

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 25 July 2018

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan)** took the chair at 14:14 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 community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I bring up the fifth report of the committee.
Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

- Dangerous Area Declarations issued for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 September 2017 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Dangerous Area Declarations issued for the period 1 October 2017 to 31 December 2017 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Dangerous Area Declarations issued for the period 1 January 2018 to 31 March 2018 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Dangerous Area Declarations issued for the period 1 April 2018 to 30 June 2018 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Road Blocks issued for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 September 2017 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Road Blocks issued for the period 1 October 2017 to 31 December 2017 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Road Blocks issued for the period 1 January 2018 to 31 March 2018 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953
- Road Blocks issued for the period 1 April 2018 to 30 June 2018 pursuant to the Summary Offences Act 1953

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—

Child Protection: A Fresh Start Progress Report as at June 2018

Ministerial Statement

REMARK HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to Renmark High School made earlier today in another place by the Minister for Education.

*Question Time***AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about the Australian Craniofacial Unit.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am certain the minister has seen the transcript of what his colleague in the other place, the Minister for Energy, said about the Australian Craniofacial Unit yesterday. The minister also took part in a radio interview this morning and would have heard the comments of Professor David David AC, the current South Australian of the Year, who described the Minister for Energy's contribution in parliament yesterday by saying, 'No, that's all totally wrong and absurd,' and then described the Minister for Energy as 'someone who doesn't know what he's talking about'. My questions are:

1. In particular, what parts of what the Minister for Energy said yesterday about the Australian Craniofacial Unit were wrong?
2. What advice had the Minister for Energy relied upon in making those comments, to the minister's knowledge?
3. Did the minister or anyone from the government tell Professor David David about the internal review that was being conducted?
4. Why was Professor David David not consulted over the course of the review?
5. Has the minister now read the review that he mentioned yesterday?
6. When did the minister last speak to Professor David David?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:21): There are a number of questions there. In relation to the comments of the honourable Minister for Energy, he has made statements to the house in clarification and they speak for themselves. In relation to my consultations with Professor David, I most recently spoke to him yesterday. I stress to the council that the briefings I have had in recent times and the independent review were—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer the question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —stimulated following a meeting with Professor David on 9 July where a number of issues were canvassed, so I sought a briefing and an independent review was initiated.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary arising directly from the answer: the minister continually refers to the review as 'independent'. He was embarrassingly forced into giving a personal explanation today.

The PRESIDENT: Keep your question tight, Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: How is the review independent if it was conducted by your own department? How is that independent?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): The selection process in question is a process of visiting medical specialists—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You will have a chance to ask that question in a minute. Let the minister answer your question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The review relates to the selection process for visiting medical specialists who serve at both the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Central Adelaide Local

Health Network. The selection process was, if you like, co-hosted by those two networks. When I raised a request for briefings an independent review was initiated. The Women's and Children's Hospital engaged a senior officer in the department to undertake the review. It's not unusual for reviews of selection processes to be undertaken either by other parts of the department or, for that matter, other departments within the Public Service.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary arising from the original answer: is the minister trying to tell the chamber that an independent review can be conducted on the actions of his own department by his own department? Can the minister inform the chamber as to what way that is independent?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): The council can make its own judgement as to whether they would use the word; I certainly would. The fact of the matter is that the officer who undertook the review is a senior officer in the department, not in the networks. Let's be clear: there is legislation before this parliament that is going to strengthen even more the independence of the networks from the department. I can assure you that people in the networks see the department as somewhat removed.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary, for clarification, from the original answer, so that we are clear: is it the minister's position and will the Marshall government in the future be considering a department reviewing parts of its own practice as an independent review? Is that really the minister's position?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): To me, that question starts to wander into hypothesis and I don't intend to wander down that path.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary arising from the original answer: does the minister consider one part of his department reviewing another part as an independent review? Does he really consider that to be independent?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my earlier answers to remarkably similar questions.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary arising from the original answer that the minister gave about having had a recent conversation with Professor David David. I assume that was the conversation that he had immediately after question time yesterday, when the minister was very worried about what he might have said and whether it was accurate.

The PRESIDENT: Don't inject—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Government benches, order! Don't inject political commentary into your supplementary. Ask a simple, tight question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you for your guidance, Mr President. Supplementary question arising from the original answer: will the minister, who is responsible to this chamber for the conduct of his portfolios, inform the chamber of the nature of the conversation and what was said with Professor David David in his conversation after question time yesterday?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:26): The conversation with Professor David was in particular to highlight to him that the review related specifically to the selection process and human resource principles.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Finally, Mr President, the part of the original question—there were a number of them. A supplementary question in relation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Government benches will be in order! I can't hear the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Who from government told Professor David David about this internal or, as the minister calls it, independent review occurring?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): As I have already told the chamber, I met with Professor David on 9 July. I asked for briefings as a result of requests.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, let the minister answer your question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: He hasn't come close to answering anything else.

The PRESIDENT: I don't need your commentary. I need to listen to the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Following the meeting of 9 July—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Did you tell him on the 9th or did you keep it secret?

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you are trying my patience today. I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Following the meeting of 9 July, at which Professor David raised a significant range of concerns, I sought briefings and an independent review was initiated. I would have thought that Professor David would be surprised if I didn't follow up his concerns.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: With respect—

The PRESIDENT: No, with respect, Leader of the Opposition, you said it was the final.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, you said it was the final supplementary. I take you at your word. Sit down. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:27): I have a supplementary, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I am being kind today, the Hon. Mr Hunter. Don't disappoint me. A crisp question, please.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I will try not to disappoint you, sir. Given that the minister is now using and redefining the word 'independent' in a way that I dare say none of us in the chamber would—

The PRESIDENT: Keep it short.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —for the sake of clarity, will he in future advise us of such independent inquiries as being 'independent review internal to my department' or 'independent review real'?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his coaching tip.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:28): My last supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: One more, the Hon. Mr Hunter.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Did the minister in fact himself inform Dr David David of this review, this pretend independent review, that was undertaken?

The PRESIDENT: No, Mr Hunter, the first part of the question was appropriate.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): Which bit am I trying to answer?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The pretend part.

The PRESIDENT: Not the pretend part; the first bit.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Did you inform the professor? Did you inform him or not?

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, he can't answer over you.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: He's Forrest Gump.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: As I have indicated in my earlier remarks—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, don't try my patience.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —Professor David raised a series of issues with me on 9 July.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Did you inform him of the review?

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, let him answer—let him answer!

The Hon. K.J. Maher: If only he would, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: He can't answer with you talking to him all the time. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The issues having been raised, the least I would have thought that Professor David would expect me to do was to follow up the issues, which is exactly what I did.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: So you kept it secret from him.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, we do not need your commentary.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: No wonder he's so angry.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, do not talk over me.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Do not talk over me, otherwise I will start penalising some questions on your side of the house. Minister, finish your answer, and then I am going to give the Hon. Ms Scriven the call.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: As I said, I met with Professor David on 9 July, and a number of issues were raised. Naturally, I would have expected that Professor David would understand that I would follow up his concerns.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, I think we have run our course on it, Mr Hunter.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: I've got no answer to my question, sir. Is that what we are to expect? Did you tell him?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, you have the call.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Chuck him out.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, please do not contribute. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the opposition benches show some respect to their own member, who is on her feet.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, hoping that he can contribute. Will Mike Turtur be the Tour Down Under race director for the 2020 race? If not, who will the new director be and what process is underway to recruit the new director, and how is the planning for the 2019 race progressing?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for her question about the Tour Down Under, a great event—a Liberal event that was instigated under the Olsen government when my honourable colleague was the treasurer. I think that, at the time, the Hon. Kevin Foley entered the bar, as we often do after these sorts of ministerial statement announcement things, and said, 'What, a bike race? Are you mad? Nobody is ever going to go to that.' Now, 20 years later, it's a wonderful event that's supported by everybody.

It was Mike Turtur's baby, and Mike Turtur is still the race director. He's doing a great job. I think the race routes are going to be announced shortly. I am not sure of the exact date, but usually around August or September they are announced, so planning is well underway for the 2019 event. It's a great event and we expect to have the record numbers that we always have at the Tour Down Under. It's a special event, and I think all of us are surprised that we now have the greatest cycling race in the Southern Hemisphere at home in Adelaide.

There are always ongoing discussions with Mike Turtur about how long he will continue as the race director. I am not privy to those; that's between Events SA, the Tourism Commission and Mr Turtur himself. I know Mr Turtur has run it for 20 years, which is an extremely long time, and I think we should be very grateful for his vision and his insight into how we could develop a world-class race. I don't know what the plans are for the 2020 race and whether Mike Turtur will be the director or not. There are ongoing negotiations. I suspect that if he wants to continue that will be a matter of discussion with Events SA and Mr Turtur himself.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, a supplementary.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: That was the second part of the question?

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you are talking over your own member.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:32): Can the minister confirm that there is no process currently underway to recruit a new director?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:32): As far as I have been advised, there is not any process underway to recruit a new director but, as I said, Mr Turtur has done it for 20 years—unlike perhaps some members opposite; I hope they are doing their job in opposition for the next 20 or 30 years. I suspect that Mr Turtur at some point will say, 'Enough is enough,' and there will be a time to look to see whoever succeeds Mr Turtur, but I am not aware of any negotiations that are underway at the moment.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:33): A supplementary arising from the original answer: the minister referred to planning for the 2019 race. Which TV network will broadcast the 2019 edition of the TDU?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:33): Actually, I don't have those details with me at hand. I will take that part of the question on notice and bring back a response for the member.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:33): Supplementary: has the minister sought a commitment from Channel 9 to broadcast the TDU live on the main 9 channel, or will South Australia and the rest of Australia be denied live coverage?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:34): It's not my role to go and negotiate with TV stations. As I said in my previous answer, I don't have those details as to the actual TV coverage. I will get that information. It may have been the role of the former minister to go and negotiate with commercial television stations.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What sort of minister are you? Don't you have an interest?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I certainly have an interest in it, but I don't have those details and I certainly haven't been negotiating with Channel 9 for the TV coverage. As I said in my previous answer, I will get those details and bring them back to the chamber.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary arising from the original answer: if the minister can clarify, did I understand him to say that the routes are announced each year in August or September?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:34): That's roughly when I think they will be announced. I don't have those exact dates with me but I know it's soon, so it is either late July, August. It's soon.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Further supplementary: is the minister aware if in every other year routes have been announced in early July to give the areas which are hosting routes time to prepare and make the most of the substantial benefit that hosting a route applies? What is the hold-up this year?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:35): I'm not aware of any hold-up. I expect the announcement to be made very soon.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:35): So the minister has referred to planning for the 2019 race. How many stages will there be for the 2019 TDU?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:35): I expect the same number of stages as normal, but I don't have the exact details. If there is any change—and I haven't been advised of any change—in the number of stages, I expect it will be the same number that we always see but, again, I will get that information and bring it back to the honourable member.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:35): Is the minister aware of any criticism that has been ventured on the lack of announcement of the stages so far put out during the Tour de France?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:36): Am I being asked a question about announcements about the stages of the Tour de France or during—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter has asked the question, Leader of the Opposition. You don't have a repechage of the conversation.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I saw the same brief.

The PRESIDENT: I cannot hear the minister attempting to answer. It is a gross discourtesy to the Hon. Mr Hunter. I want the Hon. Mr Hunter to hear the response to his answer from the minister. Minister, take the call.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I was aware of some brief concern around some delay, and that's why I am pretty certain—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: But there was one newspaper article I think I read about one of the routes, and that is why my understanding is they will be announced very soon.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:36): Supplementary, sir: given the minister has now said that he was aware of such criticism, what steps did he take to avail himself of some advice so that he could prepare our communities for the route announcements into the future and to respond to these criticisms?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:37): I've not actually received any criticisms. As I said, the routes will be announced shortly, and everybody will be aware. I'm sure the time frames will be very similar to past years.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Wortley, show some courtesy to the Hon. Ms Bourke.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:37): My question is for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Was Dr Ben Grave, a senior oral surgeon, pushed out of his position as a visiting medical officer at the unit without even an interview? Does the government share the concerns of South Australian of the Year, Professor David David, that there are impacts upon patients by the removal of Dr Ben Grave from the Australian Craniofacial Unit? Why won't the government accept Professor David David's recommendations and use Dr Ben Grave's existing clinical academic position with patients' treatment rights to reinstate him in the unit?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:38): As I said, I met with Professor David on 9 July, and following that meeting I sought further briefings and a review of the selection process. The review found the selection process was sound and in accordance with SA public sector recruitment and selection processes. It is not my intention to name anybody who was an applicant, successful or otherwise, in relation to that process. As I said, there are issues coming out of both the briefings and the review of the selection process, which raised more questions for me, which I will be seeking. But in relation to individuals, I have no intention to address an individual's situation without their permission. I hope the honourable member has done likewise.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:39): Supplementary: is the minister aware that Dr Grave has launched legal action against the government following his removal from the Australian Craniofacial Unit? What position is the minister taking on that legal action?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): I am aware that Dr Grave's legal representatives have been in correspondence with the department. I do not know the stage of that legal action, if in fact it is legal action. It could be just an exchange of letters. I assume the honourable member has Dr Grave's permission to canvass his circumstances in the parliament, but I am certainly not going to interfere in the legal proceedings that the department has afoot, if in fact there are any. I don't intend to comment further.

CHINA TRADE

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens. Wait for the call, Hon. Mr Stephens. You jumped the gun there.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:40): I actually leapt to my feet hoping to get the call. My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the council on the recent announcement of additional China Southern services between Guangzhou and Adelaide and how this is big news for our tourism sector and furthering our strong relationship with China?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in growing our tourism visitor economy. As honourable members may be aware, I travelled to China recently to support 26 South Australian business delegates in their quest to reach into or expand their presence in the burgeoning Chinese market. The delegates came from a diverse range of sectors, including health and sciences, international education, research and development, and water, environment and infrastructure.

The delegates visited 10 cities. These included Qingdao, Jinan in Shandong province—we have had a 32-year relationship with Shandong as a sister state—and the megacities of Beijing and Shanghai and Guangzhou in the Guangdong province, a massive trading hub and a key entry point for many South Australian exports and the home of China Southern Airlines.

While I was in Guangzhou, I was fortunate enough to meet the chief economist, Mr Su Liang, and his team from China Southern. As all honourable members are probably aware, China Southern has deepened its relationships with Adelaide through their sponsorship of the Adelaide Crows.

Before I left for China, I was delighted to stand alongside Mr John Yu, general manager of China Southern, and Mr Mark Young, managing director of Adelaide Airport. We jointly announced that China Southern will expand from three services per week to five services, and during the peak season a daily service between Guangzhou and Adelaide. As of February 2019, China Southern will maintain five services per week. This means the current number of seats will jump from 651 per week to 1,974 seats during peak periods. It is an absolute coup for our state and a vote of confidence in the Marshall Liberal team's plan for growth, underpinned by more jobs, lower costs and better services.

This is a big tourism story. Last week we saw tourism expenditure in South Australia hit \$6.7 billion. Expenditure by Chinese visitors was up to \$415 million from \$315 million—a massive 32 per cent jump from a year earlier. But there is still more work to be done to meet our global goal of \$8 billion visitor expenditure by 2020.

China Southern is a critical partner with South Australia. Direct flights from China are obviously fundamental to growing the visitor economy by enabling Chinese tourists to get here easily. But there is so much more to that story. Direct flights through Guangzhou can be a focal point for visitors from the Northern Hemisphere. The Premier has already talked about doubling our share of international students as an aspiration.

More frequent flights make South Australia more appealing as a study destination. They also make it more appealing for Chinese companies to set up their operations here by enabling their staff and executives to travel more easily. It provides more opportunities for our high-value dairy, horticulture and seafood operators to send their products to China and take advantage of the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

We also talked about how we can work together to improve the flow of international visitors and international students into South Australia to make our city a more compelling proposition for investment and to provide more opportunity and lower freight cost to our exporters.

Ultimately, this will drive a virtuous circle. When China Southern makes more money from flying in and out of South Australia, they will feel more confident to invest in more frequent services. This creates more opportunities for our economy, making business more confident to be able to reach out to the world and grow their operation through accessing more markets. We look forward to continuing our very prosperous partnership with China Southern and growing our economy in the process.

CHINA TRADE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:44): A supplementary based on the original answer: what steps has the minister taken in regard to an email sent to him by the consultancy Sinosphere Australia, specifically Mr Anthony Coles, in regard to the China strategy just outlined by the honourable minister? 'The actions of your administration, in trying to demonstrate evidence of their industry in China, is actually to the detriment of the state, and to local SA-based businesses.' That is a quote from the email he sent to you.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have read Mr Coles' email. Most of his criticism is directed at the former government and its approach to business. There are a number of questions directed to me, and I will be providing Mr Coles with an answer.

CHINA TRADE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:44): Supplementary based on that: is he willing to provide those answers in reply to my question today?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:45): I could not hear the honourable member's supplementary—

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps recast your—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Ridgway, have you finished?

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Yes, I am now.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Hanson, recast the question so the Hon. Mr Ridgway can hear.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr President. Is the minister willing to provide the answers to Anthony Coles from Sinosphere to this parliament in answer to my question without notice?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I thank the honourable member for his supplementary. Provided there are no confidentiality issues in relation to those answers, yes.

SAFework SA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Treasurer on the topic of SafeWork SA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I refer the minister to the email from SafeWork SA's executive director to staff in May, announcing a cut, some 17 per cent, of the regulator's budget, estimated to be in the order of some \$6.4 million. I note that, in a two-year period, SafeWork SA has been a revolving door for staff, with three executive directors, six directors of investigation and four managers of investigation teams, further noting that a specialist investigator unit in SafeWork SA was established in 2015 and budgeted to include 10 full-time investigators, plus two team leaders and a manager.

But, as *The Advertiser* reports this week, three years on, as of May 2018 only one authorised work health and safety investigator was working in this unit, a figure down from eight just two years ago. We all know, of course, that this body has seen failed prosecutions, is the subject of an ICAC inquiry and that workplace deaths are going unprosecuted and improperly investigated. My question to the Treasurer is: how will he make good on his threats to crack down on the placement of fridges or counters in supermarkets without taking away from these vital resources that should be afforded to workplace deaths and serious injuries?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for, in essence, characterising the mess that the incoming government has inherited from the former government after 16 years of mismanagement and negligence. I think the honourable member in her explanation very aptly summarised—and I could add further detail—the calamitous circumstances in which the former government left SafeWork SA.

The member has only outlined some of the challenges confronting the new management of SafeWork SA. She has rightly identified the revolving door of senior management in various areas, both at the top level and at the next level down. Having officially inherited responsibility for SafeWork SA as of 1 July this year, certainly as the new minister with responsibility for it, I am entirely

supportive of the endeavours of the new leader of SafeWork SA to try to improve, comprehensively, the performance of SafeWork SA.

Under the former Labor government, its performance has been unsatisfactory. It has led to the decision by the ICAC commissioner to establish an evaluation (I use the word 'evaluation', because that is the word Commissioner Lander used, rather than an investigation or an inquiry). We look forward to the recommendations from Commissioner Lander in relation to that.

It is also correct that SafeWork SA, whilst it was with the Attorney-General's Department under the former Labor government, inherited a significant savings task from the former Labor government. There will be further savings on all arms of government, including SafeWork SA, as a result of the election of the new government. The savings task that SafeWork SA has is a significant savings task from the Labor government—the Labor cabinet—which former minister Hunter and former minister Maher voted for. They voted for it, Mr President. Let them not hide behind the fact that there was a significant savings task imposed in the December Mid-Year Budget Review on SafeWork SA.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, we do have to try to clean up the mess of the former Labor government, but this is a savings task imposed by the former Labor government on SafeWork SA, and indeed on all departments and agencies. Mr President, the—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, let the Treasurer answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The squeaking and bleating coming from the backbench over there, from the Hon. Mr Hunter, will count for nothing because he cannot absolve himself of responsibility. The blood is on his hands, in political terms, in relation to the cuts that he has imposed on all departments and agencies, including SafeWork SA. We will accept our responsibility for the efficiency dividend and the savings that we outlined clearly to the public of South Australia prior to the election that we will be imposing.

SafeWork SA, as with all arms of government, will have to manage their budget more tightly and will have to—I think as Mr Campbell outlined in his evidence to the ICAC evaluation, he indicated there were a range of issues in relation to the use of government vehicles, FBT charges and a range of other areas where he believed significant savings could be made without impacting on the quality and delivery of the service that was being provided.

Mr Campbell has very clear ideas as to how he wants to run SafeWork SA. He has very clear ideas as to how he believes he can save money in relation to delivering a much better and quality service than had been delivered under the former Labor government.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When did the minister or his office first brief or communicate with the Minister for Energy, who represents him in the House of Assembly, that some of the Minister for Energy's comments yesterday were inaccurate?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): I will consult with my office because those communications, as I understand it, were with my staff.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary arising from the answer: is the minister confirming that there were communications between his office and the Minister for Energy's office yesterday in relation to some of the comments made being inaccurate?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): There certainly were discussions. Whether in fact it was my office who first brought the issue to the minister's attention, I do not know. As I said, I'm happy to take it on notice and I will get back to the member.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Just to be clear, a final supplementary for clarification: is the minister saying he does not know when those communications occurred?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): As I said, I don't know how the issue was first raised with the minister, whether it was my office or some other office or, for that matter, the minister himself. The fact of the matter is, I have taken it on notice and I would ask the member to respect my desire to be accurate.

WOMEN'S INFORMATION SERVICE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about the Women's Information Service. As a great advocate for women, can the minister please inform the chamber about the 40th anniversary celebration of the Women's Information Service, and outline their achievements?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in these areas. The Women's Information Service opened in July 1978 as the women's information switchboard. Volunteers have been engaged alongside paid staff since its establishment, and volunteers have played and continue to play an important role in the successful function of WIS.

This year (2018) marks the 40th anniversary of the Women's Information Service and provides an opportunity to thank many volunteers for their participation, and to look back on the way the service has evolved to provide assistance to women during this time. During this time the service has provided free information, referral and support services for women in South Australia.

It was among the first of its kind and inspired the establishment of other women's information service providers across Australia. It was originally located in the Institute Building on Kintore Avenue, and was opened by the then South Australian premier Don Dunstan on 10 July 1978. In 1995, the switchboard was renamed the Women's Information Service and relocated to Station Arcade.

In 2001, WIS's 23rd anniversary, a video and commemorative publication entitled *Telling Our Stories* was produced. WIS celebrated its 25th anniversary with other events and, in 2013, had a birthday celebration at Parliament House, which a number of MPs attended. This event provided an opportunity to launch the first phase of the WIS history project by focusing on recording the history of WIS, a project to gather and digitise the stories, photographs and memories of current and past staff and volunteers.

This particular history project was initiated by a conversation between the former minister the Hon. Gail Gago and myself. We were aware that women's history has often been poorly recorded and it was certainly worth recording the history of the WIS. The project, which commenced in 2013, has digitised stories, photographs and memories of current and past staff and volunteers and has led to the launch of a WIS Pinterest page. It has now entered its second phase, and a broad selection of women have been involved in this project.

The original interview recordings and their transcriptions will be housed in the State Library of South Australia's J.D. Somerville Oral History Collection and made available for use by researchers as an important resource material on the history of WIS and its groundbreaking work. The 40th anniversary will provide an opportunity to launch the oral history collection and to celebrate the history and success of the Women's Information Service.

It will also be an opportunity to forecast celebrations for the 125th anniversary of women's suffrage in 2019. There will be a celebration at Government House on 28 August as well as further celebrations, and I invite all honourable members to participate and avail themselves of the useful body of work that will be provided through this project.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:57): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question in relation to patients in our hospital system.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: At a Budget and Finance Committee hearing this week, SA Health's new chief executive, Chris McGowan—

The PRESIDENT: Mr Pangallo, you cannot refer to the proceedings of a committee. You could cast your question in a particular way to put your point. I will leave it to you.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you, Mr President. It has been revealed that between 30 and 40 per cent of people occupying hospital beds today should not be there. My questions to the minister are:

1. Who are these patients and how many are elderly people who have been shifted there by aged-care facilities?
2. Does the figure also represent the number of patients in our hospital system needing palliative care?
3. Will the department now seriously look at funding more community or home-based palliative care?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question. I don't think it would have been referring to palliative care patients. I certainly accept the point the Hon. Frank Pangallo makes that there is a marked divergence between the preference of Australians to die in their own home and the number who actually do. My recollection is that 70 per cent of Australians would like to die at home when, in fact, the reverse is the case: about 30 per cent die at home. So there is a lot to be done to give people choice in terms of the place of the delivery of their care.

In terms of groups in that 30 per cent estimate, I'm sure he was including people who are, shall we say, in care awaiting placement, people who have completed their medical treatment and who are awaiting their next care placement: for example, the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

My understanding is that the number of people who are waiting for a National Disability Insurance Scheme or, shall we say, a disability service provision, has more than doubled in the last year. For example, in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, there are 40 to 50 people who are in that care awaiting placement situation. It will be partly people who are waiting for either a granting of an NDIS entitlement or people who are yet to, shall we say, put the services in place.

It will also include people who are awaiting residential aged care. Again, there is a significant delay. It varies from time to time. There is a significant delay in, first of all, the ability for people to get ACAT assessments so that their eligibility for residential aged care can be determined and then, once the eligibility is confirmed, being able to actually secure an appropriate residential aged-care placement.

The other group that I think is commonly referred to in that group is the guardianship group. It was my privilege recently to meet with the Public Advocate actually at James Nash House so that I could see the context of the client that she was advocating for. It is not uncommon for people to have extended stays in forensic mental health facilities and other acute facilities as they wait for a more appropriate next step. I have heard of cases of people waiting more than a year. A lot of people can go through a hospital bed in a year, so if a person with a disability or a person with, shall we say, a care need, a person needing residential aged care or the like can't get a placement for a year, it is not good for them and it is not good for the system.

That was certainly a part of what the chief executive was highlighting. It is very important that we not only make sure that we have enough services in the hospital system—inpatient beds and otherwise—but also make good use of them. Certainly, having people in inpatient beds who don't need medical treatment is not a good use of health resources.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:02): Supplementary: could it be that some of these 30 to 40 per cent needlessly in our hospitals could be accommodated in a hotel room?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): In terms of those who have finished their medical treatment and are waiting for transport back to their home, that may well be included in the figure. I doubt if it would be a sizeable element. I know that the former Labor government closed a 47-person facility patient accommodation at the Royal Adelaide Hospital a year before the new Royal Adelaide was opened and made no alternative provision for patient accommodation.

Certainly, Tim Whetstone, the member for Chaffey in the other place, has highlighted the negative impact that had on country patients. So there is no doubt that there are some patients who are occupying inpatient beds because they are, if you like, not awaiting care but awaiting transport. It might be that a loved one needs to make a trip to pick them up. It may be that they have other transport arrangements they need to put in place. That is why the Central Adelaide Local Health Network is currently trialling the use of hotel beds.

Let's be clear: patient accommodation can come in lots of forms. I think we all know the iconic properties on Dequetteville Terrace and Greenhill Road, which are facilities run by the Cancer Council specifically for cancer patients and their families. They are often full. In fact, only this week I was talking to a renal failure patient from the South-East who was saying how difficult it is for them to, if you like, stay engaged in their medical treatment. They live remotely from Adelaide. Their health needs are, shall we say, at a tertiary level; they can't get them in Mount Gambier.

Accommodation is a significant issue for them. To be frank, they also said the variable rate of fuel was an issue. The PAT Scheme I think was last reviewed in 2013. Petrol prices have gone up since then. I am glad the Treasurer is able to hear my gentle advocacy for making sure that we can do the best we can to support country people. PATS is part of that and provides support in terms of transport costs and it also provides support in terms of patient accommodation.

I mentioned the Cancer Council but there are certainly other entities that provide accommodation. The Hospital Research Foundation has a facility near The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and I think elsewhere. I have heard recently that the Leukaemia Foundation is also providing patient accommodation. Whether it is the health system or the charitable sector there is an acute awareness of providing access to South Australians for health care. Particularly for country South Australians we need to provide patient accommodation.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:05): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Assistant Minister to the Premier a question regarding the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Committee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Yesterday, the Assistant Minister to the Premier advised the chamber that last Sunday she attended a function with selected members of the Indian community with a new SAMEAC member, Dr Sridhar Nannapenni, to 'conduct his own consultation and stakeholder engagement'. My question is: did Mr Nannapenni tell the guests at this function that he was shocked that he was appointed to the SAMEAC board as he neither applied for nor expressed interest in the position?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his interest in SAMEAC. I don't believe those words saying that he was shocked or he did not apply for the position were actually mentioned in that way. There were many, many recommendations that came from multicultural communities across the board who wanted to apply or wanted to volunteer their services and make a contribution to serve the new government of South Australia.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: So he's a liar then?

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I think it's very insulting to come from the opposition members—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr Hunter, allow the member to complete her answer.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It's very insulting to come from the opposition, to question who has the calibre to be appointed on SAMEAC when they themselves never consulted when they appointed Grace Portolesi, the former member, to be on SAMEAC.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It's very insulting.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:07): Supplementary: did Mr Nannapenni apply for the job or put in an expression of interest?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): Yes, he did.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:07): Supplementary arising out of the original answer: which association actually recommended Mr Nannapenni to the minister for appointment?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:08): Our consultation and appointment is the business for the new government.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: May I acknowledge the Hon. Martin Cameron, former member of the Legislative Council, in the gallery. Welcome.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Question Time

COUNCIL FOR SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:08): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the chamber on the Premier's Council for Suicide Prevention and also on the national Suicide Prevention Conference which is being conducted by Suicide Prevention Australia in Adelaide this week?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am happy to do so and, in so doing, acknowledge his strong work in mental health and suicide prevention. I particularly take this opportunity to congratulate him on the announcement of the Council for Suicide Prevention. The members were announced yesterday and I look forward to the support that their work will offer for all South Australians.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to addressing the problem of suicide in our state. The Council for Suicide Prevention, with appointees who were announced yesterday, will provide strategic drive to action in this area. Mental illness is very common with almost half of all South Australians experiencing a diagnosable mental illness in their life, and suicide is often linked to mental illness.

By appointing a council on suicide prevention, the Premier is naming and bringing to the forefront one of the key issues in mental health. The members of the council announced yesterday are Jill Chapman, Chez Curnow, Dr Kate Fennell, Dr Seema Jain, Janet Kuys, Lee Martinez, Peter May, Chad McLaren, Reverend Peter Sandeman, Simon Schrapel, Dr Peter Tyllis, Kelly Vincent and Tracey Wanganeen.

A mental illness does not discriminate, and the council represents a diverse mixture of people bringing together a range of age, gender, lived experience, professional expertise and interests. It even includes one former and esteemed member of this place. I understand the council meets for the first time this Friday. I wish them well in their work and their deliberations in seeking out suicide prevention strategies and solutions for all South Australians. The council plans to build on the efforts of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist led by Lynne O'Sullivan, particularly in relation to the many suicide prevention networks operating around our state.

Coinciding with the commencement of the council's work, this week Adelaide plays host to the National Suicide Prevention Conference organised by Suicide Prevention Australia. I understand the honourable member was able to give an opening address yesterday and I congratulate him and Matthew Tukaki, chair of the Suicide Prevention Australia board, the rest of the board and the Suicide Prevention Australia staff on this conference.

I have had the opportunity to meet with one of the conference's eminent speakers, David Covington, to glean some of his insights about what we can do to ensure South Australia has world-leading mental health services. Mr Covington is the CEO and president of RI International, and I was particularly interested to hear about the involvement of peer support workers in the programs that he has implemented. I trust the conference will be a fascinating learning and networking opportunity for all delegates and speakers and that they all are able to enjoy some of the many wonderful activities and places on offer in Adelaide and our regions during their visit.

MY HEALTH RECORD

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:11): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about privacy of health records.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Last week marked the start of a three-month period in which Australians can opt out of the My Health Record scheme before having an automatically generated electronic health record created for them. Much of the concern about My Health Record centres around privacy. Despite assurances from the government that the health records of Australians will be secure, many people are opting out because they do not trust government to get it right and they are nervous about highly personal information getting into the wrong hands.

According to Cassandra Cross, a criminology lecturer at Queensland University, breaches of centralised health records are all too common. She says that last week hackers stole the health records of 1½ million Singaporeans, including the prime minister's. In Canada, hackers reportedly stole the medical histories of 80,000 patients from a care home and held them to ransom.

Australia is not immune, because last year Australians' Medicare details were advertised for sale on the darknet by a vendor who had sold the records of at least 75 people. Earlier this year, Family Planning NSW experienced a breach of its booking system, which exposed client data of those who had contacted the organisation within the past two and a half years.

According to the federal privacy commissioner, the health service industry is the leading industry for reported breaches. In South Australia, the last published data—that is, the months of March April and May this year—shows that two SA Health staff received disciplinary sanctions for inappropriately accessing patient records, one employee received a final warning and one employee had their employment terminated.

My question is: what assurance can the minister give South Australians that when the federal government's My Health Record extension applies to all South Australians who have not chosen to opt out comes into effect in October, what additional steps will the state government take to protect the privacy of South Australians from inappropriate access to their health records?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): Patient privacy is very important. It is very important because if people don't have confidence that their information is going to be held confidentially, then they are less likely to provide it. For example, in the context of mental health and drug dependency, I have heard of clients not willing to disclose that information to a health professional because they are concerned about it being put on the record and that then other health providers will say, 'You are not the sort of person that we want to engage.' I can appreciate that the concern about patient privacy is important in a global sense in terms of cybersecurity, for want of a better word, but it's also important at a very local level. That's why SA Health took the action it did to stress the importance of patient privacy to our staff.

My recollection is that, in the last two weeks, SA Health has done a bulletin to staff, reminding them of the importance of patient privacy. That's why My Health Record has one of the most stringent privacy regimes of any data network. Any of us who use the internet will see a proliferation of health apps that are provided by the private sector. I would have much greater confidence in My Health

Record and what is being led by the commonwealth government and supported by the states and territories because we know how important privacy is for patients.

I don't deny that there is a risk, but I would stress to people, as they are making the choice in the next months about whether they want to take the risk of allowing their data to be available on My Health Record, that they think about the risks of not putting it on. I was in a situation last year where I became unexpectedly unwell interstate. There was no hope of the practitioner accessing my paper records. The only opportunity for him—and not just him, there was a range of professionals involved in a range of contexts—to access an electronic record remotely from my home is only possible through the opportunities of technology.

Of course, South Australians have to make a choice. I would remind them of the risks of not having a My Health Record, rather than the risks of having one. I note that the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners' president was caught out this morning by not having a My Health Record. I would like to declare to the council that I have had a My Health Record for two or three years.

MY HEALTH RECORD

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:17): Supplementary: is the minister completely comfortable with the fact that the personal details on My Health Record will be available to the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Taxation Office and other security services without the requirement to have a warrant issued to access that information?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:17): I don't accept the assertion by the member. My understanding is that the commonwealth minister has specifically refuted that claim. The fact of the matter is that this regime is robust. In the end, my understanding is that people have the opportunity not only to opt out but also to not share. Being a relatively veteran record holder, I can't remember all the details, but my recollection is that, for one thing, you can choose for some information not to be part of the record. It's very important for patient privacy, and it's also important for patient choice. South Australians and Australians will have the choice in the coming months, and I would urge them to think about the benefits of My Health Record, not merely the theoretical risks.

MY HEALTH RECORD

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:18): Further supplementary: the minister is obviously not aware that the commonwealth Parliamentary Library has issued a statement to say that the commonwealth health minister's statement was factually incorrect. Is the minister aware that My Health Record is virtually identical to the failed and withdrawn centralised health record system from the UK?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18): I am not aware that that is the case, and I am not taking it as a given.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise whether an intensive care unit or a high observation unit is currently under construction for Modbury Hospital? If so, how do these units differ from the minister's promised high dependency unit, and will the cost of establishing either of those units be greater than the funding contained within the commitment the Liberal Party took to the last election?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): As I have said to the council before, the government is working on enhancements to the services at Modbury Hospital, including physical support for critical care. In terms of the high dependency unit, we made a clear commitment at the election that we will be delivering a high dependency unit, and that remains our commitment.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:19): Supplementary: does the minister stand by Dr McGowan's comments on Monday that the plan for an HDU at Modbury will be finalised within the next three months and operational within the financial year?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): I don't know whether the member is referring to a committee of this place, which you can't refer to. I do recall that Dr McGowan reinforced SA Health's commitment of standing with the government to implement our policy.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:20): Further supplementary: what additional support would be needed to be added to the current Modbury Hospital site to allow a high dependency unit to be reinstated safely?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:20): There will be both capital and resources. Let's remember that one of the problems highlighted by Dr Berston in his review of the former Labor government's high dependency unit on that site was a lack of resourcing by the former government. On the scepticism of the Labor Party on the viability of an HDU, you have to ask yourselves: how did we managed to have an HDU there until early 2016?

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:21): Further supplementary: would the return of an HDU stop or reduce interhospital transfers from Modbury to other hospitals?

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: You guys have got no credibility.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Actually, Hon. Mr Hansen, could you ask that question again because I couldn't hear it and I don't think the minister could hear it.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I love repeating supplementaries, Mr President; anything to please. Would a return of an HDU stop or reduce interhospital transfers from Modbury to other hospitals?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:21): I certainly am clear they will not stop them. I certainly expect that it will reduce them.

PARLIAMENTARY SITTING PROGRAM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:21): My question is to the Treasurer. Members were today advised of a change of the parliamentary sitting program. My question is: will the Treasurer outline the reasons for the change?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for the opportunity to outline the reasons for the change. At the outset, I do apologise to members and to staff for any inconvenience that the decision might have caused them and their families and staff. The point was made in discussions, as I understand it, in another place that the amount of time originally allocated for discussion of the budget, or the Appropriation Bill in particular, was not long enough to allow reasonable or extensive consideration of the Appropriation Bill, particularly as this was a new reformist government with a comprehensive reform program, which I am sure will be outlined in the Appropriation Bill debate.

As a result of that, the government accepted that additional time should be made available to the House of Assembly to allow further debate on the Appropriation Bill prior to it going into the estimates committee process, which we understand. As a result of that, the estimates committees, which of course use both chambers—the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council—will be sitting from, I think, 21 September to 27 September. Of course, two of those days were projected sitting days for the Legislative Council.

Clearly, if the estimates committees are sitting in this chamber, we would be unable to have a Legislative Council sitting on those particular days. The option open, then, to those of us in this chamber in terms of our willingness to serve the people, was either to have two less sitting days or to replace those two sitting days with two alternative sitting days. I have made the judgement that all members, in their willingness to serve the people of South Australia, wouldn't want to be sitting any less. Therefore, the previous week was a little bit of a strange week for us as we were only intending to sit on Tuesday the 18th because estimates committees were commencing immediately thereafter.

Rather than just being a one-day sitting week, it will now be a normal sitting week: the 18th, 19th and 20th.

So they are the reasons. I thank the honourable member for the opportunity, through his question, to put the reasons behind it. Again, I apologise on behalf of government members—I should say on behalf of myself, because I need to apologise to my own government members as well—to staff and other members as well for any inconvenience that might have been caused as a result of that decision.

The PRESIDENT: And the President.

Matters of Interest

THEBARTON THEATRE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:25): Today I rise to speak about an institution. What do the following have in common: Killer Carl Cox, Killer Kowalski, Abdullah the Butcher, Skull Murphy, Brute Bernard, the Missouri Mauler and Blackjack Slade? While they do sound like criminals confined in solitary in a penitentiary, they also have a common bond with the likes of Louis Armstrong, Joe Cocker, Kylie Minogue, Nirvana, Midnight Oil, INXS and Robert Plant of Led Zeppelin fame. What links them together is the venerable institution on the corner of Henley Beach and South roads, the Thebarton Theatre, or Thebbie as it is more affectionately known.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: They will get there. On Sunday, this glorious, heritage listed relic of the roaring twenties is to be inducted into the South Australian Music Hall of Fame by the Adelaide Music Collective, along with John Schumann and his band Redgum, and Thebbie's gatekeepers, promoter Bob Lott and his business partner, Robbie Robertson.

It is going to be a huge occasion, and I will get to that shortly. First, a little of this iconic place's amazing history, where thousands of artists have performed and countless thousands more have attended. It was built between 1926 and 1928 and cost £30,000 or the equivalent of \$2.3 million in today's dollars.

This was the era of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*. In America, the Charleston was in full swing, gangsters were shooting up Chicago, Eliot Ness was raiding speak-easies for illegal booze and mostly silent black-and-white movies were all the rage. Phar Lap was a two year old and had just been sold for 160 guineas, or \$500, and the Great Depression was still a year away.

At the time it was one of South Australia's grandest movie houses. Chances are it played the first ever talkie, *The Jazz Singer*, starring black-faced Al Jolson, which for obvious reasons we are not likely to ever see again on the silver screen. It was then known as Thebarton Town Hall, with a distinctive council chambers next door. Incidentally, the suburb itself is something of a misnomer. It should have been spelt with an 'e' instead of an 'a', making it Theberton after the British village from where our city's planner, Colonel William Light, hailed. It became the centre of so many cultural and entertainment activities in the western suburbs.

This area also holds special memories for me. I lived just down the road when it was known as Taylor's Road and I attended Thebbie Primary School directly opposite. Thebbie Theatre was where I saw my first ever motion picture, a western called *Flaming Star* starring Elvis Presley. As kids, we had the brass-buttoned, uniformed commissars chasing us down the aisles and under seats after we opened the exit doors from the inside to let our mates in for free. At the school's annual graduation concert in 1966, I was on stage with a band of classmates, badly lip-syncing The Who's classic *My Generation*. Between 1962 and 1971, it staged Hoadley's Battle of the Sounds to find Adelaide's best rock bands. Hoadley's, of course, made Violet Crumble bars.

Movies were screened into the early 1970s and included Greek and Italian language films because of the heavy European migrant population. That brings me to those colourful names I rolled off at the start of this nostalgic trip. They were not criminals but the stars of World Championship Wrestling, the novel hit 'em and body slam 'em One Ring Circus that screened on national TV on Sundays and which successfully tapped into the huge migrant audience. The good guys like Mario

Milano and the Golden Greek, Spiros Arion, took on the baddies with those mean monikers. These theatrical imports sent the fans wild.

Things looked bleak in 1980. Thebbie was so badly rundown that its owners, the West Torrens council, were ready to put a wrecking ball through it. Thankfully, it was saved and resurrected by its current tenants, Weslo Holdings. It is one of only three of this type of design still used for entertainment.

Surprisingly, heritage listed Thebbie has never needed financial bail-outs. Today, it is run profitably by Weslo's in-house managers, legendary promoters Bob Lott and Robbie Robertson, who are being honoured for their services to the music industry on Sunday, with Redgum and John Schumann, famous for their iconic anti-war song, *I was only 19*. More than 60 musicians will pay tribute to Thebbie on the night: among them The Angels, Glenn Shorrock with The Twilights, Glenn Wheatley with the Masters Apprentices, Red Symons and ex teen idol Mark Holden—a sentimental celebration not to be missed.

BATTLE OF HAMEL

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:30): I rise to acknowledge the commemoration ceremony of the centenary of the Battle of Hamel. I was honoured to represent the Premier and the people of South Australia at the Australian national commemorative service on 4 July this year. The observance itself took place at the Australian Corps Memorial in Le Hamel, France.

The Battle of Hamel took place on 4 July 1918, and was a pivotal moment in Australian military history. The allied forces were commanded by General Sir John Monash GC KCB VC, who was tasked with capturing a ridgeline east of the village of Le Hamel. A successful capture of the area would straighten the allied line on the western front, placing further pressure on the German line. It was an important strategic location, as the ridgeline provided an elevated vantage point where German artillery had been able to fire upon Villers-Bretonneux. Australian servicemen would make up the bulk of the forces for the allies, who would be involved in the battle with military tactics far removed from those seen earlier in the conflict.

This battle included the first allied troops to see air drops of supplies while in action. Machine gun rounds were dropped to gunners in strategic locations. This careful approach would allow for the swift movement of allied forces. From the use of reconnaissance planes, troop movements on both sides could be tracked and dispatched to the required commanding officers as the battle was being carried out, allowing them to manage and adjust their forces as necessary.

This aided the soldiers on the ground, who found themselves using new battlefield tactics. Coordinated attacks using infantry, new battle tanks and accurate artillery strikes were in stark contrast to the stagnant approach used throughout much of the war. These combined arms measures quickly overran dug-in German positions.

Monash, as the commander of the Australian Imperial Forces, was also noted as being the first non-American to direct US forces during World War I. For the first time in the war, American troops were involved as part of an offensive action where, fighting alongside Australian companies, they would gain firsthand battlefield experience. Due to his planning and preparation, the confrontation was hailed a success. This is clearly evident in the estimated time General Monash had set for the engagement: he allotted 90 minutes and it took 93 minutes.

The Australian Corps Memorial itself is in a prominent location, having been established on a ridge that was captured during the battle. From this vantage point I was able to look across the fields where some of the heaviest fighting took place on that day a century ago.

As a representative of the Premier and the people of South Australia, I was there to commemorate the great sacrifices made by Australians and South Australians on that day 100 years ago. Along with representatives from other states, and His Excellency General the Hon. Sir Peter Cosgrove AK MC (Retired), I joined with dignitaries from other nations involved in the First World War. It was an incredible privilege that I was given the opportunity to lay a wreath on behalf of the government and the people of South Australia.

Following the commemoration service, we were shown just how strong the French and Australian bond truly is. In honour of the 100th anniversary, a local council authority unveiled a statue

of General Sir John Monash as part of a project called Commemorations in Perspective. This project showcases four works of art created in the style, which is a deliberate distortion of the image. There are four of these statues that honour the memory of those who were of great significance involved in the Val de Somme during the Great War.

Commemorations in Perspective has been guided by the mayor of Le Hamel, Mr Stephane Chevin. In his role as both the mayor and the president of the local tourism office, he has guided the creation of this project. He regularly welcomes groups of travelling Australians into his village and, from what I have been told, his wife is known throughout the region for making Anzac biscuits. It is a true representation of the lasting impact that the Battle of Hamel has left on our two nations.

I wish to thank the Premier, the Hon. Darren Chester MP (federal Minister for Veterans' Affairs) and Veterans SA for ensuring that South Australia was represented on this extremely significant and moving commemoration,

WAR ON DRUGS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:34): I rise to speak today on the failed 'war on drugs', particularly in light of several pieces of harmful legislation that have been introduced or announced by the Marshall government. The idea that we need to be tougher on drugs, wage war on them, or any other silly and militaristic sentence we want to use to describe this clearly failed approach is not just misguided but is actively dangerous. Jill Stark, author of *High Sobriety*, puts it best:

It is premised on gut emotion, and the fallacy that criminalising drug takers sends a message that "drugs are bad", and if you say that loud enough and long enough people will stop using them.

To paraphrase Barak Obama, I am not against all wars, but I am against stupid wars, and the war on drugs is a stupid war. Treatment is a better use of public funds than a war on drugs. Our punitive model currently wastes public funds and it clearly does not work. It is well known that a war on drugs that was sparked about half a century ago has been one of the biggest failures of public policy, and an expensive one.

In Australia, we spend approximately \$1.7 billion annually on our illicit drugs policy, with almost 65 per cent of that being spent on supply reduction via law enforcement. By comparison, only 22 per cent of this amount is spent on treatment, 9.5 per cent on prevention, and a pitiful 2.2 per cent on harm reduction. It could not be more clear that we have it completely the wrong way round in Australia.

Criminalisation has not reduced the harm caused by substance misuse and dependence, but it has cost countless lives, it has wasted a fortune of public funds, it has enriched criminal cartels, and most of all it has led us to treat people with a medical problem—an addiction—as criminals. The amount of money that we spend on criminalisation should be diverted from the criminal justice system to the health system, where we know there is a great need for more treatment facilities and support for those going through addiction recovery and for them to stay well.

Harm reduction, treatment, decriminalisation and legalisation saves lives. And you would think—well, you would hope—that that would be enough on its own. All human lives are valuable and we should do all we can to save them. However, for those who need the economic argument, it simply makes economic sense to alter our course on substance misuse. Treatment provides a far greater return on investment than law enforcement interventions. Some estimates even grade it as being 10 to 15 times more of a cost-effective option.

We cannot keep treating drug use as a criminal issue; it is a health issue. We cannot keep locking up people who need our help. Our prisons are already at breaking point, with prisoner numbers in Australia rising by 40 per cent between 2012 and 2017; 15 per cent of those behind bars are there because of illicit drugs offences. Illicit drugs land Australians in prison more than any other offence, save for assault. Instead of helping these people, we are locking them up with no support, and perversely even sometimes where it is easier to obtain these substances, and alienating them from family, friends, work, society, and of course help. Let's rethink. Anti-drug programs driven by scare tactics are not only ineffective but they are also counterproductive. The war on drugs has failed. The war should be over. Let us instead look to other solutions.

I will conclude my remarks by urging members to look to models of decriminalisation, of treating this as the health issue that it is. Look to Portugal, whose sweeping legal reforms occurred in 2001 and now we can see how effective they have been. Death by overdose has halved, HIV infection rates have declined by one-fifth. Heroin use has halved. There has been a decrease in all illicit drug use among adults from 12 per cent to 9.5 per cent. Recent drug use amongst adults has declined from 3.7 per cent to 2.7 per cent. Portugal now has the lowest rate of cannabis use in Europe. Crime rates have declined in Portugal.

Of course our situation is different, with different dimensions, but let us get these public policy lessons from places where it has worked, instead of letting our gut feelings, emotions, and the rhetoric on war on drugs get in the way. Let us minimise harm and maximise social good.

REGIONAL AIR SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:39): In many ways people are more connected now than they have ever been before. Across the state, across the nation, across the world technology advances have brought us all closer and made this world a little bit smaller. Unfortunately, a recent announcement from South Australia's largest regional airline, Regional Express, foreshadowed the disruption of one very important connection, the connection between the city and the country.

Regional Express and QantasLink flights to and from regional South Australia connect communities, communities like Kingscote, Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Whyalla, to name just a few. They are the link to unlocking vital tourism and commercial dollars for regional areas and, perhaps most importantly, to transporting our residents so that they can access the healthcare services they need and deserve.

Unfortunately, in what Regional Express has attributed to a growing, worldwide skilled pilot shortage, their flights into and out of regional South Australia have already decreased. Concerningly, we might continue to see a further decline in flight options.

As previously mentioned in this chamber, my husband and I grew up on Yorke Peninsula; my parents still live on a farm just outside Maitland. As a family we make a concerted effort to take our three children home as often as we can. We are lucky that Maitland is only a two-hour drive from Adelaide—some of my colleagues have to drive much further—but some families are not as lucky and are dependent on the services of regional airline operators.

In an article published on *The Advertiser* website of 10 May 2018 it was reported that people in the state's South-East were being left without doctors or were facing delays in the diagnosis of life-threatening illnesses because of erratic regional flights. The article contained the following quote from the Mount Gambier and Districts Health Advisory Council's submission to a federal government inquiry:

Cancelling flights at short notice has meant patients have been unable to keep appointments in Adelaide/Melbourne, resulting in delay of treatment and/or diagnosis of possibly life-threatening medical conditions.

It is clear that flights in and out of regional communities are important economically, but they are essential at a medical and social level. I note that just today, on the front page of *The Border Watch*, Regional Express announced it will offer cheaper one-way community fares following round table talks in Mount Gambier. I note the details of this are still being finalised and are dependent on partnership with the local council.

As recently as this morning I spoke with the Regional Express chief operating officer Neville Howell, hearing direct from him about the issues they are facing with what they have described as a worldwide skilled pilot shortage—and I note 'skilled' pilots. As Mr Howell rightfully mentioned in regard to having a shortage of skilled pilots, 'this is not a job where near enough is good enough.'

This is not the first time Regional Express has experienced a pilot shortage. In 2008 there was a shortage of pilots, prompting Regional Express to manage the situation by establishing the Australian Airline Pilot Academy. Regional Express has since trained over 220 cadets through that academy.

However, this demand may also create an opportunity for regional communities. The high demand for pilots has revealed itself as an exciting opportunity for jobseekers. Regional Express themselves say that they are always looking for school leavers, especially regional school leavers, to consider applying for cadet training positions offered through the Australian Airline Pilot Academy. As a state we must constructively work together to take advantage of this opportunity, while finding an immediate solution to the growing shortage of skilled pilots to support regional flights.

As I mentioned, in many ways people are now connected more than ever before, and I believe it is important that regional connections are maintained, because in regional communities regional flights matter. Cuts to flights in and out of regional communities will have a devastating impact on regional South Australia. The Liberal government has spent a lot of time tweeting that regions matter and I do hope there is some truth in that hashtag because not only do regions matter but equally so our connections to the regions of South Australia matter.

PELVIC MESH AWARENESS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:44): I rise today to inform the chamber that I had the privilege of co-hosting an event this morning in this place, which was the Pelvic Mesh Awareness Morning Tea. I did so as co-host with the member for Torrens, Dana Wortley MP, and the member for Frome, Geoff Brock MP—so one Liberal, one Labor, one Independent. It was done deliberately that way so that it was a non-partisan presentation. I would also like to acknowledge the presence of a number of other MPs there this morning, including the Hon. Ms Franks, the Hon. Emily Bourke, the member for Lee, the member for Light, the member for Hurtle Vale and the Hon. Mr Justin Hanson. The health minister sent a senior member of his staff as well.

It was well attended right across the political spectrum and I think that sends the right message but also a clear message that there is widespread parliamentary support for, first of all, acknowledging the seriousness of the condition that can result from the insertion of these devices, the complications of which can be very serious, which I learnt more about today. In fact, some of them were really quite extraordinary in terms of the extent of suffering that these devices had caused on the women who gave their evidence.

I should point out that these issues or complications as a result of the insertion of these devices are not limited only to women. It is, of course, more common in women because women more commonly receive insertions of these devices, but it can also occur in men. In fact, one of the ladies who today gave her account mentioned the impact it also had on her husband. He had one inserted to deal with a hernia and also had a number of problems.

We were also joined by the Australian Pelvic Mesh Support Group and medical professionals, with whom I had the privilege of meeting and discussing their experiences. One of the senior doctors gave an account that he refused to insert these devices. He did not give specific reasons but I think it is not unreasonable to ascertain from what he implied that he did not essentially trust them, is how I took it. When you have senior medical people making assertions or giving such impressions, then I think, clearly, there is cause for us as a society, and indeed us as a parliament, to take this very seriously.

By way of background, pelvic mesh was introduced in the 1990s to treat stress urinary incontinence (SUI). It was then adapted to treat pelvic organ prolapse (POP). In terms of what it is, it is a permanent synthetic mesh implant that is made from polypropylene or a bio material like porcine. It is surgically implanted into the vaginal wall to help support pelvic muscles. As I said though, it can also be inserted into males. The problem is what happens when it is in there. It is supposed to be a lifelong insert and what can happen is the mesh can actually harden or erode. It can shrink, it can become entwined with soft tissue and even lead to organ perforation, causing acute and chronic pain, infection and neuromuscular problems.

One of the ladies today gave an account of how it had induced very debilitating psoriasis in her particular circumstances. It led to profound problems with intercourse and led to a collapse of intimacy in their marriage. She specifically blamed the insertion of this device as the trigger, over a very long period of time, which eventually resulted in the collapse of her marriage. It has not only a very significant physical health impact on individuals where things go wrong with these things but

there are also very significant emotional impacts and what you might call social consequences as well.

The precise number of women in particular in Australia who have had mesh implants is unknown, but it is estimated to be somewhere between 150,000 and 175,000 people, so it is a very substantial number of women. This is only the women: that does not include the men. Similarly, there is no certainty of the number experiencing complications from pelvic mesh because there is no mandatory reporting requirement for surgeons and hospitals. That is, the way the Medicare system is coded, as I understand, it is not quite clear how many of these implants have occurred and therefore it is not quite clear how many of these complications have occurred as a result of the insertion of these devices.

In terms of remedy, the Australian Senate inquiry into the number of women in Australia who have had transvaginal mesh implants and related matters was conducted in 2017 and its report was published in March this year. There is so much more that I can say but I am out of time, but it is a very serious matter indeed.

ADELAIDE FESTIVALS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:50): I rise today to take the opportunity to discuss Adelaide's music and arts industry. The fact is that we live in a state that is forever growing, not only economically but creatively. In June 2016, Music SA's Live Music Census presented an increase of 14.4 per cent in the number of events or gigs, if I can call them that, if I am still young enough, where they rose to 1,101—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Thank you, the Hon. Ms Scriven—in May 2016 compared to May 2015, where they were sitting at 962 live gigs in South Australia—I used it anyway, Clare. These are great numbers for South Australia. This means that more people are enjoying live music and going out to see more local talented artists. This has a flow-on effect for small businesses, bars and even the artists themselves. According to the previous arts minister, Jack Snelling, the live music scene contributed \$263.7 million to South Australia's economy in 2014 alone, and nationally the industry contributed approximately \$15.7 billion to the economy and approximately 65,000 full and part-time jobs. This goes to show that there never has been a better time to support South Australian music.

One of the main festivals that supports the music and arts industry in South Australia is the Adelaide Fringe Festival, typically running from mid-February to mid-March, which offers artists a range of opportunities to showcase their talents. In March, we also have WOMADelaide, Adelaide Writers' Week, Adelaide Festival and the Adelaide 500. In July, there is the Adelaide Cabaret Festival and also the Umbrella Winter City Sounds Festival, which has recently returned to Adelaide and finishes on Sunday 29 July. Then, in October, there is the Adelaide Film Festival.

Along with all these festivals, Adelaide has some great venues for local musicians such as the Crown and Anchor, the Wheatsheaf Hotel, known for holding SCALA's Festival of Original Music, which is held from July through to August, and there is also the Grace Emily, the Metro and the Jade Monkey, all which support local musicians and the local musician scene.

The issue we are facing, as you may have noticed, is that the majority of these festivals are in March, otherwise known as Mad March. We have over 10 festivals occurring from late February through to mid-March. There are other festivals that occur throughout the year; however, they do not have the same vibe and exciting atmosphere that Mad March does. During this period, people are out, going to bars and restaurants, hotels get booked out and the city is constantly filled with people, not just on weekends but also during the week because the public has somewhere interesting to go once they finish work for the day. This is because there is more live entertainment and gigs on in the city, such as live shows, street performances, markets and even pop-up food and drink bars. But then the Fringe ends and the city goes back into a festival hibernation.

Of course, local musicians still perform around Adelaide in some of these great live music venues and there are other smaller festivals over the year but there is nowhere near the same vibe and exciting atmosphere as there is during the Adelaide Fringe and the other Mad March festivals. The vast majority of these events are only targeted to specific audiences and a majority of the time

these bands and artists are only performing to small audiences. When we think of March we think of a city that is vibrant, colourful, creative, unique and exciting to be in.

I would like to see Adelaide's arts and live music culture further grow and develop outside of Mad March and that period of time so that young talented artists and old talented artists are able to thrive and survive through the peaks and troughs of our live music and arts scene in South Australia. Adelaide has a good base and foundation to work from and with the right catalyst we could grow our music and arts scene outside of Mad March.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:53): I want to speak today about a small book that was launched on the weekend, entitled *Standing Strong—How South Australians won the Campaign Against an International High Level Nuclear Waste Dump*. The book was launched at the Governor Hindmarsh Hotel by Uncle Kevin Buzzacott, a well known antinuclear campaigner and Arabunna elder. The dedication at the front of the book was to another prominent nuclear-free advocate, Yankunytjatjara elder, Yami Lester. Yami was blinded by the British atomic tests in South Australia in the early 1950s. Yami was a key player in the 1983 royal commission into the British atomic bomb tests, and he was made an ambassador for the No Dump Alliance in 2016. He was an active campaigner for his people and the wider community until his death last year.

The book launched on the weekend focuses particularly on the efforts and the impact of South Australia's first peoples on the campaign. As the book states:

This plan threatened no-one more than Aboriginal people. The voices of Aboriginal communities were loud and clear in opposition to the waste dump. The efforts were unwavering and, for many, deeply personal. Acknowledgement must be given to those people and communities who stood up strong.

As well as the late Yami Lester and Uncle Kevin Buzzacott, the role of other Aboriginal leaders is acknowledged: Yami's daughters, Karina and Rose Lester; Narungga man Tauto Sansbury, chair of the SA Aboriginal Congress; Auntie Enice Marsh; the Coulthard sisters, Donna, Deirdre and Lesley; the McKenzie sisters, Vivianne and Regina; plus many more.

The impact of these Aboriginal women and men is that they were instrumental in winning over the hearts and minds of the community, including the 350 members of the community who participated in the citizens' jury, because one of the most significant findings of that process was in direct response to Aboriginal advocacy. The citizens' jury said:

There is a lack of aboriginal consent. We believe that the government should accept that the Elders have said NO and stop ignoring their opinions. The aboriginal people of South Australia (and Australia) continue to be neglected and ignored by all levels of government instead of respected and treated as equals.

To paraphrase the Roman writer Tacitus 2,000 years ago, 'Success has many parents, but failure is an orphan', and this campaign was no different. There are so many people who deserve to share in the credit for a successful campaign that it is impossible to name them all. The book itself acknowledges that it only scratches the surface of the efforts made by everyone involved. For my part, I think that the role the Greens played was crucial both in the community and in parliament. In April 2015, shortly after the announcement of the royal commission, we organised the first public forum at the Mercury Cinema, entitled 'South Australia: the "nuclear state"? Why it makes no sense'.

We organised a stakeholders roundtable here in Parliament House in May 2015, which helped the campaign to get better organised. In June 2016, we held another public forum, with 400 people attending at the German Club. We produced materials, T-shirts, corflutes and stickers. We participated in the citizens' jury and the parliamentary process. However, the royal commission rejected our submission, which was symptomatic of their flawed process, which included refusing to hear from major conservation groups while giving undue attention and even paid consultancies to supporters of the project.

The book touches on some of the legislative action we saw over several years in relation to amendments to the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000, including the Greens' amendments to reinstate the act once the citizens' jury process was complete. The book also touches on the joint select committee that recommended that the South Australian government should not

commit any further public funds to pursuing the proposal to establish a repository for the storage of nuclear waste in SA.

History will ultimately record how events played out and historians will argue over what were the defining factors. I expect that over time the role of Aboriginal campaigners and those who worked with them will be recognised, but so too will the role of economists. When the politics of this issue played out, the role of economists was critical. After all, when the only justification for the project was that it would make us fabulously wealthy, the robustness of the economic modelling was always going to be critical. As it turns out, the figures did not stack up. The risk was immense; the profits were either overstated at best or a complete load of rubbish and a work of fiction at worst.

The idea that building the world's first and biggest international high-level nuclear waste dump that was 20 times the size of the Finnish facility that was 30 years in the making, and that we would make \$100 billion profit was fanciful in the extreme, and I think most people realised that by the end. Finally, I wish to thank the four organisations that have put their name to this important record of a sad but important part of our state's history: the No Dump Alliance, the Conservation Council of South Australia, Friends of the Earth Australia and the Australian Conservation Foundation.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to take the opportunity to welcome to the Legislative Council members of the Limestone Coast Protection Alliance, who are the guests of the Hon. Mr Parnell.

Bills

PETROLEUM AND GEOTHERMAL ENERGY (MORATORIUM ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June 2018.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:00): I rise to speak in support of this bill. Naturally, the Greens support this bill, having introduced it into this chamber. It is an issue on which we have been active at both state and federal levels for a very long time. Before I continue, I would like to acknowledge the years of hard work by my colleague, the Hon. Mark Parnell, and the effort, time and expertise he and his staff have put into this issue and this campaign, as well as the fact that this is definitely not the first time that he has brought such legislation before the parliament.

We know that communities, both in regional South Australia and elsewhere, do not buy that past governments had the balance right between the protection of valuable farmland and the aspirations of gas and mining companies. We also know that the world is moving on from old, polluting coal and gas industries, and that the social licence for the continued use of fossil fuels is eroding, if it still exists at all. We are seeing fracking bans and moratoriums more and more, both interstate and internationally. This legislation simply makes sense.

There is no logical case for fracking our farmland. These practices harm our environment and our communities. While I know that commitments have been made by the Marshall Liberal government as part of their election promises to not allow fracking in the South-East for at least 10 years, by putting it into legislation in this council and in this parliament we give those communities some certainty that that promise will be honoured.

As has already been pointed out, this bill is essentially putting into law a campaign promise that the Marshall government made ahead of the state election. With this in mind, we are certainly hoping that this bill will pass swiftly through the council tonight so that we can provide certainty and protection for those communities in the South-East who have been calling long and hard and loud for this measure. Indeed, it has no social licence, and I would note that the Marshall government will have no social licence if it does not support this legislation.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:02): This bill, introduced by the Hon. Mark Parnell, seeks to legislate on the moratorium that the state Liberal government promised for hydraulic fracturing. Hydraulic fracturing is used to increase the flow of oil or natural gas from a well. It has been used safely since 1949 in millions of wells around the world. In Australia, Santos, one of South Australia's biggest employers, has used hydraulic fracturing to produce oil and gas in South Australia and Queensland for almost 50 years. While the Marshall Liberal government committed to a 10-year moratorium on fracture stimulation in the South-East of South Australia, they have not taken any legislative action to implement this.

In response to the government's broken promise on this issue, both Greens MLC Mark Parnell and Independent MP Troy Bell have had to introduce legislation to the parliament to implement a 10-year moratorium. Labor's position on this issue remains unchanged. In any consideration of the future of gas production in South Australia we will look to the science and independent regulators to guide our decision-making. Labor believes it is vital for this state's continued prosperity that gas production is environmentally sustainable and collaborative.

Gas production provides a vital resource for our community and a significant number of jobs and economic prospects. South Australia has a long and successful track record of producing gas from the Cooper Basin in the Far North and the Otway Basin in the South-East. While there are currently no proposals to undertake fracture stimulation in the South-East, the regulatory framework in place ensures any exploration and production cannot go ahead unless projects meet the highest environmental standards.

With that, I complete my remarks and indicate that the opposition will not be supporting this bill.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (16:05): I rise today to speak on this bill, brought to the chamber by the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC. The South Australian Liberal Party commitment prior to the election was to implement a 10-year moratorium on fracture stimulation in the Limestone Coast region. On 29 March 2018, following the first cabinet meeting of the Marshall Liberal government, we made good on that promise.

This moratorium was immediately implemented by way of a policy decision, and a ministerial direction was handed down to the regulator preventing the Department for Energy and Mining, Energy Resources Division, from approving any application for resource development involving fracture stimulation in the Limestone Coast region. The government's policy of a 10-year moratorium over the Limestone Coast region is functioning as intended, with the regulator, industry, stakeholders and wider community all aware that the Department for Energy and Mining cannot approve any environmental impact report (EIR) or a draft statement of environmental objectives (SOE) that relate to fracture stimulation in the region for the next 10 years.

We have already acted to implement the moratorium on fracking in the South-East in the Limestone Coast area. This bill tries to play politics by bringing into question that moratorium. We made a commitment for a 10-year moratorium, and that is what the people of the Limestone Coast and the South-East have. The moratorium is working. This is just an attempt to raise concerns in the South-East, where there are no concerns because we have made good on our promise: it is a 10-year moratorium.

In principle, we do not support using mining legislation to legislate against specific activities and technologies. The former government had a decision policy to approve fracture stimulation. The Liberal Party said we would have a 10-year moratorium, and that is what we have implemented. If it is a matter for government policy, it should be dealt with as we dealt with it: through a policy decision, which is working.

The Mining Act should not be used to advance political agendas that could or will hurt the confidence of investors. The situation in South-East is unique, and the social licence for fracking in that region was not established by the proponents. That is why we took action to implement our moratorium. Legislating this ban could be seen as the beginning of a series of legislative interventions on resource projects across the state. We have a measured approach to resource issues. We want to avoid the issues caused by legislative changes in other jurisdictions such as New South Wales and Victoria.

This government supports a coexistence framework, where diverse land uses can exist for the benefit of the community, region and state. With those few words, I can see members would be aware that the Liberal Party and the government will not be supporting the member's legislation.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:08): While I will not be speaking on this bill, I just wish to put on the record that I and my colleague Connie Bonaros will be supporting the bill. Thank you.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no clapping in the chamber. Hon. Mr Darley.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:08): For the record, I indicate that I agree with the position of the government on this matter and I will not be supporting the bill.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Parnell, would you please sum up the debate.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:08): I will begin by thanking my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks, and also the Hon. Tung Ngo, the Hon. David Ridgway, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. John Darley. As you did, Mr President, I also acknowledge the presence in the gallery of members of the Limestone Coast Protection Alliance. They have spent half a day on a bus to get here. I thank my colleagues for allowing this item of business to be given some precedence because they have homes to go to and a long drive back.

I will just reflect briefly on the contributions that we have heard. Starting with the Labor Party position, there is no surprise there. They have been fond of the gas industry in all parts of South Australia, including the South-East. They have given vast quantities of taxpayers' money under the PACE grant scheme and other schemes to the gas industry. They are nothing if not consistent. They are just wrong. They are consistent, but they are wrong. They do not have at heart the interests of the people in the South-East. They do not hold seats down there—maybe that is why. Certainly if they were listening to the people in the South-East they would know that the community is dead against this activity. The Labor Party, I think, would do well to listen.

In terms of the Hon. David Ridgway's response, that is just so disappointing. The public already have trouble with promises made by politicians in the lead-up to elections that turn out to be nothing but hot air after the election. The Hon. David Ridgway says that the party has fulfilled their promise. They say that they have made good on a 10-year ban by virtue of a policy decision and a ministerial direction. But the truth of the matter is that, now they have been elected, what the government have now done is they have attached a rider. They have attached a qualification to what was previously an unqualified policy.

What their policy now appears to be is that the 10-year moratorium only exists whilst they remain in office. That was not what they said before the election. They promised a 10-year moratorium. People will say, 'You can't promise in a four-year electoral cycle anything for 10 years.' Well, the Liberals did. If they were true to their word, they would give this moratorium the best possible chance of surviving 10 years. The best way for it to survive 10 years is to put it in legislation, because that means that, even if they were to lose the next election in four years' time, it would be a subsequent parliament that would have to come back and undo the moratorium.

I do not need to remind the Hon. David Ridgway or any other member in this place that the government of the day, Liberal or Labor, has not controlled the numbers in the upper house of parliament since the 1970s. Even if there was a change of government, even if there was a change of heart, chances are the moratorium could still survive that change because of the strong crossbench presence in the upper house.

I think it is incredibly disappointing that the Liberals have let down their constituents. There are certainly going to be some difficult questions for local members to answer. I know that we all represent the entire state. There are some members here who express a strong connection with the South-East. They have questions to answer as well.

I know that our colleague in another place, the Independent member, Mr Troy Bell, has an identical bill that he will bring forward. That is coming to a vote in September. I will not discuss the merits of the bill, which I expect would be unparliamentary. I said it is identical, but let's not discuss the merits of Mr Bell's bill other than to say that by introducing these bills into both houses of

parliament every one of the 69 members in this place gets to vote on whether or not the Liberal Party should be held to their pre-election promise.

I am terribly disappointed in the outcome. I thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo for the indication of support from the SA-Best party. My colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks put on the record again some of the reasons why the South-East wants to be protected from this activity. They see themselves as a clean, green, food bowl. The last thing they want is to be growing grapes or grazing cattle in amongst gas rigs. So I am disappointed with the outcome. Depending how the vote goes, if I am unsuccessful I will be calling 'Divide'.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 4
 Noes 17
 Majority 13

AYES

Bonaros, C.
 Parnell, M.C. (teller)

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Lee, J.S.
 Maher, K.J.
 Ridgway, D.W. (teller)
 Wade, S.G.

Darley, J.A.
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Lensink, J.M.A.
 Ngo, T.T.
 Scriven, C.M.
 Wortley, R.P.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Lucas, R.I.
 Pnevmatikos, I.
 Stephens, T.J.

Second reading thus negated.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order in the gallery! Order in the gallery, or you will be excluded from the chamber. Black Rod, could you make sure they are escorted out.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before I give the Leader of the Opposition the call, may I extend a warm welcome to his guests, senior Aboriginal women community leaders, together with his other guests: welcome to the Legislative Council.

Motions

NAIDOC WEEK

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:19): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the SA NAIDOC Week committee;
2. Acknowledges the theme of NAIDOC Week 2018 'Because of Her, We Can!'; and
3. Pays tribute to the many South Australian Aboriginal women who have contributed so much to our state.

NAIDOC Week provides Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people the opportunity to be involved in many events and activities that celebrate the oldest living culture on the planet. The South Australian NAIDOC Week committee has again exceeded the already very high standard set in previously years. I would like to pay tribute to those committee members for their commitment to ensuring Adelaide celebrates in style, and especially to the NAIDOC SA chair, Charlene Lamont.

NAIDOC Week is celebrated proudly all over South Australia; however, in recent years I have been consigned only to Adelaide activities due to it coinciding with the parliamentary sitting week. This year, I was able to get out to regional areas of the state and experience and celebrate more of NAIDOC Week. I was able to attend the NAIDOC Awards and met with some outstanding Aboriginal people doing great community work in Whyalla.

In Port Augusta there was a jam-packed NAIDOC Week, with a massive 18 events. I arrived in the nick of time to partake in the first NAIDOC Week Colour Run. I can assure you, Mr President, I did not absolutely embarrass myself in my finishing time over the 2.5 kilometres, but I did learn a very important Colour Run lesson: you ought to close your mouth when running through a colour station, especially given the onslaught of coloured powder thrown by local community constable, Bradley Amos. It is best not to ingest the stuff.

I wish to give great thanks to Dre Ngatokorua, for organising such a fun and positive event, and his mum Lavene, who I must congratulate for being the well-deserved 2018 Port Augusta NAIDOC Lifetime Achievement Award winner. Speaking of Lavene's contribution—an Aboriginal woman who gives so much to her community—it brings us to the theme of this year's NAIDOC Week: 'Because of her we can'. The week was an amazing opportunity to pay tribute to all the Aboriginal women who have played, and continue to play, crucial roles in the lives of us all.

The aim of promoting this theme has been to shine a light on the role that so many strong Aboriginal women play. Their worker does not often receive the credit it deserves. Aboriginal women are so often the backbone of our communities. They have been critical in the survival and resilience of Aboriginal people. They are our most fierce protectors, most loving aunties, and our most supportive sisters, educators and nurturers. They often bear both the burden and joy of community that many others do not experience.

There are so many incredible, inspirational Aboriginal women—unsung heroes in South Australia, just getting on with it. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all Aboriginal women who contribute so much to their families, to their communities and to South Australia. Today I want to single out just a few of them.

I was beyond proud that when I was minister for Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation, the Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation division of the state government was run by two deadly black boss ladies. Nerida Saunders and Kirstie Parker might not actually be from South Australia, but they have spent enough time here, advocating for Aboriginal South Australians, that we have no choice but to let them be honorary Nungas.

I have always received quality advice, the necessary direction and often redirection and support from Nerida and Kirsty. I thank them for the help and guidance that they have given me, and which they continue to give and deliver to the South Australian government and the wider Aboriginal community in this state.

It would be impossible to speak about strong, successful Aboriginal women if I did not mention Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, so I will do it early on because it is appropriate to mention Lowitja early on. Quite frankly, I am scared of her and I thought I had better do it early on. Aunty Lowitja needs no introduction. Her achievements are lengthy and she broke the glass ceiling becoming the first Aboriginal person to do a bunch of things: the first Aboriginal training nurse at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the first Aboriginal woman to be awarded the Order of Australia and the first Aboriginal person to address the United Nations General Assembly.

It is no surprise that Lowitja was the person the federal government turned to when they appointed the very first chairperson of ATSIC. Her entire life has been dedicated to the advancement of Aboriginal people and I pay great tribute to her for that. I well remember, in the first few weeks as minister for Aboriginal affairs, attending a dinner after the Lowitja O'Donoghue Oration. There were around five of us at this dinner and it included Lowitja O'Donoghue and Marcia Langton. I have never been more petrified and scared for a couple of hours than I was that night. They are two of the fiercest people I know; it just so happens that they are both Aboriginal women. They are two of the strongest advocates for Aboriginal people in Australia.

Another woman involved in many firsts was Dr Alice Rigney, the first ever Aboriginal school principal and a trailblazer in the field of education, notable for her dedication to the revival of the

Kaurna language. She went to great lengths to piece back what was an almost lost language. Aunty Alice went to Germany to see letters in the Kaurna language that had been written by Kaurna children in the early days of European colonisation. They were sent to Germany by missionaries who taught Kaurna children in the 1940s at an Aboriginal school on the banks of the River Torrens.

The best guess is that Dr Alice Rigney taught over 5,000 Aboriginal kids in South Australia, and her influence in shaping many of the next generation will be her ongoing legacy. As Aunty Alice Rigney used to say, 'The teaching of children is our single greatest story of hope for a reconciled Australia.' Again, I remember from my early days as minister for Aboriginal affairs that one of the things I had to do was attend, with Dr Alice Rigney, the Sisters of Saint Joey's reconciliation group in the eastern suburbs.

That brings me to Shirley Peisley, Aunty Shirley. I can only speak for the last 20 years or so but I have it on good authority that she is almost as active today—and possibly more passionate today—than she was when she joined FCAATSI in the early 60s. Her life has been well and truly dedicated to improving the rights of Aboriginal people and advocating for reconciliation in both her professional and personal life.

Last year was the 50th anniversary of the 1967 referendum, and it came with many celebratory and commemorative events across the country. I remember being at one such event in Melbourne hosted by the Prime Minister, who spent much of his speech talking about the work that Aunty Shirley did in the lead-up to the 1967 referendum—a truly inspirational South Australian whose reach and influence stretched all across Australia more than 50 years ago and still does today.

Aunty Ellen Trevorrow has nurtured so many young people, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, in the decades she has run Camp Coorong. Her whole life has been incredibly generous, sharing her culture and her Miwi wisdom. She has been a great source of strength for my family and also for many Ngarrindjeri over so many years.

Aunty Eunice Aston has been a great source of strength and inspiration to many, not just around Ngarrindjeri country but to me personally, and particularly to her nearly three dozen grandchildren. While Aunty Eunice can rattle off the names of her 30 plus grandchildren, she tells me she cannot remember all their birthdays every time. Aunty Eunice has dedicated her life to working in the field of Aboriginal health and has, in addition, been a trailblazer in her own right, becoming the very first female chairperson of the Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority.

An exceptionally strong and fierce Aboriginal leader was Kunmanara Paddy, or the Lady from Kalca in the APY lands. She also became the first female chairperson of a board, the APY Executive Board. Sadly she was only chairperson for a little over 12 months before she passed away in May 2016. She was a strong advocate for Anangu women and children, encouraging everyone to go to school. Her dignified and generous nature was a delight to all who knew her, but she was an exceptionally firm leader.

I saw the strength of the old lady from Kalca's leadership in 2016 at the opening of the Pipalyatjara/Kalca TAFE building. One of the public servants present at that opening made an unfortunate decision to single out just a couple of families, thanking those two families for helping deliver this project in Pipalyatjara. This led to about 15 minutes of heated arguing and language over which family had done more. The old lady from Kalca stood up after about 10 or 15 minutes of arguing and, in a big spray in the Pitjantjatjara language, let everyone know that she did most of the work so they should all sit down—and everyone did.

There was a fundamental change under the old lady from Kalca's leadership on the APY Executive Board, and during that time it showed just how important it is to have women around the table, strong Aboriginal women. Her legacy is now enshrined in legislation. Amendments were made to ensure that APY communities must have equal numbers of females and males representing them on the executive board.

It is, however, disappointing to see that in many areas of society the inclusion of women and gender diversity, particularly at the board or executive level, is not met with more enthusiasm. Of the top 500 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander corporations overseen by the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC), 400 had at least 30 per cent female directors, which is much more

than for non-Indigenous corporations. Also interesting and inspiring, I can remember hearing during NAIDOC Week on a radio report that, of the top 200 Aboriginal businesses in Australia, Aboriginal women make up 53 per cent of the board positions.

Finally, on the theme of strong Aboriginal women, who because of them we can, I want to turn to one particular strong, compassionate, inspiring Aboriginal woman: Aunty Viv, better known to me as mum. It is her more than anyone else I have known who encompasses this year's NAIDOC theme Because of Her, We Can! Although she is no longer with us, her influence continues to resonate deeply. Although the Aboriginal history and heritage in my mum's family was well known to them, it was not discussed widely and did not play a prominent part in my mum's childhood. My mum was raised in country Victoria in an era when racism was a more open and significant part of our society, and many people were made to feel ashamed of being part of the oldest living culture on the planet.

It was only about this time last year, in the last weeks before her death, that my mum spoke much more openly about her growing up and growing up as a young Aboriginal person. As she relayed to me, as a young kid at school, Viv Maher was sometimes asked about being an Aboriginal person. From photos of her as a young child, her obvious Aboriginality could not have been easy to deny. Viv went home from school and asked her parents about her family history after teachers asked about her being an Aboriginal person. She was firmly told by her parents something along the lines of, 'You don't talk about Aboriginal things. You don't tell people at school you are an Aboriginal. They are taking away the part-Aboriginal kids. They take them from their families.'

The deliberate racist policies of governments of the last century of stealing children from their families because of their Aboriginality has done so much damage to families, communities and enshrined and encouraged a denial of identity. But Aboriginal people and their culture is resilient: it has survived thousands of generations and is proud and surviving today. We have survived.

As an adult, Viv Maher connected deeply to her culture and heritage. She became heavily involved and was embraced by the Aboriginal community in Mount Gambier. Very little has instilled me with more pride than being on the streets of Mount Gambier and having young Ngarrindjeri or Booandik kids greet my mum with a big hug and, 'Hello Aunty.' On occasion, I have even seen my almost translucently white dad, Jim, being afforded the respect of being called Uncle because he was married to Aunty Viv.

One of the deepest signs of respect for Viv's role in the Aboriginal community was seeing Aboriginal flags flying at half mast on most buildings around Mount Gambier on the day of her funeral last year. I particularly want to thank my uncles and aunties from the Bonney, Brennan and Lovett families for their support over the last year. Like so many Aboriginal women, Viv Maher had an enormous impact on her world. Because of her, so many others could. She was always involved in ministerial advisory councils, local boards and community groups.

She had a couple of different jobs that I can remember. For much of my childhood she was a social worker and then administrated the women's shelter in Mount Gambier. I did not appreciate it as a primary school-aged kid that the time, but Viv's work with women who were suffering from the effects of domestic violence in isolated regional areas was a remarkable thing. There are many lives who were turned around and no doubt actually saved because of her work. Because of her, they could.

Viv spent a year as a high school economics teacher at Tenison Woods College in Mount Gambier and became very well known as the teacher who usually did not wear shoes and kept all her pens and pencils in her massive afro-style hair. After that, she spent time as a social worker at Centrelink in Mount Gambier where I am constantly reminded of the impact that she had on so many.

A story I had not heard until recently, which was told by her great friend and colleague Karen Lock, was that while working at Centrelink, if a client was struggling and needed a little extra to make it through the week, there was a special loans fund from which Viv could make discretionary loans. In reality there was no such fund. Viv was using her own money but was providing people with the dignity of believing that it was a loans fund.

Finally, there was the role that I think Viv considered the most important one, as a social worker at Pangula Mannamurna, the Aboriginal health service in Mount Gambier. In that role she

was working with and for her community and eventually became deputy chair of the Aboriginal board that runs Pangula.

Viv Maher had an enormous impact on the world and the organisations she worked for but her biggest impact was at the most important level, the individual personal level. I reckon the most common phrase I have heard from people when talking about Viv has been, 'If it wasn't for Viv.' 'If it wasn't for Viv I never would have got that job.' 'If it wasn't for Viv there was no way I'd have the confidence to do that.' 'If it wasn't for Viv I may simply not be alive today.' To actually make a difference, to directly help change another person's life for the better is a remarkable thing and because of her so many could.

One of my brothers tells a story of a time when he had a part-time job at the Kraft cheese factory in Mount Gambier when a random woman came up and asked, 'Are you Viv Maher's son?' He said yes. She said, 'Well, Viv is amazing. I would be dead now if she hadn't turned my life around.' That has been asked of me a fair bit: 'Are you Viv's son?' It does not matter what I do, even the couple of times I had been acting premier of South Australia, if I was in the South-East I am Viv's son.

At last year's Premier's NAIDOC Awards—which seem by some to have been rebranded the 'NIDOCK' Awards, but I am well informed they are still the NAIDOC Awards—I had a conversation with one of the finalists who asked the usual line, 'Are you Viv's son?' and went on to tell me the works she had done with Viv in changing social work therapy practices to make them much more culturally appropriate for Aboriginal people. Even just a couple of months ago at the Aboriginal War Memorial in Adelaide on ANZAC Day an Aboriginal man approached me to let me know how Viv had saved his life.

Over the years when I have gone back home I have been forced to stay in another part of the house I grew up in because what I still consider, 25 years after leaving home, my bedroom was regularly given up for a couple of months or a couple of years to young Aboriginal people whose families were having difficulties, so my mum and dad took them in and looked after them.

Viv was deeply committed to bettering the lives of others. She became one of the first, if not the first—the records are not completely clear—South Australians to be awarded life membership of the Australian Association of Social Workers. In 2014, Viv was one of three people awarded life membership of the great Australian Labor Party, a cause she had been involved in for as long as I can remember, and in 2016 Viv was awarded the Limestone Coast NAIDOC Lifetime Achievement Award for her many years of work in and with the South-East Aboriginal community.

Viv Maher was a remarkable woman, a remarkable Aboriginal woman. Growing up I hated being told, 'Kyam, you're so much like your mother.' Even in photos of the two of us when we had reached six years old we look almost identical, and I had trouble telling us apart. But in so many ways I trace the work that I do on a daily basis to the work and ideals she was committed to. I am very much my mother's son: making a difference, making a positive difference in the lives of those facing disadvantage, particularly people in the Aboriginal community, and choosing a progressive policy through the Labor Party to try to effect change.

From my point of view, it is absolutely true that if it was not for Viv, I would not be doing what I am today. I am not directly changing people's lives on a daily basis like Viv did, but I am doing my bit to change the world for the better. Viv's work and her legacy carry on through her three sons, Ky, Cam and Gib, and her eight grandsons. Viv Maher's is just one story; one strong, determined Aboriginal woman, like so many who have made a massive difference to their families, their people and their communities. Because of her, because of all the aunts and sisters, many who have joined us here today, we can. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

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

LONDON BRIDGE ATTACK

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:39): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the selfless display of courage and compassion of Kirsty Boden who rushed to the aid of victims injured in the terrorist attack at London Bridge on 3 June 2017;
2. Mourns the tragic loss of the eight innocent individuals killed in the attack, including two Australians (Ms Kirsty Boden and Ms Sara Zelenak);
3. Condemns the actions of the three terrorists who drove their van along London Bridge and into pedestrians before attacking people in the Borough Market area;
4. Acknowledges the Kirsty Boden Memorial Nursing Scholarship for regional students at Flinders University, funded by the state government;
5. Acknowledges that Ms Boden has been recognised with a posthumous Queen's Commendation for Bravery; and
6. Pays tribute to South Australia's nurses who serve selflessly both nationally and internationally.

For most of us, running from danger—perceived or real—is instinctive. Seeing an aggressive dog, an out-of-control car or a fire, we turn and run in the opposite direction. This is especially true if that danger is an armed terrorist.

Kirsty Boden's instinct was different. A professional nurse, Kirsty Boden took her commitment to care for others to the highest level. Sadly, this commitment cost Kirsty her life. Kirsty was killed as she ran towards danger following the terrorist attack at London Bridge on 3 June 2017. She could have taken cover to protect herself, as would be the instinct of most people. Instead, she rushed to the aid of an injured person and was fatally wounded by knife-wielding terrorists.

Today, this motion gives the council the opportunity to acknowledge Ms Boden's selfless display of courage and compassion and acknowledge that her heroic actions have been recognised with a posthumous Queen's Commendation for Bravery. It is an award granted for acts of gallantry entailing risk to life. It is an apt and solemn recognition of Kirsty's selfless sacrifice of her own life in her quest to save others. All South Australians are immensely proud.

Sadly, terrorist attacks have become all too familiar in our global community. The loss of lives is a terrible consequence of a malevolent agenda. Public places have become a common narrative in the storyline of terrorist attacks, and on this occasion the terrorist targeted pedestrians on London Bridge, driving their van through the crowded sidewalk before attacking people in the Borough Market area. People quickly scattered into the nearby shops, cafes and restaurants, and within eight minutes from the start of the attack, the three terrorists had been shot.

Yet, in just eight short minutes, the terrorists claimed the lives of eight innocent individuals, as well as seriously harming the lives of their families, friends and colleagues. There were also another 48 people injured that night and no doubt countless others left to bear the mental scars. We mourn the tragic loss of the victims, who included two Australians, 28-year-old Kirsty Boden and 21-year-old Sara Zelenak, and condemn the actions of the three terrorists. Both young women were simply doing what so many of us do on a regular basis, enjoying a night with their friends. It simply should not have ended this way.

Australians are travelling abroad in record numbers, with around 10 million exits from Australia every year. The indiscriminate attacks could happen anywhere, at any time, and people of all nationalities, backgrounds, religions and age could become victims. It is important that we continue to promote voices of moderation, tolerance and harmony. While acts such as those on London Bridge enrage us all, we should remember that whilst a terrorist attack demonstrates the worst in people, the reaction repeatedly brings out the best: people such as Kirsty, people who run towards danger to fight for those who are unable to fight for themselves. Amongst the ruins of terrorist attacks across the globe there are countless stories of bravery, courage and self-sacrifice.

Originally from Loxton, Kirsty completed her nursing degree at Flinders University before moving to London to work as a senior nurse at Guy's and St Thomas' hospitals. To commemorate Kirsty's touching sacrifice and ensure that her bravery and compassion are commemorated and continue to inspire others, last year the state government established the Kirsty Boden Memorial Nursing Scholarship for regional students in their final year of study at Flinders University. It is a fitting tribute to an extraordinary woman. I hope both the establishment of the scholarship and the Queen's Commendation for Bravery provide Kirsty's family with some comfort as they continue to

mourn the loss of their beloved daughter, sister, granddaughter and partner. They do not mourn alone.

I would also like to recognise South Australia's nurses, who serve selflessly both nationally and internationally. Nurses are the heart and soul of our health system. They are at the front line, responsible for a patient's treatment, safety and recovery. Beyond their formal duties, nurses are mothers, fathers, sons and daughters; they are friends and neighbours and they are strangers on the street.

Every day, South Australian nurses go above and beyond the call of duty, helping loved ones and strangers alike, assisting a person in distress, helping out at the scene of an accident or approaching somebody who is unable or unwilling to control their actions. They do so with courage and determination and do what they can to restore calm and help people along their healing journey. To all of our nurses, we thank you for your commitment to care for others.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

THAI CAVE RESCUE

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:45): I move:

That this council—

1. Celebrates the successful cave rescue of 12 boys and their football coach trapped in the Tham Luang cave in Chiang Rai province, Thailand;
2. Mourns the death of Saman Gunan, one of the Thai members of the international rescue team;
3. Acknowledges the key role played by Adelaide-based anaesthetist and MedSTAR doctor, Dr Richard Harris;
4. Acknowledges the contribution of the Australian contingent involved in the Thai-led rescue effort;
5. Acknowledges the leadership and professionalism of the Thai government and the Thai Navy SEALs in effecting the rescue;
6. Acknowledges the involvement and support of the international community, including support divers from the European Union, the United States and China, and participants from military and civilian organisations in various support roles;
7. Recognises South Australia's proud tradition of providing emergency assistance in response to catastrophic events, such as AUSMAT team member deployments to the Philippines in 2013 in response to Typhoon Haiyan, to Banda Aceh in 2004 in response to the Boxing Day tsunami and to Bali following the bombings in 2002 and 2005; and
8. Pays tribute to the courage and dedication of South Australian health professionals in so many diverse contexts.

Sometimes you dare not hope. On Saturday 23 June, a young soccer team and their coach went into a cave complex in Chiang Rai, Thailand, on a seemingly innocent adventure. They were trapped by rising water. A week later, hope was fading that they were safe and would come out alive. Nine days after they disappeared, the world was stunned to hear that they had been found safe and unharmed. However, then the reality set in: they were deep in the midst of an incredibly complex cave system that extends several kilometres into the mountainside. Heavy rainfall during the monsoon season made navigation and access difficult and threatened further tragedy.

The response was one of the largest, most complex and most daring cave rescues the world has ever seen. The world held its collective breath, waiting, hoping and praying for a positive outcome. There were many times when the Thai authorities and rescue teams—indeed, all onlookers, including myself—dared not hope. During the rescue, the danger of the highly complex and risky rescue operation was underscored by the tragic death of former Royal Thai Navy SEAL, Petty Officer 1st Class Saman Kunan, who volunteered to assist with the rescue effort. This parliament expresses its heartfelt condolences to his family and to the Thai people. His selfless endeavour is an example to us all.

The challenges confronting authorities were significant. Recognising they needed support divers and additional rescue teams, the Thai authorities brought together an extensive international team from the European Union, the United States, China and Australia. Under the extraordinary

leadership of the Thai authorities, we witnessed a remarkable example of regional and international cooperation. Seventeen days after they first entered the cave system, all the young boys and their coach were safely rescued. The ordeal was harrowing for all involved.

We recognise the skill, courage, resilience and personal sacrifice of everyone involved. We honour the courage and resilience of the coach and the boys themselves. We honour those who chose to go into the cave to rescue them. We honour the leadership of the Royal Thai Navy SEALs, who demonstrated outstanding leadership throughout the rescue operation, and celebrate their success in safely returning these children and their coach to their homes and loved ones.

The Australian contingent in the international team included 20 personnel: six Australian Federal Police divers; a Navy clearance diver; and support from the Department of Defence, the Australian Defence Force and the Australian Federal Police, as well as from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and its multidisciplinary health team, AUSMAT. Australia played an integral role, and the collective effort from those involved is something of which we can all be immensely proud.

I would like to congratulate everyone involved and acknowledge the nine members of that contingent who yesterday received Australian honours for their incredible efforts at a special thank you reception, hosted by the Governor-General, Sir Peter Cosgrove. Among those honoured were Adelaide-based anaesthetist and SA Ambulance Service MedSTAR doctor, Richard Harris, and his Perth-based dive partner, retired vet Dr Craig Challen. Both received the Star of Courage, the second highest civilian honour.

Dr Harris, or Harry, as he is affectionately known by his MedSTAR colleagues and now the world, has been internationally acknowledged for his integral role in the rescue operation. Internationally renowned for his expertise in cave rescues, Dr Harris was specifically identified by the British diving team as an expert whose skills would be critical to the mission, and he was asked for at the highest levels within the Thai government.

As well as being a member of AUSMAT, which is deployed within the Pacific to assist with responding to natural disasters, Dr Harris has also travelled overseas as part of a national aid program to developing countries. His rare combination of skills was critical in assisting the rescue team to assess the boys and the order in which they came out of the cave system and at what time.

South Australia has a proud tradition and a global reputation for answering the call to provide emergency assistance and work as part of cohesive international teams to respond to natural disasters and catastrophic events. In particular, our health professionals frequently serve as AUSMAT team members, with notable examples including deployment to the Philippines in 2013 in response to Typhoon Haiyan, to Banda Aceh in 2004 in response to the Boxing Day tsunami, and to Bali, following the bombings in both 2002 and 2005. It is what we do well. Tragically, we have had many opportunities to support our neighbours and friends in times of crisis.

This rescue is another example of the courage and dedication of South Australian health professionals in so many diverse contexts, and we pay tribute to them all. We can all be very proud of the contribution Australia's rescue team and, in particular, the efforts of our own Dr Harris, in assisting the Thai authorities and the international rescue team to bring about this amazing rescue. It is a remarkable story of human endeavour and achievement.

I wish the young boys and their coach a speedy recovery. I hope their adventurous spirit is not diminished by their experience, but in future I wish them less dramatic adventures.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. C.M. Scriven.

JUSTICENET

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:52): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the invaluable work of pro bono community legal centre JusticeNet in assisting many vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians dealing with civil matters like bankruptcy, eviction and financial abuse;

2. Notes the decision of the state government to decline providing recurrent funding to cover operational costs of the service has resulted in an uncertain future for JusticeNet; and
3. Urges the state government to reverse its decision as a matter of urgency.

As many of you may know, JusticeNet is a crucial pro bono community legal service. It provides free advice and representation to over 1,500 vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians each year. JusticeNet receives no recurrent funding from government to cover its core operating costs, though the previous Labor government provided two modest one-off grants in the lead-up to the last state election.

The lack of funding has meant that JusticeNet is forced to rely on mammoth fundraising efforts. Many of you would have taken part in this year's 10th annual Walk for Justice event in May, which raises much-needed funds for JusticeNet. The popular five-kilometre morning walk has become a fixture of our state's legal calendar, assembling the largest gathering of barristers, judges, other members of the legal community, students and supporters, for the fundraising walk that winds its way around our picturesque city before ending in a gourmet recovery breakfast served up by Chief Justice Chris Kourakis and other Walk for Justice ambassadors, including the Attorney-General, Vickie Chapman; shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Kyam Maher; the Hon. Mark Parnell; and my own colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

As the official starter at this year's walk, the Attorney-General had the audacity to praise the work undertaken by JusticeNet, together with all local pro bono legal services, in her speech to the gathering. In her own words, she acknowledged their work, and I quote:

I'm proud to have been involved with this walk for several years now, joining representatives of the largest legal profession and justice system to raise funds to help low-income and disadvantaged South Australians. Whether you're a law student, solicitor, barrister or even a judge, we all understand the importance of good legal advice to help people navigate the justice system and reach fair outcomes. But we also know that not everyone can afford a lawyer. Free legal assistance provides vital access to services for our community, particularly people facing poverty or homelessness, refugees and people with a disability. I am grateful to all the agencies and individuals in South Australia that offer free legal services to disadvantaged and vulnerable South Australians.

Weeks later, our office wrote to JusticeNet informing the service of the Attorney-General's decision not to provide funding.

The Hon. T.T. Ngo: Shame!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Shame indeed. In fact, the letter, dated 24 June 2018, came not from the Attorney-General herself but the honourable John Gardner MP in his role as acting attorney-general while the Attorney-General was on leave.

The Hon. T.T. Ngo: Holiday.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Indeed. This must have felt like a slap in the face to the wonderful people at JusticeNet, given her very public support for the great organisation at its fundraising walk only a few weeks prior. Attorney, if you are going to walk the walk, then you need to talk the talk.

On 10 May 2018, my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros asked a question in this place regarding future funding arrangements for JusticeNet. The response received from the government was:

This government committed to reviewing JusticeNet's funding formula with other agencies if elected. The Attorney-General is currently undertaking this work and will make a decision on funding in due course.

That review, as we now know, resulted in the government's decision not to fund JusticeNet's core operating costs of just \$120,000 per year, a small amount given the invaluable work provided by the service. The letter signed by John Gardner MP provides no reason for the government's position, other than to say, 'The government is not in a position to grant your core operating costs funding request at this time.'

To top it off, the possibility of a one-off project funding proposal was also rejected. I wrote to the Attorney-General as a matter of urgency last Monday, urging her to reverse the government's decision not to fund JusticeNet. I am yet to receive a response. This mean-spirited kick in the guts by the government threatens the future of JusticeNet and the magnificent and crucial free advice and representation it provides to over 1,500 vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians each year.

JusticeNet was established as a pro bono safety net nine years ago to help people who fall through the gaps in the civil justice system. It provides legal services based in three locations across the Adelaide CBD. The Legal Services Commission of South Australia only provides legal aid in serious criminal law and family law parenting matters and not civil matters like bankruptcy, eviction and financial abuse that affects many poorer Australians.

JusticeNet crucially provides free advice and representation to hundreds of vulnerable and disadvantaged people each year by leveraging the expertise of over 300 volunteer pro bono lawyers from some of Adelaide's top barristers and law firms, providing over 8,500 hours of free legal advice. Lawyers from some of South Australia's most respected and well-known law firms, including Finlaysons, Fisher Jeffries, Cowell Clarke, HWL Ebsworth and MinterEllison, provide their services pro bono to JusticeNet. They do it for free, but if JusticeNet cannot keep going all that expertise it has leveraged goes with it.

JusticeNet faces a constant daily challenge to meet the needs of its clients. Increasingly, access to courts and tribunals is becoming beyond the financial reach of most South Australians, putting further pressure on an already strained court system and hampering a person's fundamental right to access justice. About 25 per cent of South Australians experience serious legal problems each year that require the assistance of a lawyer, but many do not get the help they need to resolve serious civil law problems because they cannot afford it and/or because they do not know where to go to seek advice. JusticeNet helps redress the systemic failure. It does not resolve it; that is the duty of governments.

As mentioned, the well-respected organisation has never received recurrent government funding for operating costs, but demand for its services is at an all-time high, and the extra funds would help it meet that demand and provide certainty to the service to continue well into the future. Providing basic funding for operating costs would also save the government significant money through a reduced demand on welfare and social services that respond to bankruptcy, poverty, unemployment, homelessness and other serious adverse consequences of civil legal disputes.

Further, of all coordinated pro bono legal services in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia, only JusticeNet operates without recurrent state government financial support. The refusal to provide recurrent funding to JusticeNet will only add to the backlog of cases before the courts, with more people having no option but to try to represent themselves. It is a paltry amount, considering the state government wants to splash millions more on extravagant projects like the unnecessary right-hand tram turn into North Terrace. Tim Graham, who runs JusticeNet said:

Funding has always been a serious and ongoing challenge. Fortunately, JusticeNet has access to many lawyers who devote their time free of charge to assist people in desperate need of legal support. But even with their pro bono support, it's still a constant challenge to meet the needs of our clients.

It should not have to be an uphill battle. It's a small amount each year—\$120,000 in recurrent funding would make the world of difference to the lives of so many battlers. JusticeNet is not asking the government to break the bank. Its request for \$120,000 of recurrent funding is a drop in the ocean, given the important legal support it offers its clients.

Many of its clients have disabilities and/or are vulnerable to vultures who take advantage of their personal circumstances. Some have even been the cruel victims of financial abuse by their own family members. Take Jason Kean and Danielle Piotrowski as an example. They faced losing their Mount Compass home when Jason suffered a brain aneurysm last year. He applied for a payout from his superannuation fund, but was rejected. JusticeNet SA lawyers stepped in to help Jason and his young family secure a payout to cover mortgage repayments while Jason continues to work on his recovery.

If not for JusticeNet SA and its vast network of generous lawyers who provide their expertise free of charge, people like Jason and Danielle would fall through the cracks. Sadly, many others will do exactly that if the state government does not reverse its miserly decision and commit to funding this outstanding organisation.

What is wrong with this state government? Can it not see the crucial service JusticeNet SA provides to some of the most vulnerable and needy people in our society? There is a huge chasm in

people having access to justice, and what JusticeNet SA does is to procure help for people who otherwise would have no hope of legal representation in complex cases—it is invaluable.

I call on the Attorney-General, Vickie Chapman, and the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, to immediately reverse its mean-spirited decision, which will place a further handicap on cash-strapped litigants trying to get justice.

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

NATIONAL DIABETES WEEK

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:04): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges National Diabetes Week which commenced on 8 July;
2. Pays tribute to the work being undertaken to raise awareness of diabetes in the community; and
3. Highlights the importance of increasing awareness of the importance of person-centred care for optimal diabetes management.

I rise the move the motion in my name about the significant impact of diabetes within the community. This year's National Diabetes Week campaign was entitled It's About Time, which focused on the early detection and early treatment of diabetes. Diabetes SA also launched their own campaign for National Diabetes Week, which focuses on the importance of person-centred care for optimal diabetes management. I would like to address both of these very important campaigns today.

Why talk about diabetes? Because the nature of diabetes impacts lives, families and communities. This serious disease prevents the body's insulin production and processing capabilities. High levels of insulin in the body can cause health problems. This includes an increased risk of heart attack or stroke, kidney disease, limb amputations, blindness, and mental illness. Diabetes can happen to anyone at any time. It is a non-discriminatory disease. It is because of this that there is never a better time to talk about diabetes than right now, to promote the awareness and understanding of how this disease affects lives and families.

There are three common forms of diabetes: type 1, which cannot be prevented; type 2, which can be prevented, or at least its onset can be delayed; and gestational diabetes. Type 1 diabetes typically develops because of an autoimmune complication. This type often goes undiagnosed until people are in their early 30s, and is more common in young people. It requires constant monitoring and the use of insulin to help regulate blood sugar levels. Type 2 diabetes usually develops in adults over 45 years of age but is on the rise in younger age groups. After six to 10 years, those diagnosed with type 2 diabetes are often required to use insulin daily due to the progression of the disease over time.

The late diagnosis for both types of diabetes has the potential to create life-threatening health problems for many people. Estimates show that almost 500,000 Australians are likely to already have type 2 diabetes, which goes unnoticed and undiagnosed, and may continue to go undiagnosed for another seven years. In Australia, the number of adults diagnosed with any form of diabetes continues to increase. Over the past year alone, more than 100,000 Australians have developed diabetes, and it is estimated that another two million are at high risk of developing type 2 diabetes.

On top of this, there were 16,400 deaths in Australia in 2015 alone as a result of this critical disease. International research indicates that type 2 diabetes can be prevented in up to 50 per cent of cases. Some studies have found that the progression of diabetes can be delayed by up to 60 per cent. Whilst there is much research and study being undertaken into a cure for this disease, at present there are short-term and medium-term prevention strategies that can be pursued. This includes simple lifestyle changes which can help in either preventing the escalation of diabetes or delaying its onset.

Two of the main considerations towards diabetes prevention and management are keeping a healthy weight and diet. This will involve ensuring some level of physical activity is maintained, with a well-rounded diet where possible, and to avoid smoking. These key points are the foundation of a healthier diabetic or diabetes-free lifestyle. In many cases, a healthy diet and some more exercise can help reverse the trend. Personally, I have been traveling on this trajectory. I was diagnosed as

prediabetic a number of years ago. Some six years ago the diagnosis became formalised so that I was classified as a type 2 diabetic. Last year, in accordance with the formula for the development of diabetes, I was advised that I would require insulin.

I made a decision with the help and support of my doctors, whose initial reaction was that insulin was my only option: I decided to change my eating and lifestyle habits to the extent that my sugar levels have now significantly reduced to an almost normal state. Resorting to insulin is not always necessary, as I and many others like myself have proved. Early diagnosis and person-centred care remain critical for optimal diabetes management—hence the focus for this year's National Diabetes Week campaign.

Early diagnosis is about medical professionals regularly testing patients' blood sugar levels as part of routine or general check-ups. Person-centred care is about education; it is about explaining to people the consequences of the disease and teaching them strategies to delay or prevent its onset. This is important, because it has to occur with the support of medical professionals.

Diabetes SA and Diabetes Australia play an important role in education and support on the growing trend of the disease in Australia. Both aim to raise awareness of the disease and the effect it has on daily life. Both organisations seek to promote further research and studies to help understand this disease which could one day lead to finding a cure. Their main focus still remains on promoting healthy and active lifestyle choices for the time being. While there is no single cause for type 2 diabetes, choosing healthier lifestyle options to decrease the risk factors can considerably reduce or prevent the effects of diabetes.

One in 11 South Australians over 18 have been told they have diabetes by the medical profession, one in 11. This is a phenomenal number, and we need to address the significance of this disease. The focus of National Diabetes Week this year is on early detection and prevention, and self-centred care. Research has demonstrated how critical these points are in sustaining a healthy community.

We should be concerned about the growing rate of this disease within our community and provide the right tool so that people are aware of the symptoms and the risk factors. Governments should be developing strategies to ensure that everyone is educated about diabetes. This means that schools teach children about the symptoms and effects of the disease and about how to prevent its early onset through healthy and active lifestyles.

It also means encouraging doctors to understand the early signs and to primarily promote disease deterrence and maintenance through diet and exercise. There is clearly a role for government in this area. The NGOs are carrying an enormous load in education, research and campaign work. Governments, along with medical professionals, will need to adopt a more coordinated and systemic approach to prevention and cure, giving those who are living with diabetes more freedom and control over their condition.

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

EDUCATION OUTCOMES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:13): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the significance of improving the quality of learner outcomes across the state;
2. Pays tribute to those whose teaching and learning practices lead to improved student engagement and achievement; and
3. Highlights the outstanding success of innovative teachings, such as those of Mr Eddy Woo—teacher and YouTube sensation.

Today, I rise to move the private members' motion standing in my name about the significant impact innovative teaching can have on the quality of learning experiences in South Australia. Education plays such an important role in today's society. It is about more than learning facts, it is about building interest in positive learning dispositions. It is about encouraging the youth of today to help them find their passion to make their mark on the world, and inspiring them to become creative and critical thinkers through our education system.

There could not be a more crucial time to inspire creative and critical thinkers than now, as South Australia embarks on its innovative future based on knowledge-intensive industries. We will require a highly skilled workforce, particularly in the fields of science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM). Ideally, these jobs will be made by South Australians for South Australians. Our future societal and economic prosperity relies on the measures we put in place today for the workforce of the future. To ensure this is the case, we need to invest today across sectors such as schools, tertiary institutions, government, industry and the community.

To encourage a highly skilled workforce, as a government we need to support our education sector to implement methods that excite the imagination of students for effective learning and engagement. Take, for example, space. As many can appreciate, space is an area that interests students at an early age. Many schools teach aeronautics to engage with students and encourage early engagement with STEM.

Hamilton Secondary College goes the extra step and is the only school in South Australia with a designated facility and specialist curriculum, taking the lead in space education. Their space centre has been designed to provide an immersive, hands-on learning experience, providing students with an exciting and unique educational experience. It sparks relevance in their learnings whilst encouraging the students' interests. It supports the students' abilities to become adaptive with problem-solving and builds upon their capabilities to learn.

If students are happy and feel good about themselves while learning, we are encouraging positive relations between their interests and education. Positive relations between interests and education assist youth to approach their life without the conceptions that are stereotypically in place both in the workforce or in the sense of their everyday living. Breaking down those misconceptions allows us to become creative thinkers and contribute in an innovative manner. The absence of a strong state education system places everything at risk.

Currently, the Marshall Liberal government is focusing on the transfer of year 7 students from primary school to high school. We know that this will accrue \$40 million to \$50 million a year of ongoing costs. We know that this will lead to more time when teachers are away from the classroom. At the same time, we are hearing of cuts to wellbeing practitioners and support services in public schools. It is important to question what impact these changes will have on the learning outcomes of the students.

A teacher's effectiveness has a powerful impact on students. Not only is the government removing time with teachers, it is not placing the importance of their critically important support service provided in schools that encourages the quality of learner outcomes across the state. The government should be supporting the education system with the resources they need to deliver the inspiration that our students deserve. Our education system requires resources that enables educators to work in a supportive and safe environment.

Now is the time to acknowledge that whilst NAPLAN is a way of measuring a particular set of skills, there are other effective methods to measure the quality of our education system. We need to be able to measure both how students are going in learning the facts, but also their ability to adapt what they are learning into creative and innovative skill sets. We need this so that as a government we can provide the supports to the education system that the educators, students and community are asking for.

Last month, I was fortunate enough to attend a forum led by Mr Eddie Woo. Many people know Mr Woo for his innovation and vitality in the classroom and particularly in relation to his maths teaching methodologies. In 2012, Mr Woo began posting videos online for a student who was sick with cancer and missing a lot of school. He did this because, for him, teaching is more than a source of joy: it is also a source of moral purpose. His postings quickly gathered a following and his Wootube channel now boasts more than 100,000 subscribers and has attracted more than nine million views worldwide and counting.

Mr Woo is a teacher whose innovative approach has managed to break the misconception that mathematics is an inaccessible and difficult subject. His approach brings mathematics back to its core, to highlight that it is about imagining new ways to see problems so that they can be solved with creative and unexpected techniques.

His impact has benefited so many, yet recognition of his approach and influence is unable to be measured through NAPLAN. None would argue that he is not an efficient teacher. However, there need to be methods implemented that take into account influences such as Mr Woo's so that the government can support educators to bring out the best in our students.

I note that the New South Wales government recognises the impact of innovative teaching. Just this year, Mr Woo was appointed as a New South Wales super teacher, which will see him train other educators to inspire students across their state. Put simply, the New South Wales government has recognised that not all things can be taught through a textbook alone and that his teaching methods are a type of resource that money simply cannot buy. During his forum Mr Woo raised that the last 18 months have been a powerful reminder of how important education truly is.

South Australia has always had a rich methodology in creative teaching. The Labor government recognised this and established a system of awards in 2011, which included the STEM Educators and Public Education Awards, just to mention two. We have our own Eddy Woos, we just need them to flourish and we must continue to recognise and acknowledge their endeavours.

Thierry Herman was the 2017 winner of the South Australian STEM Educator of the Year Award. His innovative methods with naval engineering allowed students to comprehend difficult physics and mathematical tasks in a way that applies them to their practical problems. His aim was to work alongside the students and teach them why they needed to learn these complex methodologies.

Another of our own is Tammy Cane, who won the latest award for Secondary Teacher of the Year. Her work at the Naracoorte High School aims to benefit the health and wellbeing of students, which has seen a great deal of success, more so than some other mainstream pathways, leading to higher attendance rates and SACE success. We currently live in an age where we receive more information than ever and yet we still have not learnt to appreciate our own points of view in comparison to those around us.

I have been reminded about the point I made earlier, that school is about so much more than learning facts. It is about encouraging the youth of today to help them find their passion to make their mark on the world and inspiring them to become creative and critical thinkers. Effective teachers are a source of inspiration and equally provide a dependable foundation for students as they grow to make choices about further education, work and life.

Many of our best practitioners are being overwhelmed and disenfranchised by the increased bureaucracy in teaching. We should recognise and pay tribute to those whose teaching and learning practices lead to improved student engagement and achievement, and acknowledge that to be able to improve the quality of learner outcomes across the state we need to support innovative teaching and our teachers.

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

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:23): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on strategies to ensure a strong and robust South Australian livestock industry should live animal exports be either banned or restricted, with particular reference to—
 - (a) the development of a plan to assist farmers and transporters who currently gain income from the live export trade in the event that the trade ceases or is restricted;
 - (b) exploring the capacity of the local meat processing industry to expand and create jobs in a changing industry;
 - (c) developing and strengthening overseas markets for Australian chilled and frozen products;
 - (d) exploring the quantum and scope of the assistance package required for South Australian farmers to make a positive transition should the trade cease or be restricted;
 - (e) ensuring that the South Australian livestock industry is best placed to capitalise on opportunities should live exports be banned; and

- (f) any related 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.

This motion reflects reasonably closely one that is in the other place at the moment. Labor members would be relatively familiar with the words and, in fact, it echoes their call in the other place for a select committee to look at the live export industry. While there the Labor Party has chosen to only focus on sheep, the Greens' motion today focuses on all live exports. We do so because we know that the live export select committee motion is currently stalled in that other place.

Here, just a week away from our winter break, when members will not be in these council chambers, we know that there is a long, hot summer to come. We also know that one certain thing about the live export industry is that it will continue to be controversial and it continues, time and time again, to show that it has failed to ensure its social licence.

I echo the words of the member for Croydon: 'we would like to see bipartisan support for this call'. Of course, here the Greens would like to see cross-party support for a call to investigate what the member for Croydon goes on to say:

We believe the time has come. There can no longer be justification for these sheep being packed on these ships and sent across the seas on these long voyages in significant heat stress. Their suffering cannot be ignored anymore but, as I have outlined, this is not just an animal welfare issue. There will be new economic growth opportunities created for our state by banning this archaic practice.

The member for Croydon goes on to say:

We can work closely with the industry. We can work closely with the graziers. The government has the capacity to develop a transition plan to work with them so that when the inevitable legislative ban takes effect we are best placed, best equipped, to be able to deal with that. More than that, more than just working with graziers to transition out of the trade, what we should be doing is working with abattoirs and other meat-processing facilities to ensure that we capitalise on the opportunity to expand the industry. If we sit back and wait for a ban to be instituted and do not act, we will have missed the boat—no pun intended. We would have missed the opportunity to capitalise on that ban.

With those words, I do agree with the member for Croydon. I note that the government in the other place has pointed to memories of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union in 1978 protesting the live export industry because of the loss of jobs to their industry. Recently, we saw the federal government award \$146 million to meatworkers in Vietnam to upskill them, when here in this country over many decades we have seen these workers put out of work.

I note also that representatives of the meatworkers union have stood side by side with vegans down at Port Adelaide, at the docks at Outer Harbor, protesting the live export industry. If we can get vegans and meatworkers standing side by side, I would hope that this parliament could see Labor and Liberal work together to ensure that we do transition out of the live export industry.

I say to members of this council that we will do the job if the other place cannot do it. The Greens stand ready, willing and able to effect a select committee, and I am sure other members of this council will, too. Rather than stall it while we go on our winter break and we hit that long hot summer, and rather than wait time and time again for small charities such as Animals Australia to expose the cruelty, which we know they will continue to do, we could act in this state to ensure that we have a just transition plan for animals, for workers and for farmers alike. We have the capacity to act here if the government will not take the initiative in the other place. I would urge members that we consider moving in this council to do the job that the government currently fails to do.

I note also that the government takes some comfort that the RSPCA will be able to effect some change on the cruelty we see in the live export industry. I note that the RSPCA's jurisdiction does not extend into those waters, but also the RSPCA and the Animal Welfare Act jurisdiction does not actually extend to prevention of cruelty. It is a failing of our current act that we cannot prevent

what we know to be cruelty to come. Expecting the RSPCA to work miracles with flawed legislation is not going to be the panacea that the Marshall government believes it will be. With those few words, if the vegans and the meatworkers can stand together, surely we can put aside our political differences to ensure our state transitions out of this cruel industry.

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

Bills

PUBLIC SECTOR (FUNCTIONS AND RESOURCES AUDIT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:29): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Public Sector Act 2009. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:30): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is very similar to the bill that I introduced into this place about a year ago and introduces a requirement for ministers to undertake an operational audit of the departments and agencies they are responsible for. An operational audit will require a review into all activities of the department and the resources needed to undertake these functions. That is to say that the minister will need to identify each and every activity performed within the agency and ask three questions: (1) is the activity still required and relevant today; (2) is the activity performed in the most efficient manner; and (3) is the activity being performed in the most effective location?

By undertaking such an audit, budgetary savings or departmental deficiencies will be identified. Acting on these findings will streamline the Public Service and, by consequence, reduce red tape. The bill requires an operational audit to be conducted every four years. There are rumours circulating about suspected efficiency dividends that the new government will be announcing as part of their first budget.

As a general rule, blanket efficiency and savings dividends are ineffective because they often result in top-heavy departments with fewer resources where they are most needed; that is, many departments have too many executive and management-level staff and front line resources are often lacking. It is much more effective to conduct an operational audit to ensure that the services that are meant to be delivered can be delivered in the most efficient and effective way. I commend the bill to members.

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

SINGLE USE AND OTHER PLASTICS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:32): Introduced a bill for an act to regulate the sale and supply of single use and other plastics and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

There is an unfolding environmental disaster looming that has been upon us for a number of decades, but it is getting worse, year by year. I refer to the environmental disaster that is brought about by the profligate use of single-use plastic items. It is impossible to go to a beach or a river or, in fact, to go anywhere out in the environment without coming across plastic waste that has its origins in single-use items. We are talking about the lids on plastic coffee cups, straws, little stirrers so that your sugar dissolves in your coffee, plastic plates, cups and other plastic crockery and cutlery. Even those little cotton buds where we think, 'Cotton, that's a natural product,' but the sticks are made of plastic and they end up in the marine environment.

Unless you are living on another planet, Mr President, you cannot fail to know that these single-use plastic items end up in the insides of turtles, birds, whales and other marine creatures, and they are killing millions upon millions of these creatures around the world every day. Welcome to single-use plastic. But there is a better way. There is no doubting the convenience of the throwaway society. There is no doubting the convenience of not having to wash something, but that convenience comes at a terrible price, and the price is largely being borne by our environment and wildlife and, in particular, our marine wildlife.

I have just a few facts and figures. Everyone knows that plastics are made from a non-renewable resource—crude oil, gas, coal. When we have Clean Up Australia Day—I know many members participate in it—plastic items make up about 29 per cent of all the rubbish that is collected. Members also know that these plastic items never break down; they just get smaller and they stay in the environment. If you eat fish, you are eating plastic. Plastic in the ocean is responsible directly for killing hundreds of thousands of turtles, penguins and dolphins; in fact, it is millions globally every year, so we know it is a problem.

The idea of banning single-use throwaway plastic is not new. Certainly in the Greens, it has been our policy for years, and my colleagues in other states have introduced similar bills. It is also gaining a lot of traction overseas. For example, the European Union is looking at banning single-use plastic products. In fact, I asked parliamentary counsel to have a look at what the EU is doing. My bill is largely based on their initiatives. The EU ban list includes cotton buds, cutlery, plates, straws, drinking stirrers and the sticks that come with balloons. There are other countries outside the EU that are introducing similar bans; in fact, most jurisdictions are mounting some level of war on plastic, some more successful than others.

To pick out a couple of examples: if we take Taiwan, they have already got onto banning single-use plastic bags, straws utensils and cups. In Zimbabwe, their target has been expanded polystyrene foam. The Californian city of Malibu has banned straws, stirrers and plastic cutlery. That has come into effect recently. In Seattle in the US, they were the first city to ban plastic straws along with single-use plastic utensils under the snappy title 'Strawless In Seattle'. I quite like that one. There are plenty of other countries that are doing it as well.

This is nothing new; in fact, it is nothing new to South Australians because this is an area where South Australians have claimed the moral high ground over many years. Everyone knows that South Australians are proud of our container deposit legislation. Maybe not all of us, but most of us might have watched *War on Waste* on the ABC last night, and we could see the plastic bottles floating in the Yarra River. I bet you, in lounge rooms around South Australia, people are saying, 'Jeez, it doesn't look like that in the Torrens, not at 10¢ a bottle. Someone's going to fish it out to get the deposit.' South Australians have been leaders, certainly in container deposit legislation.

The plastic bag ban—the sky was going to fall in. How will civilisation survive the ban on plastic bags? Now we are used to it. We take our reusable bags to the supermarket; it is second nature. We also know that there are small things happening in the corporate world and in local government. For example, Woolworths announced recently that they are going to stop selling plastic straws; 134 million plastic straws each year they are not going to sell. We have McDonald's, apparently. I have not been into a McDonald's since the early 1980s, but I am told that they use a lot of straws, and they are going to phase out plastic straws by 2020. We have had music festivals—WOMAD and others—that have gone to compostable plates and other eating utensils over many years. So these things are happening. I was not at the meeting, but last night apparently the Adelaide city council banned plastic straws from their outdoor events in the Parklands.

But, it is actually not enough just to wait for individual, small initiatives to achieve what we know needs to be done. I have modified this bill slightly. Originally I thought two years might be a good period of time to allow people to run down their stocks of plastic straws and plates and things. We then had a Senate inquiry which basically suggested that five years might be an appropriate time frame, so I put five years into my bill.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: The Hon. Ian Hunter believes it lacks ambition. Honestly, what we are talking about is a transition. The way that I have crafted this bill is that there is a transition.

Starting from when the bill, if it was enacted, comes into operation, the first thing that food sellers need to do is start to offer alternatives and let it be known that there are alternatives so that, if people can ask for alternatives, they can be provided. The food place can charge for the alternative and say, 'Here's the single-use plastic or you can pay a bit more and we will give you the reusable plastic or the compostable.' I am happy to let them even charge for it. But in five years' time, we need to have bitten the bullet and we need to have said, 'No more single-use plastics. They are causing too much harm to the environment. We've got to get away from them.' My feeling will be that the same cultural shift that occurred with plastic bags in supermarkets will occur in this space as well.

The bill includes a couple of other initiatives. There are certainly items that do end up in the waste stream in the marine environment in particular. Fishing tackle is part of that. Personal care items are another. Do not fear, the Greens are not about to ban fishing. But what we do think is appropriate is for disposal instructions to be part of the label for fishing gear. You only have to look on the beach and see the dead birds and other creatures wrapped up in fishing line. Some of it is inherent in the nature of fishing and some of it will be difficult to avoid, but honestly there are a lot of people who are just disposing thoughtlessly of fishing tackle in the marine environment where it causes huge harm.

One that I know has been controversial, but I think is the right thing to do, is helium-filled balloons released into the environment. We have all been to various festivals. Maybe it is after a church service remembering people who have died in certain circumstances. I remember at the workplace death service that we have every year they used to release balloons. They decided not to continue doing that once they realised what harm they are causing to the marine environment. They release doves now instead, which then fly home their dovecote and can be reused the following year.

People think balloons are rubber and they biodegrade. No, they are made of plastic these days and they do not biodegrade. They end up inside turtles and dolphins and other marine life. It is not to say that if you want a helium-filled balloon for your birthday party indoors, that is fine, but the deliberate release of balloons in the environment is an activity that has had its day. It gives a very small amount of pleasure and a great deal of pain.

I urge members to have a good look at this bill and to look at the detail that is in it. I have not gone through everything that is in there, but it is a very worthwhile piece of legislation. Like the Senate multi-party inquiry recommended, Australia as a whole needs to do this within five years. Why do we not take the initiative in South Australia and be the first state to legislate for a ban on single-use plastics?

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

CIVIL LIABILITY (BYO CONTAINERS-WASTE AVOIDANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:43): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 1936.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The decision by the On The Run chain of petrol stations and convenience stores to ban their employees from filling reusable coffee cups that the customers have brought in caused outrage, I think it is fair to say, in the community. Most people's reaction was, 'What on earth are they doing?', given that most of the coffee shops that people go to are actually moving in entirely the opposite direction. In fact, I went to a coffee shop the other day and not only were they more than happy to refill my reusable coffee cup but they gave me a dollar off as well.

That is not an isolated example. All over South Australia cafes are encouraging people to bring their own cup, and the environmental benefit is clear to everyone. There are millions upon millions of disposable coffee cups discarded every day in South Australia—millions of them. One figure I saw was that it was multiple millions per day in Australia. I thought: that cannot be right. But,

you think about it: people having a coffee, maybe on the way to work—there are a lot of people drinking takeaway coffee and nearly all of those people are using disposable coffee cups.

So the On the Run decision is one that has spurred many people into action, and not the least me. I did hear that On the Run was reviewing its policy, but it is something I have come across many times before. On an Amtrak long distance train in America I took my Australian KeepCup to the buffet car and asked whether I could have a coffee. I do not know why; American coffee is just awful. Why would I want an American coffee? The person politely said, 'Well, we're not allowed to fill your cup.' I said, 'Well, why?' 'Well, it's company policy.' I said, 'Look, it's clean; it's a fresh, clean cup. I'm happy, if anything goes wrong, to take responsibility myself.' In the end, the only compromise was that she said, 'I can put the coffee in one of our cups and then you can pour it into yours,' which I thought rather defeated the purpose because there was still going to be a coffee cup in the rubbish bin that did not need to be there.

This bill is a very simple measure that is not at all radical. It is, in fact, very simple and is based on a law that this parliament has already passed. People are wondering what is an amendment to the Civil Liability Act 1936, which most people have never heard of. It used to be known as the Wrongs Act, but it is basically an act that sets out arrangements by which people can sue each other for things that go wrong.

Eight years ago, I think it was, this parliament was keen to encourage supermarkets, greengrocers and others to donate excess food to food charities. Those who were here remember that we had that debate. The issue was that some of the supermarkets and food sellers were nervous that they would be sued if something went wrong.

This parliament, in its wisdom, basically passed an amendment to the Civil Liability Act which says, 'Look, if the food was in good nick when it left the premises, and someone else mishandles it and it becomes unfit, that's not the fault of the donor—that's the fault of the people who are handling it.' So we passed a limitation of liability clause to help the food charities. As a result, we have OzHarvest and Foodbank and they have done a remarkable job and they are feeding people and helping out people who absolutely need it.

That act was reviewed after two years—you know, we often put in the two-year review clause. Guess what! Not a single problem has arisen in any of those food charities related to food contamination. I say that it was a genuine fear—they expressed it, so I guess it was genuine.

That brings us to bring-your-own coffee cups and other food containers. When you look at the media recently, Woolworths has been in the news because there have been some mixed messages around whether they would allow people to bring their own containers to buy food. What people are talking about is, say, at the butcher's section, if you wanted to buy a dozen sausages. At present it would be in a plastic bag and then it would be wrapped in paper or whatever. What if you brought along your own Tupperware container or your own reusable glass container and said, 'Put my sausages in there, thanks'?

This was the debate that was happening. Woolworths originally said they would not have a bar of it and then they came out saying that they are not ruling out customers being able to do it. Only two issues have been raised, and I will deal with those. This bill deals with one, but does not deal with the other.

The two issues are: public safety and health issues—that is what this bill deals with—and the second issue is operational. 'Operational' is really a euphemism for 'it might take our staff a few minutes extra to weigh the container', because you want to pay for the net value of the food. You do not want to take a big glass container that weighs a lot and buy something that is very light and be charged for the container as well.

These things are all able to be dealt with. It is not that hard to weigh the container and then deduct that value from the weight of the container when it is full; it is pretty simple to do. But, the food liability issue is one that I think we can and should deal with here. This bill is so simple. It just says: if you bring your own container for food, and if you die or get sick, it is on your own head; it is not the fault of the food seller.

The exception would be that if the food seller knew the food was no good—if they knew it was not fit for human consumption—they cannot have a special stock of bad prawns up the back, waiting to sell them to the Tupperware containers. That is not going to wash. If the food was okay and you have used your own container and something goes wrong, it is on your head. Secondly, if the food was subject to a recall, obviously you cannot put that into people's containers and avoid liability. But those things are pretty remote.

In the overwhelming number of cases, people will safely take their washed permanent container to the greengrocer, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick—not the candlestick maker; you do not eat candles—and they should be able to get them to fill it. I will say at the outset, this bill does not require companies to adopt this practice. If a company wants to say, 'No, we are not going to refill your containers,' then this bill does not make them do it. That might be another bill for another day, but it is not this bill for this day.

Today, I am just looking at limiting the liability, and I think it is a very sensible measure. It deals with the concerns that On the Run had and it deals with the main concern of Woolworths and other food sellers. It is a very sensible measure and I would urge all honourable members to get behind it.

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

Motions

GREAT AUSTRALIAN BIGHT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.C. Parnell:

That this council—

1. Notes that proposals to drill for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight pose enormous risks to the marine environment, the fishing industry and tourism in South Australia; and
2. Calls on the state government to work with the federal government to seek listing under the World Heritage Convention of the waters, seabed and coastline of the Great Australian Bight as a matter of urgency.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:51): I rise to speak briefly, given the hour, in support of this important motion put forward by my colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell. It is clear in our communities that there is no social licence for oil and gas drilling in the Bight, and these proposals pose a clear threat to tourism and fishing industry alike, coastal communities and marine life.

The Great Australian Bight is a unique natural wonder, with more than 36 species of whales and dolphins, and more marine diversity than the Great Barrier Reef. 85 per cent of species found here are not found anywhere else on earth. With applications for drilling and testing for oil and gas in the Bight not showing any signs of going away or stopping, it is vital that we come together and protect one of our most precious natural places in South Australia.

While BP and Chevron previously abandoned their plans to drill in the Bight, BP still owns two of the four offshore leases currently in that area, and passed the other two off to Statoil last year. BP's own modelling has shown us that a major spill would pollute up to 750 kilometres of our beaches and shoreline. Moreover, even standard drilling could affect the migration patterns of the engaged southern right whale, and the Great Australian Bight is one of the world's most important nurseries for these whales.

Arguments have been made in the past that sections of the Great Australian Parks are already protected as marine conservation parks, but proposals and plans to drill still exist, and an oil spill does not recognise such boundaries. With the world and global economy moving towards sourcing energy from renewables, on top of the risks that have been explored in this and other speeches on this bill, the risks clearly outweigh any potential reward.

Drilling for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight makes no sense, either from an environmental or an economic standpoint. Let us not just prevent it from happening now, but let's make sure it can never happen into the future. State and federal governments must work together

and seek world heritage listing for our Bight. This is critical, because without this cooperation, we will not be able to achieve that world heritage listing. This listing would be good for tourism, good for jobs, good for the Bight and good for South Australia.

Labor and Liberal state governments in the past have supported a push for world heritage listing before watering down their commitments by 1996 to a marine conservation park status. The Greens are going back to the future by asking them to get on board with this campaign and support this motion, so that the Great Australian Bight has a future, and make a submission to the federal government so that we can get this process underway.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:54): I rise to speak in support of the motion. The timing of this motion could not be more fitting, given today's front page story in *The Advertiser* with the headline, 'SA's Bight at 50-year oil boom'.

The story, originating from a speech by the oil and gas industry's mouthpiece the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association (APPEA) at an industry conference in Adelaide yesterday, espoused the potential 50-year economic stimulus oil and gas production in this pristine marine wonderland would provide to the South Australian economy if it were allowed. In the story APPEA's SA and NT director, Matthew Doman, said drilling in the Bight was 'the big opportunity' for the oil and gas sector in South Australia. He went further, saying that the industry was committed to winning over community support despite fierce opposition to drilling in the Great Australian Bight.

Well, some of the fiercest opposition comes from SA-Best, and today we applaud the Greens for their campaign to give the Great Australian Bight world heritage protection. The Bight has long been described by the Wilderness Society as a 'place of unparalleled natural beauty', a playground to more than 36 species of whales and dolphins and home to more marine diversity than the Great Barrier Reef.

Coastal communities across South Australia depend on the Bight's natural resources and environmental value for their quality of life and, in many instances, their livelihoods. The fishing and tourism industries are the backbones of many South Australian coastal towns, which my federal colleague Rebekha Sharkie, the candidate for Mayo, an electorate that takes in the pristine coastal regions of Victor Harbor and Kangaroo Island, knows only too well. Yet all this is at risk if deep-sea oil drilling in the Bight goes ahead. Mayo's coastal communities would be amongst the hardest hit if oil spilled in the pristine bight.

BP withdrew its plans to drill in October 2016 but said that the Bight remained a potential site for drilling. Its own environmental modelling indicates that the consequences of an oil spill would be catastrophic, and any oil slick would spread hundreds of kilometres in all directions, polluting up to 750 kilometres of beaches and shoreline. Further, the oil and gas monolith's own documents reveal its drilling might impact the migration of the endangered southern right whale.

The local fishing industry, the local tourism and hospitality industry—you name it—would be badly affected, if not wiped out, for years. The environmental damage would be disastrous. We simply cannot risk deep-sea drilling in the Bight. SA-Best knows this, our Centre Alliance colleague Rebekha Sharkie knows this, and her community of Mayo knows this. We wish her every success in the Mayo by-election this weekend, and hope the voters of Mayo allow her to continue providing a strong and independent voice for residents and businesses in the electorate.

I would also like to pay tribute to Kangaroo Island's mayor Peter Clements for his strong stand on protecting the Bight. You may recall that in May Peter attended the annual general meeting of Statoil in Norway to press the case for his and the six other councils in the region of the Bight that are opposed to drilling. Interestingly, at the same meeting the company changed its name to Equinor, removing the oil reference. We wonder why.

Let me quote some of the message Peter delivered that day:

I understand that oil companies like Statoil will have certain tolerances to the risks and impacts of their activities. However, we wish to be clear to you that the community of southern Australia has no tolerance for those risks or the inevitable impacts of petroleum industrialisation in the bight. For us, any risk presents an existential threat to our businesses, our industries, our environment and our communities.

Statoil's position as a socially responsible global entity is well understood. BP has withdrawn its plans to drill our bight. Chevron has withdrawn its plans to drill our bight. I am asking you to do the same—withdraw your plans to drill our bight.

Lastly, I want to ask you, as a responsible company: are you really prepared to drill the Great Australian Bight against our local community's express wishes, and what else do you need to hear from me and the people of South Australia to convince you to assess your petroleum exploration plans in the Great Australian Bight?

Peter told me recently that his message was actually well received by the big oil executives. In fact, I understand the Port Lincoln council, one of the seven, has since been told by the company that they do not proceed with projects if they do not have a social licence to do so. Well, I cannot see one being issued here. I note that there will be a community forum in Port Lincoln on this matter on 13 August.

The major parties need to support long-term protection of the Bight. Despite APPEA pushing the oil and gas industry's strong environmental credentials in Australia, as a nation we simply cannot give the green light to drilling in one of the world's most pristine marine environments. The country cannot risk a devastating spill like the Gulf of Mexico on 22 April 2010—the largest ever accidental marine oil spill in history.

That spill was caused by an explosion at Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the gulf, releasing an estimated 4.9 million barrels of crude oil into the sea. Oil gushed continuously over 85 days, leaving over 920 kilometres of shoreline along five American states drenched with oil, killing thousands of marine mammals and sea turtles and contaminating their habitats. Research indicates that populations of several marine mammal and sea turtle species will take decades to rebound following steep declines in populations and habitat destruction in the gulf.

Eight years on, BP is still counting the financial cost of the disaster, currently standing at more than \$65 billion as compensation payouts draw to a close, but much higher than the \$61.6 billion the company estimated in 2016. For BP, that financial pain has been softened by increases in crude oil prices, but nothing will ever fix the irreparable damage caused to the environment or the impact the disaster has had on everyone from a local fisherman to tourism operators and other businesses.

For those reasons, SA-Best supports this motion, calling on the state government to work with the federal government to seek world heritage listing for the Great Australian Bight. The federal government has stated that it has not received any formal proposal to commence world heritage listing for the Bight, and further stated that any proposal that is advanced needs to have the support of local communities and relevant state governments. A recent Australia Institute poll shows that 74 per cent of Mayo residents want world heritage listing for the Great Australian Bight, so it already has overwhelming, strong community licence. It is now incumbent upon the Marshall government to advance the matter on behalf of the people of Mayo and all South Australians.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (18:02): I rise to speak to this motion and to the amendment that has been circulated in my name. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraph 1 and insert in its place the following:

1. Notes that the Great Australian Bight (GAB) is an area of significant importance for many marine species, including southern right whales and blue whales;
2. Notes that South Australia's clean waters are home to some of the world's most sought after seafood, including rock lobster, tuna, oysters and prawns;
3. Notes that the protection of our aquatic environment through our environmental monitoring, aquatic animal health programs and strict zoning requirements ensures South Australian seafood retains a high standard of environmental credentials;
4. Notes that the commonwealth government is the decision-making authority in relation to oil and gas mining activities in the Great Australian Bight;
5. Notes that the commonwealth government has issued the current exploration permits and the approval process is overseen by the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Agency (NOPSEMA);

- 6. Notes that any negative impacts of oil and gas exploration in the pristine waters of the Great Australian Bight are unacceptable and South Australia recognises the risk that any potential environmental incident may have on our coastline, our tourism industry and our fishing industry.

Renumber paragraph 2 to be paragraph 7.

In moving the amendment I want to congratulate the Hon. Mr Parnell for moving his motion. My amendment purely seeks to put a little bit more detail into the text of the motion. I do it because I think it is important to put on the record our understanding of the complicated environmental and economic interactions inherent in human activity into the Bight. It is a significant environmental asset for many, many species and it is also therefore a significant economic asset for our state in relation to the many species of economic importance.

South Australia's clean waters are home to some of the world's most sought after seafood including rock lobster, tuna, oysters and prawns. The protection of our aquatic environment through our environmental monitoring, our aquatic animal health programs and strict zoning requirements ensures that South Australian seafood retains a high standard of environmental credentials. In 2016-17 South Australia's fisheries and aquaculture sectors produced about 67,000 tonnes of seafood, generating revenue of \$908 million for our state.

Our agriculture, our food and beverage and seafood industries are a vital part of our state's economy. They are our largest export sector and they are a major employer in our state. They are therefore a central part of our prosperity and our identity. The increasing global demand for premium products that are safely and sustainably produced has created an opportunity for our primary industries and our food manufacturing businesses to expand their markets and continue to grow. In 2016-17 our agriculture, food and beverage and seafood industries generated a record \$19.97 billion in revenue, an increase of about \$1.3 billion over the previous year.

Labor has not and will not support any exploration in the Great Australian Bight that would risk our reputation as a producer of clean, safe and sustainably produced food. We acknowledge that the commonwealth government is the decision-making authority in relation to oil and gas mining activities in the Bight and the commonwealth government has issued the current exploration permits and the approval process is overseen by the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Agency (NOPSEMA), as my amendment details.

Labor will continue to push for the strictest standards through the National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator, the joint authority, ensuring that companies adhere to the most stringent environmental protections, and we will do that when we talk to the companies when they come to our state to talk to us, as they have done with many honourable members in this chamber.

For us, the Great Australian Bight is of significant importance, not just for the marine species that I have mentioned, including the southern right whales and blue whales, but also for those commercial species that are so important to this state's prosperity. It is a very important part of why we instituted the conservation programs that we did, particularly the state government's establishment of the state's 19 marine parks, nine of which I think are in the Bight area.

Any negative impacts of oil and gas exploration in these pristine waters of the Great Australian Bight are unacceptable. We recognise the risk that any potential environmental incident may have on our coastline, our tourism industry and our fishing industry, and we acknowledge the serious concerns being expressed by our South Australian community.

That is why I am moving the amendment, to put all of those facts on the record, and that is why the Labor opposition will support the amended motion. The opposition understands the incredible importance of the Bight to our state's economy and to our environment and to our citizens. Again, I commend the Hon. Mr Parnell for bringing this matter forward.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (18:08): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes..... 8
 Noes 11

Majority..... 3

AYES

Darley, J.A.	Dawkins, J.S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.
Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)	Lucas, R.I.
Stephens, T.J.	Wade, S.G.	

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Franks, T.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Ngo, T.T.
Pangallo, F.	Parnell, M.C. (teller)	Pnevmatikos, I.
Scriven, C.M.	Wortley, R.P.	

PAIRS

Ridgway, D.W.	Maher, K.J.
---------------	-------------

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Liberal Party opposed continuing debate on those particular amendments of the Labor Party because we wished to consider them. They were dropped in this chamber. I do not think either the Minister for Environment or the Minister for Mining and Energy were made aware of those, and I am not sure whether the whips were, but it is fundamentally bad practice. I note, however, that other parties as well have enabled this practice to go forward. I hope that it is not something that we will consider into the future as a particularly good practice, because I consider it disrespectful to honourable members to enable these things to happen, particularly without consultation.

The Liberal Party opposes the original motion as it has been moved, and I will explain my reasons therefore. The Labor amendments to this motion improve it, and we are supporting those. However, we cannot support the original paragraph 2. I suspect that were the Labor Party in government they would also support paragraph 2, but it is interesting how these things change; how they change their spots and how this motion is conveniently being forced through this place before the Mayo by-election.

However, the new government is committed to the protection and restoration of the environment through our environmental policies and a commitment to practical environmentalism. We want to restore, protect and enhance our natural and built environment. The Liberal Party is focused on delivering improved environmental outcomes, not empty symbolism or token gestures, but real lasting results that the people of South Australia can see and experience.

As a party, we want to see stringent conditions in place for development in sensitive areas that ensure environmental protection but also allow ecologically sensitive development that creates economic benefit and employment. The South Australian coastline and waters of the Great Australian Bight are of great ecological significance, providing habitat for many protected species, most notably the nationally endangered southern right whale, which congregates in large numbers at the Head of Bight every year to give birth and rear calves.

Oil exploration companies in the Great Australian Bight—Statoil, Chevron, Murphy and Santos—all hold current commonwealth exploration permits for petroleum in the Great Australian Bight. The tenements are somewhere between 200 and 400 kilometres off the South Australian coast. The National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA) is responsible for assessing any proposal in commonwealth waters. South Australia has no statutory role in the approval process; however, a number of South Australian departments are considered relevant organisations, and proponents must undertake meaningful consultation and address all concerns.

All petroleum exploration permits in the Great Australian Bight are in commonwealth waters, with the state national park not permitting mining access. Australia has recently been elected to the World Heritage Committee for a four-year term, to 2022, and has agreed, as part of its nomination, to not submit any world heritage nominations during this time. All mining exploration in the Great Australian Bight is regulated by NOPSEMA, in line with strict processes for approval. Ultimately, NOPSEMA is the appropriate body to decide whether the impacts of a proponent are as low as reasonably practical and acceptable. There are already numerous protected areas within the Great Australian Bight region immediately adjacent on the land, such as the Nullarbor Wilderness Protection Area, and in state and commonwealth waters.

South Australia's Great Australian Bight Marine National Park extends eastward from the West Australian border, and the Far West Coast Marine Park complements and overlays much of this national park. The Great Australian Bight Commonwealth Marine Reserve covers a vast area of ocean under commonwealth control. This is a level of protection already in place. The federal government is responsible for submitting world heritage nominations to UNESCO, and the state government should not support nominations that are merely an instrument to stop development that is already regulated. No assessment has been undertaken to date of whether the Great Australian Bight would even meet the world heritage criteria. With those remarks, I have indicated our position on this motion.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (18:17): I will sum up very briefly, given the hour. First of all, I thank the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Ian Hunter and the Hon. Michelle Lensink for speaking. In relation to the Hon. Michelle Lensink's issue with late-breaking amendments, I would point out that I have been with her on that debate very often. However, this is a motion, not a late-breaking amendment to a bill. All of the amendments commenced with the word 'notes'. The action item has not changed. The action item is: 'We as a state are going to join and call on the federal government to try to get this world heritage thing happening.'

All that the amendments did was set out what I thought were some indisputable facts that relate to the area. So I cannot see that there was any great harm done in that. As the Hon. Michelle Lensink said, they were going to oppose the original action item anyway, which was to call on the state government to work with the federal government to seek world heritage listing. So no harm has been done. I just wanted to put that on the record. Given the numbers, it looks like this motion will pass. I am very grateful for that, and I will finish with this line: the only people who should be drilling in our Bight are dentists.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

BEEKEEPING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.A. Darley:

That the regulations made under the Livestock Act 1997 concerning beekeeping made on 19 December 2017 and laid on the table of this council on 3 May 2018 be disallowed.

(Continued from 20 June 2018)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (18:22): I rise to indicate that I will be withdrawing my motion of disallowance and I want to put on the record the motivation behind the motion. Recently, a number of changes to beekeeping have been made as a result of a national code of practice being introduced. This code has been in the making for a number of years and industry stakeholders finally reached agreement last year. However, there were concerns raised by some within the industry about certain elements of the code, with some criticising the consultation which occurred.

One of the main issues of concern with the new code of practice and the regulations which underpin the code was the manner in which PIRSA was going to regulate and administer the act. As many members will know, it is often not the rules which are the problem, it is the manner in which they are interpreted and enforced that can cause a problem. What was important for me was to receive an undertaking from the minister and the department that these new requirements would be enforced in a cooperative manner, with an emphasis on assisting and educating beekeepers rather than imposing punitive punishment.

I understand penalties are required in order to address those who continually do the wrong thing; however, minor indiscretions should be dealt with by way of education and a warning. As such, I was heartened to receive a letter from Scott Ashby, Chief Executive, PIRSA, advising that, and I quote:

PIRSA intends to work closely with the industry to support and educate apiarists, rather than merely prosecute those that don't conform immediately to the new regulations. To support this approach a Bee Biosecurity Officer has been employed to work with industry on the new arrangements. This position is jointly funded by industry and PIRSA. Apiarists will not be penalised for minor breaches of the regulations. Proactive education in collaboration with industry is our preferred approach.

This is very encouraging, and there should be no doubt who will be the first to speak out if this is found not to be the case. I want to thank the minister, his staff and the department for assisting with this issue. A round table was held a few weeks ago with stakeholders and the department to discuss some of the issues. Whilst there was no consensus at the conclusion of the meeting, I believe it was helpful to ensure that all sides were heard and understood. I seek leave to withdraw the motion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

Bills

INFRASTRUCTURE SA BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The quality of a society's infrastructure is critical to its economic and social vitality. Sound investment in infrastructure can boost the productive potential of the economy and the growth of exports. The key to achieving this is long term infrastructure planning that is robust and transparent.

Whether it's growing our economy, building our schools, hospitals and roads, protecting our environment, or enhancing our cultural and sporting facilities, we must plan and provide for the long term.

This bill will establish an independent body, to be called Infrastructure SA that will develop a long-term State Infrastructure Strategy and ongoing infrastructure plans which prioritise major projects.

The establishment of Infrastructure SA is not meant to absolve ministers and their agencies of their obligations to plan, own, operate and deliver good infrastructure. Rather, it will provide an assurance role, ensuring that business cases for major infrastructure projects are sound and that they are considered in the context of an integrated long term State Infrastructure Strategy. As part of its assurance role, Infrastructure SA will have the capacity to provide advice to government on unsolicited infrastructure proposals.

Critical to the success of Infrastructure SA will be its ability to maintain its independence and ensure that we take the politics out of infrastructure planning and development. This bill proposes to appoint an independent Infrastructure SA board to oversee the development and implementation of the State Infrastructure Strategy.

The Infrastructure SA board will combine the expertise of the public and private sectors in developing our major infrastructure plans for the future. The board will be free to speak out when it disagrees with the infrastructure decisions made by government.

The board will be led by a suitably eminent and experienced independent chair and three independent, non-executive directors with industry experience and relevant qualifications. These members will be selected on the basis of experience, insight and good standing.

The board will also include chief executives of core agencies – The Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Treasury and Finance and the current Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure – as ex-officio members.

The weighting of private to public sector members is balanced to ensure that the objectivity and independence of the Infrastructure SA board is maintained, but that Infrastructure SA remains connected and relevant to government decisions.

Since its introduction in the other place, the Bill has been amended by the Government to address concerns from industry for Infrastructure SA to have the specific power to disclose confidential information if the public benefit outweighs the detriment. The Bill has removed this power.

I look forward to support in both places for an initiative that is critical for underpinning the State's future.

I commend the bill to members and I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause contains the definitions of words and phrases necessary for the interpretation of this measure. In particular, a *major infrastructure project* and *capital investment value* of a project are given defined meanings. A *major infrastructure project* is—

- a project to provide infrastructure that has a capital investment value of \$50 million or more or, if some other amount (whether greater or smaller) is prescribed by regulation for the purposes of this definition, that other amount; or
- a project, or a project of a class, to provide infrastructure that is determined by the Minister to be a project, or project of a class, requiring oversight or coordination by Infrastructure SA.

The *capital investment value* of a project includes all costs necessary to establish the project, including design, construction and land costs (but not including GST).

Part 2—Infrastructure SA

Division 1—Establishment

4—Establishment of Infrastructure SA

This clause provides for the establishment of Infrastructure SA (*ISA*) as a body corporate.

5—Objects and functions

This clause provides for the objects and functions of ISA. The objects of ISA are—

- to promote such efficient, effective and timely coordination, planning, prioritisation, delivery and operation of infrastructure as is necessary for the economic, social or environmental benefit of the State; and
- to promote the adoption and use of policies, practices, information and analysis to support sound decision-making in relation to infrastructure.

ISA is given the following functions to further its objects:

- (a) to provide the Minister with the strategies, statements and plans in accordance with Part 3 of this measure;
- (b) to review and evaluate proposals for major infrastructure projects by public sector agencies;
- (c) to assess the risks involved in planning, funding, delivering and managing infrastructure, and the management of those risks;
- (d) to monitor the delivery of—
 - major infrastructure projects and other infrastructure projects identified in strategies, statements or plans adopted by the Minister under Part 3 of this measure; and
 - any other infrastructure project at the request of the Minister;
- (e) to carry out reviews of—
 - completed major infrastructure projects; and

- any other completed infrastructure project at the request of the Minister;
- (f) to provide advice to the Minister—
- in respect of infrastructure submissions that may be made by the State and its agencies to the Commonwealth Government and other bodies; and
 - on appropriate funding and financing models for infrastructure; and
 - on economic or regulatory impediments to—(A)the efficient delivery of particular infrastructure projects or infrastructure projects of a particular class; or(B)the efficient use of infrastructure; and
 - on any other matter relating to infrastructure referred by the Minister;
- (g) to administer this measure;
- (h) to perform any other function conferred on ISA under this measure or an Act;
- (i) to do anything incidental to any of the preceding functions.

6—Powers

This clause provides that ISA has all the powers of a natural person.

7—Statement of Expectations

This clause provides that the Minister must, after consultation with ISA, prepare a statement setting out the Minister's expectations in relation to the operations and performance of ISA. Such a statement may be reviewed and amended at any time after consultation with ISA.

8—Independence

This clause states that except as provided, ISA is not subject to Ministerial direction in the performance of its functions.

9—Infrastructure SA may publish statements, reports and guidelines

This clause provides that ISA may publish statements, reports and guidelines relating to the performance of its functions.

Division 2—Board

10—Board of Infrastructure SA

This clause provides for the establishment of a board of directors as the governing body of ISA.

The board will consist of 7 members, of whom 4 will be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister and the others who will be the Chief Executives ex officio—

- of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet;
- of the Department of Treasury and Finance;
- of the administrative unit of the Public Service that is responsible for assisting a Minister in the administration of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.

There is a requirement that the members of the board must, collectively, have the necessary qualifications, expertise and experience to carry out the functions of ISA.

11—Conditions of membership

This clause provides that the appointed members will be appointed on conditions determined by the Governor for a term not exceeding 5 years specified in the instrument of appointment. The usual provisions relating to the removal of vacancy of membership apply.

12—Remuneration

This clause provides that an appointed member of the board will be entitled to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor.

13—Meetings etc of board

This clause makes provision for the board's meetings, proceedings, quorum, etc, in the usual terms.

14—Validity of acts

This clause provides that an act or proceeding of the board is not invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a member.

Division 3—Related matters

15—Delegations

This clause sets out a power for ISA to delegate its functions or powers to a particular person or body, or to the person for the time being occupying a particular office or position, and makes provision for a delegation to be further delegated if the instrument of delegation so allows.

16—Staff

This clause facilitates arrangements for staffing of ISA by persons employed in the Public Service of the State and assigned to assist ISA and by persons appointed by ISA on terms and conditions determined by ISA.

17—Honesty and accountability

This clause provides that the appointed members of the board are to be senior officials for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

18—Accounts and audit

This clause sets out the requirement for ISA to maintain proper records of its accounts and provides for the auditing of ISA's accounts by the Auditor-General.

19—Annual report

This clause makes provision in relation to ISA's annual report.

Part 3—Infrastructure planning

Division 1—20-year State Infrastructure Strategy

20—Preparation

This clause provides that ISA must prepare a 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy and submit it to the Minister within such time as the Minister directs. The Strategy must be kept under review and revised at least once every 5 years.

21—20-year State Infrastructure Strategy

This clause provides that the 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy must—

- be consistent with Infrastructure SA's objects; and
- assess the State's existing infrastructure; and
- consider relevant current State Government strategies; and
- consider relevant information provided by the public, private and not-for-profit sectors; and
- consider trends in infrastructure provision; and
- assess the needs, strategic goals and priorities for infrastructure in the State for the next 20 years.

The Strategy may include—

- a statement of social, economic and environmental objectives with respect to infrastructure within the State; and
- an assessment of the options relating to planning, funding, delivering and managing infrastructure in the State to address the State's needs, strategic goals and priorities for infrastructure for the next 20 years; and
- the identification of action that would best address the State's needs, strategic goals and priorities for infrastructure for the next 20 years; and
- such recommendations as Infrastructure SA thinks fit.

22—Adoption of 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy

This clause provides for the adoption of the 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy by the Minister, with or without amendments. The Minister may also refer the Strategy back to ISA for further consideration. If the Minister makes an amendment to the Strategy before adopting it, ISA may advise the Minister that it does not agree with the amendment and make that advice available to the public.

Division 2—Statement of Capital Intentions

23—Preparation

ISA must prepare a Statement of Capital Intentions identifying the specific major infrastructure projects to be undertaken in the State as a priority within the next 5 years. The Statement must be prepared and submitted to the Minister within such time as the Minister directs and be kept under review and revised annually.

24—Statement of Capital Intentions

This clause provides that a Statement of Capital Intentions may include the following in relation to the identified priority major infrastructure projects:

- the reasons for selecting the major infrastructure projects as priority projects;
- the estimated cost of the priority projects;
- the recommended funding and delivery arrangements for the priority projects;
- the estimated time-frame for the delivery of the priority projects.

In preparing the Statement, ISA must have regard to the following:

- the 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy adopted by the Minister;
- any proposal for a priority project provided to ISA by a public sector agency.

25—Adoption of Statement of Capital Intentions

This clause provides for the adoption of the Statement of Capital Intentions by the Minister, with or without amendments. The Minister may also refer the Statement back to ISA for further consideration. If the Minister makes an amendment to the Statement before adopting it, ISA may advise the Minister that it does not agree with the amendment and make that advice available to the public.

Division 3—Preparation of additional infrastructure strategies, statements or plans

26—Preparation

This clause provides that, in addition to the preparation of the 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy and the Statement of Capital Intentions, ISA—

- may, from time to time, on its own initiative; and
- must, on the request of the Minister,

prepare other strategies, statements or plans relating to infrastructure in the State.

27—Adoption

This clause provides for the adoption of other strategies, statements or plans submitted by ISA by the Minister, with or without amendments. The Minister may also refer any such strategy, statement or plan back to ISA for further consideration. If the Minister makes an amendment to a strategy, statement or plan before adopting it, ISA may advise the Minister that it does not agree with the amendment and make that advice available to the public.

28—Publication of additional infrastructure strategies and plans

This clause provides that ISA may publish a strategy, statement or plan prepared on its own initiative under this Division on its website.

Division 4—Collection and use of information

29—Power to require information

This clause provides ISA with the power, by written notice served personally or by post, to require a person to provide ISA with such information and material as may be reasonably required for the purposes of assisting ISA in the performance of its functions under this measure. It is an offence for a person to fail to provide the information within the time (which must be reasonable) and in the manner specified by ISA. A person cannot be compelled to give information under this proposed section if the information might tend to incriminate the person of an offence or is privileged on the ground of legal professional privilege.

30—Obligation to preserve confidentiality

This clause provides that information gained under this proposed Part of the measure that could affect the competitive position of a person, or is commercially sensitive for some other reason, is to be considered to be confidential information and a person performing a function under this measure will be guilty of an offence if the person discloses such information otherwise than as authorised under proposed subsection (2).

31—Statutory declarations

This clause provides that ISA may require a person who is required by or under this measure to give information to ISA to verify the information to be given by statutory declaration and, in that event, the person will not be taken to have given the information as required unless it has been verified in accordance with the requirements of ISA.

Part 4—Miscellaneous

32—Service

This clause provides for service of documents under this measure in the usual terms.

33—Regulations

The proposed section facilitates the making of regulations by the Governor for the purposes of the scheme.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (RATE OVERSIGHT) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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

At 18:28 the council adjourned until Thursday 26 July 2018 at 11:30.

*Answers to Questions***SA HEALTH**

33 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (29 May 2018).

1. What public selection process did the Premier undertake prior to the appointment of Mr McGowan as Chief Executive of the Department of Health?
2. Did the current Premier have any discussions with Mr McGowan about taking on the position of chief executive prior to the 17 March 2018 election?
3. What was the total cost of the early end of Ms Kaminski's contract?
4. Will Mr McGowan have complete authority as chief executive regarding the staff within the department and health services according to his own judgement as per the Public Service Act?
5. Have any key performance indicators been set for Mr McGowan—and if so what are they?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised

1. Dr McGowan was one of several candidates interviewed for the chief executive's role. He was recommended for appointment based on his experience, skills and his extensive experience in the health sector.
2. The government was not in a position to offer anyone the position until after it was sworn in on 22 March.
3. The terms of Ms Kaminski's early resignation are subject to a confidentiality deed between her and the government.
4. Dr McGowan has been engaged as the chief executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing, as per section 34(1) of the *Public Sector Act 2009*. He has the functions and duties of a chief executive of an administrative unit, as set out in section 31 of the act.
5. The priorities and performance measures that Dr McGowan is expected to attain are contained in his performance agreement with his minister. All documents pertaining to chief executive performance management, including the performance agreement, are managed in accordance with the *Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular 12: Information Privacy Principles Instruction*.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

In reply to **the Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS** (7 June 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I am advised:

1. The government will establish on the old RAH site:
 - An innovation, incubator, start-up and growth hub;
 - An international centre for tourism, hospitality and food services; and
 - A national gallery for Aboriginal art and cultures.

The government's world-leading hub will give South Australians with imagination and initiative the opportunity to bring their ideas to market and build businesses that can go global without the need to leave their home state.

The government's international tourism and hospitality centre will restore the reputation South Australia once had for training the world's best chefs and hotel managers, showcasing a state with a lifestyle second to none and making our city a mecca for international students.

The national gallery will recognise the unique art and culture of our First Peoples and ensure the world can get to know a lot more about it.

2. This information is publicly available on the Renewal SA website.
3. Consultation, where appropriate, will be undertaken.
4. Arts SA is carrying out further work and consultation to determine the optimal governance/operational model. Once that work is complete the premier will be able to advise where responsibility for running the new cultural destination will lie.

Supplementary:

The definition of heritage significance is set out by the *Heritage Places Act 1993*. The buildings being retained on the site for adaptive reuse include the Eleanor Harrald building, the Margaret Graham building, the Women's Health Centre, the Allied Health Services building, the McEwin building, the Bice building and the Sheridan building.

CAREER EMPLOYMENT SERVICES FUNDING

In reply to **the Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (20 June 2018 and 21 June 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised of the following:

Decisions about programs are being considered to ensure that initiatives deliver tangible outcomes, providing value for taxpayer money, and are consistent with government policy as the government has previously stated. Further information will be provided after the budget is released on 4 September 2018.

In response to your further question on 21 June 2018 I have been advised of the following:

Funding for these programs under the policy of the former government ceased on 30 June 2018.

The Marshall government is now investing \$100 million over four years to increase the number of apprenticeships and traineeships by an additional 20,000. We have also secured \$102 million from the commonwealth through the Skilling Australians Fund to support this target.

We are delivering an industry led training sector and aligning training with real job outcomes for South Australians. Training our workforce in line with industry needs will provide increased employment outcomes.

Employment and career service organisations may wish to pursue services in line with our plan to deliver jobs. Our focus includes apprentices and trainees for:

- Occupations in demand, including in particular in the defence sector;
- Industries and sectors of future growth;
- Responding to current skills shortages, including in regional areas; and
- Trade apprenticeships

Critically, we are implementing major reforms and making significant investments to boost training participation in South Australia to address the unacceptable decline in apprenticeship and traineeship commencements over the last five years.

From 2012 to December 2017 the number of people commencing training in South Australia fell by 16,900 to 8,765—66% decrease.

The commonwealth government 2018-19 budget announced the Career Transition Assistance Program for mature aged jobseekers.

The state government is focused on delivering key programs to meet our agenda to increase training participation and employment opportunities—funding support has been streamlined, with duplication removed.