

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 1 August 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.

Ministerial Statement

WATER PRICING INQUIRY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:16): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the subject of the terms of reference of an inquiry into water pricing in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Marshall Liberal government established the inquiry into water pricing in South Australia as part of our election commitments, with Mr Lew Owens appointed to conduct this independent inquiry. The inquiry will provide valuable independent advice to the government on the complex methodology used to determine what South Australians pay. Today, I provide the terms of reference for the inquiry. The terms of reference are as follows:

The Inquiry will consider and report on the following matters relevant to the regulation of SA Water's drinking water services:

- a) The reasonableness of the opening value of SA Water's regulated asset base (RAB) established by the Second Pricing Order made by the then Treasurer on 17 May 2013, including:
 - i. Asset valuations used to establish drinking water prices in the years leading up to 2013;
 - ii. The process for setting the Initial RAB for 2013;
 - iii. The treatment of customer contributions in setting the Initial RAB;
 - iv. The treatment of the capital costs (and Commonwealth funding) for the Adelaide Desalination Plant in setting the Initial RAB;
 - v. Compliance with the National Water Initiative Pricing Principles in relation to the recovery of capital expenditure;
 - vi. RABs for drinking water services in other jurisdictions, having regard to the key drivers and variables that may affect the value; and
 - vii. Any other matter which may contribute to an understanding of the level of the SA Water drinking water services RAB.
- b) Whether there should be a change to the value of the Initial RAB (as subsequently adjusted each year since 2013 for depreciation and inflation) for the 2020 Price Determination by ESCOSA.

If there are any changes proposed to the RAB valuation, the inquiry will also consider and report on a possible implementation program and timetable that would ensure a fair and reasonable balance between the interests of consumers and the government, as owner of SA Water.

The inquiry will also consider whether there are issues associated with setting the allowed return on the RAB, including whether the methodology should anticipate inflation and returns expected by the market during the relevant regulatory period to ensure a fair and reasonable balance between the interests of consumers and the government, as owner of SA Water.

The inquiry will be conducted by Mr Lew Owens as independent inquirer. In conducting the inquiry, the independent inquirer:

1. May have regard to and consider reviews and recent developments and practices in the economic regulation of utilities in other Australian or overseas jurisdictions.
2. May undertake consultation with relevant stakeholders.

3. May consider any other matter that is viewed as relevant.

The independent inquirer will provide a report of his findings to the Treasurer by 30 June 2019. This inquiry reflects the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to do what it can to ease cost-of-living pressures for all South Australians.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the minister assisting the Premier regarding the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission board.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In question time yesterday, when the assistant minister was asked whether she or the government had conducted due diligence into the appointments to the board of SAMEAC, the assistant minister replied, 'The government of the day certainly has done its due diligence'. Further, when the assistant minister was asked whether she stood by her previous comments that the appointments were of the highest quality and calibre, the assistant minister said, 'Yes'. My questions of the assistant minister are:

1. Does the assistant minister stand by her comments that appropriate due diligence had been undertaken before appointments to this board?
2. Does the assistant minister stand by her comments that all appointments were of the highest quality and calibre, including the appointment of Mr Mario Romaldi?
3. What consultation, briefings or discussions has the assistant minister had with the Premier, or anyone from his office, in relation to this matter this week?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:22): I believe I have provided adequate answers to all the questions previously. The same set of questions has been asked in the other place. Please refer to the Premier's comments.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary arising directly from the answer: what are the questions in the other place that the assistant minister is referring to?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:23): The same set of questions you have been asking.

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

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I have given the call.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Hunter, please don't cut across—please don't show disrespect to your own frontbencher.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Have the Labor members finished? You have one of your own members standing—one of your own members standing—showing disrespect to your own. The Hon. Ms Scriven, please continue with your question.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): My question is to the minister assisting the Premier. Did the assistant minister, the Premier or anyone from the government advise Mario Romaldi to delete, clean or lock his social media account, and has the assistant minister, the Premier or anyone from the government given that instruction to the remaining members of the SAMEAC board?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Now that hasn't been asked in the other place, so you need to answer that.

The PRESIDENT: Mr Maher—Leader of the Opposition!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I have not given the call yet, Hon. Ms Lee; please be seated. We are just going to wait here until the opposition benches are calm so that the President can listen to the answer to the question that has been asked by a Labor member—by a Labor member. The Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:24): I am not privy to that information. If an individual out in the community wants to do whatever to their accounts, it's up to them.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): Supplementary, for clarification: I don't think perhaps the assistant minister heard the question—it was whether herself, the Premier or anyone has advised Mr Romaldi to delete, clean or lock his social media account, and has that same advice been given to other members of the SAMEAC board?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:25): I have not personally given any advice. I am not privy to the other information by the other government departments.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): Supplementary: is the assistant minister or her staff or anyone from the government now trawling through the social media of remaining members appointed to the SAMEAC board?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway—minister, that does not assist with proceedings.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:26): If it satisfies the member opposite, I will take those questions on notice and bring back the answer.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): Further supplementary—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Will bringing that answer back include, and will the assistant minister—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, that's not a supplementary. I have given you a lot of latitude; that's not a supplementary.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: And I am most appreciative, Mr President, thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson. Is this a supplementary or a new question?

PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:26): No it's a third question, Mr President. My question is to the minister assisting the Premier. My questions are:

1. Is the assistant minister using an official departmental email address for her portfolio business as an assistant minister?

2. If not, what email address is the assistant minister using for her portfolio business?
3. Has the assistant minister ever sent a portfolio-related email from her private or non-government email address?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:27): Currently, I am using my parliamentary email address because I have not been given a departmental email address yet. So I am not sure what matters the honourable member is referring to exactly until he puts certain context or writes to me as to what matters he is referring to.

PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:28): Supplementary: has the assistant minister read and fully complied with the instructions from the ICAC commissioner, as detailed in his 2013-14 annual report, in regard to private emails?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:28): I do not have any private emails. The email is a parliamentary email.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:28): My question is for the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Could the minister please update the chamber on some of the highlights of this morning's announcement of the 2019 Tour Down Under race, the routes in particular, offering new challenges to cyclists and even more elements of interest and entertainment for the fans?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in the fabulous Liberal event, the Tour Down Under. This morning, I joined Mike Turtur, the race director, for the much-anticipated announcement of the 2019 TDU race routes. This will be the 21st year—the Tour Down Under turns 21. This is what we call the lycra-led economic stimulus, which injected \$63.7 million into the economy last year and I expect will do even more next year. For the first time in the 20-year history of the race, the 2019 Santos Tour Down Under will see the 'Be Safe' MAC stage 6 finale move out of the city for a regional hilltop finish, which will give us a finish on a high note.

As Mike Turtur has said, he knew South Australia would create something special for the 2019 event and deliver something a little different in terms of race routes after the amazing race we had this year. So we are mixing it up and making Willunga Hill the grand finale, probably now the deciding factor for the race's result. It's important for the race that we keep everyone guessing and the riders challenged. 'We can't be complacent,' he said. The Tour Down Under's queen stage, McLaren Vale to Willunga, will be held on Sunday 20 January 2019. As I said, the 'Be Safe Be Seen' MAC stage 6 will be the grand finale of the race.

The 2019 Santos Tour Down Under race routes are expected to challenge the world's best cycling teams and riders, whilst adding more elements of interest and entertainment for the fans. The change to the last day of the race is expected to create more excitement for the race. The race will return to Angaston and the Barossa for the first time since 2014. The Corkscrew climb, which is a fan favourite, is back in stage 4, with the Challenge Tour from Glenelg to Strathalbyn now being on the Saturday for the first time in stage 5.

We expect even more fans to line the roads throughout the region to cheer their cycling heroes or simply enjoy a day out in South Australia's beautiful regional towns, showcasing our best food and wine and the destination experiences as the race travels through. The TDU is a nine-day festival of cycling, offering entertainment and participation for everyone. The 2018 Santos Tour Down Under attracted 46,000 visitors from interstate and overseas, who travelled specifically to South Australia for the event. As mentioned, it generated an economic impact of \$63.7 million or the equivalent of 774 full-time jobs.

As I said last week, I think it may have been the former opposition member, Kevin Foley, who said, 'What? A bike race? Nobody will ever come to it. You're mad.' Twenty-one years later, we have over 45,000 interstate and international visitors and a well over \$65 million economic benefit to our economy.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary arising from the answer: can the minister outline what the reason was for the one-month delay in announcing the routes?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:32): I don't believe it's a one-month delay.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: How long? How long did you wait for?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: He obviously doesn't want to hear the answer.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have asked your question. Allow the minister to answer.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: If you would like a supplementary, ask a supplementary.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —for your protection. The dates have nearly always been released after the Tour de France. My understanding is that the Tour de France, because of the World Cup soccer, was a week late this year. So one stage was announced during the Tour de France. It was promoted on SBS. It was always the intention to do it at the completion of the Tour de France, which finished on Sunday, so it's the timing of other things internationally. I can assure the honourable member that world-class cyclists, world-class teams and a record number of visitors will visit this world-class event to witness and participate in the 2019 Santos Tour Down Under.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary question arising from the original answer: did the minister or his office or the government, to his knowledge, receive any advice that there was criticism of the undue delay in announcing the dates and that it was causing investment problems?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:33): I have not received any advice in my office that I am aware of. When I was doing one of my big regional trips, when I was out with thousands of regional tourism operators, part of the 19 regional visits, I think I saw a very small article online raising some concerns. I think I saw that, but I haven't had any advice to my office.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:33): This is a supplementary to the original question to the Hon. David Ridgway. Can the minister provide the cost of corporate facilities provided by the government for the Tour Down Under, particularly at Willunga?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for his question. I don't have those costs at my fingertips, but I will make some inquiries and bring back a reply.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary arising from the original answer: can the minister outline the events that he personally attended in the lead-up to the announcement to do with the Tour Down Under?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:34): The events that I have attended in the lead-up to—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What pre-announcement events have you attended?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Did you go to the Tour de France, like Leon used to go to?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes, that's a good point.

The PRESIDENT: When we have all finished the conversation, I would like to hear from the minister.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The only cycling event I was invited to—and I declined it because it would have been inappropriate, notwithstanding the former minister's passion for travel—was to the English ambassador's residence in Paris on Sunday. He invited me there to attend that, but I thought, no, it was much better to be out in the regions of South Australia rather than in the middle of Paris. There have been no events that I have attended, except this morning with Mike Turtur—no events that I've attended in the lead-up to the announcement today about the Tour Down Under.

TAXI INDUSTRY

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Hon. David Ridgway, representing the Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, the Hon. Stephan Knoll.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In today's *Advertiser*, the Taxi Council of South Australia has raised concerns about the ongoing deregulation of the taxi industry by making it easier for the largely unregulated ride-share industry to operate at the expense of taxi plate owners and operators who pay significantly more in costs and charges to run their fleets. It runs to the tune of about \$18,000 a year.

Recommendations have been made by an advisory body, of which the TCSA is not a member, that include lifting the age limit of vehicles to 10 years, easing advertising restrictions to allow video ads to be played inside the vehicles and, of more concern, removing the requirements for driver accreditation applicants to provide copies of their citizenship, passports and visa details when applying for accreditation. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why isn't the peak body representing the taxi industry represented on the advisory committee?
2. Does he not believe that raising age limits of vehicles used to transport passengers will create lower safety standards?
3. Will any recommendations be discussed with all stakeholders before they are applied?
4. Has DPTI consulted with the federal government's Department of Home Affairs, or immigration and citizenship, about its own proposal to dispense with vital information about citizenship and visas, and what is the reasoning behind this recommendation?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a very detailed question, and I will take it on notice and hopefully bring back a very detailed answer for him.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:37): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier. Has the assistant minister been allocated an office to conduct her portfolio-related business? If so, where is that office located and are there any plans to change those arrangements? What steps is the Assistant Minister to the Premier taking to establish an appropriate email address to conduct her ministerial business?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:37): The Department of the Premier and Cabinet is organising those arrangements for me. I shall report back to the chamber when those details are ready.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:37): Supplementary: I did ask what steps is the assistant—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: No, she didn't.

The PRESIDENT: Through me.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: What steps has the Assistant Minister to the Premier taken to establish an email address to conduct her official business? She did not answer.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee, do you wish for the opportunity to respond to that?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:38): As per my previous answer, the arrangements will be made by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:38): There was already a parliamentary secretary in the Premier's office for the previous Labor government. What is taking so long—it's almost been four months now—to establish an office and to establish the very basic facility of an email to conduct your ministerial—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: I've asked the question. An email—how long does it take?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, the essence of your supplementary is appropriate. How you presented is less than satisfactory, but I am going to allow it. The Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:39): I will take that question on notice and bring back the answer.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:39): Supplementary, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: It's going to have to be tight, the Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: What will be the budget of the office of the minister's assistant?

The PRESIDENT: That's outside the original answer.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It's all about establishing—

The PRESIDENT: It's way outside the original answer.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Way outside?

The PRESIDENT: Because it's from the minister's answer, not from your earlier question.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: She didn't give an answer. It's pretty hard to have a question from a non-answer.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Have we all finished?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Have we all finished? I would like to remind both the Liberal benches and the Labor benches that we have crossbenchers and they are entitled to ask questions and hold the government to account. Should this behaviour continue—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Should this behaviour continue I will start giving the call to the crossbenchers.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: You learnt that from me.

The PRESIDENT: Well, we take our wisdom from everywhere, the Hon. Mr Wortley.

CARER SUPPORT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:40): I have a very sensible question to the Minister for Human Services—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The question is to the Minister for Human Services: can the minister please inform the chamber about the recent opening of Australia's first drop-in centre for young carers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:40): I acknowledge the interest of the honourable member in this important issue. As she has outlined in her question, South Australia is proudly the home of the first drop-in centre for young carers. The centre was opened on 11 July at Morphett Vale, which is in the electorate of the member for Reynell, who was also in attendance for the organisation Carer Support. Carer Support has been at the forefront of support and advocacy for carers in South Australia for more than 25 years. That day marked a milestone in another major achievement for this highly respected South Australian organisation.

In South Australia there are some 30,000 young carers. Caring for a loved one requires a lifetime of dedication and commitment and can often deliver significant challenges. It can take a heavy toll on young carers, especially their mental health and wellbeing and their family life. It can also impact on a young person's ability to make friends and lead an active social life. Finding a safe place to take a break from caring responsibilities can be a challenge in itself.

The new drop-in centre will provide an opportunity for young carers to take time to recharge, seek advice and to meet and engage with other young people. It is a much-needed safe haven for young carers and also enables them to have some fun. With the member for Reynell, we were able to congratulate the staff and volunteers for their hard work in getting this centre up and running.

Of course, in a policy sense, the Marshall Liberal government is committed to improving the lives of South Australians with disability and to provide support for their families and carers. We continue to be guided by the South Australian Carers Recognition Act to review and improve services to carers and to recognise carers as employees.

Quite recently, the NDIS bilateral agreement was signed by the Premier and the Prime Minister, which guarantees funding and governance arrangements for the full rollout of the NDIS scheme. South Australia is the second state, after New South Wales, to sign such an agreement to ensure that South Australians will have more control and choice over the services and support that they choose for themselves. Through the old Home and Community Care program, carer support continues to be funded and the commonwealth government is currently implementing an integrated carers support service.

From September 2019, the commonwealth will establish a new network of regional delivery partners across Australia to help carers access new and improved local and target services. These services are welcomed and the Carer Support service is to be congratulated on this innovative way of delivering services to young carers.

AIR POLLUTION

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Health a question about air pollution.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: The professional association known as Doctors for the Environment Australia has made a number of submissions to state planning authorities in relation to new fossil fuel extraction projects and new fossil fuel power plants proposed for South Australia. In their submission late last year on proposals by both Alinta and AGL they said:

Poor health outcomes in relation to the extraction of conventional and unconventional gas are now well documented and, for those living close to these activities, may include sinus and other respiratory problems, particularly asthma, and adverse birth outcomes, namely, prematurity and low gestational weight babies.

In relation to the combustion process involved in gas-fired power plants they say:

Pollutants include nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, particulates and hazardous air pollutants (formaldehyde, benzene) and sulphur dioxide. All of these are known to be injurious to health and we draw your attention to the 3,000 premature deaths annually in Australia as a consequence of poor air quality.

My questions of the minister are:

1. What role does he or his department play in ensuring that the health of South Australians is not harmed by new polluting fossil fuel projects in South Australia?

2. Is the minister or his department even consulted about such projects, and if not, does he think he should be?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:45): On behalf of the Minister for Health, I'm happy to take the honourable member's questions on notice and bring back a reply.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:45): My question is to the minister assisting the Premier:

1. Has the assistant minister or her staff ever insisted to or requested of any multicultural community organisation or council that her husband, Mr Eddie Liew, be acknowledged publicly as a guest at functions and events?

2. Has the assistant minister or her staff also insisted or requested at events or functions that her husband be seated in the front row alongside dignitaries and VIPs such as members of parliament?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:46): The answers are no and no.

DOMESTIC AIRLINES

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:46): My question is for the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Industry—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Investment.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: Investment—sorry; get that acronym right. Can the minister update the house on his visits to both Rex and Qantas regarding shortage of pilots and his keen interest in promoting regional South Australia?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:47): I thank the member for his ongoing interest in regional South Australia. As members would be aware, Qantas put out a request for a regional pilot training facility, which we lodged. Unfortunately, South Australia was not short-listed, but it was fortunate I was in Sydney on the Monday after the short-listing and already had an appointment with Qantas. It was an opportune time for me to go and meet the senior people in Sydney and discuss that particular proposal and a number of other issues.

Qantas were very keen to act quickly, and so, while they said a lot of our proposals had significant merit, they wanted to build and operate the pilot training facility in the first half of next year, because they are experiencing significant pilot shortages. We just simply couldn't deliver on time.

Interestingly, they did raise at the time the relationship they had had with the former government. I assured them that we will have a very different approach to dealing with Qantas. They were a little surprised and alarmed that the tourism minister and the Premier of the day would make negative comments about the carrier that carries more than 50 per cent of all airline passengers out of Adelaide. I assured them we wouldn't be getting negative comments from me or the new Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, in relation to dealing with—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We will have a strong and robust relationship with Qantas. We want to grow the size of the South Australian economy, and they would like to grow the size of their business also. It was interesting that those comments still have some impact on South Australia's brand reputation. But I left Qantas knowing that we would work closely together and look at some opportunities in the future for maybe further pilot training opportunities.

Interestingly, I was actually quite ill that day, so I said to all the boardrooms, 'You sit at one end and I will sit at the other.' It was a strange meeting, being almost 10 metres away from people, but being a former regional person, country person and a farmer, I have a strong work ethic; I did not want to cancel our meetings, because it would have been inappropriate.

I had deteriorated a little by the time I got to Rex, so I felt quite ill, but I sat in that room and spoke to the Rex chief executive and the senior people with Rex about the issues around Mount Gambier. I know two of the honourable members opposite, one the Leader of the Opposition and one a shadow minister, had raised concerns about Rex and their diminution of flights to Mount Gambier. Again, they cited passenger safety as a result of pilot shortages, and they have a significant investment in a pilot training facility to try to alleviate those problems.

What I thought was really interesting was that they discussed the history of Rex. Some would not be aware, but Rex came out of the collapse of Ansett. There was Kendell Airlines and Hazelton Airlines. They were formed together, and I think it was in September 2002 that Rex was launched. We were discussing their journey as a company over some 16 years, and they offered the comment to me that in the 16 years they have been in business they have no record of ever having a minister from the South Australian government visit their corporate offices.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Not even Mr Hunter?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Not even Mr Hunter, who is well travelled. I suggest that when these two frontbenchers come in here—as they did a few weeks ago—asking questions about Rex Airlines, they use their generous shadow minister's allowance or leader's allowance and get on a plane and fly over and visit Rex. It is an indictment on the former Labor government that after 16 years—and Rex provides service to a whole range of airports: Ceduna, Coober Pedy, Mount Gambier and others—they had never ever taken the time to visit an airline that provides a wonderful service to regional South Australia. I think that just shows what the former government really thought of regional South Australia—they did not care.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:51): My question is to the Treasurer. The former government sold the Lands Titles Office and valuation services to a private sector consortium, Land Services SA, for \$1.605 billion. Can the Treasurer advise what has happened to the \$1.605 billion?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:52): That's a very good question. As with the money from the Motor Accident Commission, the broad answer to the question is that it went into a big pot and essentially, under the former Labor government, a lot of that big pot was wasted through financial waste and gross financial mismanagement. I have highlighted on any number of occasions the lack of financial competency and the wasteful expenditure of the former government.

I have highlighted the personal slush fund of the former treasurer. There was \$2.6 million in the fund leading up to the state election, which he handed out left, right and centre to any struggling or marginal Labor seat candidate or MP who wanted a dollop of money. As I said, I suspect—and of course no criticism to the Greek communities involved; good luck to them—there would not be a Greek community or church in South Australia that did not get a very generous donation from the former treasurer, from the \$2.6 million or \$2.7 million personal slush fund that the treasurer had.

In aggregate, as I said, there was money both from the Motor Accident Commission privatisation and the Lands Titles Office privatisation. I think the underwritten narrative behind the honourable member's question is, of course, that this comes from a government that has said they oppose privatisation and they never privatised anything in their 16 years.

But put that to the side: I think the overwhelming majority of the money in relation to the Lands Titles Office went into the lump of money available to government from which it could spend money on infrastructure-related projects and debt funding. The Motor Accident Commission was a combination of moneys which could be used to offset net operating expenditure, wasteful expenditure, of the former government and, in some cases, to offset expenditure in relation to infrastructure projects and investing projects.

The Lands Titles Office money, because of the way the money was received—and if my answer is incorrect I will bring back clarification—I think virtually all of it, if not all of it, had to be

directed in that particular way in terms of offsetting the net debt levels of the state. Of course, as the money came in they could then spend money on any infinite number of capital works projects. I could imagine future programs such as 'Every suburb can have its own tram service' at \$250 million; if you happened to vote for a Labor government you could have your own tram service to Norwood or Port Adelaide, wherever you happened to be you could have your own tram service at \$250 million.

It was those types of wasteful projects that the former Labor government committed themselves to. Of course, in that same space—albeit it might have been in the one particular project—if you have an infrastructure project that is meant to cost a couple hundred million dollars and ultimately, through waste and financial incompetence, it ends up costing \$300 million, again that is an impact on your net debt figure and your infrastructure spending.

So the answer to the member's question is that essentially it went into the big pot of money the government had. Sadly, the former Labor government wasted a lot of that money on wasteful expenditure, wasteful projects, gross overspending, financial incompetence and negligence.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are you all finished? Hon. Ms Bourke.

ROMALDI, MR M.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:57): My questions are to the Assistant Minister to the Premier:

1. Is the assistant minister aware if Mr Mario Romaldi is a member of any other government boards or committees? If so, will the assistant minister support the removal of Mr Romaldi from those boards?
2. Will the assistant minister undertake to inform non-government boards and organisations of Mr Romaldi's social media posts?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:57): I don't have information about what other boards Mr Mario Romaldi is on. I will take those questions on notice, do some investigation and bring back the answers to the chamber.

ROMALDI, MR M.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:58): A supplementary to that question—

The PRESIDENT: It will be very difficult to get a supplementary out of that response, but I will listen to it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Will you?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I will listen to it. I am just giving you fair warning, as the benign President I am. Go for it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: My question is to the Hon. Jing Lee. Following the departure of Mr Romaldi, who was a representative of the state's large Italian community, will she or the government appoint a replacement from that community, which has more than 130,000 people of Italian heritage?

The PRESIDENT: Please be seated. It is a magnificent question but it is not a supplementary. I notice that I am giving the call to your fellow bencher. Hon. Ms Bonaros, I am giving you the call; you can adopt the question or ask your own.

STUDENT ENROLMENT, SEPARATED PARENTS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59): I will ask my own. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In 2007, Melissa Maschotta went through a separation from her former husband. Heads of agreement were put in place in approximately 2011 that made Melissa the primary carer of their child; however, no official court orders were made. On 29 August 2016, the child of the parties was picked up from school by her father, but he did not return her to Melissa two

days later as agreed, nor did the child attend school during this time. On 19 September of the same year, the father enrolled the child of the parties in a new school without the consent of the mother.

The father had provided the new school with draft orders prepared by his lawyers, which were not orders made under seal by the court. Despite this, the school proceeded to enrol the child, believing that the father was the primary carer and that the orders had been in place, which was not the case. It took six weeks before Melissa could get the orders that saw the child returned to her and re-enrolled in her former school. Former senator Skye Kakoschke-Moore wrote to the minister for education at the time to determine how this all could have occurred. In a response, it was said:

While legal advice indicates that the consent of only one parent is required to progress an enrolment application, it is considered best practice for schools to involve both parents in the process to ascertain all relevant information in relation to the student involved.

The minister also informed the former senator that the department's policy for the enrolment of students with separated parents and consequent procedures were being reviewed as 'it has been identified that more guidance for schools in relation to custody arrangements, disputes and short-term placements is required'. The department also organised for Melissa to make recommendations to DECD.

After those recommendations were made, she was informed that a review would take place and that there would be public consultation in the latter half of 2017. The policy and procedures have still not moved to public consultation, nor has that draft policy been provided. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Can the minister provide details of when the review of the policy and procedures for the enrolment of students with separated parents by the Department for Education and child development will be completed and move to the public consultation phase and explain why it has taken so long—almost two years—for the department to review the policy?

2. Can the minister advise whether the department is aware of any other similar cases to Melissa's?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:02): I am very happy to take the honourable member's question on notice and ask the Minister for Education to bring back a comprehensive reply.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:02): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier. Does the assistant minister still enjoy the confidence of the Premier, and has there been any discussion in relation to you stepping down from duties in the area of multicultural and ethnic affairs?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:02): I am really touched by the members opposite having such a keen interest in my welfare and in the job that I do. I have the full confidence, complete confidence, of the Premier—absolute confidence.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: That's always the end.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson will allow the member to answer the question.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I enjoy the role of being an assistant minister to the Premier because I enjoy the role of serving the multicultural communities of South Australia. If the opposite side is trying to divide us, trying to divide communities rather than uniting communities, they have something coming.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:03): Supplementary: did the actual Premier tell you that he had confidence in you? Did the Premier tell you personally that he had confidence in you?

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Wortley, you have asked a question; it is a reasonable supplementary. Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:04): I'm still here, aren't I? Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

JUMPS RACING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister representing the Minister for Environment and Water on the topic of prevention of cruelty to animals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Today is the Horses' Birthday in the Southern Hemisphere: 1 August is the date. It is not a happy birthday for those horses who are subjected to the practice of jumps racing. It only exists in the states of Victoria and South Australia in Australia, and has indeed been banned for its cruelty in New South Wales. Jumps racing is found to be 19 times more deadly than flats racing.

A select committee, of course, has given the industry a three-year reprieve to clean up its act, something the RSPCA (the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) disputes is possible. Previously, the Law Society has supported a bill that I have had before this place by saying that banning jumps racing would clarify the law, but they believe that already jumps racing contravenes the law and is cruelty to animals under our Animal Welfare Act.

My question to the minister representing the minister is: will the Minister for Environment and Water, with carriage of the Animal Welfare Act, ensure that amendments are made to the Animal Welfare Act to allow the RSPCA to act to prevent cruelty, not just to address cruelty where it happens, and give the horses the birthday present they need of many happy returns next year?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her longstanding interest in this area over several years. I was of the understanding that Horses' Birthday was 1 September, but we learn something new every day in this place. I will take those specific questions on notice and refer them to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, I am going to give you the call. You may wish to ask another question or ask the question you previously articulated.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:06): No, I will ask the previous question; thank you for indulging me, Mr President. My question is to the Hon. Jing Lee. Following phone calls I received this morning from the Italian community, after the departure of Mr Mario Romaldi from SAMEAC, who I gather was a representative of the large Italian community, will she or the government now appoint a replacement from that community, which represents more than 130,000 people of Italian heritage?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, the Italian community is a large representation of the multicultural community. I thank the community for their contributions. Honourable members have raised suggestions, and those will be taken into consideration.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:07): Supplementary question to the assistant minister: will she outline to the chamber the process the government will take to consult with the Italian community over the replacement?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): Certainly, consultation will definitely be made with the Italian community.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson, you didn't catch my eye previously—would you like to ask a question?

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: A question or a supplementary, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: You can ask a question.

PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:08): My question is to the minister assisting the Premier. Will the assistant minister turn over her private email server to the Director of State Records so that emails can be properly scrutinised to see whether any breaches of law or cybersecurity have occurred?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:08): I don't have any private emails. sir.

PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): Supplementary arising from the answer—

The PRESIDENT: The answer was, 'I don't have any', so—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If the assistant minister has said that she doesn't have any private emails, will she turn over her parliamentary emails for such purposes?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the member to answer the question.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:09): Why should I? I do everything to serve the community, and I have done no wrong.

PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:09): Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: I gave a lot of latitude to the Leader of the Opposition there, and there was a very tight answer, but I will listen to it, the Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Very tight—very arrogant answer! Does the Assistant Minister to the Premier believe it is appropriate to use—

The PRESIDENT: This is not a supplementary; it is out of order.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It's a supplementary—to use your parliamentary—

The PRESIDENT: It's out of order. The Hon. Mr Wortley, sit down. It's out of order—sit down. I'm going to give the call to a crossbencher. Any crossbencher wish to ask a question?

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: Mr Parnell.

WATER PRICING INQUIRY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:09): I am well prepared, as ever. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about his recently tabled ministerial statement and inquiry into water pricing in South Australia terms of reference.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Perusing these terms of reference, it appears to me that there is one gap, which I think would have fitted within the government's pre-election commitment, but does not appear to be in these terms of reference, and that is in relation to so-called STED schemes—septic tank effluent disposal schemes. I am sure I'm not the only member of parliament who gets lots of inquiries from constituents, in country areas largely, who have been fairly self-sufficient in the disposal of their own waste, only to find that their local council comes along and charges them between \$5,000 and \$10,000 to connect to a scheme that they say they want no part of. It is a part of the pricing of water services, so my question of the Treasurer—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Not by SA Water.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: No, but my understanding is that the commitment was made in relation to water pricing—I didn't think the commitment was exclusively to SA Water. So my question is: will Mr Owens, conducting the inquiry, be able to take submissions and representations from people who are worried about other aspects of water pricing other than those delivered by SA Water?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:11): I am happy to take the question on notice and come back but, certainly, my understanding is that the inquiry that has been established will be in relation to services provided by SA Water. If the service to which the honourable member is referring—and my understanding is he probably is—it is not a service provided by SA Water, but provided by councils or, indeed, other bodies and organisations.

Whilst it may well be an important issue—and I am not discounting the importance of it—it wasn't the subject of the nature of the public debate, parliamentary inquiries and other issues that were raised in relation to the regulated asset base of SA Water. So I don't discount the importance of the issues the honourable member has raised, or the fact that he and other members have had concerns raised about STED schemes as well, but they certainly were not the nature of the public debate that resulted in the commitment we gave many years ago in relation to having an independent inquiry into—he is correct in saying water pricing, but it was as a result of the public controversy and debate about the regulated asset base that had been established for the last pricing audit.

If there is anything different to that that I can add, I will bring back a further reply, but I suspect there won't be, so my response will stand, unless, as I said, I get further advice that might lead me to clarify.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Hunter, what are you seeking to do?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Seeking to ask a question, sir.

The PRESIDENT: A supplementary?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: No, a question, on the off-chance.

The PRESIDENT: A question? I will allow a question. We have time.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I was looking at your side of the benches, so go for it.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:13): I'm happy to stand aside for the crossbenchers if they have one, sir, but I will direct my question, if I may, to the Assistant Minister to the Premier. As the assistant minister has taken an oath as a member of the executive, what does the assistant minister understand her responsibilities to be to this parliament in terms specifically of answering questions and being responsible for portfolio duties that are ascribed to her by the Premier?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:13): Of course I understand my responsibility and it is all prescribed. You served as a minister, so you should know them as well.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): Supplementary arising from the answer: in what document are these responsibilities, that the minister talks of, prescribed?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:14): Earlier, the questions were about whether I have used my email for any official capacity as the Assistant Minister to the Premier—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, what's your point of order?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The point of order is relevance, sir. The question was directed to the assistant minister's understanding of her responsibilities as a member of the executive, and the supplementary was specifically about what document has she read that will tell us where those portfolio responsibilities reside. She hasn't addressed that specific question about the document that says what her responsibilities are.

The PRESIDENT: I appreciate the point of order, but I am giving the Hon. Ms Lee some leeway, as you would a minister, to respond to the question. Your point of order came a little early in the equation. The Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I have provided the answer.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Further supplementary: in relation to the assistant minister's original answer, saying that she understands all the responsibilities prescribed to her, does that also include answering questions that she is responsible to this parliament for with the phrase, 'Why should I?'

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee does not require your advice. The Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:15): I have already provided my answer, sir.

BUSINESS AND CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:15): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer outline for the chamber the likely impact on the South Australian economy of the record levels of business and consumer confidence, as recently reported publicly?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Have we all finished? Can we have some order? I would like to hear the answer from the Treasurer. Treasurer, you have the call.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16): Thank you, Mr President. I couldn't hear myself think over the cacophony of squealing from the opposition benches. So thank you, Mr President, for your protection. As Treasurer, I need protection. I thank the honourable member for his very important question because there have been a number of, I think, important indicators for the state of South Australia, which ought to be enormously encouraging, not only for businesses in South Australia but for the consumers in South Australia as well.

The recent surveys have been well publicised in the media. I think I referred, in response to a question yesterday, to the Sensis survey of small and medium-sized businesses. I was almost embarrassed to read some elements of that press release, so glowing were small business in their praise of the new Premier and the new government, and so damning of the former government and former ministers. As I said, I was red-faced with embarrassment—almost—as I read out that particular paragraph from the small and medium-sized business survey conducted by Sensis. The survey, which hasn't attracted much publicity in this house, was the survey published on Friday or Saturday in *The Advertiser* conducted by Bank SA and another organisation that they collaborate with.

That, too, highlighted the enormous boost in business and consumer confidence in South Australia and in South Australians since the March election. We shouldn't underestimate the importance, in terms of turning the state economy around, of confidence and optimism in the future. From the consumer's viewpoint, as from 1 July this year, the government kept its most significant financial commitment to struggling South Australian families and households: that we would put \$90 million back into their pockets to spend rather than into the pockets of politicians and public servants to waste, as the former Labor government had done over 16 years.

That's \$90 million that families in South Australia are spending, and will be able to spend, on goods and services with small and medium-sized businesses in South Australia. That's good for the

families, but it's also good for small and medium-sized businesses in South Australia, that they have that particular money to spend.

The confidence from the small business sector, which is the backbone of the state's economy, is being driven in large part not just by the fact that consumer confidence is turning around but because many of them know that, as from 1 January next year, none of the small businesses with payrolls under \$1.5 million will pay a single dollar in payroll tax. I do not expect members of the Labor Party or the opposition to mix freely with members of the small business community. Their former premier indicated that he wasn't much of a supporter of private enterprise or the free enterprise system. Sadly, that is the brush which tars the attitude of the Labor opposition.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, please cease your commentary. Treasurer, go on.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I can hardly hear myself speak. In relation to the huge boost in confidence for the small business community, we see the issue—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It's alright, Jing, he'll be back tomorrow. Maybe we'll get an answer from you then.

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

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: If the Labor benches are going to continue this, they won't be getting the call tomorrow.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: That's pretty tough.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Wortley, I learnt it from a previous president.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I think you've just been told to be quiet.

The PRESIDENT: Treasurer, please go on. There might well be crossbenchers who wish to ask a question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I think we have had a huge number of questions today, a world record number of questions, Mr President. Certainly—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Certainly, there can be no criticism of this government in relation to the world record number of questions that are allowed to be put by members of the opposition or the crossbenchers. I won't be diverted, because the members of the opposition are trying to divert me from answering this important question. Small business confidence is critical to turning around the state's economy. We have highlighted before that the economic and jobs growth figures in South Australia have to be turned around.

There are encouraging signs in relation to the unemployment rate, but when you look at the participation rate figures in South Australia, which are lower than the national average, and when you look at the underemployment rate in South Australia, our underemployment rate is higher than the national average because unemployment and employment is measured on the basis of you have a job and you are employed if you are working for one hour a week. Our underemployment rate in South Australia is significantly higher than the national underemployment rate as well.

They are figures that the new government has pledged to try to turn around. That is what the state budget is for. We have already started some initiatives. The payroll tax changes and the changes in terms of infrastructure investment will be continued, maintained, increased and improved over the forward estimates period. It will be all about trying to ensure that we can see not only growth in the state's economy but that we can also see, most importantly, jobs growth in South Australia, growth not only in the small and medium-sized business sector in South Australia but jobs growth right across the sectors. As my colleague the Hon. Mr Ridgway has identified, there are huge job opportunities for growth in regional economies in regional communities that he and other ministers have been seeking to drive.

I know I am running out of time, but I would like to make the particular point that, in terms of the state's economic future, there is unashamedly a pro-growth narrative being driven by the Premier himself and the government. Part of that is, unashamedly, pro-population growth in South Australia. The former government, the former premier and now the Labor opposition have opposed population growth for South Australia.

That is a completely different narrative and a completely different approach from Premier Marshall and the Marshall government. We are unashamedly supportive of growing our population base in South Australia. The more we can grow population in South Australia, the more we can see houses being built and commodities being required for those particular houses, and that will be an important part of what the Marshall Liberal government will be seeking to drive, not just from the 4 September budget but from future budgets over the first term of the Marshall government.

Matters of Interest

ENGINEERS AUSTRALIA

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:25): I rise today to speak about a number of events that I have recently attended in my capacity as shadow minister for industry and skills. That includes the South Australian Engineering Excellence Awards night and the Sir Eric Neal Address, hosted by Engineers Australia, South Australian Division. Engineers Australia is a great organisation, and I have been fortunate enough to meet with and attend a number of events with them in my capacity as a shadow minister.

Engineers Australia supports public policy that promotes local jobs and investment, future prosperity of the South Australian population, consumer safety and confidence, and innovation. Some of their areas of focus include:

- Review of education foundations to result in significant increases in student numbers of both genders, but particularly female, undertaking intermediate and advanced maths and science subjects to avoid the real risk of the limitation of numbers of future engineers.
- Cooperation at all levels of government on implementing recommendations of the Independent Review into the Future Security of the National Electricity Market and especially the need for more engineers in governing bodies.
- Infrastructure development across South Australia, particularly developing long-term residential solutions, including those suitable for the aged, based on community connectivity, with direct access to health facilities, social needs and related services; making infrastructure asset maintenance a leading priority with a focus on road safety, water management and general consumer safety and confidence; and building South Australia into a national transport infrastructure and development hub.
- Maximising engineering engagement and employment in the defence industry in South Australia.
- Facilitating the transfer of advanced technology capability from defence into local cross-industrial manufacturing innovation.
- Advocating for the introduction of legislation and regulation for registration of engineers, again to address consumer safety and confidence and to leverage associated economic benefit.

Last night, I had the pleasure of joining Mr Greg Parker, the division manager of Engineers Australia, Ms Claire Faulkner, members engagement manager of Engineers Australia, the Hon. Trish White, national president of Engineers Australia, and many other members of Engineers Australia at the annual Engineering Excellence Awards night.

This night is the engineering profession's night of nights, highlighting and celebrating the extraordinary contributions made to the local economy, community and environment. The awards recognise and promote new and innovative ideas that are brought to life in ways that bring fundamental change to our society. They inspire and encourage distinction through teamwork, innovation and technical excellence.

The night culminated with the presentation of the prestigious Malcolm Kinnaird Engineering Excellence Award. This year's winner was Innovation R&D in Cycling Performance, with Associate Professor Richard Kelso from the University of Adelaide present to accept the award. The projects that were nominated for the Engineering Excellence Award were diverse and included:

- the Acoustic Data gauge hanger;
- the Adelaide Convention Centre east building;
- Adelaide Health and Medical Sciences Building;
- ASC's Collins class submarine main motor refurbishment;
- Coopers Brewery malting project;
- Glenelg WWTP inlet works and Anderson Avenue WWPS upgrade;
- the Hope Valley water storage roof upgrade;
- Innovative R&D in Cycling Performance, as mentioned;
- Mayne Pharma oral solid dosage production facility expansion;
- O-Bahn City Access Project—of course, this was a project done by the previous state Labor government that thousands of north-east residents are benefitting from every day;
- SA Power Networks RedEye DMS implementation for dynamic engineering and operational delivery;
- Self-healing power system;
- Smart Water Network;
- South Australian emergency generators;
- Torrens Road to River Torrens Project, which of course was another project the previous Labor government championed; and
- the Waterproofing Eastern Adelaide Project.

As you can see from the list of projects, they are very diverse and impact on many aspects of our lives. The event was very well supported, including by our Governor, His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, and Mrs Le, T2T Alliance, SA Power Networks, the University of Adelaide, Mott MacDonald, Arup, McConnell Dowell, Aurecon, AECOM, Lendlease, Acoustic Data, GHD, Fulton Hogan, Guidera O'Connor, ASC, SA Water, Jacobs, Wallbridge Gilbert Aztec, and York Civil.

It was also good to see the Minister for Industry and Skills attend this Engineers Australia event, given that there was no representative from the Marshall Liberal government at the Sir Eric Neal Address in May organised by Engineers Australia. The extraordinary contributions made to the local economy, community and environment are something that should make us proud of all our engineers, and I would encourage this current government to give them the support they need.

It is evident that engineering in South Australia is in great hands through Engineers Australia and the young people—and not so young people—who are involved with them. The future looks

bright, and I place on record my sincere thanks and appreciation for the contribution they make to the state.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:30): Last week was a great week for the suicide prevention sector, not only in South Australia but across the nation. The national suicide prevention conference, conducted by Suicide Prevention Australia, was held not very far from here in the Adelaide Convention Centre, attended by over 600 delegates from around Australia and some from overseas. It was a terrific gathering of people from a wide range of organisations, from universities right through to volunteer suicide prevention networks, that have a passion for suicide prevention and the advancement of awareness about suicide throughout all aspects of our community.

I was particularly pleased to attend the dinner and the life awards, which recognise excellence in that area in a variety of categories, and also to see the way in which the wide variety of topics at the conference provided fabulous information to many of the people who attended.

Other highlights of the week were, obviously, the naming by the Premier of his Council on Suicide Prevention, which had its first meeting in this building last Friday. There was also a reception for the South Australian delegates at the conference last Thursday afternoon in Parliament House. I was delighted to host that conference on behalf of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

It gives me pleasure to share with the council some information about a new initiative commencing in South Australia. For the first time, this state has a formalised mechanism between SAPOL and South Australia's three postvention providers, driven by the Country SA Primary Health Network. Where a person dies by suicide anywhere within the state, within 24 to 48 hours there will be a notification from SAPOL to the postvention providers, and those families or individuals bereaved by the suicide will be informed of the specialised service available.

This is an important agreement which has changed the landscape significantly and ensures integration across the emergency service and suicide prevention sector. This collaboration between state and federal jurisdictions will ensure timely referrals and access to services for those impacted by suicide. It is very indicative of the way in which both I and the Premier's council wish to go in encouraging much more work between both state and federal governments in this area and, of course, with local government as well.

The parties involved in the work towards this initiative were SAPOL, represented by Detective Senior Sergeant Trevor Rea; the National Indigenous Critical Response Service, which is active in all of South Australia; Living beyond Suicide, in the metropolitan area; StandBy, in country SA; the Adelaide PHN; and the Country SA PHN, which led a lot of the work. That body was represented by Ms Chez Curnow, who played an integral role in the formation of the initiative. She said:

It has been a pleasure to lead these negotiations. All involved showed leadership and a willingness for collaboration. We know when an individual is bereaved by suicide that exposure and impact significantly increases the risk of suicide attempt and suicide for those impacted by the death.

I commend all the people involved, and I was delighted to launch the formalised South Australian postvention referral mechanism as described above.

ASK FOR ANGELA SCHEME

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:35): I rise today to speak about the Ask for Angela safety campaign. In 2016, Hayley Child, a sexual violence and abuse strategy coordinator for Lincolnshire County Council in the UK, created the Ask for Angela initiative in response to the growing popularity of online dating and the potential increased risk this poses. With online dating, it is common for people to meet in public places after initially making contact online or via a mobile phone application. In some circumstances, these meetings can become uncomfortable when one person believes the other has misrepresented themselves or they turn out to be decidedly different to what they had envisaged.

In many situations, it is merely awkward, but at times it can become unnerving and distressing. It is in these situations that people can 'ask for Angela'. Patrons in all participating bars and hotels can ask staff for a woman named Angela if they are feeling uncomfortable or unsafe. The

name Angela serves as a codeword to alert staff that a patron needs assistance to discreetly leave the venue. Staff can lead them away to a safe place, alert the police if necessary or escort them to the back of the venue to a taxi or an Uber.

The initiative understands that it can be difficult to just simply leave a situation or to reach out and explain to someone exactly why you are feeling unsafe, intimidated or threatened, and allows individuals to seek help in a discreet and safe manner. Individuals do not need to justify why they feel unsafe. Staff are trained to ensure that prompt action is taken to ensure that the person is separated from the individual who makes them feel unsafe or uncomfortable. Posters advertising the initiative are often placed in the bathrooms of participating venues to advise individuals of the support available.

Earlier this month, the New South Wales government launched the campaign across Sydney, after successful trials in Wagga Wagga, Albury, Orange and Byron Bay. According to the New South Wales police assistant commissioner, Mark Walton, sexual assault offences increased by 8 per cent in the central metropolitan area last year. On 50 per cent of those occasions, the perpetrator and the victim were meeting for the first time. He has hopes that the Ask for Angela initiative will help individuals escape potential assaults. The success of the campaign will be monitored by police before it is implemented broadly.

In the last 10 years, the number of reported sexual assaults in South Australia has risen by more than 20 per cent. Considering the success of the Ask for Angela campaign overseas and in New South Wales, this campaign is a step in the right direction, and consideration should be given to introducing it to South Australia.

PORT ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB, POWER INTERCULTURAL PROGRAM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:39): It is a great privilege today to rise to speak about the Port Adelaide Football Club's Power Intercultural Program. As we know, South Australia has been a proud multicultural state, and it is very encouraging that the Power Intercultural Program is designed to celebrate vibrancy of cultural diversity and promote pride and social inclusion by recognising the positive contribution of our culturally and linguistically diverse communities through sports.

The Power Intercultural Program is an innovative educational program that is delivered to secondary school students in years 10 and 11 from schools across South Australia with large multicultural populations. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and congratulate Port Adelaide CEO, Keith Thomas; the general manager of Power Community Ltd, Ross Wait; and program manager, Alipate Carlile, for their vision in introducing the meaningful intercultural program last year.

The program was launched in 2017 with the belief that if anything can transcend race, intolerance, discrimination or disadvantage it is sport—in this case, Aussie Rules footy. In 2018, 225 secondary students from over 80 different cultures took part in the program, and I was pleased to learn that for the first time this year the Power Intercultural Program has SACE accreditation as part of the integrated learning subject.

Ambassadors are valuable assets to the club, and I would like to acknowledge the excellent work of the current AFL multicultural ambassadors of different heritages: Jimmy Toumpas, Greek/Cypriot heritage; Emmanuel Irra, Ugandan heritage; and Chen Shaoliang, Chinese heritage. These ambassadors, together with former Port Adelaide Football Club players, dedicated time to conducting and delivering sessions of the intercultural program. Those workshops encouraged students to explore their own culture, Aboriginal culture and other cultures within the school and local community.

The program allows students to develop an understanding of cultural differences and learn the skills of the Australian Rules football game. It promotes topics that foster intercultural acceptance and respect, and helps students build resilience. It is wonderful for students to have the unique opportunity of being mentored and motivated by their sporting hero players and professional staff.

I attended the inaugural launch of the intercultural carnival last year and it was wonderful to be invited back by Port Power this year. It was an honour to represent the Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, and the Minister for Education, the Hon. John Gardner, in the other place at the Power

Intercultural Program carnival opening ceremony on 21 June 2018. I was joined by the member for Colton, Matt Cowdrey OAM, at the ceremony to convey the government's best wishes to participating schools, and witnessed students and teachers wholeheartedly embracing this exciting multicultural program.

Football guernsey design is part of the intercultural program activities. The development stage requires students to research different cultures, consult the school community and come up with a design with symbols, images and colours that tell the story behind each guernsey and its relationship to cultural significance and the community it represents.

My heartfelt congratulations to all the students from the eight participating schools: Adelaide Secondary School of English, the Australian Islamic College, Garden College, Glenunga International High School, Pinnacle College, Thebarton Senior College, Thomas More College and Underdale High School. I commend all the students on their amazing efforts in the Power Intercultural Program carnival.

Special thanks to Port Power for reaching out to our young South Australians by delivering intercultural programs, Aboriginal programs and youth programs to create life-changing experiences for young people to gain further education and employment opportunities. I also thank the Power Community sponsoring partners for their ongoing commitment to promoting and delivering a wide range of programs that help to address key issues confronting young people across diverse communities.

Once again, well done to the leadership team at Port Power for their vision and dedication in using football to deliver meaningful educational and sports programs for young South Australians. These programs have the great potential to build confidence and resilience, open up new pathways and opportunities for young people to learn and grow, and to make a positive contribution to our multicultural society in South Australia.

REEVES PLAINS POWER STATION

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:44): I want to speak today about a new fossil fuel power plant proposed by Alinta at Reeves Plains near Mallala in the state's Mid North. The 300-megawatt gas and diesel-fuelled generator was approved by the former planning minister on 16 February, which was one day prior to the commencement of caretaker period in the lead-up to the March state election. A large number of local residents have now signed a petition addressed to the House of Assembly urging reconsideration of the approval of this power station.

Construction of the power plant has not commenced, and Alinta has not yet committed to construction. In fact, in the time-honoured tradition of the fossil fuel industry, they are putting their hand out for public subsidies. I will come back to that later. As members know, the rules around formal petitions to parliament are strict, antiquated and bear absolutely no resemblance to how people in modern society communicate, so it is likely that this petition will fall foul of some technicality or other, which is why I want to honour those residents by putting their concerns on the record in this house today.

In the petition, 170 residents of Reeves Plains and surrounding areas set out their concerns about this power station. They are worried about the proximity to houses, the nearest being 600 metres from the site. That sounds like a long way but, when you have 400,000 litres of diesel fuel stored on site, it is far too close for comfort. Residents are also concerned about noise, air pollution and the devaluation of their homes.

In relation to pollution, the residents are supported by Doctors for the Environment. In their submission to the State Planning Commission, that organisation pointed out that pollutants coming from gas-fired power stations include nitrogen oxides; carbon monoxide; volatile organic compounds; particulates; hazardous air pollutants, including formaldehyde and benzene; and sulphur dioxide. Doctors for the Environment point out that all these are known to be injurious to health, and they draw attention to the fact that 3,000 premature deaths occur in Australia every year as a consequence of poor air quality.

Aside from the petition, a large number of residents also engaged in the public consultation process in November last year. As one of the residents put it to me at the time:

The residents worry about the lights, noise, air quality, health impacts and devaluation of property. Many residents are on rain water and we worry about what we will be drinking and showering in...

Our human right to clean water and clean air is being taken away from us and I am asking for your help if there is anything we can do about it?

Back on 31 January, I travelled up to Mallala to support the local residents at the hearing of the State Planning Commission's assessment panel. In my submission, I pointed out a range of considerations, including the residents' concerns, but also addressing the elephant in the room by posing the question: why on earth, during unprecedented human-induced climate change, are we supporting or considering brand-new fossil fuel power stations? Again, I will refer to what Doctors for the Environment said in their submission:

At this time, when global warming is shaping an energy transformation around the world, South Australia is recognised as a leader in renewable energy. To turn to fossil fuel power generation in order to fill a shortfall in capacity is regressive and cannot be justified on health grounds (or economic grounds, given the price of gas). Dispatchability, a key requirement of the Energy Security Board, can be achieved with batteries, concentrated solar thermal with storage and pumped hydro and, together with demand management and higher levels of solar, can provide South Australia with energy which is not only reliable but healthy.

I need to remind members that this is not just a private project by a private company. It was supported by the state government, and it had the benefit of special state government planning processes, which included the final decision being made by the planning minister with no right of appeal by residents or conservation groups.

When it comes to economic viability, in an article in *The Australian* two weeks ago, under the headline 'Back our power plant, Alinta tells Canberra', we can see that the company is putting its hand out to Canberra for subsidies and handouts. They are not committing to go ahead unless we, the taxpayers, foot the bill. That just adds insult to injury. So I would like to urge this government and the federal government to get behind residents and support their legitimate expectations of living in a clean and healthy environment.

CYPRUS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:49): Today, I rise to speak out in support of Cyprus and the goal of unification and demilitarisation of the island country situated in the Aegean. According to Greek mythology, Cyprus was the birthplace of the goddess of love, Aphrodite. Unfortunately, in contrast, Cyprus' modern history has been characterised by conflict, war, turmoil and death.

This year marks 44 years of unresolved tensions since Turkey's military invasion and part annexation of Cyprus. Approximately 200,000 Cypriots were driven from their homes and became refugees, while 4,000 people lost their lives and around 1,619 people went missing. The result has been that Turkey, and Turkey alone, recognises the northern part of Cyprus as independent from the south.

The island continues to remain divided and partitioned, with the northern third occupied by Turkish Cypriots and the southern two-thirds inhabited by Greek Cypriots. The dividing line between the two parts, known as the green line, is patrolled by United Nations peacekeeping troops.

What occurred in 1974 and continues to remain unresolved lives within the minds and hearts of many in our communities in South Australia. Each year in South Australia the Cyprus Community of South Australia Incorporated, in association with the Justice for Cyprus Coordinating Committee of South Australia (otherwise known as SEKA), organises a series of events to mark the 44th anniversary on this occasion of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. These events are an expression of solidarity and support to the people of Cyprus wherever they may be, and a mark of respect to those who lost their lives for liberty.

I attended their wreath laying service, advocating for a just and viable solution to the Turkish military occupation and forced division of the island and its people. I have also met with the President of the Democratic Rally Party of Cyprus, Averof Neophytou; Deputy Minister of Shipping for the Republic of Cyprus, Natasha Pilidou; the President of the Cyprus Community in Adelaide, Andreas Evdokiou; Chairman of the Justice for Cyprus Committee, Peter Ppiros; and the High Commissioner of the Republic of Cyprus, Martha Mavrommati, over the recent events and commemorations.

We discussed how we, our multicultural community with strong ties to Cyprus, can best provide support on this matter to achieve unification and demilitarisation of the island. We discussed the importance of collaborative initiatives between Cyprus and South Australia in terms of cultural exchange and economic cooperation.

We have seen in recent years the success of sharing and promoting culture within the wider community. For example, the annual Cyprus Greek festival is a celebration of Cypriot/Greek culture, shared with the wider community. Each year it continues to gain interest and support. Our respective governments should be encouraging more activities like this.

We also discussed the importance of our government discussing collaboration at a business level. Cyprus is a gateway to the EU, and the state government should be considering the potential to encourage collaboration. I look forward to meeting again with members of the Cypriot community to discuss how together we can collaborate and support the unification and demilitarisation of Cyprus.

RIVERLAND

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:53): One of the many privileges of being a Legislative Councillor is the opportunity to meet and represent different communities across our state. Today, I pay tribute to one of our many regions, our beautiful Riverland. The two stand-out features of the Riverland are the pristine environment and the wonderful community, made up of towns, farms and orchards along the River Murray.

During my most recent visit I joined my colleagues, the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos MLC, in talking to local businesses and community members about the proposed changes to shop trading hours. The Riverland went through its own deregulation process some 17 years ago, and we were keen to hear from local business owners about how this process has affected them over the years.

I valued the discussions I had with local business owners. Mostly, I heard from people who wanted to ensure that consumers are provided with a choice to purchase produce that is locally supplied from a business that is locally owned. Small businesses and locally owned businesses rely on trade when the large chain supermarkets are closed. This is also the case in regional areas. Deregulation of shop trading hours in the city threatens to have an impact on regional areas; namely, if a retail worker is required to be at work on public holidays in the metropolitan area, it is less likely that families will have the time to visit our regional areas on a long weekend, which impacts on local trade, local farmers and tourism.

Towns and communities based along the River Murray—the lifeblood of our state—have made such an important contribution to our state, not least in their fight for the future health and sustainability of the River Murray. The previous Labor government worked closely with local businesses, irrigators and farmers and secured an additional commitment of 450 gigalitres and \$445 million for our state's future.

The previous Labor government also acted swiftly after the ABC's *Four Corners* program aired allegations of water theft by upstream irrigators. The Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission is now well underway. Labor fought to protect South Australia's interests and ensure that we receive every drop of water that we are entitled to receive.

From opposition, Labor will continue to stand up for South Australia and hold the federal Liberal government to account. To that end, the Liberal state government must act on the findings of the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission and ensure that they stand up for the health and wellbeing of the Murray-Darling Basin. The wellbeing and sustainability of Riverland communities depends on a healthy river. Water theft by upstream irrigators can and should be stopped. The Liberal state government must be forthright with their federal colleagues and demand a comprehensive response on water theft in the northern basin—anything less would be the worst outcome for our state.

I would also like to pay tribute to a true blue local, Mr Sim Singh-Malhi, who put up his hand to be Labor's candidate in the seat of Chaffey, which encompasses the Riverland community. Sim is a tenacious, passionate and hardworking young man. Sim's passion for his local community was

evident on the campaign trail. He doorknocked on 42^o days and relished the opportunity to chat to people about important local issues.

Sim is reliable and persistent. He followed up on issues raised and advocated on behalf of many people who he had spoken to throughout the campaign. Sim grew up in the Riverland and his family are fruit and vegetable growers. Sim has firsthand experience when it comes to the importance of preserving the health and sustainability of the River Murray. It was always going to be a tough ask for Sim to be elected, but he gave it his best shot and he should be proud of his efforts.

It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the tough times that the Riverland communities have experienced over the past years owing to the Millennium Drought. Nevertheless, the local community is resilient and has persevered. We are seeing increasing demand for produce from the region and at better prices. Locally grown and top quality produce such as citrus, almonds and stone fruits is exported all over the world.

A thriving Riverland presents strong job opportunities, particularly for our young people. I was proud to be part of the Labor team that secured \$265 million in federal funds for river communities and the future health of the River Murray. I note that, through the creation of the River Murray Sustainability Program, \$1 billion of economic activity has already been generated. My Labor colleagues and I look forward to working with the Riverland community in the future to promote good policies for the region, the community and the economy.

Bills

ANIMAL WELFARE (JUMPS RACING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:58): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Animal Welfare Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is not the first time that I have brought this bill before this place. Indeed, it is the third time I have brought this bill before this place, but this is a new parliament and this is a new day. Indeed, today is the Horses' Birthday: 1 August is, in the Southern Hemisphere, the Horses' Birthday, and I bring this bill before this place to wish jumps racing horses many happy returns.

In New South Wales, back in 1997, it became a criminal offence, through legislative reform, to ban jumps racing. In WA, they have not had a jumps race for some 70 years. In Tasmania, it is over a decade since they have had a jumps race. In the ACT and the Northern Territory, there never really was a factor of jumps racing as a major part of the racing scene. Queensland actually abolished jumps racing in 1903, well over 100 years ago. South Australia has a long way to go to catch up. It is only our jurisdiction and Victoria that still see jumps racing taking place. In 1991, a federal Senate select committee on animal welfare recommended the phasing out of jumps racing in all states over the consequent three years, yet here we are.

Sadly, many key decision-makers in many jurisdictions—our jurisdiction being one—have ignored this recommendation, and today we see, to our shame, South Australia and Victoria standing as the last two jurisdictions to still hold jumps racing events. Of course, South Australia now has an opportunity to rectify this error.

It is an error that perpetuates animal cruelty. That is not just my opinion or the opinion of the Greens, or indeed the opinion of the RSPCA, although it is all of those things, it is also the opinion of the Law Society. In their advice to my previous bill, which replicates this bill that I introduce today, the Law Society provided advice that stated that they believed it would be a useful piece of legislation because it would clarify what they already believed to be an illegal act under the Animal Welfare Act; that is, the practice of jumps racing.

They already believe that jumps racing is in contravention of the Animal Welfare Act, that it is a cruel practice and that it is likely to be illegal, but it is difficult to prosecute these issues. So my

bill, if passed, would simply make what the Law Society, the Greens, the RSPCA and many in our community—indeed, some 80 per cent in terms of opinion polls—already believe to be a clear breach of the law. Jumps racing has a very small part to play in the South Australian racing industry. Indeed, the South Australian Jockey Club has come out previously to say that they do not want jumps racing at Morphettville. Indeed, Morphettville remains the only metropolitan location for jumps racing in the country. Of course, in the last month it was the scene of yet another horse death on the track.

In terms of that legal advice, it would clarify once and for all that jumps racing is illegal. Certainly, as I raised in question time today, the RSPCA (the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) should be given the powers it needs to prevent cruelty to animals under the Animal Welfare Act. At the moment, our act does not allow that preventative remedy. So here we have a bill that would resolve that issue.

Since 2009, at least 18 horses are known to have died in South Australia on our tracks as a result of jumps racing. The true death toll is believed to be higher. Horses that die at trials are not added to the official statistics. Indeed, the number of jumps races that take place in this state is so small as to mean that the number of deaths, while it might seem to some to be quite low, is in fact proportionately quite concerning.

A University of Melbourne study found that jumps racing is 19 times deadlier than flats racing. To put that in context, if jumps racing deaths were to occur in the same way as flats racing, as in each flats racing meeting that would be held, it would see a horse die on the track each and every time a flats race meeting were held. The public outcry would be extreme and enormous. In terms of the future of racing, this bill proposes a ban.

What I would say—and I would be echoed by many of the 1,811 submissions to the previous select committee on jumps racing—is that if there is not a ban, people will vote with their feet. Sponsors have already started to pull out their support, and Morphettville itself recognises that their brand is damaged by the presence of jumps racing. That is why the SAJC has previously indicated that they do not wish to see jumps racing in the metropolitan area of South Australia into the future.

I introduce this bill today in the middle of the jumps racing season. As I note, it is quite small but it has two months to run. However, today, being Horses' Birthday, I thought they deserved a present. Many happy returns to those jumps racing horses that I hope will not die into the future. This bill would provide for a ban a year after its assent that would save those horses' lives into the future. To counterclaims that those who support this ban would see those horses die at the knackery instead, I do know that many rescue groups already take these horses, these horses that are often rejected by the industry when they do not make a profit for their current owners.

The trainers and jockeys in jumps racing do not comprise a major part of the racing industry in this state; in fact, no full-time jockeys or trainers would exist in this part of the industry. Indeed, there are transition arrangements that could be made to ensure not just the welfare of those animals, not just the increased safety in the workplace of the jockeys, but, of course, the reputation of the racing industry overall. While jumps racing probably accounts for a very small proportion of the industry in South Australia, it pretty much accounts for 99 per cent of the bad publicity that they receive. With those few words, I commend the bill to the house.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DIFFERENTIAL RATES ON VACANT LAND) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:08): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Many councils charge a higher differential rate for vacant residential land as an incentive to build on the land. Sometimes this rate can be double the regular residential rate. The theory behind this is

that if the rates are higher it will encourage people to build on the property rather than leave it vacant. However, there is concern that this actually provides a disincentive or penalty for people, especially young people, from purchasing land.

The ABS has previously reported that for every \$1 million spent in construction, a possible \$2.9 million of output would be generated in the economy, including 37 jobs as a whole. Stimulating the economy through construction is positive; however, if people are being penalised with high rates while they are saving to pay for the construction of their property the differential rate may act as a disincentive but certainly as a penalty.

My bill will stipulate that councils who charge a differential rate will only be able to do so after the first three years the land has been within ownership. After this, councils will be able to charge a higher differential rate. If the property changes ownership the three-year grace period starts again for the new owner. There are some who may try to exploit this grace period by changing ownership after three years. However, the costs associated with changing ownership through the Lands Titles Office would be disincentive enough. Currently, the cost to do this for a property worth \$300,000 is \$14,000 or \$6,000 for a piece of land which is worth \$150,000.

I understand this amendment is unlikely to gain the support of councils; however, I believe it is necessary to help those who are already struggling with the cost of living and the additional cost of vacant residential land and building a new home. I commend the bill to members.

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

GAMING MACHINES (PROHIBITION OF EFTPOS FACILITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:11): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Gaming Machines Act 1992. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:12): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on this bill and indicate this will in fact be the third time that I have introduced these measures into this house. In essence, the bill will prohibit EFTPOS facilities being in gaming venues. EFTPOS facilities were introduced into gaming venues in 2015 by the previous government in a seemingly ill-considered move. This went against the Productivity Commission's recommendation to limit access to cash in gaming venues and is a move which has been condemned by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. South Australia is not only seemingly the only jurisdiction that allows for EFTPOS facilities in gaming venues but is seemingly the only jurisdiction the world which allows gamblers to access cash by withdrawing money via EFTPOS.

I have said before that this was a bad move and did nothing to protect vulnerable problem gamblers. It is in fact correspondence from a constituent which I received recently that has prompted me to reintroduce this bill into parliament. They wrote:

I have recently returned to South Australia after living in Perth for the past six years. Problem gambling was not a major issue for me in Perth as the Casino was the only location that offered gambling. My withdrawal limits from the ATM machine were \$400 and cash withdrawals were not available over the counter by the casino staff. This ensured that any gambling episode could be capped and harm could be minimised.

There was always the option of driving outside the casino complex to make a withdrawal from an ATM machine, but the time outside the venue would ensure I had a level head when making the decision to withdraw more money. Under no circumstances would I withdraw more money than I would have liked to have lost as it would be dangerous to have extra cash in my pocket. During one episode, I reached my maximum \$400 withdrawal and left the casino 3 times in total, withdrawing an additional \$100 each trip. On my fourth frantic trip towards the ATM machine, I realised how irrational I was being and decided...to go home instead of withdrawing more money.

Now that I am in back in Adelaide, there are avenues to gamble on every major intersection across South Australia at all hours of the day and night. ATM withdrawals are capped at \$250, but the introduction of Eftpos facilities over the counter within venues has given me access to unlimited cash withdrawals. Last night, I decided to drop into the pokies with a level head to try my luck with \$50 that I withdrew from an ATM on my way to the Britannia Hotel. I received a \$2k tax return several days ago and had access to more cash in my account that I have had for a very long

time. I was intoxicated when I arrived to the venue and was feeling a little emotionally unstable due to the lack of purpose that I currently have in my life.

The \$50 was quickly consumed and I decided to make a withdrawal from the ATM outside the facility of \$60, changing \$20 of coins at a time. The hotel staff member did her rounds offering patrons coffee, so I opted...for a high quality barista prepared latte. My coins ran out before she returned with my coffee, so I decided to make another \$60 withdrawal. Before I knew it I was hypnotised by the sounds and thrill of winning the jackpot. I withdrew another \$60 from the machine and another \$60 soon after, trying to control my spending by changing \$20 of coins at a time. The ATM machine withdrawal [limit] was capped at \$250, so I put the sign up onto my machine and advised the gaming staff member that I would be heading out to find a ATM machine outside the venue. This would have given me the opportunity to take a breath of fresh air and reflect on my rationale.

The staff member told me that I can make a withdrawal over the counter via Eftpos and I don't even need to pay a transaction fee. Without even thinking rationally, I opted...to make a withdrawal via Eftpos of \$60. I made a further 6 x \$60 withdrawals over the counter and lost the money \$20 x \$1 coins at time. In total I withdrew 7 x \$60 over the counter via Eftpos, 4 x \$60 from the ATM machine and \$50 that I arrived to [the] venue with.

As you might have expected, my anxiety increased after every withdrawal and I was by no means level headed. I was emotionally invested and was fixated on chasing my losses. The gaming staff member didn't attempt to intervene at any point and did her job without question giving me access to cash via Eftpos.

This constituent's experience very clearly shows that the so-called safeguards, which were argued, do not exist. The government at the time argued that by having to make the transaction through a person, it would give the gaming staff member the opportunity to be able to question the person making the withdrawal and offer information on problem gambling, if required.

Very clearly, that did not happen with this constituent. No attempts were made to intervene. This constituent was able to gamble away \$710 in a very short amount of time, when they would have lost less than half of that if EFTPOS facilities were not there. Our constituent goes on to say:

All I want is to close the loop hole to protect the people of South Australia from having access to unlimited funds for gambling.

That is what I have been asking for as well. Introducing EFTPOS machines in our gaming venues was a bad move. Leaving them there when we know the harm they are causing is worse, and I am pleading with this parliament to right the wrongs of the previous government and remove EFTPOS facilities from gaming venues to give protection to those vulnerable in our community.

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

Motions

INTERNATIONAL NELSON MANDELA DAY

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:21): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges International Nelson Mandela Day held on 18 July 2018;
2. Pays tribute to the work of Nelson Mandela in his devotion to serving humanity; and
3. Highlights the impact that the removal of social responsibility has on society.

Today, I rise to move the private members' motion standing in my name about the significant impact that Nelson Mandela has had on supporting and promoting human rights in his country and around the world. This year marks the 100th birthday of Nelson Mandela, if he were to see this day. Unfortunately, this extraordinary man passed in 2013 at the age of 95, but his legacy, fortunately, continues.

The United Nations resolved to commemorate 18 July, Nelson Mandela's birthday, as International Nelson Mandela Day in 2009. Each year, the United Nations asks for 67 minutes of silence to recognise the 67 years that Nelson Mandela devoted his life to peace and freedom. In his time, Mandela contributed to the progression and development of his country and culture, most significantly by helping to rid South Africa of apartheid. As a consequence, he was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in 1993 and became the first democratically elected black president of South Africa in 1994.

He devoted his life to supporting his country's struggle for liberation and unity. As a humanitarian, he valued the promotion and protection of all human rights, reconciliation, equality of race and giving a voice to vulnerable groups and individuals. He pursued a nonviolent, anti-apartheid campaign against the South African government. As a result of his activities, Nelson Mandela served a significant time in a South African prison.

In 1962, he was convicted of trying to overthrow the white supremacist government and was given a lifetime sentence. However, 27 years later, after an international campaign, Mandela was released and was able to continue his campaign for peace and freedom until his death. Three years ago, the United Nations broadened its understanding of International Nelson Mandela Day to include and promote humane conditions for prisoners.

It is very important that we consider that all of our citizens, irrespective of where they may be housed, are recognised members of our society and are afforded their rights as citizens under our legal system and in accordance with international human rights law. This internationally recognised day is a useful starting point in any discussion of citizens' rights and the United Nations' standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners, otherwise known as the Nelson Mandela rules. Expressed in them is that:

The prison regime should seek to minimise any differences between prison life and life at liberty that tend to lessen the responsibility of the prisoners or the respect due to their dignity as human beings.

The Nelson Mandela rules also enunciate that, 'The treatment of prisoners should emphasize not their exclusion from the community but their continuing part in it.'

Currently, South Australia allows persons in custody the right to vote. This may change as a result of a bill introduced in March this year that aims to disenfranchise any person serving three or more years from being able to act on this simple right. We need to have regard to all perspectives and issues when debating this matter in both houses. This day commemorates the changes made possible by one man backed by the will of his nation. As the first black president of his country Nelson Mandela set aside adversity to achieve his goals.

In Australia it is important that we recognise our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and highly value their rich history and role in and contribution to our country and communities. It is evident that this group of Australians is disproportionately represented within the penitentiary system; only 2 per cent of our South Australian population is recognised as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander yet they represent almost 25 per cent of our prison population. We currently recognise all people within our community, yet we prevent a significant portion of them from further participating in society or acting in pursuit of their human rights.

In recognition of this model humanitarian, of a man who won a Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts in reconciliation between those in power and those without a voice, we should use this time to consider all members of our society. It is often easy to overlook those who are not seen or heard but we need to consider the harm this suppression may cause, the impact that stripping over 3,032 South Australians of their right to vote has on our state and its people, and consider the impact on their rehabilitation and their view of our society.

As we, as a state and a country, continue to grow and develop, it shows greatly when we take time to reflect on the life of such a devoted man. Nelson Mandela helped his country develop and grow in the overall struggle for democracy and liberty. To be selective about which groups of people are and are not supported to vote, stripping away what is a human right for all, strikes at the core concern that Nelson Mandela worked tirelessly to change.

The teachings of Nelson Mandela should be used as an example of growth and development of our democratic society and the intrinsic value these issues have in our community. We have a social responsibility to ensure that all citizens remain part of our community, no matter their status. It should be at the heart of our community and societal values. In the words of the great man himself:

It is said that no-one truly knows a nation until one has been inside its jails. A nation should not be judged by how it treats its highest citizens, but its lowest ones.

Vale, Nelson Mandela.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to welcome the Consul General of Greece and senior members of the Greek and Cypriot communities. Welcome to the Legislative Council.

Motions

GREECE, WILDFIRES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:28): I move:

That this council—

1. Expresses its deep regret at the loss of life of almost 100 people in Mati, east of Athens, from devastating forest fires;
2. Acknowledges that at least 187 people were injured in the blaze, including 23 children, and many more people remain missing;
3. Recognises the efforts of firefighters, the coastguard and volunteers to save lives;
4. Praises the efforts of the Greek Orthodox community in South Australia to raise funds to contribute to the relief effort in Mati; and
5. Offers its deepest sympathies to Greek-Australians who have lost loved ones in Mati.

Like all South Australians, including my colleagues in this chamber and the other place, I have been moved by the graphic images of the utter devastation caused by fierce forest fires that have ravaged the small beachside town of Mati, east of Athens, and nearby areas. The unfolding tragedy has hit very close to home not only because of my proud Greek heritage, which I detailed in my maiden speech yesterday, but also because, in South Australia and across the nation, we are all too familiar with the complete destruction that bushfires can cause to the landscape and, most devastatingly, the heartbreaking loss of life.

The images emanating from Greece of burnt forests turned to ash, torched vehicles lining once picture-postcard streets and homes destroyed and still smouldering from the remnants of one of the most catastrophic forest fires that country has ever experienced have shaken the Greek-Australian community to its core and left us all aghast at the post-apocalyptic scenes. Rescuers rushed to evacuate residents and tourists stranded on beaches as Greece battled blazes on the scale of those that hit large tracts of the western Peloponnese in 2007 and tragically left a death toll of 77 people.

The wildfires in and around Mati now represent Greece's worst natural disaster since that tragedy 11 years ago, claiming nearly 100 lives and rising, leaving thousands homeless and many still missing. The human cost of what has happened in Mati is incalculable, and it will take many years for the Greek people to recover. At least two-thirds of the houses in the Marathon district, which includes Mati, have been razed—that is two-thirds of the 1,900 houses in Mati, while a further 1,100 homes in Neos Voutzas are no longer habitable. These numbers are hard to comprehend.

My heart goes out to the people of Mati and the entire country, the birthplace of my parents and their siblings, as they begin the sorrowful task of burying the dead, caring for the sick and injured, rebuilding and learning invaluable lessons about preventing loss of life in the future. It is in such dark times that there has been a groundswell of support across the nation and the globe to help the people of Mati. I have been heartened by the solidarity of the Greek-Australian community throughout Australia and the broader migrant and local community in South Australia, who have united to assist the relief efforts in Greece.

On Monday night, leaders of various ethnic groups joined to help victims of the Greek wildfires disaster. More than 100 people from the Greek community, as well as business and political leaders—including our Greek Consul General, Andreas Gouras, who is here today—together with a number of other Greek community leaders and representatives, were present. I thank them all for their ongoing efforts in relation to this issue. Also present were Premier Steven Marshall; opposition

leader Peter Malinauskas; my colleagues from this place, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos; and a number of others from this chamber and from another place.

They met at Olympic Hall in the city for a forum organised by the Greek Orthodox Community of SA. In addition, there were representatives from the Cypriot, Italian, Jewish, Islamic, African and Indian communities. The president of the Greek Orthodox Community of SA, Mr Bill Gonis, who is here today, said:

We are getting phone calls not just from the Greek community but from the public asking how we can help and where do we contribute funds.

This public outpouring has led to the Greek Orthodox Community of SA banding together with local Greek associations to form a partnership with the Bank of Sydney and Delphi Bank to establish a community relief fund. Mr Gonis has said that, by establishing a coordinated committee, the public could have confidence that their money would go to the people and groups most in need of help. He also told the meeting that it was hoped that the committee could evaluate where money was needed most and formulate a plan for distributing it within the next eight weeks or so.

Many social and sporting clubs, including Adelaide's Greek soccer clubs, have already started fundraising at grassroots level. In addition to this wonderful outpouring of community support, world-renowned Adelaide plastic surgeon, Dr John Greenwood, has flown to Greece to treat burns victims with a skin repair technology that he developed right here in Australia. Dr Greenwood is director of the Adult Burns Service at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and was South Australia's 2016 Australian of the Year for his world-leading work in burns treatment.

Dr Greenwood will assist Greek surgeons to treat the 10 most severely burned patients from the Mati forest fires. He begins his work on Sunday at the Attica General Hospital KAT in Athens, using a biodegradable skin graft substitution that he pioneered with CSIRO following the Bali bombings in 2002.

Dr Greenwood's extraordinary willingness to help follows soon after the remarkable efforts of Dr Richard Harris, who we had the pleasure of meeting just last week and who was instrumental in an international and highly dangerous rescue of 12 young boys and their soccer coach from a flooded cave system in Thailand only a few weeks ago. Dr Greenwood's assistance is yet another example of South Australian selflessness, bravery and excellence in specific medical areas of expertise.

I also welcome news from the Premier that he will announce an official South Australian aid package in coming days, which SA-Best will support wholeheartedly. The tragic events unfolding in Mati are a salient and stark reminder that Australia's bushfire season is only a few months away, and that we must brace ourselves for a potentially dangerous fire season due to the current drought and dry conditions impacting many parts of regional South Australia. I certainly hope that this motion receives bipartisan support, and I commend it to this place.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:36): Today, I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC regarding the Greek wildfires disaster. The fire that sped flames through the seaside village of Mati is completely heartbreaking. Locals in the region have lost their friends, their family and everything they had to their name. The community has been completely demoralised. To learn that there are victims from the fire itself, but also from drowning in the sea whilst fleeing from the flames, is heart wrenching, as the numbers continue to expand, drawn from the list of those thought to be missing.

Termed the deadliest Europe has experienced in over a century, the wildfire ripped through five kilometres in 90 minutes, where 20,000 people were present. Acknowledging those figures alone shows how difficult any evacuation effort would have been. Over 3,500 homes have been damaged in the blaze, with more than 1,000 of the affected structures considered uninhabitable and scheduled for demolition.

We here in South Australia know too well the devastation that fires can inflict on our lives and our community, and the arduous task that lies ahead to rebuild from the ashes. Greeks are hardworking, passionate people. The brave work currently being undertaken by the firefighters, coast

guard, Navy SEALs, health officials and all the volunteers has been unbelievable. Without their commendable efforts, there is no doubt more lives would have been lost.

South Australia has a rich affinity with Greece. Time and again we have experienced the generosity of our Greek community to help build our state and to assist other communities who have experienced natural disaster, so much so that we here in South Australia will not only mourn for those who have been lost and provide condolences to those who are left to rebuild but will provide help and support.

I was proud to join leaders of various ethnic groups to attend Olympic Hall to discuss how we as a multicultural community can unite to provide support to Greece. Organised by the Greek Orthodox community of South Australia, representatives from the South Australian Greek communities, SAMEAC and the Greek Consulate joined representatives from the Indian, Sikh, Islamic, Italian, Cypriot and African communities and members from sporting associations across the board.

We met this past Monday to constructively discuss how we as a state can work collaboratively to provide support for the victims in Greece. I applaud the contributions made that night, as it was a clear indicator of the strength of our multicultural communities in South Australia. The discussion on the night was primarily centred on fundraising efforts, and how we as a South Australian community could best direct and manage funds so that maximum resources reach the people most in need. I raised that there should be a multicultural coordinating committee to oversee those fundraising efforts.

I have every confidence that the volunteers on the committee will be very successful with their endeavours and look forward to their initiatives as they transpire. Not only do I stand here to offer my deepest and most heartfelt condolences to those who have lost due to this tragedy, I stand in solidarity with the Greek communities within South Australia whose drive and efforts to contribute to provide relief aid in Mati has been astounding.

I would like to also acknowledge people who are here today: Mr Andreas Gouras, Greek Consul General; Mr Bill Gonis, President of the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia; Mr Peter Gardiakos, member of the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia; Mr Peter Piros, Chairman of the Justice for Cyprus Committee; Mr Andreas Evdokiou, President of the Cyprus Community; Ms Martha Ioannidis, President of the Executive Committee for Messinian Association of South Australia; and Mr George Kontopoulos, businessman, Omega Foods. I would just like to end with a few words in my first language.

Ta silipitiria mou ston Elliniko llaο kai kourayio sto Elliniko kratο stis thiskoles meres pou pernai.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:40): Further to my honourable colleagues, Connie Bonaros and Irene Pnevmatikos, I had the pleasure to attend the forum on Monday evening, organised by the Greek Orthodox community, along with other MPs, including the Premier, Steven Marshall; Leader of the Opposition, Peter Malinauskas; the Hon. Jing Lee; the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos; the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis; the Hon. Russell Wortley; a former member of this chamber, the Hon. Julian Stefani; and, of course, the Consul General of Greece, Mr Andreas Konstantinos Gouras, who is in the chamber today—welcome.

Mr Marshall has offered state government assistance and I hope it is as generous and giving as the Greek community has been to this great state, city and nation. There were about 100 in attendance, representing the rich fabric of our wonderful multicultural society, described by Mr Gouras as the best in the world—and who can argue with him. In times of adversity, it is heartening and uplifting to see our communities rise as one to help those in need, whether at home or in overseas countries which have strong bonds to Australia and South Australia, and there are bonds as strong as Hercules that link South Australia and Greece. In fact, former Premier, the late Don Dunstan, once conferred the title to Adelaide as being the Athens of the South.

While we are not quite in the same league as Melbourne—the third largest city outside of Greece with people of Greek heritage—we are the third biggest in Australia with some 50,000 people aligned in some way to the country, myself included. Despite my Italian background, I am married

into a proud Greek family, and, as Greeks often remind and rib me, 'Una facia, una racia,' which basically means 'one face, one race'.

The destruction of Mati was shocking and the huge loss of life was heartbreaking. It was reminiscent of the bushfire destruction we see here in our own state and country. The consensus from the Monday meeting was that South Australians from all walks are ready, willing and able to help, whether in financial terms or by the provision of services and equipment. As has already been pointed out, Dr John Greenwood from Adelaide, a specialist in burns, immediately travelled to Greece to offer his skills.

An organising committee has been established to coordinate the fundraising efforts and determine what is required that can assist the community to recover. The offers of support have come from a wide sector of our ethnic communities, including the Cypriot Greeks, the Italians, Sikhs, Africans, Hindus, Islamic and Jewish. Can I pay tribute to the President of the Greek Orthodox Community, Mr Bill Gonis, who has been unwavering in his efforts to bring together people for a common cause. The goodwill to the people of Greece I have seen in the past few days has been quite special and moving. It makes me proud to be a South Australian. Thank you, and I support the honourable member's motion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:44): I rise on behalf of government members and on behalf of the Premier to speak in support of the motion. In doing so, I cannot claim, as some of these speakers already, Greek heritage, or indeed marrying into Greek heritage. My only claim, for the members of the Greek community present, is that I am occasionally mistaken as a member of the Greek community. I am told that the name Lucas, spelled differently with a 'k', is not uncommon. In my youth, when I had dark hair, I was sometimes thought to be a member of the Greek community. It is flimsy, I know, but it is the best that I can offer to the members of the Greek community who are with us today.

I rise to support the Hon. Ms Bonaros's motion on behalf of the government, in particular on behalf of the Premier. I think members have acknowledged that the Premier attended the gathering a few days ago and indicated a willingness, on behalf of the new government, to provide not only compassion and support but also a support package, which I think he indicated will be announced in the coming days. As someone who has some responsibility for the budget, the Hon. Mr Pangallo indicated that he hoped the government would be generous. If there is any cause which would deserve generosity of spirit, I am sure this particular one would be the case. If the Premier indicates a willingness to support it, there will certainly be support from me as the Treasurer.

I share all members' comments and the community's comments thus far, that we share the tragedy and sadness of the Greek community, in particular those who have suffered and will continue to suffer. We in South Australia, and in Australia generally, know the heartache and heartbreak of bushfires, as we call them. We and our communities have suffered the tragedy over the decades of massive bushfires in my own part of the world, and indeed a part of the world shared by other members, of the South-East of South Australia and through the Adelaide Hills, in particular, but also many other parts of South Australia. It is small comfort, but we understand what the Greek community is going through, not only in Greece but also their friends and wider family in Australia and around the world.

As I explained to the Hon. Ms Bonaros, the Liberal party room normally, on these occasions when there are private members' motions and bills, have a process where we take a private members' motion or bill to the party room and everyone has the opportunity to speak, and we then form a position. However, I think this particular motion is of such significance that I have taken the executive decision, with the agreement of my Premier, to indicate that, whilst we have not formally discussed this as a party room and formed a position, I speak on behalf of the government and the Liberal party room in unequivocally supporting the motion that the Hon. Ms Bonaros has moved.

Certainly, more importantly, there is a willingness on behalf of the Premier and the government to work with the Greek community in South Australia to provide whatever level of assistance we might be able to provide and whatever level of comfort we might be able to assist with, in terms of managing the process over the days, weeks and months ahead. With that brief

contribution, I indicate, on behalf of the Premier, the government and Liberal members, our wholehearted support for the motion moved by the honourable member.

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

NAIDOC WEEK

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher:

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.

(Continued from 25 July 2018.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:49): I rise on behalf of Liberal members to support the motion and, in doing so, can I indicate that I speak on behalf of the minister, indeed in this case it is the Premier who has responsibility for Aboriginal affairs. I am indebted to the Premier's office for the notes that I will now place on the public record on behalf of the Premier and the government in relation to this particular motion.

NAIDOC Week is held across Australia each July to celebrate the history, culture and achievements of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. NAIDOC Week is celebrated not only in Indigenous communities but by Australians from all walks of life. NAIDOC originally stood for National Aborigines and Islanders Day Observance Committee. NAIDOC 2018 will be held from 8 to 15 July. Its theme will be Because of Her, We Can! to honour Aboriginal women.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women continue to play active and significant roles at the community, local, state and national levels. They have fought and continue to fight for justice, equal rights, rights to country, law and justice, access to education, employment and to maintain and celebrate their culture, language, music and art. For at least 65,000 years, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women have carried the Dreaming stories, songlines, languages and knowledge that have kept Aboriginal culture strong. They have marched, protested and spoken at demonstrations and national gatherings for the proper recognition of rights and calling for national reform and justice.

Aboriginal women were heavily involved in the campaign for the 1967 referendum. They did so while caring for their families, maintaining their homes and breaking down cultural and institutionalised barriers and gender stereotypes. They did so because they demanded a better life, greater opportunities and rights for their children, families and people. Their achievements, their voice and their unwavering passion have empowered past generations and paved the way for generations to come.

NAIDOC Week in South Australia will feature five main events: the NAIDOC church service, the NAIDOC SA Awards, the NAIDOC SA March and Family Fun Day and the NAIDOC SA Ball. I note that there are only four. The chair of the NAIDOC SA committee is Joyleen Thomas. A Kokatha woman, Joyleen has worked in the state and federal public sectors in a range of positions ranging from employment, education and training to the criminal justice system. Other members of the committee include Camille Dobson, an Eastern Arrernte woman born in Alice Springs, who has lived in Adelaide for the past 25 years. After graduating from the University of Adelaide with a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Laws, she has worked with the Legal Services Commission, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and is currently employed by Santos.

Leata Clarke, born in Western Australia, graduated from the University of South Australia in 1997 with a Diploma in Aboriginal Community Administration. Since 2010, she has worked as the reconciliation officer for the Adelaide city council. Brenda Underwood is an Arabana woman with close family ties extending across South Australia and the Northern Territory. She has spent many years working in various roles in the disability sector.

The 2018 NAIDOC celebrations in South Australia will also honour Aunty Josie Agius, following her passing. Aunty Josie was patron of NAIDOC South Australia for many years. She

worked tirelessly to assist and support the NAIDOC committee to promote the week to the wider community.

Other prominent South Australian Aboriginal women, amongst the many who could be listed, include Gladys Elphick, a strong advocate for Indigenous women and non-Indigenous women alike. She is remembered as the founding member of the Council of Aboriginal Women of South Australia, which worked for the rights of Indigenous women. In 1984, four years before her death at the age of 84, she was named South Australian Aboriginal of the Year. In 2003, the Aboriginal Women's Group advising the International Women's Day Committee, established the annual Gladys Elphick Award.

Lowitja O'Donoghue, born in 1932 at Indulkana, had a career in nursing and the Public Service, culminating in chairing the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission between 1990 and 1996. In December 1992, she became the first Aboriginal Australian to address the United Nations General Assembly during the launch of the United Nations International Year of Indigenous Peoples. Rebecca Richards is the first Aboriginal Rhodes Scholar, an honour conferred in 2010 after her anthropological studies at the University of Adelaide.

As I said, I am indebted to the Premier's office for that detail and background in explaining why he and the government support the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition in this chamber. On behalf of government members, again, we acknowledge NAIDOC Week and we acknowledge the theme of NAIDOC Week, which was 'Because of her, we can!' In particular, on behalf of the Premier and government members, we pay tribute to the many South Australian Aboriginal women who have contributed so much to our great state.

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

Bills

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION (BASIC SALARY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading

(Continued from 20 June 2018.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:56): I rise on behalf of government members to speak on this bill. It is an important bill. I have in the past, when in opposition, previously when in government and now again in government, been prepared to stand up on behalf of not only government members but all members of parliament and speak out against these sorts of bills and motions.

I feel strongly about this particular issue. As I near the end of what many of my opponents say has been too long a parliamentary career—nevertheless, as I near the end of it—I speak without fear or favour, but I speak in exactly the same way as I have on many other occasions, both earlier and in the middle stages of my career. I think these bills and motions do no good service to what I think should be an important role, an important profession and an important occupation, that is, serving the community as an elected representative as a state member of parliament.

Members of parliament are often demeaned collectively as a species by all and sundry. The whole notion of members of parliament being overpaid and underworked is such a populist notion that it is an easy horse upon which opportunists can hop. In my view, this particular bill and these particular types of motions are perfect examples of that.

It serves no good purpose, in my view, and all it seeks to do is to cast an even worse light, if that is possible, in terms of what I think should be an important profession and occupation that one would hope more and more South Australians would aspire to over the coming years. I know it will be a forlorn hope, but I hope at some stage in my dotage I might look back in my post parliamentary life and actually see that there is a united view amongst all in the parliament, and perhaps a view from some in the community, that members of parliament are not indeed overpaid and underworked in terms of the work they undertake.

I know how hard members of parliament generally work. I accept that, as with any profession, there will be a minority that do not carry their weight. There will be a minority, perhaps, that do not

earn their living—I suppose that is the polite way of putting it. However, overwhelmingly, in my experience, even though I am trenchantly opposed to the political views of the opposition on many occasions, I nevertheless have a fervent view that the overwhelming majority of members, Labor, Liberal and crossbenchers, work hard for their living and are entitled to a reasonable recompense for the work they do on behalf of the community.

When I last spoke on these sorts of issues—it seems a long time ago, but it was actually only three years ago in 2015, when the most recent substantive changes, which I will address in a moment, were addressed. I have not had the time to pull out more recent information, which seems a little bit silly, because now that you are in government you have so many staff and departmental people you would think you would be able to pull out these sorts of figures very quickly, but we have other things to do at the moment rather than pulling out debating points for this particular motion.

At that time, in 2015, we did a quick check of the departmental reports and the Auditor-General's reports, and we established that at that particular time there were more than 1,300 public servants being paid more than \$151,000 a year. The reason why \$151,000 was the figure is that at that time the base salary for MPs was \$153,000. So there were 1,300 public servants being paid more than the base salary three years ago. There were 500 public servants being paid more than \$201,000, so we are not just talking about 15 or 16 CEOs who are all being paid \$400,000, \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year. We are talking about a—cavalcade is not the right word—large number of public servants at levels below the CEO level who are being paid significant sums of money.

Again, I have not had the chance to check what I have been told in some of the budget bilateral discussions, but I have been informed that there are at least 50 persons within the SA Health department who are being paid more than the Minister for Health. Now, the Minister for Health is paid somewhere between—I am guessing—\$350,000 and \$400,000, because the base salary now is just under \$200,000 and the loading for a minister is \$75,000.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: Seventy-five per cent.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Seventy-five per cent, yes. So it is somewhere between \$350,000 and \$400,000, I would imagine, that the Minister for Health earns. If that information is accurate, what I am told is that there are more than 50 persons within SA Health who are earning more than \$350,000 to \$400,000. I suspect a number of those will be clinicians who have a combination of salary and remuneration fee arrangements within their salary package, but I do know that at the bureaucrat level there are significant numbers as well being paid above \$250,000. Admittedly, it is an extraordinarily large department.

In highlighting that, I am not arguing that members of parliaments' salaries should go up to those particular levels, because that will be an easy grab for the odd politician or two or for the media, but what I do is in defending what I believe is not an unreasonable package of entitlements and benefits that members of parliament, office holders and ministers have.

That is the essential premise that I have in relation to these issues. I have always had it, and I will continue to put that particular point of view. It is not a point of view that will win public favour. It is not a populist view, but the easy hit is, as I said, to take a tilt at the salary and wages of members of parliament, to take a tilt at their benefits and entitlements—I will have some more to say about that in a moment—to take a tilt generally, as I said, and to surf the populist wave of criticism of MPs as being overpaid and underworked.

In 2015, that particular debate was in part driven by comments that the former premier had made in relation to MP salaries and superannuation. As it transpired, the former premier's position on superannuation was not continued by the former government, but in relation to the salaries and allowances issue, a range of changes were entered into, which were the subject of the 2015 legislation.

The Hon. Mr Parnell expressed concerns about some aspects of it. I think he referred in the second reading this time to—joint appearance might be too strong a description—an appearance that he and I and, I think, the then Attorney-General made at the same time before the Remuneration Tribunal in relation to the aftermath of the 2015 legislation.

I refreshed my memory reading my contribution this morning about what was driven in relation to the 2015 legislation. I did not actually indicate when it had started, but I highlighted that for many years MPs' salaries in South Australia had been linked to federal MPs' salaries and had been linked at a level of \$2,000 less than the federal MPs' salaries. The Hon. Mr Parnell will say, 'Why would you pick \$2,000?' The honest answer to that is that it was, I suspect, just a number that MPs picked out at the time in terms of the difference. That is, there was an argument that they should not be paid any more than a federal MP, because federal MPs have, generally, bigger electorates, except, of course, that senators only have the same size electorate as legislative councillors, so perhaps we, as legislative councillors, should be treated differently.

Then what happened was there was a major change at the federal level, and state parliaments—and our state parliament followed suit—locked in state MPs' salaries at \$42,000 less than the federal MPs' salaries. That was because there had been an increase in the federal MP salary of \$40,000 and the view at the time, supported by all and sundry in South Australia, was that we would just adjust the nexus from \$2,000 to \$42,000 difference.

The 2015 bill, of course, was then in response to the former premier's public statements on remuneration and superannuation, and what transpired as a result of that was that there was an increase in the base salary for state members of parliament, but differently to what occurred in the federal arena, it was in essence compensated, in terms of its cost, by a reduction in the benefits that state members of parliament had.

I am sure some of my colleagues will well remember that one of the benefits that MPs lost at that particular time was a travel allowance of around about \$13,500 a year. It was not a travel allowance which entitled MPs, as most would imagine, solely to travel overseas but it also was a travel allowance that allowed travel interstate and intrastate in relation to the workload that members had.

That is an important part of the role of a Legislative Council member, who represents the whole of South Australia, intrastate travel. An important role of MPs and, in particular, shadow ministers is occasional interstate travel, to look at what is going on, what occurs, in other states or jurisdictions. However, as part of the offset to the increase in the base salary that \$13,500 travel allowance was removed as well.

What was also removed—and, again, the Hon. Mr Parnell has been just a touch on the cynical side in relation to this, because he believes he is one of the very few people who ever use public transport—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Every time he says that the Hon. Mr Dawkins puts up his hand as well as the Hon. Mr Stephens, the Hon. Mr Hood, the Hon. Ms Franks, the Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Ms Scriven. So the Hon. Mr Parnell is not the only saint in his own painting in relation to this issue; there are others who have, and who would have if it had continued, availed themselves of the benefits of what we colloquially refer to as the 'gold pass'. In reality it was called something like the Metrocard special pass, which entitled people to free travel on public transport.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Indeed; checking the quality of the services, as my colleague the Hon. Mr Stephens interjects—perhaps out of order, but I will acknowledge it. In a related benefit there was also travel on the interstate railways, The Ghan and the Indian Pacific; there was access to travel through that. That entitlement was removed as well as part of this particular offset.

Again, and this does not satisfy the Hon. Mr Parnell's relentless pursuit of trying to portray members as greedy and avaricious members of the community—

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: I don't recall using those words.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure he would have, if he had thought of it. The fact is that, from the Hon. Mr Parnell's viewpoint, we only took away the payment for committee members; that is, members of committees, unlike the federal parliament, were paid for their work on standing committees of the parliament. They were also paid a very small fee for select committees, a princely

sum of \$12.50 a day which I think, as I explained in my contribution, originally started at six guineas or something like that and which eventually translated to \$12.50.

That did not satisfy the Hon. Mr Parnell, because he has already indicated that he is coming after the remaining payment, the payment for presiding members of committees—and he nods furiously as I indicate that. He is coming after those members who are paid as chairs of committees. Again, that was an offset.

The fourth offset, which did not impact on a huge number of people, was an entertainment allowance. The Premier had a special entertainment allowance—I think it was \$8,000—I think the Leader of the Opposition had an entertainment allowance, and I think ministers had a very small entertainment allowance, so I am told, of about \$3,000 or something. All those were removed as part of an offset package to compensate for the cost of the increase in the base salary for members of parliament.

The increase to the base salary obviously had flow-on benefits for some, clearly in relation to those who had additional office positions, such as ministers or whips or presiding members of committees, which involve a percentage of the base salary. If a base salary is higher, then the percentage is higher as well. There is also the flow-on—which was identified at the time—additional benefit of superannuation. Whether you are in PSS1 or PSS2, the defined benefit schemes with a percentage of your final salary, there is an impact there, and if you are in PSS3 the percentage superannuation payment from the taxpayers is a calculation of your base salary. So there was a flow-on benefit that a number of people identified and criticised at the time.

That was the package that was by and large supported by the overwhelming majority of members of parliament. I said in that contribution and I repeat now: I have lived through all the iterations of adjustments to parliamentary salaries preceding this nexus arrangement. The Hon. Mr Parnell says, 'This nexus is unfair and unreasonable. How do you justify it? We are the only group in the community who don't have to justify ourselves in terms of pay increases,' etc. I challenge the Hon. Mr Parnell to identify in his reply the criticism-free model for wage and salary increases for members of parliament. That is the challenge I put to the Hon. Mr Parnell.

I have lived through the various models. Pre the nexus arrangement, the Hon. Dr Such, possibly Mr Parnell at times—although I will not swear to that—and a number of Independent members were critical of these arrangements and said that we should have an independent tribunal. The remuneration tribunal should sit each year and establish the salary, wages and conditions for members of parliament. I remember an occasion back in the eighties when the independent tribunal indeed did that. The independent tribunal came back with a massive recommended increase in salary for members of parliament.

This was an independent tribunal. It sat down, looked at it and said that there should be a very significant increase. I am of a mind that it was \$25,000 or 25 per cent. It was a very significant increase in salary at those particular times. There was uproar; there was outrage. The Independent members of parliament led the outrage, of course. Members of the media, members of the community, every Tom, Dick and Harriet in the community were outraged at this massive increase in salary, even though it had been set by an independent remuneration tribunal.

That was always my argument to the Hon. Dr Bob Such and others who said, 'Instead of this nexus, where you don't have anyone independent and you don't have to justify it, let's have an independent tribunal.' I said to them, 'You go back and have a look at what happened when we had an independent tribunal. Dr Such, the Hon. Mr Parnell, or whoever else, what are you going to say if the independent tribunal says that there should be a \$50,000 increase in the salary of members of parliament on the basis of a work value case?' or whatever it is they happen to do.

They will be the first ones to run at 100 miles an hour, saying, 'This is an outrage and should not be accepted,' even though an independent tribunal, perhaps with a work value case, has indicated that there should be this level of salary paid for what should be seen as one of the most important jobs in the community: a member of the state parliament, a leader and a legislator. That was the old model and that is why we ended up with the nexus model.

It is a question to ask: why it is \$2,000 not \$5,000, or whatever the number happens to be? The reason we ended up with a nexus with the federal parliament was that eventually the state

parliament, Labor and Liberal, agreed that there is no perfect model for this. There have been various models linking it to state Public Service salaries—if only—on the basis of what I have just highlighted, or linking it in some other way or having an independent tribunal, but there is no method of adjusting politicians' pay that will not be the subject of widespread criticism.

I highlighted in my contribution in 2015 that we occasionally have these outbreaks saying that members of parliament have to be role models; we have to freeze the pay of MPs to set the lead for the community. Let me remind members of the most recent example of that, and there were two others in my time as a member of parliament. The most recent one was the one just prior to the 2015 adjustment.

Prior to the 2015 adjustment there had been no pay increase for 2¼ years for members of parliament in South Australia. The view had been taken that we would show the lead nationally in South Australia; we would freeze wages because times were tough and the whole community would rise up in support and say, 'What a fabulous lead those South Australian polities and federal polities have taken; we will now follow and we will be happy to accept a wage freeze across the board.'

So what actually happened in that 2¼ years in which MPs salaries in South Australia were frozen? There was a 6 per cent increase in those two years in both public and private sector wages in South Australia; so an average of 3 per cent, but a 6 per cent increase over the two years whilst MPs salaries in South Australia were frozen.

I have no problem in saying that there is no earthly reason why, if wages and salaries in the public and private sector are going up at 3 per cent or 6 per cent, or whatever is the average, that politicians' pay, members of parliament's pay, should not be increasing commensurately. I have no problem with arguing that particular case, either in this chamber or publicly, and I abhor the notion that in some way politicians and state members of parliament are overpaid and underworked.

It is quite easy, as I said, to be critical, and this particular bill is just the latest manifestation of that sort of surfing of the populist wave of public opposition and contempt for our profession and for the state parliament. What this bill will set up, should it be successful, is in essence a series of virtual roadblocks, I suppose you would say, in terms of justifying a salary increase. I think the honourable member has outlined in his second reading contribution what has to occur.

There would be a recommendation for a salary increase and then the government would have to make a political decision to, in essence, support that particular salary increase. Then it would be set up by way of a regulation or an instrument, something similar to that, because crossbench members like the Hon. Mr Parnell will move for the disallowance of the salary increase because it is outrageous and it is outside community expectations, even though it might have originated from an independent tribunal decision in relation to the salary.

So it is not an issue of getting an independent judgement: you then have an independent judgement and then you have to have a political decision of the government of the day. If the remuneration tribunal says there should be a 10 per cent salary increase because it is way out of kilter, this sets up a process where the government of the day would get belted by every Tom, Dick and Harriet in relation to a 10 per cent increase and if the government of the day managed to fight its way through that and say, 'Hey, this is a reasonable increase and we'll support it', then, as I said, you would have every populist politician in the state parliament moving a disallowance motion, being cheered on by the media and the community, to disallow that motion.

In the event that the two major parties—Labor and Liberal—did not support the disallowance motion, then it is grist for the mill for the minor party, for the Hon. Mr Parnell, to say, 'Well, there you go; it's the old parties banding together, putting their snouts in the trough and seeking unreasonable pay increases at the expense of the long-suffering taxpayers of South Australia.' It is just so easy to take a tilt at members of parliament; it is just so easy to be critical of members of parliament and their salary and conditions.

That is why I have previously, and I do so again today on behalf of government members, oppose, and oppose most strongly, the bill that the Hon. Mr Parnell has moved. For so long as I am in this place, with great respect to the Hon. Mr Parnell, I will continue to oppose what I think are

populist attempts to curry favour with the community at the expense of his hardworking colleagues in this place and in another place.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:25): I will sum up the debate, and I thank the Hon. Rob Lucas for his contribution. I would never accuse him of being inconsistent on this matter. As he has pointed out, it has been his longstanding position to oppose this bill. I do rail against being verballed in the way that the honourable member has done, and I will respond to some of those. I will take up the honourable member's challenge in relation to a criticism-free model and the role of independent tribunals.

Just as I say that the Leader of the Government is consistent in his opposition, I remind members that I am consistent as well. My folder consists of five bills that are pretty much identical: July 2007, October 2009, November 2010, and then, of course, we had an eight-year gap before I reintroduced this bill for the fourth time. However, as the Hon. Rob Lucas has pointed out, we did have the government's own remuneration bill in 2015.

I fully appreciate that what I am doing and have done four times—five if you count the government's bill—is going against the club, rocking the boat and going against the prevailing orthodoxy amongst members of parliament that, whilst we know the system is flawed, whilst we know it does not have a lot of logical sense, you do not talk about it because you cannot win that debate in the community. Ultimately, I think that is what the Hon. Rob Lucas is saying. He said it is a no-win situation and ultimately what we have is the most pain-free method possible of securing adjustments to pay and minimising the ability for people in the community to criticise MPs themselves because, ultimately, it will not have been their doing.

I do not accept that it is the best way we have at the moment and I think that we can do better. It might surprise the honourable member to know that I am frequently out there defending the class, if you like, of members of parliament, talking to constituents about how hard most people work. I am forever trying to dismiss the stereotype that we spend all day in the dining room drinking free wine, just like the rum corps of New South Wales 200 years ago. I do not believe that that stereotype is true and I do what I can to dispel it.

However, that does not mean that the method of setting remuneration is logical. As the Hon. Rob Lucas himself said, the idea of getting paid six guineas for a day's work or an hour's work on a select committee, which translated in 1966—presumably, when decimal currency came in—to 12 bucks, and that that was kept going, was completely illogical. I understand why the government in 2015, when the commonwealth had some radical restructuring of their pay rates, decided it needed to do something different as well.

The honourable member referred to our appearance at the same remuneration tribunal. I figured, after nine or 10 years, it was probably time that I went and eyeballed the people who had been setting conditions for all these years. I had never met any of them and I had no idea of how the process worked. It was interesting. Whilst I think my submissions had some sympathy, they were not consistent with the legislation that was passed so they did not get anywhere.

I still maintain that the idea of giving all members of parliament an extra \$1,500 for losing the right to use a bus that most of them never set foot on in their entire lives did not pass the sniff test. It is not as if we have reached some new egalitarian model of fairness. As the honourable member said, quite correctly, I am after some of the other quite unfair and unreasonable supplements to pay that are not borne out by any effort on the part of those who get them. I am glad that when the new government came in they got rid of those two chauffeur-driven cars for chairs of committees. That was outrageous and I will give the minister credit for that. It was good to see those go, but I think there is still a lot more that we can do.

The bill that is before us does not say that politicians should never get a pay rise. What it does—and I think the minister accurately described it—is put in place a process that does enable members, if the circumstances require it, to say, 'Actually, the time isn't right if unemployment is at 10 per cent.' People should remember that, when I first introduced these bills, the steps of Parliament House were awash with nurses, police officers and teachers who were fighting tooth and nail to see if they could get their 2 per cent pay rise out of the state government. It was in that context that I first introduced these bills, because I thought, 'How unfair that they have to fight so hard to get a very

modest increase while we just shrug our shoulders and say, "Nothing to do with us—it just turned up in the pay packet."

In terms of a criticism-free model, I think the minister is probably right, in that there is no model that will be universally criticism free, but I think we can certainly do more to reduce some of the criticism. The method that I have put in place in this bill is the ability, if collectively we think circumstances are such that a pay rise is not needed, to not have to take it every year just because it is there.

The minister referred to the difficulty or the problems that have come from having an independent tribunal set salaries, but that is how they are set at present; it is just that it is not the South Australian tribunal, it is the commonwealth Remuneration Tribunal. We have this pegged \$42,000 difference. So the commonwealth tribunal sets that amount, and then we still have to go to the state tribunal anyway because they are the ones who set the common allowance. That is where the \$30,000-odd comes from: the committee pay, the interstate train trips, the metroCARD and travel allowance.

The Remuneration Tribunal of South Australia is already saying to a member who lives in the country that they can get a bit extra to help them get to parliament. Members of big electorates get extra money and the state remuneration tribunal sets that to help them to travel around their electorate and service their members. So I do not think it stacks up, as the minister said, that the state Remuneration Tribunal is the wrong mechanism. It is actually the mechanism that we are using for a lot of the package, just not the whole of the package.

As I said, it is the fourth time that I have introduced the bill before us. I am disappointed that no other member, of the 21 of us on the floor, has chosen to express a view on this.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: They all agree with me.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: It may be that they all agree with Mr Lucas, but I cannot take Mr Lucas's word for that. So, whilst I appreciate that I will not have all the numbers, I will be calling a division on this in the event that I do not get the call from you, Mr President, in favour of this. As I said, I was verbally before, but this is not opportunism or pure pollie bashing or populism; it is actually giving the South Australian legislature the opportunity to lead by example when the government of the day is calling for restraint.

I remember Bob Hawke had his wages accord. There are often calls in the community for restraint. The one sector of society that is not exercising any restraint and is shrugging its shoulders and saying, 'It's got nothing to do with us,' is the people who are making the laws—members of parliament. I am disappointed that it does not look as if I have the numbers today but, given that other parties have not expressed a view, we will test that by way of a division.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 4
Noes 15
Majority 11

AYES

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

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.

Darley, J.A.
Hunter, I.K.
Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Pnevmatikos, I.
Stephens, T.J.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Maher, K.J.
Ridgway, D.W.
Wortley, R.P.

Second reading thus negatived.

Motions

BATTLE OF CORAL-BALMORAL

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

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Coral-Balmoral which was fought between 12 May and 6 June 1968;
2. Recognises the bravery of those 3,000 Australian soldiers involved in the battles at Coral-Balmoral, and pays its respects to the 26 men who lost their lives and the more than 100 injured;
3. Commends the commonwealth government for officially recognising the gallantry of 3,000 Australian soldiers who fought at the Battle of Coral-Balmoral by awarding them a Unit Citation for Gallantry; and
4. Pays special tribute to the mothers of these fallen Australian soldiers, particularly those of the 11 men who died on the first night of the battle, which happened to be Mother's Day.

(Continued from 6 June 2018)

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (17:41): I rise today to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of the battles of fire support bases Coral and Balmoral. I rise to support this motion to acknowledge the sacrifice of the Australian soldiers, and of course their families, who ultimately courageously fought to defend fire support bases at Coral and Balmoral. The sacrifice of 60,000 soldiers and their families who served in Vietnam—of those, 3,000 men served at the battles of fire support bases Coral and Balmoral. These 3,000 Australian soldiers were outnumbered by up to 4,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Kong soldiers.

Here, 26 young men, and then ultimately their families, made the ultimate sacrifice and more than 100 men were injured. Three of these men are buried at Centennial Park Cemetery: Sergeant Peter Lewis from Poochera, which is near Streaky Bay; Private Allan Cooper from Rose Park; and Private William Thomas, a national serviceman from Adelaide.

I have previously spoken in this place about veterans returning from Vietnam feeling disconnected from ANZAC veterans, veterans who they feel have little in common—a different war, different tactics and different times. However, being a veteran is not in the specifics of the war but in the ability to lean on one another and the comfort of mateship.

Our veterans have fought for recognition since they returned from Vietnam. They all made sacrifices. I stand in this place with the belief that Vietnam War veterans ultimately deserve to be recognised and acknowledged; it was a shameful period in our past when we were reluctant to do so. They should be recognised for their sacrifice, hardship, bravery and strength.

It is with pride that I note that on 13 May 2018 the federal Minister for Veterans Affairs, the Hon. Darren Chester MP, announced that the 3,000 soldiers who courageously fought at the Battle of Coral-Balmoral would be awarded the Unit Citation for Gallantry, a military unit that is awarded for extraordinary courage in action.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the veterans' community for their continued support and hard work for our veterans, both young and old. There are organisations such as Legacy, which I have previously spoken about in this place. Mr Acting President, Legacy works, as you well know, with the families of veterans, particularly war widows and their dependent children. Legacy currently cares for about 65,000 widows and widowers, 1,800 children and disabled dependants throughout Australia.

On the year of the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Coral-Balmoral I would like to take this opportunity to thank all Vietnam veterans and their families for their sacrifice, bravery and strength. Our veterans are the backbone of our nation. They have protected our freedoms and advocated for democracy and justice. Our veterans are our real-life heroes.

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

WOMEN IN AGRIBUSINESS

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

That this council—

1. Raises awareness of the important role women play in agribusiness and in regional South Australia, especially in leadership roles;
2. Notes that women are occupying an increasing number of diverse roles in agribusiness; and
3. Recognises that South Australia continues to encourage more women to pursue careers in agriculture and horticulture as the world's growing demand for our food continues to rise.

(Continued from 6 June 2018.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:44): I rise to wholeheartedly support this motion. We know that women play a vital role in the agribusiness sector. We know that it is crucial for South Australia to continue to promote women in agribusiness. Under Labor, the Women Influencing Agribusiness and Regions strategy was developed. This strategy, from 2014 to 2017, was an overwhelming success.

It was under the former minister for agriculture, Leon Bignell, that this strategy became a reality. To bring the Women Influencing Agribusiness and Regions strategy to life, the Labor government, through the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA), engaged talented and committed women who worked in the agribusiness sector to share their expertise, insights and leadership.

Some of the highlights and outcomes of the strategy included distributing 2,200 profile packs to state government agencies, industry partners, schools and career expos; commencing a program with UniSA to assist in matching up pre-service teachers with industry partners; and working with the former department of education and child development on a STEM in schools program, where women in agribusiness helped young people with project ideas and mentorship.

Talking of science, technology, engineering and maths, or STEM, I am glad to be able to highlight the previous Labor government's investment in STEM, including the \$250 million STEM Works initiative which was announced as part of the 2016-2017 Labor state budget.

One of the women involved in the Women Influencing Agribusiness and Regions program is Wendy Fennell, who I have known since I worked in the forestry sector. Wendy is profiled on the Primary Industries site, and describes herself as 'Company owner, business leader, B-double driver, truck puller'. Wendy is both managing director and co-owner of Fennell Forestry, which is one of the largest timber harvest and transport companies in my area of the state, the South-East. Wendy was named Business Woman of the Year at the Women in Business and Regional Development awards in 2015, an award that was well-deserved.

Wendy was the instigator of the annual Fennell Forestry Truck Pull Challenge, which attracts teams from around Australia and raises money for children's charities. Each year she harnesses up to help her company team drag a 23-tonne B-double truck for 100 metres—hence 'truck puller' in her title. Wendy speaks very highly of the impact of the 12-month business growth program with which she was involved in 2016. She describes doing that program as her smartest move because she and her business partner, her brother Barry, learned to better manage the business by working to their strengths.

She says that people are the most important part of any business and if you are going to lead, lead by example. As I am shadow minister for forestry, I was particularly pleased to see the following quote from Wendy:

Forestry has a great future. Timber is a renewable resource, it has neutral carbon footprint, and there's constant innovation. It's dynamic.

And of course, 'dynamic' is an excellent description of the entire agribusiness sector.

Other women from the Limestone Coast involved with the Women Influencing Agribusiness and Regions program include Sheryl Vickery, who is a harvesting forester and roading manager for

a Mount Gambier-based forest management company. Sheryl essentially oversees the flow of wood from the forest to the port—from log making and timber identification to weighbridge and dispatch.

Sheryl started her career as a mill hand in a local timber mill and progressed to be team leader and then supervisor before studying for a Bachelor of Forest Science and Management. Sheryl completed her study part time over six years while she continued to work full time and care for two children. I also like the quote she uses to promote women's involvement in the industry:

If you enjoy the outdoors and mixing with lots of different personalities, consider forestry. There are lots of jobs for women where you can be outside most of the time, like working in health and safety, planting, chemical and fertiliser application, mapping, or the nursery.

She also says:

Our industry is in a really good position at the moment, particularly with the emergence of new technologies that use forest residue in the production of biofuels, electricity and pellets for heating.

Another woman profiled in the program is Josie Jackson, who is a farmer, businesswoman and passionate revegetator. Josie runs a native tree revegetation business in the South-East, manages the stock side of the family farm and organises and hosts horse schools. Josie also provides a great comment, 'Remember that good luck is spelled W-O-R-K.' I think that is something that most people involved in agribusinesses know all too well.

Some people assume that for women to enter the agribusiness sector or succeed in it they need to come from a farming background, live in a rural area or marry into a farming enterprise. This is not the case, and I encourage a look at the profiles on PIRSA's Women Influencing Agribusiness and Regions web page to get a taste of the diversity of backgrounds and the diversity of experiences of women involved in agribusiness in our state.

Networks are an important part of business and professional development, and can be invaluable for women in the agribusiness sector. They are particularly important in regional areas, where there are fewer opportunities for face-to-face interactions than in city-based businesses. There are many effective networks that I could talk about, but I will mention just one today.

The Women in Forests and Timber Network (WFTN) is a forum for women in forestry and timber industries to meet and exchange ideas as well as to recognise the contributions of the women in the industry, to celebrate their achievements and to support their access to skills and professional development opportunities. I encourage women involved in the forest and timber industries to seek out the network and through their involvement raise the profile and strength of the industries and women's success within them.

As I am sure honourable members are aware, the agribusiness sector forms a huge part of the state's economy and contributed nearly \$20 billion in revenue in 2016-17. This is a state record and one which the opposition is extremely proud of. There are many talented and committed women who are affiliated with primary industries through a variety of professions, and I urge the current government to do everything it can to follow in the footsteps of the Labor government and continue to promote women in agribusiness.

I would also like to use this opportunity to acknowledge the distress and heartache that farming families are going through due to the drought in New South Wales, as well as parts of Queensland and South Australia. Many farmers in Australia are desperately searching for feed to keep precious livestock alive as the drought deepens. It is a catastrophic situation and we all, of course, hope for rain as soon as possible. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:52): I thank the Hon. Clare Scriven for her contribution to this motion and for her support. I also thank her for highlighting successful role models in forestry and rural women in agribusiness from the Limestone Coast in the South-East region. It is great to hear the achievements that she has outlined of many agribusiness women in that region. We can be reassured that the South Australian government will do its best to support agribusiness women as well as the region. With those remarks, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

STATE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:53): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on—
 - (a) all aspects of the 2018 state election and matters related thereto, with particular reference to—
 - (i) the operation of the funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme as outlined in the Electoral Act 1985 (the act);
 - (ii) the operation of changes to the voting provisions of the act;
 - (iii) the application of provisions requiring authorisation of electoral material to all forms of communication to voters;
 - (iv) the influence of advertising by associated entities and/or third parties who are not registered political parties during the campaign targeting candidates and political parties;
 - (v) the need for 'truth in advertising' provisions to communication to voters including third party communications;
 - (vi) the regulation of associated entities and/or third parties undertaking campaign activities; and
 - (vii) the potential application of new technology to voting, scrutiny and counting.
 - (b) the regulatory regime regarding donations and contributions from persons and entities to political parties, associated entities and other third parties and entities undertaking campaign activities;
 - (c) the extent to which fundraising and expenditure by associated entities and/or third parties is conducted in concert with registered political parties and the applicability and utilisation of tax deductibility by entities involved in campaign activities; and
 - (d) 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.

The 2018 state election campaign was described by respected ABC election analyst Antony Green as 'a bit like a First World War battlefield'. For a person who lived and breathed every day of that campaign as the campaign director of SA-Best, that description could not be more apt. Those in this place who very kindly indulged me yesterday during my maiden speech would have heard me describe the state election as being the most targeted and bitter campaign I have ever been involved with, and I have been involved with a few. SA-Best, and specifically our leader at the time, Nick Xenophon, copped it from every which way. It was outrageous.

In such battles the Liberals can see their arch nemesis, the Labor Party, coming straight at them and mount an attack accordingly. Similarly, the Labor Party sees the Liberals in their crosshairs and aims their machinery accordingly. Nothing much else distracts either party on their chosen pathway to success—that was, until SA-Best arrived on the scene and genuinely and seriously challenged their privileged positions of power.

We set out to position ourselves as a genuine alternative political power. We wanted to strike some common ground with voters disenchanted with the major parties who were seeking to vote for a party that could make a real difference. We went to the election seeking to win enough seats to hold the balance of power to ensure that, whichever major party won the most number of seats, they would need our imprimatur to form government.

Wow—did that set the proverbial cat amongst the pigeons. Both major parties and their vested interest groups unleashed a tsunami of lies, mistruths, slurs and downright gutter politics against us, the likes of which have never been seen before. As Nick said at the time, 'Labor says SA-Best will support the Liberals. The Liberals say we'll support Labor. They can't both be right.'

Unlike the Liberals and Labor, we copped it from all sides. We fought a war on all fronts and, while we set out and were expecting to fight a good fight, the others were not. It was win at all costs—all costs—for the Liberals and ALP, regardless of the fallout. The Liberals jumped into bed with the rich poker machine barons who control the AHA, the Australian Hotels Association. We estimate that the AHA invested at least \$250,000 in its advertising campaign that expressly told lie after lie about SA-Best and the impact our gambling reforms would have in South Australia.

Labor, and the powerful union movement that controls it and dictates who should represent the party in parliament, unleashed a disgusting campaign of its own. Anything was on the agenda to ensure that SA-Best did not gain a foothold in the South Australian parliament. It was an election fought on a scale never seen before, with huge amounts of money spent by the AHA and unions urging people to vote not against any of the major parties but against SA-Best. This was unheralded in South Australia's political history, and was motivated to undermine Nick and keep us out of parliament.

While we did not achieve anywhere near the result we had hoped for, the election of Frank and me to the Legislative Council shows that we were not vanquished. In fact, as everyone in this place would know, more than 200,000 South Australians, or nearly one in five South Australian voters, voted for SA-Best. On their behalf, Frank and I will continue to do all we can to hold the government to account. We also stand tall and proud in the knowledge that we were not, and are not, beholden to big business or the unions. We are not a party of vested interests but a party that will only ever be beholden to our constituents.

The Australian Hotels Association is a powerful, vested interest group which had unprecedented influence on the outcome of this election. It saw SA-Best as the main threat to its livelihood and the insidious poker machines that have infiltrated nearly every pub and hotel in South Australia. It had everything to lose and nothing to win if SA-Best achieved what it set out to achieve.

If the status quo remained and poker machine numbers in South Australia remained at current levels, the AHA's members would continue to make huge profits on the back of gambling addicts' misery. As a result, pubs across the city were plastered with posters urging people to vote against Nick as though he were public enemy number one, and we know that busloads of volunteers were brought in on election day to do the same.

As I said, this was an election like no other, using technologies never before implemented. Reuters reported that the SA Liberals used a data mining program to intensify lobbying in marginal seats during the election. The Liberals used the i360 app imported from the United States that:

uses information gleaned from social media, polls and surveys to pinpoint vacillating voters' addresses and the issues they care about in key marginal seats so they can be targeted for lobbying.

The Sydney Morning Herald reported:

...the tool is said to have been critical to their victory [and] the Victorian Liberals are also using the platform ahead of the state election later this year.

i360 is funded by the US billionaire brothers, Charles and David Koch, who have played a crucial role in helping conservatives win countless American elections. Data mining is playing a more significant role in campaigns across the political spectrum. As such, it is vital that we examine whether our electoral laws are keeping up to date with these emerging technologies.

Then there is the outrage and controversy caused by Cambridge Analytica in the UK after it pilfered the data of 50 million Facebook users and secretly kept it. Cambridge Analytica is a British political consulting firm that combined data mining, data brokerage and data analysis with strategic communication during the electoral processes. Serious questions about this technology and how it is used are now being asked after it was revealed that the data analytics firm worked for Donald Trump's election team and the winning Brexit campaign.

The election landscape is changing—we accept that—and changing rapidly as technologies change and become even more accessible. I personally lodged complaint after complaint to the Electoral Commissioner on behalf of SA-Best during the election campaign and, to be frank, some of those complaints are still outstanding. The fact that the AHA was able to produce and circulate a 'scratchie ticket' featuring Nick Xenophon and, even more disturbingly, the fact that that ticket was somehow able to be delivered to residents' letterboxes inside one of our own candidate's election pamphlets is no coincidence.

It is for these reasons, amongst many others, that a select committee inquiry into the results of the 2018 state election is needed. It is my intention to outline more fully a number of other complaints and issues that were raised during the campaign on the next day of sitting. For now, I seek leave to conclude my remarks on this motion until such time.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS

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

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the moratorium on the cultivation of genetically modified (GM) crops in South Australia, with specific reference to—
 - (a) the benefits and costs of South Australia being GM-free for the state, its industries and people;
 - (b) the effect of the moratorium on marketing South Australian products both nationally and internationally including:
 - (i) costs and benefits to South Australian industries and markets of remaining GM-free;
 - (ii) costs and benefits to South Australian industries and markets from lifting the moratorium on cultivating GM crops in South Australia;
 - (iii) current or potential reputational impacts, both positive and negative, on other South Australian food and wine producers, that may result from retaining or lifting the moratorium;
 - (iv) consideration of global trends and consumer demands for GM crops/foods versus non-GM crops/foods;
 - (c) the difference between GM and non-GM crops in relation to yield, chemical use and other agricultural and environmental factors;
 - (d) any long term environmental effects of growing GM crops including soil health;
 - (e) the potential for contamination of non-GM or organic crops by GM crops, including:
 - (i) consideration of matters relating to the segregation of GM and non-GM crops in the paddock, in storage and during transportation;
 - (ii) the potential impacts of crop contamination on non-GM and organic farmers;
 - (iii) consideration of GM contamination cases interstate and internationally; and
 - (f) any other matters that the committee considers relevant.
2. That standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

(Continued from 26 July 2018.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (18:02): As members would be aware, the cultivation of genetically modified (GM) food crops is currently prohibited in South Australia until 2025. GM food crops are

crops that have been derived or developed from organisms that have had changes made to their DNA using genetic engineering. South Australia has a reputation for producing some of the world's most premium food and wine from our clean and green environment. In 2016-17, under the Labor government, gross revenue from our food and wine industry was almost \$20 billion, a South Australian record.

Key highlights from the 2016-17 food and wine scorecard include gross food and wine revenue increasing by \$1.33 billion to reach record levels of almost \$20 billion, with increases in revenue generated by the field crop and wine industries. Finished food and wine values continue to grow, with an increase of \$334 million, to reach record levels of \$8.9 billion. Increases in revenue were generated by the wine, field crops, horticulture and dairy industries. Total overseas exports of food and wine increased by \$419 million to reach \$5.64 billion, a 49 per cent increase in merchandise exports.

Finished or processed foods and wine exports increased by \$23 million and reached \$3.4 billion. Many may think these record figures could be attributed to our non-GM status. However, this is not concrete evidence, and there is a need to examine the financial benefits of our current non-GM status and to what degree we receive a premium, whether that be locally, interstate or internationally.

I also believe there should be further examination of the impact of removing the moratorium on South Australia's reputation as one of the world's clean, green premium food regions. We also need to determine whether we can derive any additional benefits of our non-GM status, and determine what gains/losses would occur if we were to remove the moratorium on GM produce.

It is also important to examine whether GM crops can coexist with non-GM crops in South Australia. There is also the question of regional exclusion zones for non-GM food crops, such as Kangaroo Island. Before any decisions are made, it is imperative that we hear submissions from farmers and other relevant parties in relation to their views on whether South Australia should be allowed to have GM food crops.

It goes without saying that we all want South Australia's agriculture industry to continue to boom and, in the midst of the drought that is affecting the majority of the nation, it is wise to consider all options that would help the bottom line in this industry.

Whatever decision we make ultimately in relation to GM, it should be guided by the best available independent science and evidence in relation to the impact of GM and non-GM-related price premiums. For these reasons, I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this motion, and we thank the Hon. John Darley for bringing it to the council.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (18:06): On behalf of the government, I am happy to speak to this motion moved by the Hon. John Darley. As an election policy, the Marshall Liberal government committed to commissioning an independent expert review of South Australia's GM moratorium within the first six months of coming to office, and the process to instigate that review is underway.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, allow the minister—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I know it has been a long day for him and he is a bit frustrated, but best if we could just sit and listen for a change and learn something. As members opposite would recall, we had a long debate last year, very late in the parliamentary sitting period before the election and very late at night, which was a bit unusual the way things were dealt with when we had a bill that went through parliament last year, promulgated by the Hon. Mark Parnell, to give the parliament the right to decide whether or not we should have a moratorium.

We did not support the Hon. Mark Parnell's bill. I will make a few more comments, but it will be no surprise to members in this chamber that we will not support the select committee. We have the government review, the independent one—that will do—and I think the parliament will be given an opportunity to make a decision.

I can see that, if that review is tabled and the select committee has not reported because members choose not to report, or because they have not got around to reporting—I was talking to the Hon. Mr Hunter during one of the divisions that maybe we should instigate (I don't know the figure) three or four active select committees at any one time, and we have to deal with them before we can consider the next ones.

It is becoming more complicated for people to get the time to sit on select committees, and I wonder whether this is an opportunity to say, 'Okay, yeah, let's have them.' The feds have an inquiry, they deal with it and they do the next one, rather than having these things drag on. Anyway, I am getting a little distracted on standing orders and procedure.

It is important to note that the regulatory scheme for gene technology only allows states to have in place a moratorium for trade and marketing purposes. This was because the commonwealth regulates all the human health and environmental impacts for genetically modified organisms. The state government's independent review will consider similar matters to those proposed in the select committee. The government's review is focused on assessing, marketing and trade issues and economic costs and benefits of the moratorium across the supply chain.

The Hon. John Darley has correctly stated, following last year's extension of the moratorium to 2025, that it cannot be lifted unless it is the will of the parliament. The government's independent expert review will provide critical, impartial data to allow the parliament to have its considered debate on the merits of the moratorium, to ensure the best outcome for the people of South Australia. As I said earlier, we will not be supporting it.

There are a few other comments I would like to make in response to some of the comments made opposite. It was interesting that the Hon. Ms Bourke said that we needed the best science and evidence. I find it strange that the Labor Party have a member and former minister in Mr Hunter, who has a science degree and reads the *New Scientist* magazine every day in parliament to keep himself abreast of the latest issues and trends, but, bafflingly, is not being proposed as a member of the committee because—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: He's been sidelined.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: He must have been sidelined and excluded from it. We actually try to draw on the skills of the members in this chamber. Maybe you should say we should exclude the Hon. Mark Parnell because he already has a view on GM that is already well documented in this place. Maybe we should have some independent scientists there, rather than people who have already declared their hand. Anyway, the Labor Party has made the decision as to who they would have.

The Hon. Ms Bourke, who is new to the parliament—and I am sure she learnt something about the former government's budget—I am sure will be very happy that she was not a member of the former government and she can actually distance herself from all of the atrocities that I am sure our new Treasurer will tell us about over the coming weeks. It is interesting that she made the comment that we should be able to see whether they could coexist. Your colleague the Hon. Tung Ngo was in Bordertown with me last year to present some money, I think to a local soccer club. We actually had the pleasure of going to the Bordertown Cup, the race meeting on the Sunday, and I was down there for a family birthday on the Saturday night.

I said to Tung, 'Come with me, I want to take you for a drive out to Victoria,' because I farmed on the South Australia-Victoria border. We went along the back road of my old farm, and lo and behold there was my neighbour, Mr Jamie Edwards, and his son, harvesting canola right against the Victorian border, and blow me down, on the other side of the border was the canola of a Victorian farmer. He had harvested his so I do not know whether it was GM or non-GM. I know him but I did not have his mobile phone number to call him.

But Tung saw that it is only a matter of a few metres between South Australia and Victoria—no different to any neighbours anywhere in South Australia—only a few metres between two farms. We talk about coexisting—we do coexist between South Australia and Victoria because we have to. I think a lot of members in this place, when they think about the moratorium, think about our state borders north of Loxton, right the way around the Northern Territory, Queensland, and down Western

Australia, where it is just desert and nothing grows. But you have an important interface between Victoria and South Australia and we can prove that we can coexist.

The distance between those two crops is no different from two neighbours at Clare or Blyth or Buckleboo or Bordertown—no matter where you are you can still have that same situation. My good friend and neighbour Jamie Edwards was happily growing their non-GM canola because that is what they could grow. He and his wife happen to be two farmers who have mixed views about GM, but the neighbour, I am sure, who is a very progressive farmer may well have been growing GM. So the two can coexist.

At the South Australia-Victoria border, there is a lot of cropping. There are actually farmers who own land on both sides of the border and grow the GM canola on one side and non-GM on the other side and use the same harvester, the same air-seeder, the same trucks and bins and everything is the same. It is interesting, last year we had a farmer from Auburn send me a photo. He could not kill the volunteer canola in his wheat crop because it was GM canola. We asked questions of the former honourable minister, I think in estimates, who said that these days we allow 1 per cent of GM canola in canola because we have a tolerance.

This farmer sprayed the volunteer canola from the previous year and sowed the wheat crop in a timely fashion, and there was one plant in every 20 metres that did not die because it was GM canola. So, we think we are totally GM free—there is already a tolerance there. I was happy to show the Hon. Tung Ngo that two farmers can coexist.

I am also interested in the fact that the Hon. Ms Bourke spoke about the drought. Right now, everybody talks about Monsanto or the big chemical companies when it comes to GM, particularly in relation to herbicide tolerance. However, what we need in South Australia is drought tolerance, salt tolerance and frost tolerance, all the things that will improve the productivity of our farmers. Certainly, chemical and herbicide resistance has been a tool from the point of view of farm rotation and wheat management.

I remember that, during the debate last year, the Hon. Mark Parnell talked about GM premiums. He missed the point that farmers often use GM canola not because it makes more money than non-GM but because it can control some of the weeds in their rotation so that they can afterwards grow a better wheat or barley crop, or lentils or peas or beans or whatever. So it is not about the crop itself at the time. It is a sort of myth that we have. We deny our farmers the latest technology. It does surprise me that the Hon. Mr Hunter's mobile phone is a bit older than most. Where everyone else has pretty modern technology, he is taking a little while to catch up.

We embrace technology wherever we can to make our lives better and our businesses and hospitals more productive. I was talking to somebody last night about how building a new hospital is a challenge, because if you design it in 2011 and move into it seven years later, technology has changed so much in that time. We expect our community, our public leaders and our politicians to allow uptake of technology for our children at school and in universities, yet we say to our farmers, 'No, you can't actually access that technology because we think we know best.' I think this is unfortunate for our farming community because they need to have the right to make a choice.

I note that the policy of the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Ms Bonaros, which I looked at before the election, was that farmers have a right to say no to GM. That might not have been the exact wording, but I think that is right. The farmers in Victoria have a right to say no—they do not have to grow it. They are not forced to grow it.

I think there is a bit of a myth put around by some of the friends and supporters of the Hon. Mark Parnell in relation to being beholden to the big chemical companies, namely, if you grow this stuff you will have to use their seed and their herbicides. Farmers will only grow what makes them profitable. They will not do something if it is not profitable. It is tough enough as it is, and in years like this, when it does not rain, it is very tough.

So I always find it bizarre when I hear, 'You'll be beholden to the big companies.' The only company you will be beholden to, if you are a farmer, is the bank. It is the bank that is breathing down your neck, especially in a season like we have now. I am very grateful that, finally, we have the Farm Debt Mediation Bill that has passed through parliament because, tragically, we will probably have some need for that in this particular year.

I always find it strange that we think that farmers will be beholden to the big companies. Surely they should have a choice and a right to say no. In all the other states nobody is beholden to any of the big chemical companies—they have the right to say no. I think it is interesting that that part of the debate is thrown up.

It is also interesting that, straight after the last election about four years ago, our former minister joined the march against Monsanto out the front of Parliament House. If you look at what Monsanto has delivered, which is a herbicidal glyphosate marketed as Roundup, most people in agriculture would say that it is the best invention since the invention of the tractor because of the productivity gains, the environmental gains, the reduction in diesel usage and more soil carbon and organic matter in soil because people are not cultivating to kill weeds. Every vineyard would be spraying the weeds in and around the vines with Roundup because it is universally seen as a fabulous productivity gain for farmers.

We had a minister who had his views about GM, and he had a view of Monsanto that was totally at odds with the entire industry he was meant to represent at the cabinet table. So it is an interesting debate. I think Mr Darley has the numbers. I look forward to the committee reporting on the evidence given to it. I hope it is done in a timely fashion because a government review will have to be done.

When it is completed, if there are compelling reasons to bring the bill to parliament—and the Hon Mr Parnell and the Hon. Mr Darley supported him last year—that will be a debate that we will have in this place. I know the Hon. Mark Parnell said publicly that he would be happy to be convinced, that he would take all the evidence and advice that we are looking at, which are the economic benefits, because that is the only thing that we as a state can look at. The federal Labor Party already have a position that supports the GM technology in Australia, so they are already on the record as supporting it at a federal level.

I think the Hon. Mr Pangallo said he was doing a tour of regional South Australia. It would be good to get a bit of a feel for what people are saying out there in relation to GM, drought, frost, heat and all those things. They are important factors. While we do not have access to it, we do not have that next generation of technology breeding or plant capacity coming into our farming systems.

Another thing is that we have lost a number of key scientists from the Waite Research Institute. They have been here for 16 years in an environment where the government policy was at odds with their views. We have seen the funding of the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics withdrawn, and some of the people working there have left, which is a shame.

With those few words, I indicate that we will not be supporting the Hon. Mr Darley's select committee.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (18:21): I move the following amendment:

Delete paragraph 2 and insert new paragraph as follows:

2. That the committee consist of four members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at two members and that standing order No. 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (18:21): I thank honourable members for their contribution: the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. David Ridgway and the Hon. Mark Parnell. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion as amended carried.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, can you restrain yourself?

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (18:23): I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. Mark Parnell, the Hon. John Dawkins and the mover.

Motion carried.

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

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on 5 December 2018.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:25): For the benefit of members, can I indicate that we have been waiting for a message to come back from the House of Assembly on the productivity commission, which is the government's priority for this week. There seems to be some delay in their consideration of the bill, as the bells ringing would indicate.

I will undertake to have the Premier's office circulate the final message from the members to members' emails. I alert you to that because that is to be our priority tomorrow when we sit at 11 o'clock. I will undertake to make sure—so if you could check your emails—that the final resolution of the message from the House of Assembly, whenever it is concluded, will be emailed to members as soon as we have it.

At 18:26 the council adjourned until Thursday 2 August 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***LOW-FLOW BYPASS SYSTEMS**

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (3 July 2018).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised :

1. That since 2015, approximately \$690,000 of state funds and \$1.1 million of commonwealth funds has been expended across the eastern and western Mount Lofty Ranges.
2. 230 landholders expressed interest. In the eastern Mount Lofty Ranges construction works commenced at the start of 2018, with 100 sites returning low flows to date.
3. No.

FERAL PIGS

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (4 July 2018).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

1. Natural Resources Kangaroo Island (NRKI) is responsible for delivering a range of programs and projects on behalf of the Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board and the Department for Water and Environment. NRKI has put in place a range of measures to address the size of feral pigs on Kangaroo Island. This includes the loaning of 15 feral pig traps and working with local land and forestry managers on how to use the traps effectively.

NRKI has also worked closely with the Kangaroo Island Feral Pig Stakeholder Committee to identify priorities and coordinate action. In addition, local departmental staff have trapped and removed numerous pigs in parks and reserves across Kangaroo Island. The local NRM board have also applied for grants and funding from the commonwealth government to further tackle this important issue.

2. Broad scale baiting using compounds such as 1080, cage trapping, deployment of Felixar grooming traps and detector dogs will all be used to reduce the number of feral cats on Kangaroo Island.

Further information on the Kangaroo Island Feral Cat Eradication Program is available publicly at: <http://www.naturalresources.sa.gov.au/kangarooisland/plants-and-animals/pest-animals/Kangaroo-Island-Feral-Cat-Eradication-Program>