that brings in \$50 million a year in activity to our economy and there are hundreds of people employed by it.

It is simply not right to close down a sound industry at a time when South Australia has an unacceptably high unemployment level and many people are crying out to be gainfully employed in a rewarding job. Apart from the monetary value, greyhound racing is a form of racing that is accessible to all and brings an immense amount of joy to many South Australians. That pleasure should not be taken away because some irresponsible participants of the sport interstate have acted in an appalling way.

I will leave my contribution there, but to summarise, I am extremely disappointed by the decision by the New South Wales government to ban greyhound racing and call on all members of the South Australian parliament to avoid acting in a similar manner by emphatically rejecting the call for a select committee on the greyhound industry in this state.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:34): Just very briefly, Dignity for Disability will be supporting the establishment of this committee and we do so not only because we have received many letters and emails asking us to do so, but also because we believe it is the job of this parliament to be informed and transparent, and to explore those issues that those members of our community think are important enough for us to explore as a parliament.

So, we welcome this opportunity to bring these issues into the light and, if there is nothing to be hidden or ashamed of, I very much look forward to that being proven as being true. For the time being, I would like this parliament to get on with its job and investigate, with transparency and in a thorough manner, an issue that is obviously very important to many out there in the community.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:35): I thank those speakers who have made a contribution to this motion calling for a select committee inquiry into the greyhound industry in this state. The Hon. Michelle Lensink: I must acknowledge her particular work on this issue, and certainly she was on the front foot taking on the issue of live baiting after that awful revelation made through *Four Corners* in the program, 'Making a killing'. I acknowledge her work, but I disagree that this inquiry is somewhat premature.

This inquiry is happening a year and a half after many other states and territories initiated similar processes, but South Australia failed to act. I acknowledge the contribution of government member, the Hon. John Gazzola, who, if I can make a summary of his argument, seems to say that,

because the industry has been corporatised, it is somehow not within the realm of the minister or the government to do anything about it.

While the government and the minister seem to not want to do anything about this particular industry, they do not want the parliament to do anything either, when the parliament clearly does have the ability and a remit to inquire into this industry, should it so choose. The Weatherill government, yet again, has chosen to sit on its hands and say that there are good people in this industry, they do not deserve to be punished and that there is no proof of any wrongdoing. Yet, we are one of only a few states and territories in this nation that has not had an inquiry into this industry.

In those other states and territories, not only have we seen the exposure of live baiting, which has been illegal for many, many years, yet had persisted, we have actually seen a royal commission no less—not a parliamentary inquiry, but a royal commission—in New South Wales find that the industry in that state was untenable. That was, of course, under Premier Baird. Premier Baird has accepted that particular recommendation and, as we all know, will phase out this industry in New South Wales in 2017. The ACT government, where there is a Labor Party in place, has followed the lead and has also announced that they will pursue a ban on greyhound racing in that state.

The government spokesperson argued that this was about jobs, and the jobs of those in the industry that will be lost in New South Wales and the ACT. I ask the government how it feels about the jobs of those vet nurses, for example, who have talked about the trauma of having to put down so many healthy greyhounds each year. How do they talk about those workers and about putting them in that situation in jobs across the nation?

We were also told that there was no inquiry needed because there is no evidence. That is the most spurious bit of logic I have heard in a long while. Of course there is no evidence, because there has been no inquiry in this state: we have had no inquiry, we have had no action. The minister has refused to act, that is why we have no evidence. We were also told and assured by the government that at a 6 per cent rehoming rate, Greyhound Racing SA is the most successful rehomer in the country—6 per cent, people. That is 94 per cent of dogs not rehomed.

I note that much is made of the commitment made by Greyhound Racing SA to rehome animals and their 6 per cent figure, which is apparently the best in the country (although of course we cannot compare apples with apples in this particular case), but that \$1 million pales into insignificance when you compare it to \$6.5 million that has just been announced for a new racetrack for greyhound racing in Murray Bridge.

I understand that Greyhound Racing SA, in its development application, claimed that the impact, in terms of development for the council to consider, would be minimal because the track would not be used that often, it would not employ that many people—a few people in the bar staff—and the car park would not actually create any undue noise or nuisance to the community because there would not be that many cars in the car park as a result of this new \$6.5 million track in Murray Bridge. I note, as I say, that \$1 million is often trumpeted by Greyhound Racing SA as what they commit to rehoming, yet they can find \$6.5 million for a track and the car park will not cause undue nuisance to the community because it will not be that full.

The Hon. Terry Stephens is off on record as being a passionate advocate of both horse and greyhound racing. He claims that Greyhound Racing SA has proven itself and that it will be able to insulate itself from the bad practices in New South Wales. I am not sure whether the Hon. Terry Stephens has a plan to put some sort of security force up at the border, but the last I saw people can bring their animals and move to South Australia if they are going to pack up shop in New South Wales. We have to believe that those in the New South Wales industry will be looking across the borders, whether that is Victoria, Queensland or South Australia, but some of them will be coming here. How will we insulate ourselves against that?

It would be timely to have an inquiry to cope with what I believe will be an influx of those people from New South Wales who, as has been attested to, even those with the strong support of the greyhound racing industry in South Australia, are apparently the bad apples that we do not have in our state, but we are going to be opening our borders to them to welcome them in.

I thank the Hon. Kelly Vincent for her, as always, sage words. Why would we not have an inquiry? Why would we not be asking these questions? Certainly, that is the role of a parliament, to

have inquiries, to ask questions, particularly when a minister for racing does not ask the question and does not demand the answers. Greyhound Racing SA has not been terribly forthcoming with answers. Just this very day they have finally released a three-page document which reveals the number of animals that they breed and race and rehome and what they have called euthanase.

Of course 'euthanase' is a tautology in this case. Euthanase is for an animal that is unhealthy or unable to be socialised. It is not the term that one uses for a healthy dog that is put down because it is too slow or unprofitable. 'Wastage' is a term that I had never heard until I came into this place and got to know that the term 'wastage' is used in the racing industry, an industry that profits from animals that it races, of course. It is a euphemism to talk about animals that are healthy, that could have long and productive lives, but have those lives cut short because they are put to death.

It is not making a living to make a killing. Those who seek a social licence to have an industry, which the Hon. Terry Stephens is more than happy to support and no doubt take a punt on, that is indeed profitable and creates jobs, surely they are the very people who can afford to ensure that their business model is one that does not see dogs put to death unnecessarily.

The South Australian public wrote to us in their tens of thousands in terms of the Care2 petition that was put online, and I draw to the attention of the members of this council that there are 33 pages at the beginning of that petition that are specifically South Australians, and to the 307 open letters that have been individually signed by residents of South Australia, addressed to Premier Weatherill, against the Murray Bridge greyhound track. I seek leave to table both of those documents: the 307 letters individually signed by residents of South Australia, addressed to Premier Weatherill and others, against the Murray Bridge greyhound racing track, and the Care2 petition South Australian signatures, some 33 pages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I draw to the attention of members, who think that these people are somehow removed from the greyhound racing industry, one particular statement on the Care2 petition from Lyn of Murray Bridge in South Australia (I think as close as you could possibly get to this issue of the Murray Bridge \$6.5 million racetrack), who states:

I own a retired greyhound and I have seen him in some of his behaviour that he still thinks he is at a greyhound track waiting to race. He is learning very slowly to try and live a normal dog life. He was dumped when he stopped earning money. Just another piece of meat and not a dog who deserves a normal life of a dog. I despise the greed of man to damage such beautiful dogs.

Thank you, Lyn, for those words. It is a shame that today the parliament of this state has not listened to those words, but it has been people power that has actually seen Greyhound Racing SA finally respond to the public pressures. Certainly, I had asked questions in this place, I had put in freedom of information requests to try to get to the truth of the matter of how many dogs are killed because of the greyhound racing industry each year—healthy dogs that could live healthy, long lives.

It is only today that we finally received a document that has one year of what we are asked to believe are actual figures. I note that this is not an independently verified document, as we have called for, and it is not a document that outlines five previous years of practice. It is a document that has one year, that we were asked to take on face value and to trust, and then it has two years of projections, so it is the wish list of Greyhound Racing SA.

I have to say, I agree with their wish list. I think we all want to see us getting to zero or lower death rates of these dogs, but how can we trust them when it took the people power of tens of thousands of signatures on petitions and, indeed, the threat of a parliamentary inquiry to release this particular one year and their projected wish list? They need to do better. They need to do more. The people who have worked and contacted members of this place in past months will not be silenced by the loss of a vote today.

I certainly will be bringing back a piece of legislation to ensure that Greyhound Racing SA keeps to its word and continues to publish the figures that they have finally released today. It has taken a long while and they have taken a baby step today, but I hope they will be taking steps in the right direction in the future. I hope they will continue to work with those who criticise them. Of course, it is those who criticise them, those from the RSPCA and the animal welfare groups, who are the

very people who step up and help rehome these dogs. That is because they care about these dogs, and I hope that is something we can all agree on.

I would like to commend the work of: the RSPCA; Melanie Easton, who is a filmmaker and a local who put together the Care2 petition regarding Murray Bridge; the Animal Justice Party, which organised an event outside the front of this place today; and all those other greyhound support groups and individuals I have met. They are passionate people and they are people who are willing to work with this industry.

This industry also needs to look at its breeding numbers because, even in their wish list and even in their projections, they are not looking at the fact that they are overbreeding. We will have the New South Wales breeders and trainers coming across our borders. We need to be vigilant on this issue. I hope that members who have argued that it is too early or somewhat premature to have an inquiry, or that there is no evidence so therefore we do not need to have an inquiry, will go away and have a think about the logic of those statements.

When I put up pieces of legislation to ensure that Greyhound Racing SA continues to be transparent, as I have done this morning, I hope they support those pieces of legislation. With those few words, I commend the motion to the council.

Motion negated.

TALLEN, MR JARED

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (16:49): I move:

That this council congratulates Jared Tallent on rightfully being awarded a gold medal for the 50-kilometre walk from the 2012 London Olympics.

I rise today to acknowledge Australian Olympic athlete Jared Tallent on his outstanding achievements across three Olympic Games where he has won four medals in athletics. He has finally been awarded a gold medal for his outstanding performance in the 50-kilometre walk at the 2012 London Olympic Games. I am pleased that Jared has finally been recognised as the rightful winner of the 2012 Olympic gold medal for the 50-kilometre walk event.

Jared finished the 50-kilometre walk event in London in second place behind Russia's Sergey Kiryapkin and at the time claimed silver. Since then, Sergey tested positive for a banned substance and was subsequently stripped of the gold medal he won at Jared's expense. Almost four years passed before this injustice was corrected. While we are very proud and happy for Jared that he has finally been presented with his gold medal in Melbourne, it is a sad fact that he has effectively been robbed, by a competitor's illegal drug use, of the simple human pleasure of enjoying his place on the podium at the 2012 Olympics in celebration of the pinnacle achievement of his athletic career.

Congratulations, Jared. You and your coaches have worked for many years towards this great achievement and, on behalf of South Australia, I thank you for your hard work and contribution to athletics. Jared has set a wonderful example for Australian children participating in Little Athletics. It is possible to aim to be the best and become just that through hard work, perseverance and by being a clean athlete.

This year at Rio, in the 2016 Olympic Games, we witnessed Jared win his fourth Olympic medal, a silver, in the 50-kilometre walk event. He finished the race just 18 seconds behind the Rio gold medallist, Matej Toth of Slovakia. Jared's was another incredible performance and one in which he again gave his all. Jared was wonderfully gracious in conceding the gold to his fellow competitor, Matej, and it is for this good sportsmanship, as well as his commitment to excellence, that we take pride in his world-class performance.

With his fourth Olympic medal, we salute Jared's remarkable achievements. His silver in Rio makes Jared one of the most decorated Australian male athletics Olympians of all time, with three consecutive Olympic podium finishes in the 50-kilometre walk event. Jared is truly deserving of being named the athletics team captain of Australia's team competing in Rio. We are incredibly proud of Jared's exceptional Olympic record, which speaks for itself. In the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games he won bronze in the 20-kilometre walk event. For the 50-kilometre walk event, he now has three

medals: two silvers, won during the 2008 Beijing and 2016 Rio Olympics; and a gold won in the 2012 London Olympics.

In claiming two athletics medals in the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, Jared became the first Australian male track and field athlete in more than a century to win two medals at single Olympic Games events. In addition, he also won medals in numerous world championships and Commonwealth Games. Jared's career has reached incredible heights and he has confirmed a place in world athletic history for himself, South Australia and the entire country.

Jared's successes throughout his career are truly exceptional and inspiring. He cannot fail to impress with his commitment, drive and ambition, and most of all his achievement on the athletics field. Jared is undoubtedly an inspiration for the next generation of South Australian athletes. Growing up on a potato farm near Ballarat, Jared, now based in Adelaide with his wife and coach, Claire, has worked extremely hard to get where he is. He is now one of seven Australian men who can call themselves Olympic champions in athletics, joining Ralph Doubell, Herb Elliott, Edwin Flack, Steve Hooker, John Winter and Nick Winter.

The year 2016 will long live in Jared's memory. Along with being recognised as the rightful gold medallist in London and claiming silver in Rio, he was recognised in the Queen's Birthday Honours and awarded an Order of Australia medal for his service to sport. I am sure everyone in this chamber will agree that it was very well deserved.

On behalf of the state government and the people of South Australia, I would like to take this opportunity to again thank and congratulate Jared Tallent and his wife and coach, Claire, on their phenomenal success and achievement, and wish them every success going forward. I would also like to acknowledge and congratulate all Australian, in particular South Australian, Olympians and Paralympians who competed at the Rio Olympics this year.

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

Bills

WATER INDUSTRY (COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:55): I rise to make some remarks in relation to this private member's bill which has been promulgated by the Hon. Mr Robert Brokenshire. I understand this bill was prompted by the appalling spectacle of water leaks that we have had in this state this year. My colleague the member for Unley, Mr David Pisoni, has attended many of the water leaks to meet with local residents and to talk to the media about our plans for what we would do if we were in government in relation to this issue and the complete absence of the Minister for Water. This has led to *The Advertiser* coming up with a corflute which appears regularly on its pages as an indication of the minister's absence—not only his absence physically but his absence in this policy space whatsoever.

I think it was the situation at Paradise which was the most appalling. I understand the minister's office was in touch with members of the media and there was some discussion about whether he would attend. One may only guess as to whether he made the decision to attend or not based on what they said, but he certainly does not have oodles of compassion for people whose houses have been flooded by an error of his agency by offering them some sort of comfort, as one might hope for. At least he could say, 'I am really sorry about this. We will do everything that we can to rectify the situation.' We were reminded of Clovelly Park earlier today by the Hon. Mr Lucas. Indeed, I think we saw a similar situation there with this particular minister. It is strange that he seems to be a Labor man, but he does not really care too much about people.

However, that distracts from the matter at hand, which is a piece of legislation that has been drafted to address the situation where people who are affected by burst water mains are seeking some sort of compensation. I think it is a reflection on the current government that a number of people are having difficulty. From what I understand from a radio transcript I read maybe four weeks ago or

certainly last month, some of the people of Paradise were still not able to live in their homes and had not received an adequate response from the government.

I think this particular piece of legislation is well intentioned, but we are not convinced that it is going to rectify the situation, and let me explain why. Parliaments need to be very, very careful about unintended consequences of legislation that are drafted with good intent. Our concerns are that this legislation, if it comes to pass, may discourage the taking out of insurance by individuals, which I think is always undesirable.

People do need to try to cover themselves with home and contents insurance. I think that is a fairly basic matter and, if some individuals are discouraged from taking out insurance, that just places the burden on everybody else. Certainly, we on this side of the chamber believe that people should try to be self-sufficient and people should not be discouraged from taking responsibility for their own property by not taking out insurance.

I think it also has great potential to create legal ambiguity regarding liability for damage. It shifts, and I think it would create a precedent in South Australia where we would have a situation where there was a new entity or new piece of legislation that would provide some sort of recompense which is different from other states, and I think that is also not desirable. It also may encourage insurers to drop the coverage of damage from leaks and bursts from their policies in South Australia, and I think it is also quite undesirable for that situation to occur.

As we know, many consumers do not read the fine print in their insurance policies. Lots of policies run to many pages and can be in small print these days. If that were to be the situation, then I think we may well find ourselves in quite an invidious position in South Australia and at a disadvantage to other states.

We sought feedback from a range of industry bodies, and I think I am accurate in saying that I do not think they had been contacted by the mover of this bill, which I think is naughty, if I can put it that way. We always try to seek to do due diligence, so the Water Industry Alliance, the Master Plumbers Association of South Australia and the Insurance Council of Australia were those we thought, at the very least, were the relevant stakeholders who may have a view.

The advice that we received was informal, so I will not name which association it came from, but their concern was that this may well have an unintended consequence on consumers. I would urge the mover of this bill that in future he try to ensure that he formally contacts the relevant stakeholders and provide the feedback to this chamber that those organisations provide to him because I think it is a fairly basic thing to have to do.

I am quite happy to do it. I think it is just a question of due diligence and everyone ought to do it. In fact, it is one of the things we often find the government has not done. With all their resources that nobody else in the parliament has, they often do not consult adequately. I think it is a very important part of the process to make sure that we are not causing unintended consequences and, therefore, further hardship to the people of South Australia. With those comments, as I have indicated, we will not be supporting this bill.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (17:02): On behalf of the South Australian government, I rise to oppose the private member's bill introduced by the Hon. Robert Brokenshire proposing to amend the Water Industry Act 2012. The bill proposes to impose a legal liability on all water bodies such as SA Water when a person suffers damage or loss as a result of a water main burst or leak. We oppose this bill, not because the state government has a lack of regard for the damage and distress caused by burst mains, on the contrary, we already have robust policies in place to deal with those issues and welcome feedback about how we can do better.

No, we oppose this bill because it is unnecessary and based on false assumptions. This bill plays politics by taking advantage of the recent spike in media coverage regarding leaks. Both the media coverage and this bill refuse to acknowledge that SA Water already has a well-established claims management process for people whose properties are impacted by bursts and leaks. SA Water's current claims management process treats each case on its merits to minimise the financial impact on affected customers.

The immediate response involves clean-up of the property following water damage, both indoors and externally, such as vacuuming and mopping out water, and pressure cleaning external hard areas. If the premises are subject to a sewer overflow, clean-up is more extensive and may involve extracting all sludge and fluid, washing and sanitising affected areas, and fumigating if required. At the same time, a number of steps are undertaken to address the needs and claims of affected residents, including:

- offering alternate or cask water if the water supply is interrupted;
- offering to refund temporary accommodation if the residence is flooded/damaged, making the house unfit for habitation;
- providing guidance about contacting their insurer to notify them of the incident;
- offering to reimburse any insurance excess payment required following settlement of an insurance claim;
- negotiating with people affected who are uninsured and paying reasonable costs of damage or loss; and
- considering payment of out-of-pocket expenses.

In addition, in March this year SA Water established a dedicated customer response team that is available on a 24/7 basis to assist people affected by significant water main bursts and sewer overflows. SA Water also has a standard customer contract, which has been endorsed by the independent economic regulator ESCOSA. It includes general obligations relating to SA Water's infrastructure and, in the case of unplanned interruptions, requires SA Water to:

- use its best endeavours to ensure damage or inconvenience to a customer is minimised; and
- compensate customers for any loss, damage or injury occurring at the supply address as a result of a burst, leak, blockage or spill occurring within SA Water's network to the extent caused by SA Water's negligence.

It is important to note that SA Water's claims management process is comparable to the schemes offered by the major water companies interstate, and the process appears to be working well. SA Water has no record of complaints about the level of compensation paid or any other aspect of the claims management process, and has not been involved in any litigation concerning the reasonableness or otherwise of the process.

The other problem this bill raises is that it obliges a water body to compensate irrespective of fault. Not only does no other jurisdiction in Australia have such a mandatory compensation scheme, it also has the potential to impose very substantial costs on all water industry entities, including councils, several private companies and SA Water. I wonder if the Hon. Robert Brokenshire consulted with councils about this bill—I doubt it.

There are also a number of unintended consequences that could arise from this bill that should give us pause. For example, the imposition of a liability without negligence is likely to set a precedent for many utility providers, such as gas, electricity and telecommunications providers, as well as other institutions. The resulting economic cost certainly has not been assessed—not that the Hon. Robert Brokenshire has provided, at least—but is likely to be beyond the state's capacity to pay.

In addition, the bill would also make water industry entities responsible for damage caused by on-property infrastructure. In simple terms, this could impose obligations where internal or on-property pipework fails or does not meet minimum plumbing standards, as determined by the national Building Construction Code (Plumbing Standard).

Currently, SA Water's responsibility for its infrastructure has been accepted to end at the meter on the customer's property. The bill's extended scope of responsibility would transfer the responsibility of a landowner for its infrastructure to the water industry entity. This bill, if passed, could also create a disincentive for a person whose property is damaged to claim on insurance. This in

turn may also impact on the insurance industry's approach to coverage; for example, the industry may choose to no longer include this type of flood damage in its building insurance products.

The bill's provision is likely to be contentious, and may result in many cases resorting to litigation between water industry entities and insurance companies, adding unnecessary costs and delays in settlement of claims. By requiring a water industry entity to compensate for all damage and loss, the bill effectively makes the water body a de facto insurer. This includes having to assess the damage and the claim, forcing water industry entities to enter an industry in which they have no particular skills, and imposes costs which drive up prices.

The Hon. Mr Brokenshire has alleged his advice is that if SA Water does damage to other agencies, such as DPTI or any other government agency, SA Water has to fully compensate the other agencies for all the costs of repairing it back to its original state. This is not strictly true. Where SA Water unwittingly damages another utility's infrastructure, pipes, cables, etc., in the normal course of carrying out its activities or works, SA Water will fund the cost of repairing the damage (for example, reinstating a road that has been dug up to repair a pipe).

SA Water may dispute the claim; for example, if SA Water damages an unknown cable which is not registered on Dial Before You Dig or not laid to a particular standard. Where damage occurs to another utility's land (for example, a sewer overflow onto council land) SA Water will clean up the spill and the council will need to deal with any associated damage through its insurer in the same way as an individual property owner in the same circumstances.

There also remains a number of unanswered questions. For example, what consultation has occurred or is planned with people and groups, including within government, who may have an interest in this proposal? There is not much evidence of very much consultation, if any. What are the impacts and risks associated with this proposal and how will they be managed? Considering all these points, I feel very strongly that this bill should not proceed and honourable members should not support it.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (17:11): I will sum up and I thank honourable members for their contributions. First and foremost, I would say that I did not go and speak to the Master Plumbers Association on this one; I spoke to and had representation from the people who were actually affected by SA Water infrastructure causing damage to their properties. It is one thing to run around and get near the cardboard cut-out, jump up and down and demand that things are fixed so that we do not have any more bursts; it is another thing to represent constituents and get some legislation tightened to ensure that these people do not have to go through the trauma that they are going through.

There are people still going through trauma and who are still financially disadvantaged months and months after their properties have been damaged. So, no, on this occasion I consulted with people who were directly affected. I also listened to the massive amount of talkback radio and general media on this matter. There is no doubt that the absolute majority of people believe there should be due and proper compensation, and have lost trust in the government.

The government says that they now have a customer response team. Do you know when that customer response team was set up? In March or April this year. Do you know why it was set up? Because the government was getting belted for the lack of concern and the lack of response to these people who are affected, and the arrogance of SA Water. It was set up to try to appease some of the media that was out there attacking the government, and rightly so.

Family First will often undertake broad consultation. On this occasion, just like the government and the opposition—there have been lots of examples of the government bringing in quite interesting pieces of legislation and us being told that the government themselves have not consulted anyone outside of their own departments, so you look at it on its merits.

I refute the technical debate the government put up when it talked about not compensating other government departments with words like 'unwittingly', etc. I asked the minister, 'Were they compensated or not if a main burst or did the other department have to pick it up?' The reality is the other department will not pick it up and SA Water will ensure that everything, at their expense, is put back to where it was before the burst.

This is about burst water mains outside of properties, and the legislation does not interfere—there are no unintended consequences once you go to the privately-owned side of the water meter and there are no changes there whatsoever; this is external to the property. People who can afford to—and I encourage everyone to make it a priority to have their own insurance—are still always going to have the insurance, and they need the insurance.

Most of the time, people claim house and contents insurance for claims other than flooding through a burst water main. It may be that the stormwater pipe of some neighbour next door fails and floods their property or it may be an internal pipe on that property itself, but there are also claims when you have trees fall on roofs of houses and when other things happen. The reality is that people will not give up their insurance.

The legislation clearly addresses double dipping, and ensures that insurance companies will not be let off, which was the government's main concern. At the end of the day, I still believe that this is the right and proper legislation to look after these people. Both the major parties have a different view, and I would suggest that the reality with government and opposition (alternative government) is that they are looking at the fact that, if this legislation was to be passed, it might affect the bottom line profit from Treasury's cash cow, SA Water, and Treasury would not like that.

The opposition—and if this is the case, rightly so—is concerned that if they get the keys to the State Administrative Centre on the third Saturday of March 2018, they are going to see one hell of a mess from Treasury when the books are really opened up; therefore, they are being very cautious on any legislation that may pull away further money.

From my viewpoint, this is about looking after people who go about their business and come home from work, shopping or wherever they have been, to discover that a main has burst. All of a sudden, they cannot live in their home, and it is a hell of a job for them to try to get their lives back together with their family. At the moment we are dealing with constituents, and the builders have told them that it could be five years before they know the absolute extent of the damage by SA Water. It is one thing to run around with a few plastic bottles full of water and give them out, but it is another thing to properly compensate them.

I do not apologise for introducing this bill. I am doing some consultation with the Housing Industry Association at the moment, because they are a peak body I should consult with on a particular matter, but this is totally focused on the people who are affected and, frankly, insurance companies will not be getting let off the hook. I do not know what the master plumbers have to do with it anyway, and from a council viewpoint there is already legislation there that deals with indirect pipelines, with purple pipes, with common effluent schemes and all those sorts of things.

I hear what the two majors are saying—I do not agree with them, but at least I have put up this bill on behalf of constituents and I will continue to fight for a fair go when people, through no fault of their own, are affected by burst water mains through SA Water.

Second reading negatived.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PULSES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:18): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that Australia is ready for pulses to take centre stage in 2016 in the United Nations declared International Year of Pulses;
2. Recognises that Australia is now a major player in the global pulse market and one of the world's largest exporters of pulses;
3. Highlights the importance of pulses within South Australia's agricultural industry; and
4. Raises public awareness of the nutritional benefits of pulses as part of sustainable food production aimed towards food security and nutrition.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion acknowledging 2016 as the International Year of Pulses. This motion provides the opportunity for this parliament to recognise that Australia is now a major player in the global pulse market, and one of the world's largest exporters of pulses.

I would like to use this motion to highlight the importance of pulses within South Australia's agricultural industry, as well as congratulating so many individuals and organisations on their efforts to raise public awareness of the nutritional benefits of pulses as part of a sustainable food production aim towards food security and nutrition.

Pulses, as we know, are grains and legumes produced for human consumption and include lentils, faba beans, field peas, chickpeas and lupins. Pulses are essential dietary components for millions of people around the world due to their high protein and nutritional content. They are important food crops for food security of large populations, particularly in Latin America, Africa and Asia, where pulses are part of traditional diets and often grown by small farmers.

On 10 November 2015, under the campaign theme slogan entitled Nutritious Seeds for a Sustainable Future, the United Nations, led by its food and agricultural organisations, launched 2016 International Year of Pulses. The objective of the launch was to raise awareness about the protein power and health benefits of all kinds of beans and peas, their production and trade and why they are considered as new, smart and fashionable products on the food chain.

The International Pulse Trade and Industries Confederation came up with four themes to mark the International Year of Pulses in 2016. The first theme focused on health, nutrition and food innovation. Research worldwide has shown that malnutrition (under or overnutrition) is the greatest single threat to global public health; 1.5 billion people are overweight, including 43 million children under five; and 3.9 million children per year die from undernutrition, suffering from deficiencies of iron, for example.

In South Central Asia and East Africa, half of the children have growth retardation due to protein energy malnutrition. Pulses have high nutritional value in iron and protein and they are low cost. The key objective for the first theme is to educate consumers about the health and nutritional benefits of pulses and to partner with governments, international bodies and engage the private food sector to develop innovative food products to include pulse ingredients to address health and nutritional issues.

The second theme focuses on market access and stability. This theme aims to address the trade barrier costs that are borne by farmers, processors, exporters and consumers. The federation sees the need to create greater efficiencies and benefits all along the value chain and proposes to work with governments and international bodies to improve the regulatory framework in which trade occurs, to enhance food security, reduce price volatility and also enhance the return to growers.

The third theme focuses on environmental sustainability. Through national resource management and sustainable use of land, water and biodiversity, pulse crops increase the productivity and water use efficiency of cropping systems, as well as biodiversity. For example, using pulse crops in rotation means the reduction of fertiliser costs or needs. The objective of this theme is to increase the awareness of the contribution pulse production makes to sustainable global agricultural development.

The fourth theme focuses on production and food security. Just over 1 billion people are in hunger and chronically deprived of adequate food. Food security is a major issue in many disadvantaged communities around the world. This theme aims to highlight the pulse's improved productivity of farming systems. As I mentioned earlier, pulses have been an essential part of the human diet for centuries, yet their nutritional value is not generally recognised and is frequently underappreciated, which is why the UN has wanted to highlight the importance of pulses in 2016.

I have a deep appreciation for pulses because lentils, chickpeas and all of these beans, green mung beans and broad beans, have all been a part of my family's traditional diet. As the shadow parliamentary secretary for multicultural affairs, it is always a great privilege to be invited to join community members at various functions and festivals throughout the year. It is no surprise that pulses feature significantly in the preparation of delicious meals across South Australia's multicultural communities.

These communities cook some of the most amazing food, using pulses such as chickpeas, lentils and beans. Knowing the nutritional values of pulses, it is no wonder that many of these community members are looking fabulous and in good shape and healthy because the pulses feature as a regular diet on their lunch and dinner plates every day. However, despite strong evidence on their nutritional values and benefits, the consumption of pulses remains low in many developing and developed countries.

Pulses have gone from an emerging industry in Australia in the 1990s to a mainstream crop today. Prior to this, many pulse crops were used as green manure or fodder crops because of the beneficial effect they had on soil and their value as livestock feed. Since then the industry has grown significantly and pulses are being increasingly recognised for their role in sustainable and profitable production systems.

In 1990, the total production amounted to only 1.3 million tonnes of pulses in Australia. The highest level of production to date occurred in 2005 and 2006 when Australian growers produced over 2.5 million tonnes of pulse grains. The potential of the Australian pulse crops is to increase its current size to 4.2 million tonnes, with a commodity value of \$1.504 billion and a farm system benefit of \$538 million, a total of just over \$2 billion.

As the shadow parliamentary secretary for trade, I am pleased to see that, within South Australia, the grain sector continues to be a powerhouse industry, generating more than \$4.6 billion in revenue in 2014-15, with approximately 85 per cent exported around the world. We used to joke about lentils being seen as a hippie food. Well, this hippie food is becoming a serious business for South Australian farmers, planting the high nutrition crop on an unprecedented scale this year.

Farmers expect up to 40 per cent of the Yorke Peninsula crop will be planted to lentils, as more people move away from crops such as barley and canola, due to their low prices. Pulse crops in South Australia fared much better than first thought, with lentils pricing more than \$1,000 per tonne in 2015-16. The attractive prices are bringing in more producers to think about farming lentils, especially those who have never considered them as an option in the past.

For example, as revealed in *The Advertiser*, dated 21 May 2016, Paskeville farmer, Nick Correll, expects to plant about 40 per cent of his cropping area to lentils, following prices of \$1,200 to \$1,500 a tonne last year. Troy Johnson, a Yorke Peninsula agronomist, stated, 'We have also seen land values and lease prices increase as people chase property to grow lentils.'

The Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences estimated that South Australia produced 206,000 tonnes of lentils last cropping season from a national crop of 250,000 tonnes. The Yorke Peninsula is already the largest lentil growing region in Australia, producing more than half the national crop in a good year because of its ideal growing conditions.

Statistics show that the 2015-16 pulse crop estimates for South Australia and Yorke Peninsula are over 400,000 tonnes for South Australia and around 160,000 tonnes for Yorke Peninsula. This demonstrates that 40 per cent of the state's pulses have been farmed along the Yorke Peninsula. The pulse industry has established a mature value chain that provides stability and quality assurance from paddock to plate in South Australia.

The member for Goyder, Mr Steven Griffiths, in the other place, often highlights the work of hardworking farmers in his region and is very proud of the enormous contributions of the agricultural industry in his electorate. Australia exports a substantial volume of pulses each year, proving favourable over competitors because of the consistent, high-quality commodity production. A large proportion of the Australian crop is exported to international markets, with the majority of exported grain used for human consumption.

The Australian pulses export market is fully deregulated. Pulses can be purchased in processed form from a number of companies in Australia. Alternatively, pulses can be exported as whole grain in bulk shipments or packaged into containers and bags to send to countries where market access has been approved. Australia is the fifth largest exporter of pulses in Australia, with major markets being India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Egypt and Sri Lanka. Other major export destinations include the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia, Malaysia and South Korea.

Australian pulse standards are updated each season by Pulse Australia, with extensive consultation across all sectors of the Australian pulse industry. Because of these high quality standards, Australian pulses are held in high regard, due to Australia being labelled as one of the cleanest environments in the world, delivering safe food-grade grains.

Pulses and pulse foods are universally recommended as part of a healthy diet. They feature prominently in some of the world's healthiest diets and longest lived food cultures, such as the Mediterranean diets. A number of health researchers have consistently shown that higher intakes of pulses are associated with a reduced risk of obesity and chronic diseases, including heart disease, type 2 diabetes and certain types of cancers—diseases that we know are on the rise globally.

I wish to place on the record my special thanks to Peter Semmler from Agri Semm Global Brokerage. It was a pleasure to meet Peter at the International Women's Day breakfast this year. I would also like to thank Lidia Moretti, the president of the United Nations Association of Australia, South Australia division, for her kind introduction to Peter.

At the breakfast, Peter and I spoke at length about the importance of pulses in South Australia. I mentioned to him that it will be a wonderful opportunity to promote the International Year of Pulses in parliament and help raise awareness of these humble, yet amazing consumable products. Peter was very generous with his time. He met with me and the Hon. David Ridgway, our shadow minister for agriculture, food and fisheries, to brief us about the importance of pulses and provide valuable information to my office for my contribution for this motion today in parliament.

I would like to thank the United Nations Association of Australia, especially the South Australia chapter, for their great work in promoting the year of the pulses. They have been involved in many projects with Tasting Australia, as well as some celebrity chefs such as Cheong Liew, Simon Bryant and Maggie Beer, to bring to their attention the nutritional value of pulses in everyday cooking. At the Royal Adelaide Show, Rosa Matto also dedicated a daily session to demonstrate a pulse-based dish at her stand in the Tasting South Australia Pavilion.

I am very pleased to be able to move this motion to highlight the importance of pulses within the South Australian agricultural industry and recognise that Australia is now a major player in the global pulse market and one of the world's largest exporters of pulses. Congratulations to everyone who has made incredible contributions to celebrate the International Year of Pulses. I wholeheartedly commend this motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.E. Gago.

Bills

ASER (RESTRUCTURE) (FACILITATION OF RIVERBANK DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 September 2016.)

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (17:35): I would like to thank all members for their contributions thus far and I look forward to discussion in more detail during the course of the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: I have a contribution to clause 1 and then it is unlikely that I will be asking any questions on the other clauses. The provisions of this bill enable the initiation and construction work to commence. The clauses of the bill are themselves not controversial. The bill itself is not necessary for the works to commence. Mr Hanlon, the CEO of Renewal SA, recently

advised publicly that other contractual arrangements could be entered into but that the passage of this bill was his preferred option.

The Liberal Party has consistently advised the government that it would not progress the bill without information regarding the proposed development. It was a reasonable and responsible request by the Liberal Party. As early as 21 June 2016 in the other place, the shadow attorney-general, the member for Bragg, set out the Liberal Party's position. The member for Bragg said:

So, whilst we may have done it differently, we support there being development and would agree to progressing the bill in the event that there had been full disclosure of the documentation we consider necessary to advance the progress.

The shadow attorney (the member for Bragg) then went on to require correspondence between the parties, details of the Art Gallery proposal and, importantly, the contract between the parties. This is what we were elected to do: to hold the government to account and ensure parliament had an opportunity to oversee these types of important developments where public moneys are being spent and public land is being alienated.

The shadow attorney-general, and indeed the Hon. Mark Parnell, had to pursue the correspondence by a tortuous path of freedom of information requests. There were no attempts by this government to expedite the process, even when there was a ruling by the Ombudsman that the information, namely the correspondence, should be released. The Walker Corporation deployed an old tactic to delay further by instituting and then abandoning proceedings to prevent the release of the correspondence. This is not an act that foretells of dealings in good faith. Going forward, I fear that the corporation may not have adequate regard to the public good.

The consistent narrative has been a government and a corporation unwilling to hold themselves accountable for the arrangements they have entered into. The Minister for Urban Development in the other place even had the gall to try to reassure the parliament that the Public Works Committee had signed off. Even a cursory read of the report of the committee reveals that they had very little information to make their assessment and the committee stated in their report that they required more detailed evidence on the proposal.

On 4 August 2016, I reiterated the requirements of the Liberal Party in this chamber. In response to this reiterated request, the delivery of the contract only took place yesterday. The contract is over 500 pages of dense legal prose and parts are redacted. Of interest to the chamber may be that the contract is dated 26 May 2016 and clause 37.6 does provide for the minister to release confidential information to the parliament, so it was within the capacity of the government legally to release information to assist the opposition in its deliberations of this important project.

Yesterday, even the Leader of the Government in this chamber took it upon himself to try to ram the legislation through the chamber, seizing the opportunity to prevent consideration of the contract. This act alone indicates the lengths the Labor Party will go to to avoid transparency and the rightful examination of the arrangements that the government has entered into on behalf of the people of South Australia. I quote even my own *Hansard* from 4 August 2016:

As a consequence, the Liberal Party has formed the view that it cannot support the passage of the bill at the third reading without it having had an opportunity to consider the information requested.

It is a credit to the shadow attorney-general, the member for Bragg, that she spent a large portion of yesterday and last night going through the contract, along with others of us who had the opportunity to have a copy. As I said, the contract should have been provided long ago. It should have been released even under the government's own Department of the Premier and Cabinet circular.

This contract involves the alienation of Parklands and the spending of public money. There is no reason that the contract, once entered into, could not have been made public. All this is against the backdrop of the Gillman inquiry by the ICAC where maladministration was found and the Treasurer was chastised for his behaviour in relation to public servants. Further down North Terrace we have a hospital that remains empty and unused. I would not be surprised if these arrangements will eventually be subject to examination by inquiry agencies.

The Hon. P. Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: Praise the hospital when it is actually working, minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. Malinauskas: What's that?

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: Praise the hospital when it's actually working. This government has form in not—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr McLachlan has the floor and I think we should give him the respect to listen to what he has to say in silence.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: As I said, I would not be surprised if these arrangements will eventually be subject to examination by other inquiry agencies. This government has form for not liking its activities being examined in the light of day. Why should we trust this government that actively works to ensure we are kept in the dark?

On a personal note, I think this development is underwhelming and may even scar the Riverbank. I recently came across an article by Philip Drew on The Death of Public Architecture. I am paraphrasing, but he makes the valid point that responsible governments add to the public estate and deliver essential properly targeted services, backed by inspiring public architecture, but often default to resorting to selling off the state's valuable heritage to private developer corporations. I hope that it does not, but I am concerned that this project won't meet the lofty ideal of inspiring public architecture.

I feel the project is ill conceived and that it will be a symbol of the government's contempt for its own people and its addiction to secrecy. It is not lost on me that we will end up with a commercial building towering over the house of the people. The tower will be an edifice symbolising greed at the expense of the people's own land. The continued alienation of the Parklands is of great concern to me. In essence, we are stealing an asset held in trust for all, the people, and stealing from the future generations.

It is a breach of trust, simply to pay the debts that the government has casually and negligently incurred to date. It was very sanctimonious on radio this morning for the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, the member for Lee, to suggest that the Liberal Party was seeking to frustrate the development. He has had ample opportunity to disclose the information we needed in accordance with the government's own policy. To disclose the content at the last minute and then claim we are frustrating the bill is pure hypocrisy.

A leader would have sought to take the community with him rather than pandering to a developer. There are some good aspects to this development but the governance arrangements and the desire for secrecy leave little to be desired. I advise the chamber that the Liberal Party's conditions have at last been met. The Liberal Party will now support the passage of the bill.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: In my contribution yesterday I posed four questions to the minister. Am I going to get an answer to those?

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS: I thank the Hon. Mr Darley for his questions. I have received some advice, which I am happy to share with the chamber, which hopefully goes a long way to addressing the questions that the Hon. Mr Darley has raised. The first question, I understand, was: how much larger will the Casino site be as a result of including the expansion area into the included Casino area?

I am advised the following: clause 7(1) of the ASER bill provides that the Casino site, which is a component of the overall ASER site, is defined by regulation. The bill provides that the Casino site is to include the expansion area. The expansion area is indicatively identified by reference to a plan referred to in the bill. That area is an increase to the existing Casino site by approximately 2,957 square metres. The expansion area is intended to be used primarily by SkyCity to construct a hotel and ancillary facilities—jobs, a good thing.

Secondly, will this expansion site continue to be considered part of the Casino area once the Riverbank redevelopment has been completed? I am advise the answer to that is that, yes, the bill provides that the Casino site will include the expansion area from the date that a declaration is made

by the Governor under clause 7(1)(b) of the bill. Until such time as the Governor makes such a declaration, the Casino site remains as presently defined by regulation.

The Hon. Mr Darley's third question, I understand, was: will the rent the Casino pays increase as a result of this expanded area and, if so, by how much? The answer I am advised is that SkyCity will pay consideration to the state for the leasehold interest in the expansion area. That amount, and other financial aspects relating to the lease of the expansion area, is currently commercial-in-confidence.

Finally, the Hon. Mr Darley's fourth question was: can the minister advise if this is a method to permanently expand the Casino area? I am advised the answer is that the mechanism in the bill dealing with the inclusion of the expansion area in the Casino site is a mechanism to facilitate the construction by SkyCity of a hotel and ancillary facilities on the expansion area, an area which does not currently come within the definition of 'site' in the act. The act contains a mechanism for defining the Casino site at any time by regulation. I hope that answers all of the Hon. Mr Darley's questions.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (17:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC SECTOR (DATA SHARING) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Resolutions

ELDER ABUSE

The House of Assembly passed the following resolution to which it desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

1. That in the opinion of this house, a joint committee be established to inquire into and report on matters relating to elder abuse in South Australia, and in doing so consider—
 - (a) the prevalence of abuse (including but not limited to financial abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological abuse, social abuse, chemical abuse and neglect) experienced by older people in South Australia;
 - (b) the most common forms of abuse experienced by older persons and the most common relationships or settings in which abuse occurs;
 - (c) the types of government and/or community support services sought by, or on behalf of, victims of elder abuse and the nature of service received from those agencies and organisations;
 - (d) the adequacy of the policies, resources, powers and expertise of specialist agencies (including South Australia Police, Office of the Public Advocate, Aged Rights Advocacy Service, Legal Services Commission, Public Trustee, Domiciliary Care South Australia) and other relevant service agencies to respond to allegations of elder abuse;
 - (e) identifying effective ways to improve reporting of and responding to elder abuse to assist in establishing best practice strategies for multi-agency responses;
 - (f) identifying any strength-based initiatives which empower older persons to better protect themselves from risks of abuse as they age;
 - (g) the effectiveness of South Australian laws, policies, services and strategies, including the South Australian Strategy for Safeguarding Older People 2014-2021, in safeguarding older persons from abuse;

- (h) innovation for long-term integrated systems and proactive measures to respond to the increasing number of older persons, including consideration of their diverse needs and experiences, to prevent abuse;
 - (i) the consideration of new proposals or initiatives which may enhance existing strategies for safeguarding older persons who may be vulnerable to abuse or prevent such abuse, including with reference to international best practice;
 - (j) identifying ways to inform older South Australians about online scams to which they may be vulnerable; and
 - (k) any other related matter.
2. That in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly shall be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

Bills

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

NOTARIES PUBLIC BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (MENTAL IMPAIRMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 17:56 the council adjourned until Thursday 22 September 2016 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT FUND**

In reply to **the Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (13 April 2016).

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): The Minister for Small Business has provided the following advice:

The Department of State Development consulted with the following stakeholder organisations in the development of the fund's guidelines:

- Industry associations and members of the Small Business Round Table, including Business SA, Defence Teaming Centre, Civil Contractors Federation, Motor Trade Association, Housing Industry Association, the Property Council of Australia and the Australian Hotels Association (SA);
- Northern Futures;
- City of Salisbury (Polaris Centre);
- City of Playford (Stretton Centre);
- City of Port Adelaide Enfield; and
- Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union.

AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR PLANT FUNCTIONAL GENOMICS

In reply to **the Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition)** (23 June 2016).

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): The Minister for Agriculture Food and Fisheries has received this advice:

It was never the intention of the State Government to fund the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics indefinitely and plenty of warning was given that this would cease. We will continue to work with them to find new commercial partners and focus on marketable research.

Since 2002, The Centre has received tens of millions of dollars from universities across Australia, industry, the Australian Research Council and more than \$22 million from the State Government. In recent years, almost all of the original partners have stopped funding the Centre. South Australia should not be expected to be the only state to provide ongoing funds for the national research undertaken at the Centre. If the whole nation is benefitting then the total cost shouldn't be borne by one state.