

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Thursday, 16 October 2014**

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (10:32):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, the Spent Convictions Act 2009, the Summary Offences Act 1953 and the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (10:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill aims to change the sex industry in South Australia so that sex workers have the same rights and responsibilities as other workers and to decriminalise sex work. To achieve this end, my bill gets rid of the term 'common prostitute' in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935; deletes common law offences relating to prostitution; inserts the definition of 'sex work' into the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 and clauses that make it unlawful to discriminate against a person because they are or were a sex worker; amends the Spent Convictions Act 2009, aiming to wipe a person's criminal record clean of sex work offences; deletes the term 'prostitute' from the Summary Offences Act 1953; repeals offences relating to brothels; and amends the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 to recognise commercial sexual services and employee/employer relationships like other industries. The explanation of clauses will spell out these provisions in more detail.

As a campaigner now for many decades to improve equal opportunity and anti-discrimination legislation, I believe that decriminalisation must be combined with anti-discrimination and human rights protection to be fully effective. In the words of Catherine Healy from the New Zealand Prostitutes Collective and Scarlet Alliance:

It is widely recognised that discrimination is the optimal model for sex work legislation. A decriminalised framework removes police as regulators of the sex industry, repeals criminal laws specific to the sex industry, regulates the sex industry businesses through standard business planning and industrial codes and does not single out sex workers for specific legislation.

She went on to say:

Favourable experience of decriminalisation in New Zealand and New South Wales demonstrates that decriminalisation supports sex workers' self-determination, maximises compliance, increases transparency, reduces police corruption and minimises discrimination.

Most of the crimes are covered by the Spent Convictions Act, which means that, if one does commit another crime for a period of 10 years after their original conviction, it will be considered spent, or no longer applicable, or wiped from one's record. As there has been some doubt as to whether sex work was covered by this legislation, I sought clarification from the Attorney-General and made submissions, along with many others, to him, stating that it needed to be clear that sex work convictions could be spent.

Changes made to this act have been helpful to many people with old and minor convictions. At least one former sex worker told me she had gone before the court to have her considerable number of sex work convictions from the 1990s wiped clean. She hopes that now her qualifications in the aged care and disability area will be recognised and she can now get permanent work in those areas.

Unfortunately, I have had complaints from former sex workers who still have sex work charges on their record, despite the changes to this act. Due to the high demand from many areas now for police checks and requests for criminal records, it seems that the administration of this area has not caught up. As members would be aware, this issue of spent convictions was one that the late Dr Bob Such (the member for Fisher) campaigned for.

Sex workers and former sex workers have talked to me about problems they have had in getting permanent work, being a volunteer and helping out at their children's or grandchildren's schools, kindergartens or sporting groups due to their criminal record. Having the slate wiped clean with regard to sex work offences proved to be an important action in the New Zealand legislation. My bill seeks to do that in South Australia.

Sex workers with a record have also cited cases to me where they have had problems with different insurance companies in pursuing a claim or in different social situations disclosing their work or former work and having to cop the discrimination at a whole lot of levels. I have also heard from former sex workers who have been blackmailed or threatened with blackmail. The Law Society of South Australia in its response to the draft bill said:

Prior convictions of sex work offences should be spent on the commencement of the act. Having these convictions spent could make it easier for workers with convictions who have remained in the industry because of limited options due to their criminal record to consider leaving the industry.

I am often asked why I have campaigned for such a long time with regard to reform in South Australia's sex industry. My initial response is that I believe it is a question of equity, but I will just give a little bit of background to put this into context. I left home and was in full-time employment by the age of 16 years. I lived in Halifax Street in the city, up the east end, and got to know some of the local sex workers, as well as the other colourful people who lived near St John's church in the lane off Halifax Street.

Being on a junior clerk's wage at Harris Scarfe Industrial and working at Woodville Bowl at night meant I could just pay my way, so when the night receptionist job came up at the health studio around the corner, I applied. I was honest about my age; I told them I was 16 years old, but argued my qualifications meant that I would be the perfect receptionist. It was only then that I realised this was not actually a health studio and also the reason for me being 18 years old to do this job became apparent all of a sudden in the interview. I did not get the job or accept the job, but not for moral or ethical reasons. I knew that I did not actually want to be a participant in this industry. I did, however, get a job in a nearby restaurant as a kitchen hand soon after, so that was another good night job. It meant I had three jobs to fund my independent lifestyle.

While doing adult matric one of my jobs was as a waitress—I think the correct term now is table attendant—at Pagana's restaurant in Hindley Street next to the Third World Bookshop. Most of you are too young to remember this, but there are probably a couple who may.

**Mr Pederick:** I don't.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** The member for Hammond is on record as not knowing these things. Pagana's coffee and gelati area was at the front of the restaurant and it took a while for me to work out that this was the base or meeting point for a number of women and transsexual sex workers, some of whom had managers. The place was also frequented by a number of police and plain clothes detectives. Pagana's restaurant was a very busy place. A couple of fellow students, both in matric and then at uni, worked as sex workers so that they could study and also support their family. I guess what I am saying is that I knew and I know a number of people from that industry, and it really seemed to me that they should as workers be treated as equally as anybody else in industry.

My views with regard to the sex work industry were really influenced and consolidated politically having read the report and findings of the Commonwealth Royal Commission into Human Relationships in 1997. By that time I was still working two to three jobs, but I was a student in politics, sociology and women's studies at Flinders University. My work as the director of the Working Women's Centre and later as a trade union advocate meant that I kept in contact with sex workers, their organisations and the many campaigns that they have had.

The royal commission, of course, saw the criminalisation of sex work as an inappropriate use of criminal law and resources. Those findings that we are talking about were coming out in 1977,

but since that time there have been many reports and reviews with regard to the sex industry. Various bodies of the United Nations have called for decriminalisation including the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to health, the UN Development Program and UNAIDS.

Amnesty International has been considering the issue of sex work and the local South Australian group had a seminar on this issue where they were looking at models for improvement. *The Lancet*, the very famous medical journal, has published a seven-part series of research on HIV and sex workers. The report argues that decriminalising sex work will have the single greatest effect on the course of the HIV epidemic across the world, and could avert at least a third of HIV infections amongst sex workers and their clients in the next decade through its immediate and sustained effort on violence, policing and safer work environments. I am also advised that the World Health Organisation and the United Nations Secretary, Ban Ki-moon, also recommended the decriminalisation of sex work.

The working group to develop this bill has included sex workers and their organisations, particularly Scarlet Alliance, Australian Sex Workers Association; Sex Industry Network; Sex Worker Action Group: Gaining Empowerment, Rights and Recognition (SWAGGERR); and organisations supporting sex industry reform including the Australian Services Union, Working Women's Centre, Zonta District 23, SA Unions, Business and Professional Women (SA), the Women's Standing Committee (SA Unions), some chapters of Soroptimist International, Adelaide White Ribbon workers, and MLCs and MPs in state parliament.

Comments and qualified support for the bill has come from the Women Lawyers Association and the Law Society of South Australia. Academics from Flinders, University of South Australia and Adelaide universities and individual sex workers and sex-work business owners. The Local Government Association also responded and has raised issues surrounding some small home-based sex businesses and the location of sex work.

Media people have also been very helpful. The late Greg Kelton, Amanda Blair, Peter Gôers, Petra Starke, Lauren Novak, Laine Anderson, Simon Royal, Michael Maguire and Ian Henschke have assisted in making the facts about the sex industry known and have helped expose some of the myths.

I particularly acknowledge the assistance I have had from the member for Morphett, Dr Duncan McFetridge, the minister, Gail Gago, the shadow minister, Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. John Gazzola, the member for Colton, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the member for Florey, the Hon. Mark Parnell and the late member for Fisher, Dr Bob Such. All have been working with me on this issue since the last parliament. I also acknowledge that the new members of Giles and Reynell have also followed in their predecessors' stead of assisting with this legislation.

The Ashford EO staff and volunteers have been particularly supportive and have gone through a number of years, with me, of trying to get this legislation through parliament. The staff of other members of the Legislative Council have been particularly supportive, and I thank them for their great role in this campaign. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

###### 3—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment by deleting the definition of 'common prostitute', a term which will no longer appear in the Act.

## 4—Insertion of section 68AA

This clause inserts new section 68AA into the principal Act, creating an offence to provide commercial sexual services to children, with a maximum penalty of 10 years imprisonment.

## 5—Amendment of section 270—Punishment for certain offences

This clause deletes section 270(1)(b), a paragraph dealing with common law offences relating to prostitution, and is consequential upon the abolition of those offences.

## 6—Variation of Schedule 11—Abolition of certain offences

This amends Schedule 11 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to include common law offences relating to prostitution to the list of common law offences abolished by that Schedule.

Part 3—Amendment of *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*

## 7—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of 'sex worker' into section 5 of the principal Act.

## 8—Amendment of section 85T—Criteria for establishing discrimination on other grounds

## 9—Amendment of section 85U—Application of Division

## 10—Amendment of section 85ZA—Application of Division

## 11—Amendment of section 85ZB—Discrimination by associations

## 12—Amendment of section 85ZD—Application of Division

## 13—Amendment of section 85ZF—Discrimination by person disposing of interest in land

## 14—Amendment of section 85ZG—Discrimination in provision of goods and services

## 15—Amendment of section 85ZH—Discrimination in relation to accommodation

## 16—Amendment of section 85ZI—Charities

## 17—Amendment of section 85ZK—Measures intended to achieve equality

These clauses collectively amend the Equal Opportunity Act to make it unlawful to discriminate against a person because they are, or were, a sex worker.

Part 4—Amendment of *Spent Convictions Act 2009*

## 18—Insertion of section 16A

This clause inserts a new section 16A into the Spent Convictions Act 2009. The new section provides that convictions for prescribed sex work offences (which are listed in new section 16A(2)) are taken to be spent for the purposes of that Act as soon as the new section commences.

Part 5—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

## 19—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause deletes the definition of 'prostitute' from the interpretation section of the Summary Offences Act 1953, as the term will no longer appear in the Act.

## 20—Amendment of section 21—Permitting premises to be frequented by thieves etc

This clause amends section 21 of the Summary Offences Act 1953 to delete references to 'prostitutes' in that section. The offence set out in the section (committed by a person who permits premises to be frequented by specified persons, or who is in premises that are frequented by specified persons) will no longer include prostitutes among the specified persons.

## 21—Repeal of sections 25, 25A and 26

This clause repeals sections 25A and 26 of the Summary Offences Act 1953.

Section 25 relating to the soliciting a person for the purposes of prostitution, and is based on the illegality of sex work, which will no longer be the case on the commencement of the Bill.

Section 25A related to the procurement of persons for prostitution, and is based on the illegality of sex work. That will no longer be the case. However, the repeal of the section does not affect the provisions of Part 3B Division 12 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, which deals (amongst other things) with offences relating to sexual servitude, deceptive recruiting for commercial sexual services and the involvement of children in commercial sexual services.

Section 26 related to living off the earnings of prostitution. With sex work no longer, in general terms, being illegal, this offence becomes redundant.

However, it is again worth noting that the repeal of these sections does not affect the operation of other laws (such as the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935) regulating criminal behaviour, including where the behaviour occurs in the context of sex work.

#### 22—Repeal of Part 6

This clause repeals Part 6 of the principal Act, which contained offences relating to brothels.

#### Part 6—Amendment of *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986*

#### 23—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes an amendment to the definition of 'employer' in section 3(1) of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 that is consequential upon the insertion of new section 6C below.

#### 24—Insertion of section 6C

This clause inserts new section 6C into the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. The new section provides for a number of matters that are related to the repeal of certain offences relating to prostitution by this measure.

In other words, the fact that a person can, within limits, lawfully engage in the provision of commercial sexual services as her or his occupation means that that occupation should be included in the occupations to which the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 applies, and so extends the protections that the Act provides in respect of the rehabilitation and compensation of workers who have been injured in the course of their work.

To do this the clause includes sex work to be work of a prescribed class, so that the arrangement between a sex worker and their employer is recognised as a contract of service, provided it satisfies the requirements set out in paragraph (a) of the new section.

It should be noted that by doing so, employers of sex workers will need to be registered under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 in the same way as other employers.

Section 6C(b) clarifies that a person to whom commercial sexual services are provided is not an employer for the purposes of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, nor is a person of a class prescribed by regulation (which may include, for example, a person organising the provision of commercial sexual services on behalf of a disabled friend).

Section 6C(c) provides that the WorkCover Corporation cannot, when considering whether to extend the protections of the Act to a self-employed sex worker under section 103 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, refuse the person's application simply because he or she is engaged in sex work. This provision is intended to ensure that a sex worker is treated no differently from other applicants.

#### Schedule 1—Transitional provision

#### 1—Application of section 59(1) of *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986* to certain employers

This clause provides a transitional provision that provides a 'grace period' for employers of sex workers to apply for registration under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

Section 59 of that Act provides an offence of employing a person in employment to which that Act applies if the employer is not registered with the WorkCover application.

The transitional provision will allow employers a reasonable time to prepare their applications and apply for registration.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

### **ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS (GARNISHEE ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 September 2014.)

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurana.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, if he speaks he closes the debate, that is why I am going here.

**Mr TARZIA:** Deputy Speaker, I move:

That this bill be adjourned to the next available day of sitting, being Thursday 30 October.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Why can't—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Is there a problem with the member for Kaurna speaking?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Not the member for Kaurna. The member for—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We understand that, if he speaks, he closes the debate. We understand all of that. But he was on his feet.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The call was given to the member for Hartley—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I actually called the member for Kaurna first.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** —on the basis that he had stood in his place first. There obviously has been an issue raised about the question of closing the debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hang on! I saw him stand up. I did not see him. What is your point of order?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I know, Deputy Speaker, how attentive you are to this.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, I am looking. Let's hear the point of order.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** In light of the fact that there has been a statement made that this could close the debate, it is not the intention of the mover to close the debate. Accordingly, to ensure that there is no suggestion of that, I stand to move:

That the debate be adjourned.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I understand that, but I am just asking why the member for Kaurna cannot speak and then you close the debate.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Because that is the view of the mover to want to move—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** But I actually recognised—what is the story here? Can I recognise the member for Kaurna—he was on his feet?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** And I put the point of order—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Okay, but the member for Kaurna was on his feet. I gave him the call, then this all happened. I cannot see a problem with his speaking.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** As I have indicated, Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no issue. You can adjourn it as soon as he has finished. The member for Kaurna.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (10:50):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. There must be some great concern and worry about what I am about to say. I rise to give the government's response to the member for Hartley's bill, the Enforcement of Judgments (Garnishee Orders) Amendment Bill 2014.

The member for Hartley's bill amends section 6(2) of the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 to allow the court, on application by a judgement creditor, to order that money owing or accruing to the judgement debtor from a third person, or money from the judgement debtor in the hands of a third person, be attached to answer the judgement and paid to the judgement creditor, a garnishee order, without the consent of the judgement debtor or any other person—that was quite a sentence.

The government cannot support this bill. We currently have before the other place a bill which seeks to bankrupt serious and repeat drug traffickers. That is a bill I have spoken on, and it is a bill that a number of people on this side of the house are very passionate about, and it is a bill that—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What is your point of order, member for Bragg?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The member for Kaurna is now canvassing a bill which is before another place. It is still a live bill.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will listen with great intent and, if he does that again, or if he has indeed done that at all, I will pull him up. Member for Kaurna.

**Mr PICTON:** In previous bills we—the Labor Party, the government—have put up trying to bankrupt serious drug offenders, we have seen that the opposition has opposed these bills time and time again. Yet, on the other hand, we now have the member for Hartley choosing to introduce this bill which quite possibly has the effect of bankrupting people on low incomes, rather than serious drug offenders. Considering the member for Hartley's bill, as against the Criminal Assets Confiscation (Prescribed Drug Traffickers) Amendment Bill, shows two things, firstly, that those opposite—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The member for Kaurna is now quoting the bill which is before the parliament, of which he is proudly displaying—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He will not do that, will you member for Kaurna?

**Mr PICTON:** Absolutely not, Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr PICTON:** I think what we are seeing is that the opposition does not have a strong tough on crime policy by evidence of their actions, and—

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Be seated, member for Kaurna. The member for Finniss has a point of order and it is only—what is the time?—10 to 11.

**Mr PENGILLY:** The member for Kaurna and the government are not responsible for the opposition's policies.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you member for Finniss. Member for Kaurna.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I will not have people talking over each other. I have the option to leave the chair, which is what I will do. I ask you all to cooperate and not to lower the tone of the house any further than it has been already this morning. Member for Kaurna.

**Mr PICTON:** The other thing that we see is that the member for Hartley has failed to consider the social implications of this bill. Although in his second reading contribution the member for Hartley states, 'People's welfare will not be touched—let's be clear about that,' this bill fails to acknowledge—

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hartley is called to order.

**Mr PICTON:** —what the significant impact garnishee orders will have on people with low incomes.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is called to order.

**Mr PICTON:** It is not clear what, if any, consultation the member for Hartley undertook before introducing this bill, whereas here in the government we are happy to help out and we have consulted widely on this bill with interest groups—

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley will have to be warned.

**Mr PICTON:** —representing those people who are likely to be affected. For instance, the South Australian Financial Counsellors Association provided feedback, voicing significant concern as to the implications of the bill, including concerns that (a) courts already have a number of means by which an order for the payment of moneys can be enforced; (b) garnishee orders may prove to be an extra administrative burden on employers, particularly small business (which you would think that people on the other side would care about), as a garnishee order would require employers to administer deductions from payroll; and (c) a garnishee order may force people into bankruptcy where reduced income means that they will be unable to pay debts which arise subsequent to such an order.

The government will not support this bill, which has the potential to adversely impact on low-income earners, whilst the Liberal Party continues to oppose serious drug offenders who—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Point of order. This is the third time—

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Vince, please. This is the third time that the speaker has referred to the drug offenders legislation which is currently under consideration.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I shall have to ask the member for Kaurana to desist. If I hear the member for Hartley move his lips, as the Speaker says, 'once more', there will be repercussions. Please do not lower the tone of the house. You have been asked not to interject. Do not interject. Do you understand?

**Mr Tarzia:** I do.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Right. Member for Kaurana, on task. You have finished.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

## COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE BILL

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 September 2014.)

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:56):** I rise as the shadow minister for families and child protection to support the Commissioner for Children and Young People Bill that has passed from the other place. This bill is to establish a commissioner for children and young people who is independent of government and has investigative powers.

I would like to take the opportunity to commend the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place for introducing this bill so quickly after being appointed as the shadow minister for child protection at that time. This is something that was first recommended to the government way back in 2003 by the Hon. Robyn Layton QC; it has taken the government 11 years to act on.

The Liberal Party has taken the lead on this issue, taking to the 2014 election a policy, 'Protecting our children: restructuring the education department', that included a children's commissioner. Our policy included an independent commissioner for children and young people that had investigative powers. Our children are our future and they deserve the best start in life they can get. The Hon. Stephen Wade summarised the bill quite effectively in saying:

The children and young people of South Australia deserve every opportunity to fulfil their potential and strive for their dreams. Every child has the right to a safe, loving environment in which to grow. Families, government and



the wider community need to work together to ensure that children and young people are given the best possible chance in life. The bill seeks to do this by promoting the wellbeing of children through the establishment of a Commissioner for Children and Young People.

Under the Liberal bill, the commissioner:

- will be the voice of all children and young people in this state;
- will promote the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in all areas of community life;
- will monitor the decisions of government and non-government agencies in terms of their inclusiveness in considering the rights and interests of children and young people;
- will conduct ongoing research and provide suggestions to government about ways to strengthen the rights of children and young people in South Australia;
- will ensure that all agencies of government that deal with children are implementing and following best practice policies on child protection matters;
- will have full investigative powers to be a truly independent statutory officer; and
- will produce an annual report and be fully accountable to parliament.

The requirement for a children's commissioner in our state has been identified in numerous reports commissioned by this government: in 2003, the Layton report, 'A state plan to protect and advance the interests of children'; in 2004, the Mullighan inquiry into children in state care; and a later Mullighan inquiry into children on the APY lands. In 2007, the Legislative Council appointed a select committee to examine and report on Families SA. In 2013, Mr Bruce DeBelle QC handed down his independent education inquiry, and now there is the latest royal commission, appointed this year, on the safety and welfare of children at risk.

These reports have shown the requirement for change and the diabolical state of Families SA. I truly wonder how many children and the lives of their families could have been changed if the government had not failed to act 11 years ago. If it had implemented the recommendation that it acknowledged and agreed on, how many children would have been spared the harm we have witnessed through our newspapers over the last number of years?

The government commissioned the Layton report, it agreed with the Layton report, and it failed to act for 11 years. This government has failed these children. The failings of this department and its failure to even investigate have been highlighted countless times over the years. It is most definitely time for action.

In 2012 the Labor government released a discussion paper on the child development legislation proposing an advisory council and formal community network, and in 2013 it released a draft bill. Neither the discussion paper nor the draft bill provided for a commissioner. The response to consultation was so strong in favour of a commissioner that a revised bill was released in October 2013 providing for a commissioner albeit a watered down version of a commissioner.

I think at this point in time it would be beneficial to highlight why Labor's proposal for a commissioner is inadequate which is addressed in the bill. Firstly, the commissioner, as outlined by Labor, will not be independent despite its reassurances that it is. The Law Society has criticised Labor's commissioner model saying that the role, as defined, lacks independence from government and the resources required to guarantee that independence. To be effective the commissioner must be independent, and this should be expressly provided for.

Stakeholders and child protection experts see Labor's proposal as inadequate as it lacks investigative powers. This was wonderfully put by John White, former president of the South Australian Law Society, who said:

What is the commissioner really going to do? If South Australia wants an effective advocate for children, and not just another department, it is time to look at the fundamentals of an independent commission. It is critical that the commissioner be independent of government. This ought to be beyond argument...the method of appointment must be transparent...it is essential that legislation clearly sets out the commissioner's functions and duties, status, powers and method of appointment.

There have been numerous child protection incidents in South Australia that are horrific and very disturbing. These matters highlight that the risk to children and young people will increase when the government fails to put in place appropriate processes to ensure transparency in the protection of young people.

The minister may say that since the Layton report the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee has been established, and it certainly has. However, this committee has limited powers to investigate. It cannot interview; it can only use existing documentation; it reports directly to the minister; it is exempt from FOI; and the child has to die or be seriously injured before it could take up the case. The minister has also established the Guardian for Children and Young People. However, that only applies to children in care.

We need a commissioner who has the power to intervene, to investigate, to penalise, and to properly be resourced; a commissioner who is independent of government, and who can truly get to the bottom of all of the issues going on in child protection. The children and young people of South Australia deserve the best level of care possible and the best form of commissioner.

I conclude by thanking all of the people who have provided me and the Liberal Party with feedback regarding this bill. In particular, I would like to thank the Law Society, YACSA and Save the Children for their feedback. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (11:03):** The bill before the house is solely concerned with the creation of a children's commissioner. That said, the creation of such a position is supported by the government and that is why we have introduced legislation into this house. It has been passed, and is now being dealt with in another place. What is opposed, however, is the narrow-minded and punitive way in which the opposition seeks to do this.

This bill contains extensive and detailed provision of investigative powers by the commissioner in relation to complaints and other investigations, including for individual matters. Although there is some qualification of the commissioner's legal mandate to investigate, the bill provides for investigators with extensive powers to investigate and significant penalties for a range of offences.

The Layton report, in recommending a South Australian commissioner for children and young people, specifically excluded the functions of deciding individual complaints and grievances from the functions of a commissioner.

The Leader of the Opposition, when he spoke in support of this bill, mentioned that commissioners in other states have been granted individual investigative powers. What he failed to mention was that where these powers do exist they are in the process of being removed. No jurisdiction in Australia will exercise individual investigative powers for their commissioners or commissions. Queensland will be the last jurisdiction to remove these functions later this year.

At a time when all Australian jurisdictions are moving away from a model where their children's commissioner exercises individual investigative powers, or will do so shortly, the opposition is proposing legislation with incredibly far-reaching powers—a quasi ICAC commissioner. By contrast, the government proposes to create the position of a commissioner as part of a broader context of entrenching the fundamental importance of children and their wellbeing.

I have previously reflected upon the significant achievements of this Labor government in reforming how South Australia approaches early childhood development. Our record speaks volumes about the emphasis we place not only on the welfare of children in our state but also on their wellbeing. South Australia has long been recognised as a leader in this field. Since 2002, we have sought to bring children to the centre of what we do. We have invested billions in infrastructure for children and their families. We have increased funding to our child protection system from a paltry \$90 million in 2002 to \$325 million in 2014.

South Australia is the only jurisdiction to sign a memorandum of understanding with UNICEF to further develop child-friendly initiatives that seek to define, continuously monitor, measure and improve outcomes for children, young people and their families. This achievement comes after a decade of work to give every chance to every child, and helps to build the foundation for the coming

decade and beyond. Research tells us that the care and support we provide for children in their early years makes a difference that lasts a lifetime, not only in terms of positive outcomes for them as individuals and for society, but also in economic terms.

This is the work we believe should be enshrined in legislation. While individual cases may have suddenly sent those opposite diving for a punitive instrument with which to respond, we on this side of the house have been working extensively with the community to develop legislation that does achieve these aims—legislation that seeks to look beyond what is done wrong, to try and ensure more what is done right.

There is no question that things do go wrong, and when they do there should be avenues to examine individual cases. These avenues exist. We have complaints and investigative mechanisms available across all areas of government. There is no need, at great cost to the South Australian taxpayer, to duplicate these systems with a children's commissioner with individual investigative powers when we already have a Health and Community Complaints Commissioner; the Guardian for Children and Young People; the Ombudsman; Independent Commissioner Against Corruption; obviously, our South Australian police force; the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment; and the Police Ombudsman, to name a few.

The legislation this government has passed in this house and now to be considered in the Legislative Council provides the commission with powers to investigate—investigate issues identified as systemic or in the interest of all children. Our model ensure independence. It was surprising that the Leader of the Opposition who, as he put it himself, 'did not get into politics for the social issues', was the sole speaker the last time the bill was put before the house, and I am pleased to see that the member for Adelaide has finally had her turn; she was told to sit down last time she tried to speak on this bill.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** You didn't let your own minister speak.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms Chapman:** That is shameful.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** That's the truth.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** It is shameful!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I agree!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left and on my right! Standing order 144: the house is to maintain decorum and dignity. This is not decorum and dignity. Members are not to interject. Please cooperate in maintaining the dignity of the house. I call the minister.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I agree it was shameful and I think—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No need. Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I think the member for Adelaide—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What is your point of order?

**Mr GARDNER:** It is No.137.3, the minister is refusing to accept the authority of the Chair.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, you are too. I am asking the minister to continue.

**Mr GARDNER:** That was a reasonable point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, well, I do not want anyone making points of order. I just want you back to debate, on topic, so that everyone can hear what you are saying.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I was about to commend the member for Adelaide because I think she has a genuine care and concern for children. I am sorry that the member for Morialta has a problem with that, but never mind.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He does not have a problem.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I do think it is important that when you have a shadow spokesperson—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —you allow them the opportunity to be able to speak—

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! You are warned.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** This bill is a blunt instrument that will do little to improve the lives—

**Mr PENGILLY:** Madam Deputy Speaker, point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You have a point of order that is not frivolous, member for Finnis?

**Mr PENGILLY:** Well, given that you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PENGILLY:** Madam Deputy Speaker, you said, 'You are warned.' You did not identify who. It could be any one of us. I am asking which member was warned.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think I said, 'You'll be warned.' It does not matter. The minister is on her feet, aren't you, minister?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** This bill is a blunt instrument that will do little to improve the lives of more than some children. This government believes that we should not just look backwards but also forward, and aim to improve the way in which we as a community approach the care of all children and how we engage with them as citizens to ensure that they have the best possible start in life.

The bill before the house does no more than seek to lay blame when things go wrong. Perhaps if the opposition had cared to consult as widely as the government has in the preparation of our bill, they too would have received the overwhelming support not only for powers to punish those who do wrong by children but for us all to do right by them.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader, if you speak, you close the debate.

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:12):** I would like to thank all speakers on this bill, those who have spoken in this house and those who have spoken in the other place. I particularly want to acknowledge the work of Stephen Wade in the other place and the

shadow minister Rachel Sanderson, the member for Adelaide in this chamber, for their contribution to and support for this very important bill which is before the house at the moment.

There is no doubt that there is a huge amount of public interest in the area of child protection here in South Australia at the moment. There is no doubt that people on both sides of this house, and in fact throughout the entire parliament, need to do everything we possibly can to make sure that those people who are most vulnerable are protected. We have fallen well short of best practice in this area, and this has been acknowledged by many people right across South Australia.

From our perspective on this side of the house, we have put forward positive plans to improve child protection here in South Australia. Part of it, of course, is the bill before the house at the moment, this bill to establish a commissioner for children and young people. More than that, the Liberal Party has been out there saying it is important to separate our child protection from the education department. This failed experiment is no longer supported by people working within the education department, with principals, with the AEU, the Primary Principals Association and a range of other very significant stakeholders in South Australia. The experiment has failed and the government needs to take action now, not after a royal commission, not two, three or four years down the track, but right now.

We have also said on this side of the house that we want a separate stand-alone agency, not subsumed into another department here in South Australia, but a dedicated agency—

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The construct of Families SA and the Department for Education and Child Development has absolutely nothing to do with the establishment of a commissioner for children, nothing to do with this legislation.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader.

**Mr MARSHALL:** So, this is a very important plan for us. We have also said that child protection is such an important area at the moment that we need to have a dedicated cabinet minister in this area, a cabinet minister who has no other responsibilities but to get this important area of child protection right. More than that, we have a select committee in the other place looking at Families SA. This is not a witch-hunt. This is a hardworking, genuine select committee chaired by the Hon. Stephen Wade, not to score cheap political points but to look at systemic improvements which are so—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You have a point of order, minister?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** There is nothing in the legislation that bears any relevance to a select committee that is operating in this parliament.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You have a further point of order?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I rise to speak on the point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Your point of order or this point of order?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On this point of order. Only to put this to you, Deputy Speaker: during the course of the debate the minister made a contribution outlining the basis upon which she questioned the bona fides of the development of this bill and the justification for it. Accordingly, the circumstances surrounding the development of this bill and the other important initiatives that are being taken are very much the subject matter of this debate and we would hope the minister would listen to it in silence.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader.

**Mr MARSHALL:** As I say, the Liberal Party has a very positive agenda to try to improve child protection in South Australia. The number one issue is the establishment of a commissioner for children and young people and one which has the necessary investigative powers so that we can have the right protections in place and so that we can improve our systems and improve them as soon as possible. Of course, this bill has already passed the other place. We introduced this bill in May. It is something which has been before this house. We were very disappointed when the government used its numbers to adjourn this debate off previously.

The minister in her contribution to the house for some reason chose to have a go at the opposition for limiting the number of speakers that we had on this important bill before the house. We do this for a very good reason. I make this point to you, Deputy Speaker, and to the parliament in general: at the moment it is the Liberal Party that has more legislation on the *Notice Paper* in this house than the government has. We have more bills, more legislation on the *Notice Paper* than the government of this state. That is the simple fact of the matter. How long do we get to put our program for positive change and reform in this state? I will tell you: one hour per week. So, of course, we have to limit the contributions which are made by this side so that we can bring our important reforms to a vote. Shamefully, the government has used its numbers to adjourn off the debate.

I hope the Independent members of the cabinet make sure that they allow this to go through to a vote. I was speaking with the grandmother of Chloe Valentine earlier this week and she made an impassioned plea to the South Australian parliament to bring this commissioner into place as soon as possible. I commend the bill to the house and I ask that the vote be put.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes .....	20
Noes .....	23
Majority.....	3

#### AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S. (teller)	McFetridge, D.
Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Williams, M.R.	Wingard, C.	

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Digance, A.F.C.
Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Hildyard, K.
Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)	Key, S.W.
Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Rankine, J.M.
Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.	

#### PAIRS

Pisoni, D.G.	Close, S.E.
--------------	-------------

Second reading thus negatived.

**Honourable members:** Shame!

**The SPEAKER:** The next person who says 'shame' will be ejected from the chamber.

#### *Personal Explanation*

#### **COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE BILL**

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:24):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you very much.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Will members please move to their seats and keep the noise down.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** On 25 September, when speaking to the bill we have just voted on (Commissioner for Children and Young People Bill), I informed the house of what was my understanding at the time, that Queensland was the last jurisdiction to have investigative powers for its commissioner. I have since learnt that it still has those powers but that it is in the process of getting rid of them. I apologise for that mistake.

*Bills*

**WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SACFS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:27):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a very straightforward bill that has come down from the other place where it was strongly supported. It has been debated for a long time in this place. CFS volunteers deserve to be valued by this government. It has procrastinated, it has prevaricated, it has tried to delay, and it is time that volunteers, at the start of the fire season particularly, were given confidence that this government supports them and values them, and I move that this bill be now voted on.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:28):** I wholeheartedly support the bill. It is completely in line with many other comments I have made in this house, and I ask all members to support it.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** This has been talked about a lot in this place and I look forward to the government, particularly the member for Frome, supporting this worthwhile piece of legislation.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We have a contingent motion.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:29):** Contingently on the order of the day for the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (SACFS) Amendment Bill being read, I move:

That all words after 'be' be left out and the words 'withdrawn and referred to the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation for its report and recommendation' be inserted in lieu thereof.

There are a couple of bills here before the house, both of which I have included contingent motions for. I think it is a good idea for the house to send both of these bills to the Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Committee to have full consideration of both bills and see whether it would not in fact be more prudent to merge them or to move them in one particular bill or to recommend one way or the other whether they be agreed to or not. I think they are both worthy bills. It is an important topic for many people in this state. We are obviously deeply grateful for the commitment and the work of many volunteers in the CFS—in fact, all of the volunteers in the CFS.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....23  
Noes .....20  
Majority .....3

AYES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brock, G.G.  
Gee, J.P.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Piccolo, A.  
Rau, J.R.  
Weatherill, J.W.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Caica, P.  
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.  
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Snelling, J.J.  
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Digance, A.F.C.  
Hildyard, K.  
Key, S.W.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Rankine, J.M.  
Vlahos, L.A.

## NOES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D. (teller)
Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Williams, M.R.	Wingard, C.	

## PAIRS

Close, S.E.	Pisoni, D.G.
-------------	--------------

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended agreed to.

*Motions***METROPOLITAN, RURAL AND REMOTE REGIONS RELATIONSHIP**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:36):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the very important interrelationship between metropolitan Adelaide and the rural and remote regions of our state; and
- (b) acknowledges that the equitable provision of resources to and the development of both are necessary for our state's economic and social success now and into the future.

My reason for bringing this motion forward in such a non-political way is that I want all members of this house to consider this motion, to think very carefully about it, and hopefully all form the view that they support it wholeheartedly. This is not about a proud country member bashing the city or anything of the sort. It is genuinely recognising that both metropolitan Adelaide and our country and remote parts of the state are very closely interrelated, that they both need each other, that they both should be valued, and that they both should receive an equitable provision of government resources, which are actually taxpayer-funded resources.

We have approximately a quarter of our population living in regional areas and we have approximately a third of our state's wealth generated in regional areas so, by that measure, regions are punching well above their weight with regard to contribution to our state's prosperity. That includes the fact that much of the wealth that is generated in regional South Australia is reported as having been generated in metropolitan South Australia, and a very strong example of that is mining wealth generation.

If you have the opportunity to look at the gross state product statistics, you would be absolutely staggered to learn how much mining wealth is generated in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide. The reason for that, of course, is that is where many of the mining companies' headquarters are based, so they report their profits, employment and a number of their very positive economic statistics within a metropolitan Adelaide context, whereas actually the true wealth is generated in regional South Australia.

Regional South Australia can be very proud of its contribution to our state's wealth. The very important link is that it cannot continue if we do not have strong, thriving, prosperous and sustainable regional communities. As I said, this is not a debate about pitting one against the other. I can assure members that every single person who lives in regional South Australia knows how vitally important Adelaide is as well. They all know how critically important Adelaide is and how vitally important it is that services are provided in Adelaide as well.

There would not be a person living in regional South Australia who does not, even just occasionally, use a metropolitan road, who does not just occasionally shop in metropolitan Adelaide,



who does not just occasionally avail themselves of some medical service, or some other service in metropolitan Adelaide, and who would not have other family members who do not do the same. We understand how vitally important Adelaide is, but it is important that government resources are handed out equitably.

As I said, it is critical that we have thriving, sustainable and successful communities in regional South Australia, because if we do not people will not live there, and if people do not live in our regions, the regions cannot continue to provide the economic contribution to our state that our state requires. That is a very important thing for all members to understand.

I thought I might just quickly go through a few of the government portfolios in no particular order. There are good situations and good examples with every single one of them, which really highlight how vitally important both regional and country South Australia are. In terms of health, as I mentioned before, country people come to Adelaide for health care—there is no doubt about it—but, if they do not have health care in their own region, then young families will not stay in small towns and older people will not be able to come to small towns, and you will not attract workers; in fact, tourists will not be able to comfortably travel from Adelaide to regional areas either if they are concerned that, if they have a car crash, get sick, or need some medication for one reason or another, they would not be able to get help in regional South Australia. If they are worried about that they would not travel to regional South Australia, so health care in regions is exceptionally important for regional people and also for city people.

Education in regions is vitally important—absolutely critically important. South Australian and interstate universities are setting up campuses in regional centres, and that is a very welcome step forward. It benefits those universities, those traditionally Adelaide-based universities, but it also benefits regional towns. There is certainly enormous proof coming from Newcastle and Wollongong in New South Wales, for example, which are both traditionally heavy industry towns where those industries have not disappeared but have subsided enormously, that having tertiary education bases in those regional centres has been one of the really critical foundations of commercial and social growth in what were dying regional centres. Universities have contributed enormously. Universities are not there just for regional people: they are there for themselves as well, and that is quite fair and quite right. There are many shining examples of marvellous South Australians, over the last 175 years, who have been educated in rural South Australia and gone on to make significant contributions to our state.

With regard to transport, I have a view that the single most important road upgrade that should take place in our state, with a view to contributing to our state's economy, is the Strzelecki Track, with 500 kilometres of currently very poor dirt road. The people who work on that road do the very best they can with the insufficient resources they have to keep that road in as good a condition as possible, but they just cannot keep up with it due to the volume of trucks. The reason that there is a volume of trucks is primarily because of the Cooper Basin. There is bitumen from Brisbane all the way to the Queensland/New South Wales border, but people coming from Adelaide have to travel the last nearly 500 kilometres on dirt.

I have great support for the desire to upgrade all sorts of other roads—and there are many other very important roads in metropolitan Adelaide that have been discussed here—but the Strzelecki Track instantly, overnight, as soon as it is upgraded, will bring business that is currently being done in the Cooper Basin from Queensland back to South Australia. Instantly, overnight, there will be significant improvement to our state's economy.

Usually you have to make very expensive, very significant infrastructure step outs and then, after that, business slowly establishes itself around those infrastructure step outs. Following that the state's economy can benefit. We have a situation where our state's economy would instantly benefit. That is not to say that metropolitan road and transport infrastructure upgrades are not warranted, because they are warranted; however, I certainly claim that the upgrading of the Strzelecki Track would be the most important one for our state with regard to immediately contributing to our state's economy.

Disabilities is a very important government and opposition portfolio. There should be no differentiation between people with disabilities, whatever they happen to be, in country or city areas.

I am sure that every member in this house—and certainly members on this side—know of families who have had to leave regional areas and come to Adelaide because they have children with disabilities but they just cannot get the support and care that they need in the regions.

An example of what is, fortunately, at the lower end of personal impact—it is still very serious, but we are not talking about a quadriplegic or something like that—are children who need speech therapy. There is a dreadful shortage of support in country schools for children who need speech therapy. I do not believe we have a shortage of speech therapists in our state; we have a shortage of funding for speech therapists in regional schools. That has a huge impact on families. I use that example because it is at the lower end. Ideally, you can still end up having a very healthy, productive and constructive life if you need speech therapy and you do not get it, but you cannot lead nearly as constructive or as positive a life, or make the same contribution, if you do not get it. Unfortunately, it can lead on to other issues.

In terms of housing, there are issues with regard to housing all over the state. I am very concerned to see that there is significant impact on regional South Australia with regard to the government's desire to sell off Housing SA properties in regional areas, where they are greatly needed. I think that has largely been done. Former treasurer Foley is very clearly on the record as saying that he wanted to do that, basically to help fix the state's budget, and regional areas are being adversely affected.

With water and the River Murray, I suggest (and this is not supported by anything firm that I know of, but the member for Chaffey may be able to support me) that more of the people who use the River Murray for recreation come from metropolitan Adelaide than from regional areas. So all metropolitan people should be supporting the River Murray as much as they possibly can.

It is similar with regard to the environment and to small business. One thing that regularly confounds me in this place is the government's failure to understand that 95 per cent or more of all regional agricultural businesses are small businesses. It seems to want to differentiate farms from small businesses. We have had debates in this place and we have spoken about small businesses and farming, and the Minister for Small Business has very regularly and unfairly tried to chastise members of the opposition by saying, 'You only ever stick up for farmers. Why don't you think about small businesses?' He has not realised that they are the same thing; they are almost always the same thing. Agricultural businesses in our state, from east to west and north to south, deserve as much support from the Minister for Small Business as does any other small business you would like to think of.

It is similar for fisheries and forests. By definition, all commercial forests are outside metropolitan Adelaide, but they support our state enormously, and they should not be considered as things that can just be sold off when your budget is running a bit tough. As former minister O'Brien said, they should not be used as a way of trying to get out of putting wages on the credit card. I think that was the expression that he used at the time. It is very unfortunate.

In regard to multicultural affairs, we are very proud in regional South Australia. There is not a region in regional South Australia that does not have a strong foundation from migrants who came, made their livelihood and contributed to our state in regional areas. Again, that should never be considered a 'metropolitan only' portfolio. Of course, tourism is vitally important for both metropolitan and regional South Australia, as is employment and training and emergency services. Every single one of these portfolios—and I have not named all of them—is equally as important, if not more on some occasions, in regional South Australia as it is in Adelaide.

We understand that on the government side there is only one Labor member who is from regional South Australia and there is an Independent member from regional South Australia, and those two are in the vast minority when contributing to this government forming decisions. I call very earnestly on the government to consider this motion and to support it and to recognise that both regional South Australia and metropolitan Adelaide are interlocked, intertwined and neither can do without each other. Investments in transport, health, recreation and sport, education, infrastructure—in anything you could think of—in regional South Australia would support our entire state's development.

If we do not have strong regional development, and if we do not have strong regional communities, we will not have people living in regional South Australia. If we do not have people living in regional South Australia, we will not have people in regional South Australia creating the wealth that people in metropolitan Adelaide rely upon. Investment in regional South Australia is a very sound investment for all South Australians.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (From—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (11:52):** I support what the member for Stuart has said. However, on this side we are moving—

**Mr Pederick:** Which side is that?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am on my feet. All members need to sit down. I will not have the house's order disrupted. The minister is entitled to be heard in silence. Interjections are out of order. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. The government amendment is:

Leave out all words after (b) and replace with:

supports the balanced provision of resources that recognises the interdependence of metropolitan and rural areas of South Australia and takes into account local needs and priorities as a basis for our economic and social success now and—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Just let him finish his sentence and then you can have your point of order.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** It says:

—into the future.

Am I doing this the wrong way?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, don't worry. What is your point of order, member for Morialta?

**Mr GARDNER:** The minister appears not to understand standing orders. He is certainly not moving an amendment in the form in which an amendment should be moved, as the Clerk was so happy to advise me yesterday.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can we have a look at the amendment?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is a procedural thing, in that you need to say, 'I move the amendment with the house's indulgence.' We will consider the amendment moved. Are we all happy to continue is the question, and the question is obvious, so the minister has the call.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Can we have a copy?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That normally will happen, and it will happen in a second. It happens automatically and it will happen.

**Mr Gardner:** It doesn't happen automatically, we have to ask for it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As I understand it, when an amendment is moved the attendants print the copies and distribute them, so let's get the house's time moving on. The minister can continue.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** It gives me pleasure to be able to recognise the very important relationship between metropolitan Adelaide and our regions. Strong regions are the building blocks of a strong state and the key to providing a sustainable, prosperous future for all South Australians. Regional South Australia accounts for 29 per cent of the state's population, produces nearly half of

our merchandise exports and contributes about \$23 billion—that is about 25 per cent of gross state product.

The government recognises that there is a very strong supportive role in building a framework for prosperity that is responsive to the needs identified by local communities. The government has listened to regional communities and will continue to listen to regional communities about their concerns and aspirations. I propose to amend paragraph (b) so that this house supports the balanced provision of resources that recognises the interdependence of metropolitan and rural areas of South Australia and takes into account local needs and priorities as the basis for our state's economic and social success now and into the future.

The government is committed to regional South Australia and is making a significant investment in our regions in 2014-15 and the following three years. We have a \$39 million commitment this year comprising a \$13.4 million increase to the Regional Development Fund, a \$10 million regional jobs accelerator fund in 2014-15, and some \$15.5 million of existing resources across government which have been earmarked for the regions. That commitment remains at \$29 million per annum for the following three years.

**Mr KNOLL:** On a point of order: as much as I am enjoying the minister's contribution, the clock seems to be stuck.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Clerk is adjusting things. Thank you for your reminder, though.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** In addition, the government has established the Regional South Australia Cabinet Committee to ensure regions are considered at the highest level of decision-making. We will be holding three country cabinet meetings outside of Adelaide each year as part of the government's Charter for Stronger Regional Policy. Country cabinets provide opportunities for community members and business people to interact directly with the most senior levels of government.

Similarly, the Senior Management Council comprising chief executives of all government departments is required to meet in the regions three times each year. We have established a new division, Regions SA, within the Department of Primary Industries and Regions to provide a strategic policy focus for regional development across the state and to provide the regions with a strong voice in the government.

Funding available to Regional Development Australia boards has more than doubled to \$3 million. The 2014-15 state budget includes \$278 million for capital works projects being undertaken in the regions, covering transport, infrastructure, health, correctional services, emergency services and education. There is also \$6 million over four years for the Agribusiness Accelerator Program, \$35.5 million for the Rural Road Safety Program, and initiatives to ease cost of living pressures in the form of a \$9.3 million allocation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme and reductions in electricity costs in remote areas. This government is serious about ensuring our regional areas continue to be supported to grow and meet their potential.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:58):** I note with interest that the so-called independent member—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! You are not going to reflect on the member, are you?

**Mr KNOLL:** I am not going to reflect on the member's presence.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, you are not going to reflect on the member, though, are you?

**Mr KNOLL:** No.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Good; that would be good.

**Mr Pederick:** Call him a Labor minister, that might be alright.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KNOLL:** I will defer to the member for Stuart on—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KNOLL:** —the amendment that has been moved. It is interesting to note that comments from members opposite have very much, to my mind, questioned the independence thereof, and I find it quite interesting that we have so-called independent members of the government opposite. In moving a motion such as this, I question the so-called independence that exists.

Unlike other states, in South Australia, we do not have large regional cities. Indeed, we do have one of the most urbanised populations in the world here in South Australia. On the other hand, our regions contribute hugely to the prosperity of this state. In fact, they always have. I had the Flagstaff Hill Primary School group in here yesterday and I pointed out to them that the wheat and the grapes that adorn our carpets here very much reflect the beginnings of our state and, interestingly, still very much reflect two major industries in our state.

But, in order for us to continue to have prosperity in South Australia and to make sure that our regions are prosperous places, we need to make it attractive for young people to live there. Indeed, this is a huge endemic problem in the Barossa where one-third of students, once they reach the end of their secondary schooling, leave the Barossa, with most of them not returning to the region once they have grown up. That is a frustrating and difficult loss of talent for our region.

Many of them go on to do bigger, better and brighter things and study abroad and make huge contributions to our state but the difficult thing is it is not sustainable for any region to be losing one-third of its young people. That is something that is very important to understanding the relationship between metropolitan Adelaide and remote and rural regions.

As I stated in my maiden speech to this house, we cannot continue to ignore the hand that feeds us. We are still, in large part, an agricultural state, and it seems in recent times that we have become embarrassed by this and, for the life of me, I cannot understand why. We have gone chasing new industries, and contentious within the regions is going down the path of increasing mining—which, I must admit, is good for this state but, once we have seen the so-called mining boom come and go, to my mind, very much we come back to this industry which has quietly chugged along (that is, agriculture) and those industries that have been ignored by this government over many years have started to look more and more exciting to the government, possibly because they are some of the few prosperous industries left in South Australia. We should not be embarrassed by our agricultural roots and the strength of our agricultural economy. Instead, we should be looking to embrace it and value-add.

In this place, as a state parliament and state government, we need to reduce the dissidence between city and country, because it is a huge issue. More and more, I see a disconnect between city and country, and creating a divide in our community is not a good thing. I see that divide very much when it comes to food production and, formerly as a food manufacturer, I saw firsthand the dissidence and disconnect that exists.

Indeed, many of the questions that I fielded with regard to food production and how our food is grown suggest to me that there is a lack of understanding within metropolitan areas as to where our food comes from, and that leads sometimes to perverse and adverse consumer interests and creates strains on our farming communities that, through a greater level of education and connectivity, could otherwise be avoided.

There are also challenges in not only keeping young people more generally but that challenge is intensified when it comes to keeping them in the farm sector—to attract them and keep them on the farm. At this point, I would like to commend a group in my electorate that I have been working with closely, Barossa Young People in Agriculture, which is a great initiative of my local Barossa RDA. I commend them for the work they have done in identifying this problem and seeking ways to fix it.

Not to put too fine a point on it, if I look at the major exports for goods going outside of South Australia in 2012-13, all of them, almost without exception, are regional exports. It includes wheat, at over \$1 billion, and alcoholic beverages (which would certainly include wine from the great electorate of Schubert), at over \$1 billion. There is iron ore, copper ore and concentrates, copper,

meat (excluding beef) and lead. Well down the list we have passenger motor vehicles and, unfortunately, I do not see a great future for that export. Underneath that is vegetables, oil seeds and oleaginous fruits (soft).

My point is that we rely so heavily on our regions for our export economy. Understanding the interconnectivity between our regions and between metropolitan Adelaide is important in making sure that those industries stay strong. Investment in Adelaide supports our regions and vice versa. A lack of investment in either will hurt the other, and I would like to point out a couple of withdrawals of investment in my area that have hurt that interconnectivity.

The first is the impending closure of the Tanunda court and other outer metropolitan courts that will add further pressure to our metropolitan court system and will actually make it harder for people in regional areas to access the justice system.

Poor health services in the regions puts pressure on nearby hospitals, and in our case hospitals located in metropolitan Adelaide, adding pressure to an already ailing major hospital system. At this point I would say that I have an answer to some of the congestion issues in the northern Adelaide hospital system. A purpose-built, brand-new health facility in the Barossa would certainly help to ease that congestion. On this side of the house maybe we do not always put enough good ideas forward, but that is certainly a purler I believe the government should take up in helping to reduce congestion in our hospital system.

The third is something that we have been dealing with over the last couple of days in this place and that is the Gawler line electrification. The terminal is the long-term punching bag for the state government. The first cab off the rank every time something needs to be cut is the Gawler line electrification, and I do feel for the people of Gawler and the people of the northern suburbs, but certainly I feel for the communities from Schubert who have certainly been waiting for a long time for an improved train service through to Gawler. But what the effect of that does is to discourage people from using public transport and puts more congestion back on to those communities who then use major arterial roads in metropolitan Adelaide.

The second part of this motion, which amended or unamended I struggle to see the difference, talks about acknowledging the equitable provision of resources, and what has frustrated me most in this place is the government inefficiency that exists that prevents people from going about their daily lives. There are two things I would like to point out.

Firstly, there is a woman in my electorate that I have spoken of previously who waited nine weeks for her DCSI clearance to be able to go back to her job. Nine weeks of unpaid leave where she sat at home waiting for the government to allow her to continue to do the job that she had been doing very well beforehand.

The second is a local drain that I managed to have fixed in my local electorate which had been a sore point for two years. For two years my local community had been waiting for action and it took advocacy on my behalf to get the thing fixed which actually in the end was quite simple. It was merely a Coke bottle in a drain. Why it takes two years for a government to pluck a Coke bottle out of drain to stop major flooding, I do not know. The second part of this motion:

...acknowledges that the equitable provision of resources to and the development of both are necessary for our state's economic and social success now and into the future.

I think about the inequity when it comes to our emergency services levy rate increases where in 2014-15 rural South Australians will pay \$22.9 million towards the levy; however, emergency services in the area will only receive \$9.4 million worth of funding. This means that country people are paying \$13.5 million more than they receive in services, and this is certainly an area where equity or balance needs to be looked at.

In the most recent budget we have seen job losses at SARDI which has had its funding cut by \$3 million after a \$1.4 million cut last year, cuts to Biosecurity SA, and cuts to the NRM management fund that all hurt our regional areas.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:09):** I would like to congratulate and thank the member for Stuart for bringing this motion to the house. Incredibly it reeks of common sense and we see so very little of that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Incredibly for the member for Stuart or just incredibly?

**Mr TRELOAR:** Isn't common sense a wonderful thing, Deputy Speaker, so, thank you to the member for bringing this motion to the house. The motion reads:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the very important interrelationship between metropolitan Adelaide and the rural and remote regions of our state; and—

In the unamended form, it goes on to state:

- (b) acknowledges that the equitable provision of resources to and the development of both are necessary for our state's economic and social success now and into the future.

The member for Frome has moved an amendment to that, and we will consider that in due course. It seems to me that it has very much the same intent; it has just changed some words, which the government is wont to do.

It has been stated already that a quarter of the state's population lives in the regional areas, and, of course, that means that three-quarters of the state's population lives in Adelaide, as the capital city. It is very much a city state—that is recognised—and we have to make our financial decisions, our economic decisions, with that knowledge. Having said that a quarter of the state's population live in the rural areas, we understand also that a third of the state's GDP is produced from those regions. If you follow that argument, it means that the country people, the regions, are very productive in their own right.

The member for Stuart did make the observation that some of that income, particularly mining income, is declared from the eastern suburbs of Adelaide, where many of the mining companies have their headquarters. So, there is a little bit of smoke and mirrors that goes on there, but, in essence, the productivity of the regions remains. It has always been the case, since the very early days of settlement in this state, in fact, that Adelaide has always been the centre and the focus of both population and economic activity.

It was in 1840 that the state, for the very first time, became self-sufficient in food production. It was a good harvest in 1840, and it was the first time the colony was able to feed itself. So, it was a significant year. Of course, very soon after that, in the mid to late 1840s, there was the discovery of copper, which took place in a regional area as well and which led not just to increased wealth but also, in many ways, saved the colony from the brink of bankruptcy.

Primary production is the essence of the regions, and most of that is based on agriculture. Our grain harvest is about to get underway. It looks like being at least average. It is not the bumper crop we were hoping for a couple of months ago; unfortunately, the spring weather has been rather dry and there has been patches of frost, which will impact the grain harvest. Wheat is the main crop, as it always has been. There are very important crops, such as barley, canola and hay, of course.

The member for Schubert has been spoken about viticulture. The member for Chaffey will, no doubt, talk about horticulture when he makes a contribution. Often, the Riverland is referred to as the food bowl of the state. He is probably going to get a debate from other regional members but, be that as it may, the Riverland certainly makes a significant contribution. The adoption of technology in that part of the world has led to more efficient water use, as has the adoption of technology right across primary production increased efficiencies and productivity.

In my own electorate of Flinders, we have the seafood industry, which is of vital importance. It brings around \$400 million into Eyre Peninsula. Most of that was initially wild catch, but as we see the years go on, aquaculture is becoming more and more important, with oysters, kingfish, mussels. Who knows what developments might occur in the aquaculture sector in years to come. I know that there is a proposition to grow razor fish out on the West Coast, and we will see where that goes; certainly, the waters are admirably suited.

With forestry down in the South-East, we have seen the debacle of the sale of the forward rotation of the forest. That really has been to the detriment of that industry and that region but, be that as it may, the government has seen fit to do that for short-term gain. In fact, it is interesting in

that the income from the sale of the forest matched almost exactly the cost of the Adelaide Oval upgrade—almost to the dollar, I would suggest.

**Mr Pederick:** And they sold it cheap.

**Mr TRELOAR:** They sold it cheap.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** Like the TAB.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Standing order 144 say the business of the house must be maintained and proceeded with in dignity and I do not see that. Everyone can have a turn to speak; you are just not permitted to speak over the top of each other.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and the Government Whip should be well aware of the need for decorum. Tourism is the last one I want to touch on—that sector which of course also brings such interest and wealth and economic activity to the regions of the state. Some of the tourism activity is nearby to Adelaide, and some of it is further afield. We will hopefully see some growth in that area, although once again I do not see the government necessarily being particularly supportive of that.

We have talked about the challenge of declining population in regional areas and this is a long-term trend. It is a trend that has been going on certainly since the 1960s and probably longer than that. In fact I have seen a graph that would indicate that the long-term price of wheat in real terms has been declining since the middle ages, since those halcyon years following the Great Plague where wheat prices peaked and they have been declining in real terms ever since, so this is a challenge.

It is not just price that dictates or brings about a decline in population; it is also the introduction and adoption of technology and I will give you an example. In the district council of Wudinna, the current population is just half of what it was in 1981, so just 35 years ago. I would be very surprised if that was not reflected in many other councils around the state. At the same time, the productivity of that district council area in agricultural terms has increased. We are achieving more with fewer people and it is purely and simply because of the technology that has been developed and is being adopted.

I do not see that long-term trend of declining population necessarily turning around. That will be the challenge. The challenge for governments and the challenge in this state will be to provide essential services such as health, education, schools and hospitals, roads, infrastructure and telecommunications to areas where their productivity is maintained or increasing, but the population is actually declining. It is all around equity.

Of course, the provision of essential services and the provision of infrastructure components such as roads, rail, ports, telecommunications and television is vitally important not just for the social wellbeing of the country areas and the health and wellbeing of country people but also to help them maintain competitiveness in a global economy. I have spoken about this before, but as a wheat grower, the member for Hammond competes head to head with a grower in Canada, a grower in North America, a grower in the Ukraine and with a grower in Argentina, and unless we are able to maintain a competitive edge or, at the very best, not become uncompetitive due to government restraints and government lack of expenditure, then we are really behind the eight-ball.

I do not think a lot of people have quite grasped this yet. It is absolutely imperative that our small businesses are able to maintain their competitiveness. I will give you an example. The government's cabinet is about to visit the West Coast, I understand, in the last week in November. They will discover, and I have warned them to be prepared for this, that there is very little phone service.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Very little?

**Mr TRELOAR:** Telephone service.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Alright.



**Mr TRELOAR:** That is one of the very things that we are battling with and grappling with each and every day not just to undertake our social activities but to actually undertake our businesses. Very quickly, and I see I only have a minute left, Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thirty seconds.

**Mr TRELOAR:** You are cutting into my time, Deputy Speaker. I would like to thank the member for Frome for the opportunity to speak with him yesterday about some road funding priorities. I have talked about the Tod Highway in this place. We also spoken about the Balumbah-Kinnaird road, the Mount Wedge to Warramboos road, and the Wirrulla-Kingoonya road, and I can check the spelling of that with *Hansard* at a later date.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:19):** I, too, rise to speak on another great motion by the member for Stuart. I note that there has been an amendment put forward, and I am not aware of whether the member for Stuart will acknowledge that amendment.

I think we have had many motions in this house regarding the importance of regional South Australia not only to the state's economy but to the state as a whole. Regional South Australia fits hand-in-hand with metropolitan South Australia and I really think that, in a sense, they are areas that need to reflect on one another and complement one another.

In the course of my time in this place over the last five years, we continue to come back to the importance of regional South Australia to the state's economy. We note the importance of South Australia's main hub, which is Adelaide, and the importance of how Adelaide fits into the landscape of the state.

More important, I think, is how this current government of almost 13 long years has exacerbated the wedge between metropolitan South Australia and regional South Australia. I look over the last 12 years at just exactly where the government's priorities have been because I think, at the end of the day, what it boils down to is priorities. It is about where the government puts their energy, their finances, their funding and their favouritism.

It has become very obvious, particularly over the last four years, where the majority of their funding is going. We look at the major road projects in this state, we look at the major infrastructure projects, we look at the major hospital projects—all of the major spend in this state is being put into Adelaide, and it is not supporting what I would consider one of the major economic platforms in the state; that is, agriculture. I think many people on this side will agree that agriculture is a renewable, sustainable economic base that has continued to come back year in, year out over the last 100 years or more to sustain South Australia's economy.

Let us face it, over the last 10 years, we have seen drought which has affected the state's economy and we have seen the lack of ongoing mining support. Mining has not flourished as the government, in its overspruiking way, has claimed. What is happening is we continue to see, particularly, as I said, over the last four or five years, the government deprioritise the support that our economic bases need. We hear about mining. We obviously have to remember that mining is essentially digging a big hole and taking out what is underneath the scab. They keep taking it out and eventually it runs out, then that mine becomes defunct and we go to another spot.

In the meantime, agriculturalists, farmers, horticulturalists, vignerons and all of the food producers continue to find better ways to use their land. They find better ways to grow and cheaper ways to grow, but we continue to keep on hitting those walls, which are the costs of doing business, the capacity to employ people and the capacity to have some form of government expenditure to support what the state is in need of; that is, a buoyant economy.

Once we have grown a product on a property or on a farm, we need to get it to a processing plant. We need to get it from the processing plant to the market. We need to get it from the market to the retail outlet, then we have got to get it from the retail outlet to the mouths. Again, we look at how that is being done.

We look at any big road infrastructure. We do not see any rail infrastructure in South Australia—none. At the moment, we are looking at the demise of rail in South Australia. Both

of the Mallee lines are imminent for closure. There is pressure on the viability of rail lines right around this state. And yet we look at electrification to bring people from the south into the city—

**Mr Picton:** Hear, hear.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** —and from the north into the city. But where is the energy put into infrastructure that is looking to sustain an economy? The member for Kaurana says, 'Hear, hear.' It is all very fine to have your passengers picked up and taken to work, but when you need to have competitive food put on your table that has to come down by truck it is going to congest the roads. It does not make our roads any safer—look at the horrific accidents happening at the bottom of the South-Eastern Freeway. It is with arrogance that we continue to disregard how important rail is.

Look around this great country and all the other states. Every other state in Australia is investing in rail except for South Australia because the importance of rail in South Australia is to put up electrification here in metropolitan Adelaide and make that our priority. We look at the priority of putting in a superway, the north-south connector. That will induce more trucks to come into the city and take the connector from south to north and north to south. Again, why are we not looking outside the square? Why are we not looking at a connection from the South-East to the north and then coming into port?

There are already roads in place, but there is a city-centric focus on having a north-south connector. It is not about bringing more trucks to that connector, it is about easing traffic congestion in metropolitan Adelaide. I assure you that when the north-south connector is finished we will be aghast by trucks because by then, sadly, I see the demise of rail. Just in my electorate alone there will be an extra 10,000 truck movements on the road by the discontinuation of those two rail lines.

Again, it is about the government's priority. Sadly, over the short space of time I have been here I continue to see the government's priority is shifting further and further away from supporting the regions, supporting the regional economies that support South Australia as a whole—not only for food, but for jobs, for prosperity, for the ongoing sustainable economy that regional South Australia established.

In taking away a priority we look at cuts to globally integrating the South Australian economy program. It is about our trade mechanism and how we can grow and trade product overseas to bring new money into this state. But we look at cuts to all sorts of agencies: look at PIRSA and SARDI where the budget is 35 per cent of what it was in 2010. How are we ever going to compete in a changing and more competitive world when all these agencies are having the guts ripped out of them with staff put on voluntary separation packages and never replaced? So, how are we going to remain competitive, not only with the rest of the world, but with the rest of this country? South Australia will just continue to languish.

Yesterday, the Minister for Agriculture stood up and beat his chest about how fantastic South Australia is to be phylloxera free and fruit fly free, yet when we look at biosecurity 13 staff have been cut out of the department and funding is being reduced. How much longer can he stand up and beat his chest and claim that South Australia will be free of phylloxera and free of fruit fly when they continually defund and pull staff out of these departments?

If we look at the sanctuary zones, again it is another pill that regional South Australia is going to have to swallow. It is not about the sustainable industry or the fishing sector. We have already been told that we have best practice in fishing, sustainable fishing practices here in South Australia, and yet we have conservation parks going into the ocean to the detriment of commercial-sector fishing. It really does make you wonder. The member for Flinders mentioned the sale of the forest forward rotations. Again, that is another priority that the government does not see as important.

Time expired.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:29):** I rise to support the motion by the member for Stuart:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the very important interrelationship between metropolitan Adelaide and the rural and remote regions of our state and

- (b) acknowledges that the equitable provision of resources to and the development of both are necessary for our state's economic and social success now and into the future.

That is the motion I support, but I note the amendment to paragraph (b) moved by the member for Frome, which reads:

- (b) supports the balanced provision of resources that recognises the interdependence of metropolitan and rural areas of South Australia and takes into account local needs and priorities as a basis for our economic and social success now and into the future.

That is quite interesting, because it really does not change anything of the original motion; it is just the Labor Party trying to put their brand on this excellent motion by the member for Stuart. Perhaps the Labor Party could just concentrate on putting more effort into the regions instead of doing ridiculous changes to motions, and actually recognise what does happen in the regions.

I am bitterly disappointed in the actions of the member for Frome (Minister for Regional Development) in his vote on marine parks. When he addressed fishermen and their families at Port Wakefield, he said that he knew that the locals would help make the best decisions. Certainly, in that case, he did not listen to the locals, and we now have a very poor situation where fisheries right across the state area heavily impacted by these sanctuary zones.

We were only going to take 12 out of the situation and bring it back to 72 no-take zones instead of 84. The minister has got the Labor Party to agree to an impact study in 12 months' time on what happens with keeping the sanctuary zones as they are. Well, that is far too late, because my information is that it is already having a devastating effect on fishing families and communities.

Not that I want to see suicides happen, but I wonder if the breakdown and summary of the regional impact statement will come back and tell us how many people have suicided because of this poor decision, how many people have left the state because of this poor decision, and how many people have just packed up their businesses because of this poor decision. That is when that will really reflect on not just the Labor Party but also the member for Frome, who is the so-called regional development minister.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I just ask the member for Hammond to address the motion and not reflect—

**Mr PEDERICK:** I am; I am talking about regional development in that last sentence.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** —on other members. Thank you, member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK:** That is very important for the historical record—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for your instruction. I also note that the member for Frome (the Labor Minister for Regional Development) said he has \$39 million for the regions. Well, that is fantastic. When we went to the electorate, we put up \$139 million of regional policy, and these included policies with regard to giving councils money that would help prop up loans and would have generated somewhere between \$500 million and \$1 billion of input into the regions. But, no, that obviously was not good enough when the member for Frome was making his decision.

**Mr Whetstone:** The Labor member for Frome.

**Mr PEDERICK:** That's right.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is not orderly to interject, and it is not orderly to reflect on other members, so I just draw the member for Hammond back to the debate.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I would like to acknowledge the massive input that farming puts into this state right throughout our regions. We have dryland farming, irrigated farming, and wine from our great vineyards. Many billions of dollars goes in, and all of this has to be freighted through to Adelaide.

The member for Chaffey quite rightly talked about the potential demise of the Mallee railway lines. If that happens, I believe it will be a very retrograde step. I know that a deal has been cut between Genesee Wyoming and Viterra in regard to keeping those lines open. It is because these

lines are in a terrible state of disrepair that trains have to go so slow and work during the night on hot days—because of the temperature rating of these lines. I am really worried, and I have mentioned in this place before about the extra truck movements. There could be 10,000 extra truck movements in regard to this rail going off the lines.

If anyone has been up the Mallee roads, like the member for Chaffey and I have been many times, they will understand how dangerous it is. There are no overtaking lanes. There are many corners. In fact, I have mentioned before that when the road to Lameroo and Pinnaroo from Tailem Bend was being constructed, I think they were paid to put corners in. It just twists and turns, there are S-bends all along the length for many kilometres. It would just add further issues for people who live in the Mallee.

I note that the member for Chaffey talked about the access down at the South Eastern Freeway. It is a corner and a hill coming down from the ranges into Adelaide. I have come down there thousands of times. There have been some horrific accidents there. We have seen the sad loss of life of innocent people when out-of-control trucks have come down the freeway.

I knew (through football) the man from Pinnaroo who tragically died when he lost control of a B-double coming down the freeway, hitting the wall on the other side of Cross Road. I believe that, instead of a 60 km/h limit, for the sake of safety, we might have the same situation as what happened at the long, steep roads in Wollongong and Perth. There may have to be some discussion, and there may have been some discussion at industry level, about bringing the speed limit down to 40 km/h.

At the Wollongong hill—and I cannot remember the name of the exact road; I have met with a truck driver who used to traverse it many times—the speed limit had to be changed because they did not even have a separating barrier between the lanes. The truck driver witnessed a major accident, where a truck went over into oncoming traffic and killed a family plus two friends of the driver's young daughters who were in the car.

The South Eastern Freeway to Adelaide is a freight route and passenger vehicles can obviously use that route as well, and people need to understand that. It is a vital part of our regional economy and a vital part of our interdependence between rural South Australia and the city. Other drivers have talked to me about B-doubles that may have loads of ice cream containers, for instance, and this happens. They might only weigh three or four tonnes, if that, and they can go down a bit faster but, for the sake of safety, it may get to a stage where a 40 km/h speed limit for heavy vehicles is instigated.

On another issue, I recognise what the mining industry does for this state. I certainly recognise the issue of the Strzelecki Track. I used to work in the Cooper Basin 30 years ago. The Strz has not moved forward much since those times. A couple of years ago on a trip up through Innamincka, I noticed that several sections of several kilometres of road are bitumen. I think they are in the wetter spots. This is for overtaking—where they do not have bulldust—B-doubles or semitrailers heading up to the Cooper Basin. It is a bit sad that I am running out of time. However, this is a vital road that needs work. When we were up there it was wet, and we had to go out to the Queensland side and take a 1,200 kilometre detour to get home.

If we want to make sure that oil and gas companies have their operations out of Adelaide, to head up to Moomba instead of coming out of Brisbane, we need to make sure that road is upgraded in the near future, otherwise we will lose many opportunities from this state. As I said, that road really has not improved too much since I was working up there 30 years ago.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:40):** I would like to make some comments in support of the motion that the member for Stuart brings to the house. I commend the member for Stuart for moving this motion. We know he is a very passionate representative of rural South Australia and that is reflected in the support he receives from his constituents. I am inspired to speak to the motion because I think it is most relevant to the electorate that I represent in this place, being the outstanding electorate of Kavel. Kavel is really the interface, it crosses the divide, if you like, between metropolitan Adelaide and the rural regions of the state.

If we are not already there, we are fast becoming—I am talking about the town of Mount Barker—what could be described as a satellite suburb of metropolitan Adelaide, particularly given the decision the government took three or so years ago to rezone all of that land, quite

controversially I might add, that 3,000 acres of land around the perimeter of the existing township of Mount Barker to full residential development. Prior to that the town was experiencing some challenges, but that decision has brought on significantly more challenges in relation to the provision of services and infrastructure to that part of the hills district. While I stand in this place as the member for Kavel I will continue to hammer away at the continual need for services and infrastructure for, particularly, the towns of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne because that is where the significant residential development has taken place.

We have seen the government provide some level of improvement in services and infrastructure, being its commitment, together with the local council. I would like to commend the local council for their continued efforts in seeing the commitment from the state government and also my colleague in the federal parliament, the Hon. Jamie Briggs, assistant minister for transport and infrastructure, in funding for the second interchange, the Bald Hills Road interchange, which will see some big improvements in traffic management and the like in what I call the tri-town district of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne. Those three towns will be impacted in a positive way with the construction of the second interchange.

We have seen some development at the local hospital where the maternity wing has been expanded, and not before time, can I say. We were getting to a point, if we were not already there, where women were having to travel to metropolitan Adelaide to have their babies because the maternity section at the Mount Barker Hospital was at and exceeding capacity. We have recently seen the opening of an expansion of that facility, which was necessary. We have seen two park-and-rides built in Mount Barker, and again not before time. The second park-and-ride at Dumas Street certainly was not before time because the day the Dutton Road Mount Barker Railway Station park-and-ride was built and opened it was at capacity. So, not before time with the Dumas Street park-and-ride being opened.

When we move further away from Mount Barker to the east, the country opens up into the rural region of the state. The Bremer Valley out through Monarto is open farming and grazing country. Even though we have some very important horticulture and viticulture industry within the Hills district, which is regarded as rural primary production, when we move further east to what is regarded as the back of the Adelaide Hills, the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges, it does open up, as I said, into the Bremer Valley and out across the Murray Plains through the Monarto-Brinkley district into the rural regions of South Australia. This is an example of how the Kavel electorate really crosses that divide between metropolitan Adelaide and the rural region of the state.

The member for Stuart brings to the house very important issues. I will be very quick, because I know we need to get on to other business on the *Notice Paper*. I did have the pleasure of travelling into the member for Goyder's electorate on the weekend and I just want to quickly talk about the condition of some of our rural roads. It has been my opinion that, instead of the government putting money into improving our rural and regional roads, their default position is to reduce the speed limit. If that road to Kadina was in a good state, I do not think there is any reason why it could not be posted at 110 km/h.

It is the same in other electorates. The road between Spalding and Jamestown is 100 km/h and, if that road was brought up to a decent, satisfactory level, there is no reason that could not be posted at 110 km/h, but what we see is the government reduce them back to 100 km/h, which I think is the wrong move for regional South Australia. With those few comments, I certainly support the motion the member for Stuart brings to the house.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:46):** I also rise to support the motion and, really, I think it encapsulates the reason I sought the opportunity to be in this place. I am a proud child of a regional community. I have lived in a variety of regional communities. I live in a town of 1,000 people and it is the biggest place I have ever lived in. I have the great opportunity now to represent others which means travelling to be in Adelaide so many times, probably about 140 nights a year, so I live that interrelationship that exists between regional and metropolitan areas. I am not sure whether it is a dream come true or a nightmare that has become realised, but it is what we live in now.

I think this is a wonderful motion because it emphasises the importance of the relationship that needs to exist. I know that in my communities, many of which are in coastal areas, I have up to

40 per cent non-resident property owners. That shows me that no matter where people may primarily reside, on occasion they choose to visit other areas and that is where the interrelationship is very strong. It has been part of South Australia's past and it is important that policy decisions, legislative decisions and budget decisions recognise that.

That is part of the reason why, when the opportunity was presented to me in 2005 to stand for preselection and be elected as a parliamentarian, I took it. I believe in it very strongly. I think this is a good motion, and I am not sure why the member for Frome has moved the amendment. It seems to me a slight play on words, which has the same intent, but I look forward to its passage and I look forward to future parliaments where whoever is in power ensures that the needs of all South Australians are considered in every decision they make.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:48):** I am grateful for the support for this motion. With regard to the member for Frome's amendment of behalf of the government, I am really a bit bewildered why the government felt the need to ask him to change 'acknowledges that the equitable provision of resources to and the development of both are necessary for our state's economic and social success now and into the future' to 'supports the balanced provision of resources that recognises the interdependence of metropolitan and rural areas of South Australia and takes into account local needs and priorities as a basis for our economic and social success now and into the future'. That smacks of exactly the same intent and so it smacks of just trying to be difficult, which is a great shame. Since the words have the same intent, we will certainly support that amendment.

Let me just finish as I started. This is about recognising both. This is not about trying to say that one is more important than the other. Regional people value Adelaide enormously and metropolitan people should value regional areas enormously. We need each other and we cannot survive without each other.

Very important industries like small business, defence industries, manufacturing, innovation, mineral resources and energy require both metropolitan and regional presence. Very important services like Aboriginal affairs, health, education, transport, disabilities and housing must be provided equitably to both regional and metropolitan people. Regions are nothing without Adelaide; Adelaide is nothing without regions. Our state needs both and our governments, now and into the future, should provide resources fairly for both.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### **AUSTRALIAN RED CROSS**

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:51):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the Australian Red Cross is celebrating the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its founding on 13 August 1914, nine days after the outbreak of World War I;
- (b) congratulates generations of Australians for their extraordinary contributions through the everyday work of the Red Cross; and
- (c) continues to support the independent, neutral and impartial humanitarian mission of Red Cross to work with and assist the most vulnerable people in need, both in Australia and internationally.

This year, 2014, is the centenary year of the Red Cross in Australia, a substantial milestone in the social history of this nation, and it commemorates 100 years of humanitarian service to the people of Australia.

I would like to congratulate first, Sue Vardon AO, Chair of SA Red Cross and Helen Connelly, the Executive Director of SA Red Cross, and their team, and generations of Australians for their extraordinary contributions through the everyday work of the Red Cross. It is important that we continue to support the independent, neutral and impartial mission of Red Cross to work with and assist the most vulnerable people in need, both in Australia and internationally.

Many Australians have shared a personal connection with the Red Cross from its humanitarian role during two World Wars and other wars, to preparing for, responding to and recovering from natural disasters, helping vulnerable people and communities, helping them to overcome disadvantage, and also through its world-class blood service that is available.

The Red Cross was of particular importance to many Australian prisoners of war interned by the Japanese during World War II. The Red Cross was their only source of aid in many cases, or contact with the outside world, in the most appalling of circumstances. For 100 years the Australian Red Cross has enjoyed a unique auxiliary status to the public authorities in the humanitarian field, working in partnership with governments of different political persuasions, both in Australia and internationally, to alleviate suffering in a voluntary aid capacity whilst adhering to its principles of independence, neutrality and impartiality.

The Australian Red Cross is part of the world's largest, arguably, humanitarian movement, with millions of volunteers working in over 100 countries, united by the fundamental principle of preventing and alleviating human suffering without discrimination and wherever it may be found in times of war, conflict, disaster or personal crisis.

Today the Australian Red Cross has a network of, some say, many hundreds of thousands of volunteers, members, staff, donors, aid workers and supporters. I would like to particularly acknowledge the work that Red Cross volunteers from Australia did, helping with the recovery effort after the devastating 2004 Boxing Day tsunami.

In July 2014 in my own electorate I attended a Red Cross Gala Dinner to celebrate the Centenary of the Australian Red Cross at the Fogolar Furlan Function Centre in my electorate. I would like to especially thank Cavallaro Lorenzo Ferini, the President of the Fogolar Furlan Club, and the Hon. Julian F. Stefani OAM, JP, a former member of the other place, as well as the Hon Dean Brown who also attended that function. It was at this function that I met members of the state Red Cross, and it was an absolute pleasure to see and share their success stories and pay tribute to this great organisation.

As a member of this place, I believe that all sides of politics should honour the Red Cross's service to Australia. It is not a partisan issue, I know members on both sides of the house have good relations with this group and have given great support to the Red Cross over a number of years, and I would call for that support to continue. I encourage all members to support the motion and continue to support the fantastic work of the Red Cross.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (12:55):** The Red Cross has been active in Australia since 13 August 1914, nine days after the outbreak of World War I. It quickly became the leading wartime voluntary charity, appealing largely to Australian women. Twenty-five years later, during World War II, Red Cross was the largest charitable organisation in Australia, both in terms of the scale of its operations and also in the support it received from the Australian people. From a national population of 7 million, nearly half a million people were members of the Red Cross at that time.

Red Cross branches and volunteers were vital through the post-war reconstruction period, focusing on social welfare and national emergencies, including floods and bushfires. The Red Cross blood service and first aid programs were also established at this time. The Australian Red Cross works tirelessly to: help communities prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters; increase international aid and development; champion international humanitarian law; address the impact of migration; partner with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples; reconnect socially isolated individuals with their communities; strengthen communities trapped in a cycle of disadvantage; and provide a world-class blood service.

Currently, the Australian Red Cross has 30,000 volunteers, including 2,400 South Australians. Volunteers help make daily phone calls to older people living alone to check that they are okay, serve nutritious breakfasts to schoolchildren who may otherwise go without, provide a friendly face and customer service at Red Cross shops, and are trained to support the community if a disaster strikes.

The Australian Red Cross is a member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The movement's mission is to prevent or reduce human suffering wherever it is found and its focus in Australia is international humanitarian law programs and refugee services. In all its activities, volunteers, members and staff are guided by the fundamental principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement being:

#### Humanity

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavours, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst people.

#### Impartiality

It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavours to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.

#### Neutrality

In order to continue to enjoy the confidence of all, the movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

#### Independence

The movement is independent. The national societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the movement.

#### Voluntary service

It is not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.

#### Unity

There can be only one Red Cross or Red Crescent society in any one country.

#### Universality

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in which all societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities in helping each other, is worldwide.

I commend the member for Hartley for bringing this motion to the house, and I support the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

House of Assembly—Parliamentary Service of the Annual Report 2013-14

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

South Australia Police's Response to the Coronial Findings into the death of Mrs Zahra  
Abrahimzadeh on 21 March 2010—  
Taking a Stand Responding to Domestic Violence—Policy Document

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Marine Parks Council of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14  
South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council—Annual Report 2013-14

### *Ministerial Statement*

### **DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:01):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.



**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** On 7 July, State Coroner Mark Johns released the findings of the inquest into the death of Zahra Abrahamzadeh, who was murdered by her estranged husband at a cultural event in the city in March 2010. Mr Johns noted that:

...given...this Inquest is about domestic violence, an issue which has recently been described by the Premier as a key priority of the Government, I have thought it appropriate to direct the recommendations to the Premier.

Today, I reassert our resolve to address this issue of domestic violence and will set out the responses we have made in addressing the issues raised by the Coroner. I would like to acknowledge the presence in the chamber today of Arman Abrahamzadeh, Zahra's son. Today, I have released both the response to the Coroner from SAPOL and a whole-of-government response that addresses issues raised in the inquest and sets out our broader response to domestic violence in general.

SAPOL has accepted eight of the 10 recommendations in full, and its actions include: a new prosecution staffing model; enhanced domestic violence training programs; and formal protocols between the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and SAPOL to flag and update domestic violence safe houses. With regard to the other two recommendations, the government has taken some different actions from those recommended to help address the concerns raised by the Coroner.

The Coroner recommended SAPOL's criminal justice section be staffed by legal practitioners so that domestic violence restraining orders can be properly presented before magistrates. In the Abrahamzadeh case, the perpetrator's permanent intervention order was modified to permit him to attend cultural and religious functions, and, ultimately, the victim was murdered at such an event. In response, the government will establish a women's domestic violence court assistance service, which will provide a greater level of support within the court system for victims of violence. Legal officers, including a senior lawyer, will provide support and advocate on behalf of women to apply for an intervention order or report a breach and raise safety concerns or any other issue that may need to be raised in court. This free and confidential service will be funded by the Victims of Crime Fund.

The Coroner's findings highlight that we need to better identify at an early stage any gaps or flaws in our system of responding to domestic violence. The Coroner recommended that all domestic violence calls to the SAPOL call centre be handled by sworn police officers. This is not something done in any Australian jurisdiction, and we do not believe it is an appropriate response here. However, the government has responded to the Coroner's criticism by establishing an early warning system to provide an escalation point where there have been process flaws or gaps in the response of a government agency to domestic violence. It will be a point of call for domestic violence services when a situation occurs where they believe the response was not adequate.

In addition to our responses to the Coroner's recommendations, I have announced today that all South Australian government departments will obtain White Ribbon workplace accreditation. Workplaces play an important role in preventing violence against women and the state government, as the largest employer in the state, must lead by example. A reduction in the prevalence of domestic violence will not be achieved with law and order responses alone. The community's attitude that underpins domestic violence needs to change. It needs to be recognised that domestic violence is a men's issue as well as a women's issue. We need men to be role models on this issue.

Amidst the grief of losing his mother, Arman has stepped up as a male role model on the issue of domestic violence. I pay tribute to him for his tireless work and thank him for being here as I present to the house our response to the issue of domestic violence.

#### **FORREST, MS CAITLIN**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:05):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** It is with deep sadness that I inform the house of the death overnight of promising South Australian apprentice jockey Caitlin Forrest. Nineteen-year-old Caitlin, who was riding early leader Colla Voce in the feature sprint of the Murray Bridge Gold Cup carnival, died from injuries sustained in a tragic accident, having been thrown to the turf when her mount broke

its leg, crashed through the running rail and brought down three other horses and riders. Colla Voce was put down following the incident. Fellow jockey Libby Hopwood is still receiving treatment for her injuries. I understand Thoroughbred Racing SA stewards commenced an immediate review. SafeWork SA has also commenced its investigation.

Considered to be a top prospect, Caitlin came from a racing family. Her dad, Darren, and her mum, Yvonne, worked for trainer Sam Kavanagh, who took Caitlin on as she first learned her trade. Caitlin had been riding since 2013 and was a member of Thoroughbred Racing SA's Apprentice Jockey Academy. She had ridden 51 winners (seven metro, 20 provincial and 24 country) and was recognised at the recent Thoroughbred Racing SA Industry Awards as the South Australian Provincial and Country Apprentice Jockey of the Year for the 2013-14 season.

This horrendous accident comes only a few days after Queensland jockey Carly-Mae Pye died after being critically injured in a fall during a barrier trial at the Callaghan Park racetrack, while former South Australian jockey Simone Montgomerie and veteran Queensland rider Desiree Gill died in the past 15 months. Earlier this year, many of us were there when our own champion jockey Clare Lindop suffered multiple fractures when she fell at Morphettville on Adelaide Cup Day. There was obviously a lot of concern around Clare that day felt by all those at the track.

I know the member for Hammond was there yesterday at the biggest race meeting in his area for the year. We had a discussion this morning and everyone who was there needs to be praised for their quick work, particularly the medical staff and the retrieval team, but also those who were on hand to provide the best medical service they possibly could.

Dedication and bravery are attributes required in many sports and they are found in abundance in the sport of racing. Jockeys are truly high performance athletes who literally put their life on the line every time they go into a race. Serious injuries are frequent and so many jockeys have lost their lives since racing began in Australia. This is where the generous support and donations of the National Jockeys Trust comes into play, providing invaluable assistance to injured jockeys and their families. I know there are people on both sides of this house who are strong supporters of the National Jockeys Trust.

This terrible incident serves to remind us of just how dangerous horse racing is. Jockeys know the dangers but come back courageously day after day because they love the sport and are very talented and exceptional at what they do. The racing industry is like a big family, and at a time like this every stable and every track will be feeling the same grief and sorrow.

This morning I telephoned the President of the Murray Bridge Racing Club, Reg Nolan, as well as the Chair of Thoroughbred Racing SA, Frances Nelson, and the chief executive officer of the South Australian Jockey Club, Brenton Wilkinson, to offer our condolences and any across-government support we may be able to provide.

Caitlin's talent and passion were evident in her success and commitment to racing. On behalf of the government of South Australia and indeed everyone here, I offer our deepest condolences to Caitlin's parents, her partner and fellow jockey, Scott Westover, as well as to everyone who knew Caitlin and who must be feeling enormous loss at this sad time. Our thoughts are with you.

*Question Time*

#### **CHILD PROTECTION**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Is the government aware of the welfare and whereabouts of the two-year-old girl whose aunty, known as Dawn, has raised concerns in the media today?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:10):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I will attempt to provide as much information to the house as I can about this particular case. As members would be aware, we went through a process of identifying all of the children who had been in the care of this particular worker. Certainly there has been a lot of work and contact with the carers and parents of those children who have been identified as victims by the police in this particular case, but there are also children who have been in his care and we have yet no advice that in fact they are victims.

In an abundance of caution, again, we are attempting to contact all of the parents and carers in relation to those young people. It has not necessarily been an easy exercise and I am advised that the little girl the leader refers to, we understand, is living interstate with her father. She is no longer under any form of custody order. She was united with her biological father, having been removed from the care of her mother, and the department is attempting to contact the father to advise him that this young girl had been in the care of the Families SA worker.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** Supplementary, sir: is the minister advising the house that the father has not been made aware that his two-year-old girl was in the care of the Families SA worker charged with child sex abuse either face to face or in any other form of correspondence or telephone call?

**The Hon. J.J. Snelling:** The minister just said that.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health is called to order.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:12):** No, if the Leader of the Opposition is asking me, have we spoken to the father, I did answer that question. If he is asking me now, have we made attempts to contact the father, yes, we have made numerous attempts by various means to make contact and have not been successful as yet. But we will continue to explore all avenues so that we can contact the father.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** A supplementary: what action is the government taking to locate this child and the father?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:12):** What the department has done was contact Centrelink to request contact details for the father. We received an address in another state and so that is what alerted us to the fact that he was no longer living in South Australia, as I understand. We attempted to contact him via a phone—we had a phone number. That was not successful, so a registered letter was posted to his address. Following no response, we again made numerous attempts on a phone contact—again, with no success. When that was not successful, we did contact the child's mother.

Up until then, what we were trying to do was locate the father and the mother so that they could be told at the same time. Since then, we have been in contact with Medicare and asked them to do a search for the father and daughter's details and another address was provided and another registered letter was sent to the father. So, we have made numerous attempts to contact him and we are continuing to pursue those sorts of avenues.

#### CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:14):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. In relation to the additional 180 Families SA staff that the government is in the process of employing, has the screening process changed for these positions following Mr Hyde's report and, if so, how?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:15):** All Families SA staff are screened. If you are asking about the criminal history check and background screening, that is undertaken as it has always been undertaken.

**Mr Marshall:** It hasn't worked.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Why would the Leader of the Opposition say that background screening and criminal history screening doesn't work? It is one tool.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** No, now you're lifting the bar. Once again, you're lifting the bar. And, as I've said on many occasions—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —we go through very similar testing with our Families SA staff as we do with the police. I notice the Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting, for a minute, that we go and screen all of our South Australian police because a group of them has been charged—are you? You're not going down that track. They go through the same sort of psychological testing but you are not suggesting that. Why not?

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Why not?

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Why not?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Education will stop taunting the leader.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** We're going through these processes. We have also implemented a process so that, once they go through the testing regime, they are interviewed by a psychologist and the recommendations of the interview panel are now going to senior management for approval before appointment.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Education is called to order. I haven't been suggesting anything about this matter. The Minister for Education is warned a first time. Member for Adelaide.

#### **CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING**

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:16):** Supplementary: has the new amended process that now includes the interviewing with a psychologist been done for people who had already commenced the procedure? You have found out new information from Mr Hyde. Have you gone back to the original people, the 180, to interview all of those and put them through the new screening process?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:17):** New applicants, people who are being assessed, are being put through that process.

#### **BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:17):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that people with borderline personality disorder have limited access to specialist services in South Australia, will the government establish a dedicated borderline personality disorder support service in South Australia and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17):** I thank the member for Morphett for the question. It is a good question. I have had a meeting with the Hon. Kelly Vincent who has been speaking to me about this particular issue. It is something that is being worked on by the Department for Health. I will be happy to bring in an up-to-date report on exactly where we are at with assistance for people with that particular disorder.

#### **APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that Mr Bruce Deans, the general manager of the APY—the seventh general manager of the APY in less than four years—was sacked yesterday?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:18):** No.

#### **APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:18):** Supplementary, Mr Speaker: will the Premier immediately ask the Auditor-General to examine the financial management of APY?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:18):** It is a matter that I will refer to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, who I think, from recent discussions with me, has been giving some careful consideration as to how he will deal with some of the issues of the dysfunctional

governance that seems to be presenting itself on the APY lands. I expect he will be having more to say about that soon.

#### APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Supplementary: what is the process that is in place for the sacking of the general manager of the APY lands? Is this a decision taken by a minister, taken by the department or taken by the cabinet?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** My recollection is that the APY lands executive, which is an autonomous body—it is not a state government-run body: it is set up pursuant to statute, I think, under the APY lands act—has the capacity to engage or dismiss the general manager. My recollection, and I stand to be corrected, is that there is some role that the government plays in providing approval or otherwise. Certainly we are involved in terms of funding, so I would have imagined that we would have been involved in some way in this matter, but whatever the answer to that question is I know that the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs is deeply engaged in these issues and I am happy to bring back a report to the house.

#### APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:20):** Supplementary: will the Premier support the call today from Mr George Kenmore and 20 other traditional owners to suspend the APY Executive Board and for the appointment of an administrator for the APY lands?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20):** That may well be a good idea, but it may well be that it is not a good idea. I think it would be a very brave person indeed to back a particular faction of the representatives of the APY lands. From bitter experience I can tell you that there are some fairly deep divisions on the APY lands, and just because somebody can get themselves organised with a petition to advocate a particular course of action does not necessarily mean that it would be the most appropriate course. It also does not mean that it may be the proper course as well, but I do not think I would find a petition persuasive. The truth is that this is a very long conversation to discuss the question of dispute and division on the APY lands. I think it is best left there and I will leave the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to provide a detailed response.

#### APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21):** Supplementary: can the Premier update the house on the status of the APY Executive or governance review? This was tabled by the government before the end of last year and it still has not been implemented.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:21):** I will bring back an answer to the house, but I think the broader question of the APY lands needs to be looked at through the prism of what the future is for the APY lands, and after question time today I will be meeting with Mr Andrew Forrest who has produced the Forrest review in relation to remote Aboriginal communities. He is in South Australia to advocate for some of the measures that he has placed in his report and that is all about having a future for the APY lands, a persuasive vision for the future, which means that young people there can actually see a place for themselves in the broader South Australian community.

All of these questions about the scrabbling for essentially the spoils of misery in the APY lands, these dysfunctional communities that are riven by child sexual abuse, dysfunction and unemployment, are never going to be resolved unless there is a strong sense of purpose in these communities, where young people can imagine a job for themselves and a future, and where schooling means something because there is actually some vision for the future for themselves. That is what Mr Forrest's ambition is. He has a range of controversial measures, some of which are pretty hard to swallow, but for me it is the first time I have seen a persuasive vision for the future in relation to these remote Aboriginal communities, including the view that these are no places for young people to see a future for themselves.

There is no economy in these remote Aboriginal communities, and I have seen all of the high-minded ideals that somehow we will let private property rights flow and then the cold winds of capitalism will turn these into mini tourist icons. Then I see the other group of people saying they

should be closed down, robbing people of their connection to land and community. The truth is young people need to be shown job opportunities outside these communities, given the schooling, the training, and the connection to those jobs to allow them to see a future for themselves. That is how we will grapple with the dysfunction, violence, sexual abuse, domestic violence, and drug and substance abuse that sadly are too often the lot of these communities.

#### **APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** Supplementary: you referred to previous reports and you say the Forrest report is the most significant that has occurred. Could the Premier perhaps reflect on the recommendations of the O'Donoghue Costello report which talked about a completely different governance structure for the APY lands, and why the government rejected that very clear recommendation?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:24):** Because we didn't agree with it and it wasn't persuasive. What I am saying to the house is that back in those days the critical issue there was grappling very first with the complete scorched-earth situation that we found ourselves in, in coming to government. When we came into government, I remind those opposite, and the leader was not in the house, his former Aboriginal affairs minister didn't even permit the Aboriginal lands standing committee to go and visit the APY lands. We had no sworn officers on the APY lands, we had no TAFE, we had no child protection workers going anywhere near the APY lands.

The communities there were not only in deep distress, they did not have any government service response, even the basic responses of law and order were not present. Now we have put in those basic building blocks. We have rebuilt communities, schools have been rebuilt, housing has been rebuilt, police stations are on the lands, sworn officers are now on the lands, but that is not enough. It is not enough to have basic services; you also need to have a persuasive vision for those young people and their future.

I am the first to admit that there have been extraordinary failures in the APY lands and that is why I am prepared to give almost anything a go, and that is why the Forrest report is something that we are trying to take a positive stance in relation to. It was discussed at COAG and there isn't an enormous appetite by the person who sought the report, the Prime Minister. We have the Prime Minister and everybody else around the nation walking away from it at a rate of knots, but we are determined to at least take the central messages of that report and try to work together with both sides of politics.

There is plenty of blame in what happens in the APY lands to share around across governments, federal and state, Liberal and Labor, about what we both have not been able to achieve for these communities, and we are trying to find a better solution and we are looking forward to working with everybody in this house to find that solution.

#### **APY LANDS**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** Can the Premier update the house on the consultation which was conducted by the Commissioner for Indigenous Engagement in South Australia, Khatija Thomas, following the Premier's public statements supporting the Forrest report recommendations?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:27):** I can, and the responses were mixed. Some communities were supportive of elements of the Forrest review and others were opposed to elements of the Forrest review. I do know that in relation to the APY lands, the subject of this series of questions, there was strong support, especially from the women in those communities for the existing arrangements in relation to income management that have been placed in the APY lands. It has made a material difference, they believe, to the health and wellbeing of their communities, but the truth is that there are mixed views about some of the measures that are contained in the Forrest review.

I certainly have reservations about a number of them but together as a package they try to offer a vision for the future for these communities, and I think that we are duty bound to grapple with even the most radical solutions to try to find a persuasive hope for the future for these communities.

**APY LANDS**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** A final supplementary from me. Can I just ask—

**The SPEAKER:** In fact this is seven supplementaries on the trot so we will just call it a question.

**Mr MARSHALL:** The question I would ask the Premier is whether he could clarify the government's position regarding the income management recommendations contained with the Forrest report.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:28):** My position in relation to that is that it is a commonwealth matter. It doesn't really require the state government to do anything. The commonwealth is—

**Mr Marshall:** Do you support it?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I support the broad thrust of the Forrest review and in particular the ones that are relevant to the South Australian government.

**Mr Marshall:** The income management?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, in relation to the APY lands we already have income management, which was introduced—

**Mr Marshall:** Compulsory income management?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes, which was introduced by the previous Labor government and is something which is already in place, and there was a report recently—

**Mr Marshall:** Not for all people on the APY lands?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes.

**Mr Marshall:** I'm sorry—

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, I'm sorry. There is a review that has been put in place in relation to income management in relation to people on the APY lands, and it received a favourable review, and in relation to the Forrest reforms, I would support their broad thrust.

**APY LANDS**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** This is the first supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** My supplementary question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's statement of his understanding of the importance of employment for young people on the APY lands, can he explain to the house why, after nearly a year, the government hasn't implemented the driving-licence program which was legislatively referred last year and which we were asked to put through the parliament in a hurry to ensure job opportunities in respect of the camel industry and transporting food supplies for APY lands could be activated for young people?

**The SPEAKER:** We have got the idea.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Thank you.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:30):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Pisoni:** Pull rank on each other.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The deputy leader raised this matter with me in estimates and I undertook to provide some further detailed information to her. I haven't yet received that, but as soon as I do I will provide that to the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I said, I am happy to provide the advice that will come from the department which has the responsibility for implementing these measures. As soon as I have that information, I will provide it to the deputy leader.

#### APY LANDS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** My supplementary is to the Minister for Road Safety. Could the Minister for Road Safety explain to the house why this hasn't been implemented after a year?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:31):** I thank the honourable member for her question. Given that my colleague, the Minister for Transport, has undertaken to provide the information, I will await his report.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order!

#### COOPER BASIN

**Mr GEE (Napier) (14:31):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister update the house on petroleum well forecasts in the Cooper Basin?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:31):** South Australia is at the centre of an energy revolution, and you might be aware that it is happening right here in South Australia. Our great state is seeing billions of dollars spent across the state in the search for oil and gas. This investment has broken through the half billion barrier in 2013-14 to \$531.3 million. It is a new record, up threefold on exploration expenditure just two years ago.

Our basins in the state's north rank amongst the world's best to source both oil and gas in conventional reservoirs and natural gas in unconventional reservoirs. The world's petroleum explorers want to come to South Australia to be part of the nation's largest onshore oil and gas province. They want to come to South Australia to capitalise on our estimated 300 years-plus worth of domestic supply. They want to come to South Australia because they know they will find no more supportive government than this Labor government.

We welcome these explorers and the billions of dollars of investment they can bring to our economy. Our regional communities have the most to gain from the jobs and development that their investments generate. As employment figures in this sector show, more than 15,300 people are now employed in the resources sector in South Australia—more than double what it was a decade ago.

I am pleased to inform the house today of the figures from the Department of State Development which give yet another indication of how our sector is thriving. Forecasts to the year end by the Department of State Development show that we are on track to drill more petroleum wells in a year in the Cooper Basin than ever before.

Based on rig schedules, 116 wells are expected to be drilled breaking through the 100 well barrier for the first time. Each well drilled translates into more investment, more jobs and secures our energy security. It is an exciting forecast and evidence of a very, very thriving oil and gas sector.

Today also marks the third and final day of the Asia Pacific Oil and Gas Conference held at the Adelaide Convention Centre. We are proud to have hosted more than 1,000 registered delegates,



all of whom are dedicated to growing opportunities across this most vital sector. The message that I want our interstate and overseas guests from the conference to take away from this forum is that South Australia is the very best place in the world to invest in the oil and gas sector, despite what the opposition says.

**The SPEAKER:** The last comment was beyond the scope of the question and, accordingly, I call the Minister for Mineral Resources to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, I didn't say a thing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I just sat down quietly.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** No, it was the last clause of your answer.

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:34):** My question is to the Premier in relation to the document tabled by him prior to question time, the Coroner's inquest findings into the death of Mrs Zahra Abrahamzadeh and South Australia Police's responses to the finding, in particular in relation to the Coroner's recommendation 3, that all domestic violence calls to the SAPOL call centre be handled by sworn police officers with particular training in domestic violence risk assessment.

In estimates this year the government provided information that calls relating to 10,000 domestic violence incidents every year are referred to the 13 14 44 call centre. Can the Premier advise how many of the staff in that centre are sworn officers and how many are unsworn officers, given that the government has indicated it is not going to make any changes to the current arrangements?

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:35):** That is just a misrepresentation of what we announced. What I just announced, and made clear in a ministerial statement, is that there would be changes to the existing arrangements; it is just that we have responded differently to the recommendations made by the Coroner than how he suggested. We are addressing the question he raises, but in a different way.

There were two recommendations that we have responded to in a slightly different way than the manner he suggested. One was not having sworn officers who are entirely in the call centre; in other words, removing all civilian officers and having only sworn officers in the call centre. We have not accepted that recommendation. It is worth observing that every other jurisdiction follows the same practice of having properly trained civilian officers but supervised by sworn officers.

The particular issue that was at stake here was a call by a domestic violence service to the call centre that, in the view of the domestic violence service, did not get an adequate response. What we have done is supplement the call centre with a further hotline for services that they can call where they are concerned about the adequacy of the service response. That is directly linked into the Multi-Agency Protection Service (MAPS), which can get a real-time response where there appears to be a service failure.

This is in addition to all the other mechanisms that exist for people to get assistance where there has been a service failure. This is a real-time response, and it is in addition to the 000 service that people can call for an emergency response. What we are talking about here is a service system response. We have looked carefully at what the Coroner has recommended. We think what he has recommended is impractical, and we have looked carefully at the issue he is seeking to address and have tried to address it in a different way.

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:38):** A supplementary question: given that the response tabled by the Premier does identify what he describes as, I think, an escalation point, and the staffing arrangements in the call centres with sworn staff supervising unsworn call centre people on the telephones, in addition to my initial question of how many sworn staff and how many unsworn staff are in these areas, I ask the Premier how many unsworn staff are being supervised at any one time by the sworn officer in this case, in particular in relation to the coronial findings on the call in question, given that that triage was inappropriately handled by an unsworn staff member?

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:39):** I thank the honourable member for the question. Unfortunately, I do not have those exact details before me, but what I can say is that the call centre is not a huge centre, of course. The supervisor there is available all the time, and they can actually listen in to discussions. As I understand it, from what I have been advised, if ever a doubt arises a supervisor will be present to take a call and assist. So there are sufficient supervisors involved to handle any situation.

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:39):** Supplementary to the Minister for Police, if I may: in the current circumstances in which you will provide extra information to the house as to how many are sworn officers and how many are civilian officers, could you explain to the parliament how the matter can be dealt with if in fact the original civilian officer who has taken the call either hangs up or doesn't process the matter further under this triage system, because clearly this was identified in the Coroner's report and was to form part of the recommendation? On that recommendation, could you also confirm whether you supported this government's decision to not accept that recommendation and in fact to deal with the early warning system option?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:40):** I thank the honourable member for her question. There are two parts to it, if I understand correctly. The first part is in terms of the situation which was identified. Clearly, there was an issue in which additional training would assist. So, we should not take one case, as sad as that case was, as to say that was the normal practice. Clearly, additional training was required for that situation. In relation to the second matter—what was the second matter?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** If I might assist the minister. Did you, as the Minister for Police, support the rejection of this recommendation and the acceptance of the government's position as announced by the Premier?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Thank you. First of all, we didn't actually reject the recommendation. The recommendation was about addressing the particular issue. The advice to myself from the police, which I then referred to the Premier, and the Premier's response is consistent with the advice I received from SAPOL.

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:41):** My question is to the Premier and it relates to the government's response to recommendation 9 of the coronial investigation, which reads:

...when a domestic violence victim makes a report at a police station, they are afforded an opportunity of privacy in an interview room;

Given that the outlined response provides no changes to the limited infrastructure in SA's 138 operational police stations, why is the government claiming that they have accepted this recommendation when to do so would require the provision of a private interview room in each of those stations?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:42):** I thank the honourable member for his question. My understanding is that what police will do is they will give a person a private space to have an interview. They are committed to doing that and, as the member has identified, it will vary from station to station because of the way the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** If you will let me finish. They will clearly not interview people in a public place. So, they will take whatever action is required to give that person privacy and that will vary from station to station. It will depend on the circumstances at the time. What I can say is that the police are committed to making sure that any domestic violence report is handled in a private way.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:43):** Supplementary: given that in estimates the minister identified that in those situations where it is difficult to do (i.e., to provide a private interview room) they will arrange a particular time for that person to come in to ensure that will happen, is it the minister's response that part of the government's idea is that it is still appropriate to send people away and arrange a separate time for them to come back?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:43):** I am not going to try to speculate as to every situation which will arise in every police station across the state. Having said that, depending on how the report is made, particularly in regional areas, it may be okay to organise a time which is both suitable to the person making the complaint and the officer involved. In the case—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I said actually in the case where it was reported by phone, if you are listening. Secondly, in the case where a person presents themselves, the police have advised me they will make the necessary arrangements to make sure that person is interviewed in a private way and that will, as I said, vary from station to station, but, importantly, they understand the importance of doing so.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:44):** Supplementary: given the exact wording of the coronial investigation's recommendation is that they will have the 'privacy in an interview room' (those are the exact words), is the government prepared or has the government flagged that there will be any money provided for infrastructure improvements to the police stations in order that such an arrangement may be possible?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:44):** I would like to thank the honourable member for that question. I haven't received such a request from SAPOL. Until I do receive such a request I can assume—and I will check for you and get back to you—that police are confident they can handle people's reports in private.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:45):** Final supplementary, sir, on this strain: can the minister then confirm that the government is not in fact accepting fully recommendation 9 of the Coroner's recommendations?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:45):** Not at all, Mr Speaker. The substance of the recommendation is to ensure that a person who is reporting a particular matter to the police does so in a way which is private and nonthreatening. That is the essence of the thing, and that can be addressed in a number of ways. The advice of the police is that they are confident they can do that, and, like I said, that will vary from station to station. It is

easier to do in some larger metropolitan stations where there is more capacity. In some of the smaller stations or some of the one-officer stations it will have to be negotiated, and each station and each officer will use their professional judgement to make sure it's done.

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:46):** My question is to the Acting Minister for the Status of Women. Can the minister update the house on any initiatives the government is supporting that will address the issue of domestic violence?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:46):** I thank the member for her question; I know it's extremely heartfelt. I am extremely pleased to update the house about an important initiative that will serve to address the scourge of domestic violence. Our Watch, which was previously known as the Foundation to Prevent Violence against Women and their Children, began in July 2013. Our Watch, with its aim to drive cultural and attitudinal change to prevent violence against women and their children, will enhance South Australia's ability to address the scourge of domestic violence. This government pledged South Australia's membership to Our Watch in August of this year, committing \$79,000 a year, indexed for the next four years.

Addressing domestic violence is a priority for this government. I am pleased to be a member of a government that is committed to actions and initiatives that target domestic violence at all levels. Our Watch will promote best practice intervention strategies based on research; undertake prevention and early intervention projects through communities, schools and media; deliver information sessions, forums and conferences; and run targeted social marketing and online campaigns.

The official launch of Our Watch was attended by the Premier. This media campaign is aimed at making Australians aware of the effect of our attitudes to violence against women and promoting equal respect and positive treatment. The video can be viewed on Our Watch's website, and I would encourage all members to do so and to also encourage people who they know to watch this important video. Using community engagement and advocacy to drive this change, Our Watch will build community leadership and drive change across our institutions. A specific example of this is the national media engagement project.

The media can both reflect and challenge the society in which they are based, and they can either reinforce or undermine the attitudes and norms that contribute to violence against women. The representation of women and girls in popular culture, for instance in billboards and television advertising, can powerfully influence the way the role of women is viewed, particularly in relation to men. However, the media can also raise awareness of violence against women, its consequences, and underlying causes. Our Watch will work to develop training curriculum materials for both university journalism students and practising journalists. This two-pronged approach will embed and support a shift in newsroom cultures and practices around reporting on violence against women.

Becoming a member of Our Watch is one of a variety of ways this government has demonstrated its commitment to eradicating domestic violence. Across the state, we have rolled out the Family Safety Framework to ensure that services to high-risk families are dealt with in a more structured and systematic way. We have committed to the Multi-Agency Protection Service, which the Premier mentioned earlier (MAPS), which will streamline the work of key agencies for timely and coordinated responses to child protection and domestic violence issues. We have strengthened police powers in relation to intervention orders to enable police to issue them on the spot in certain circumstances.

During the election we committed to policies which addressed domestic violence at all levels. For example:

- the body image campaign, a digital media campaign which will aim to inspire young women to build their self-esteem and love their bodies, as we know that there is a link between a woman's self-esteem and her likelihood of becoming involved in an abusive relationship;

- flexible workplace futures, valuing women's contributions and allowing them greater access to workplace participation;
- perpetrator pays, making perpetrators of domestic violence contribute to the cost of their own rehabilitation programs; and
- domestic violence serial offender database, a database to identify domestic violence serial offenders across women's domestic and Aboriginal family violence services, thus improving risk management.

The announcement by the Premier today of 'Taking a stand: responding to domestic violence' further demonstrates this government's willingness to drive changes to community attitudes and behaviours. Domestic violence should not be someone else's issue, it is our issue—every man, every woman.

### DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister inform the house about the threats to future job creation in South Australia?

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for a second and final time. The minister.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:50):** I thank the member for Newland for this question because I know jobs are very important in his electorate. The government is committed to encouraging investment in the South Australian economy, investment that will create jobs. At the moment there is a significant issue with one particular project that has the potential to create or lose thousands of jobs over coming decades for South Australia.

**Ms Redmond:** No-one believes you, Martin.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is called to order.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** There is a threat that this project will be sent offshore by the federal government, with the billions of dollars that would go with it injected into an overseas economy, creating jobs and enterprise in someone else's country. Concerns continue to grow that the federal government will make a decision to build the next generation of Australian submarines in Japan or elsewhere and that this will be done without any form of open process or tender, or project definition study. That such a scenario is even possible is hard for South Australians to fathom.

When considering the expert opinion and research available on the economic impact of different build scenarios for the future submarines, it is impossible for South Australians to understand that a federal government could build these submarines offshore. The South Australian Economic Development Board this week released economic modelling that demonstrated the significant difference in building the submarines between here and overseas. The modelling estimates there would be a \$29 billion negative impact on Australian GDP over the 40 year life of the project if the submarines are built overseas. The Chair of the Economic Development Board, Raymond Spencer, said this:

Initial indications are that importing Australia's next generation of submarines would be an economic mistake. Not just for South Australia but for Australia as a whole.

Overall, the modelling found that the submarines, if locally built instead of being built overseas, would leave this country better off by \$20 billion in net contribution to GDP over the life of the project and through 120,000 man years of additional jobs in the economy over the life of the enterprise. The call for a more open process is not just being supported by those who look at the economics. Dr John White, a nationally recognised expert in naval ship building, recommended to the Senate Economics References Committee Inquiry into the Future of Australia's Naval Ship Building Industry on Monday that the design, build and sustainment of our future submarine should be managed by one authority and that there should be a fair and open process.

The government is pleased to see that some Liberal South Australian federal MPs have now given their support to a more open process. Senator Edwards has expressed his belief—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Would the minister be seated. I have a question for the member for Florey, the Deputy Speaker: was the member for Hartley warned twice this morning?

**Ms BEDFORD:** I do not have the piece of paper any longer, but I think if we check *Hansard* he was very close to being in trouble.

**The SPEAKER:** Would the member for Hartley tell the house how many times he was warned before question time?

**Mr TARZIA:** I honestly cannot remember, sir, but I will endeavour to—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir. I can assist the house because I have perfect recall.

**The SPEAKER:** I anticipate that the point of order may be that the Speaker cannot require a member to self-incriminate. I will take a point of order from the member for Morialta.

**Mr GARDNER:** The *Hansard*, I am confident, will actually reflect that a question was put to the Deputy Speaker this morning asking who she had warned at one point, and the Deputy Speaker answered that everyone was warned.

**Ms BEDFORD:** It came very close to invoking standing order 73, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Arrest?

**Ms BEDFORD:** However, the two incidents that the member for Morialta is talking about were different. The member for Hartley was definitely in trouble but then the member for Morialta came to my attention, so I think we just move on if that is a suggestion.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I think if you check the record, you will find that the Deputy Speaker said, 'If you do anything like that again, I will have to warn you.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** This is worse than yesterday's yarn about the Lord Mayor.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Mr Speaker, I rise to make a few comments *amicus curiae* for the assistance of the member for Hartley.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't recall appointing such a counsel.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I would advise the member for Hartley that he does have a privilege against self-incrimination and he should continue to say nothing.

**The SPEAKER:** Accordingly I call the member for Hartley to order and I call the minister to continue. I think we were on Senator Sean Edwards.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** We were. Senator Edwards, Senator Ruston and Senator Fawcett have now called for an open tender process. The PM and the Minister for Defence appear to have a different view. With the defence minister in Japan today as we sit, signing an exchange of technology agreement with his opposite number in Tokyo, this matter is of crucial significance to all South Australians. Building these submarines is not just important in itself. No business will escape punishment if this decision goes the wrong way. Eighty to 90 per cent of the work done overseas with only 10 per cent here is not good enough; it must be quite the reverse.

A strong local industry with a strong local multiplier effect, all of that is crucial. The workers will spend money on new homes, hardware stores, supermarkets and local retailers here, not overseas. It is time for other members of parliament to stand up and be counted on this issue. I applaud those who have had the courage to do so to date. There can be no South Australian MP who has any view other than that these submarines must be built wholly in South Australia. It is

impossible to claim you are pro-jobs and to argue that these submarines should be spent overseas. It just does not make—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** A point of order, sir. The minister is giving a hypothetical answer to a hypothetical question—

**The SPEAKER:** No, he isn't.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —and now he has started debating.

**The SPEAKER:** That is a bogus point of order and the member for Stuart is called to order. I will allow another minute for the minister.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is clear that any further steps down the path of deciding to build the next generation of submarines overseas without an open process presents a massive risk to the future of jobs in South Australia. To build these submarines in Japan or anywhere else would be a jobs catastrophe. This is the most important job to manufacturing decision this state has faced since World War II, and it is in the hands of the federal government. There are members in this chamber who could influence that decision, and there can be only one course of action they must take.

Next Tuesday the government will hold in this chamber a summit which will bring together key industry stakeholders from the commercial sector, the unions and academia to debate these issues, to inform our white paper submission on defence industry by the end of the month. The Leader of the Opposition and the shadow spokesperson on defence have been invited.

We need to get the right answers; we need to reach the right decision point because this is the story of jobs. If you are serious about jobs, then you must be serious about getting the right decision. There are kids in primary schools now whose jobs will be determined early next year on the basis of this decision, and this government will be calling till its last breath for those 12 submarines to be built right here in Australia, based in South Australia. That can be the only outcome.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport is called to order, the member for Schubert is called to order and the Treasurer is warned a first time. The member for Giles.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister report on the level of interest at the local level in the upcoming local government elections?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01):** I thank the member for Giles for his question and also acknowledge his 23 years in local government and his contribution as deputy mayor of the City of Whyalla.

I am sure all members here will welcome the fact that a record number of nominations have been received for this year's local government elections—1,334 people have chosen to stand and this is the highest number since the period of significant council amalgamations that occurred in the latter part of the 1990s. It is also very pleasing to note that there is the lowest number of candidates who have been elected unopposed—73, which compares to 100 at the 2010 elections, 144 in 2006, 172 in 2003 and 226 in the 2000 elections.

It is also good to be able to report that a record number of women are standing as candidates—381, which equates to 28.56 per cent of the total number of candidates. However, I am sure we all welcome the increase but it is obvious that we—that is, everybody in this chamber and South Australia—have a lot more to do to correct this gender imbalance.

Based on information sourced through the LGA, I see that there are also 30 mayoral elections out of a total of 51 councils where electors directly elect the position of mayor. In my view, the more mayoral contests, the better, because they help to enliven the community debate and participation in the elections is always higher.

Given the large number of candidates presenting themselves for election this year, I think we can all look forward to, and have already seen, some robust debates—very robust debates—

about a wide range of issues that concern local residents and property owners. Common issues I am aware of include local planning issues, the efficiency and effectiveness of council service delivery and issues which have come to the fore this year like the impact of the commonwealth budget decisions relating to pensioner concessions and supplementary road funding.

I am sure we are all aware that local communities have a very high expectation about the performance and conduct of their council members—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —so it is no light decision to put yourself forward as a candidate. Consequently, I have a very strong belief that councillors should be supported to maintain and improve the currency of their knowledge and the level of their skills in order to fulfil their responsibilities as locally elected officials.

I am advised that the mailout of voting material to all electors will commence on Monday 20 October, with close of voting at 5pm on Friday 7 November. Scrutiny and the counting of papers will begin on Saturday 8 November, and I know there will be lots and lots of people in the counting rooms waiting for the outcomes.

The local government elections appear to be off to a positive start and I commend all who have put themselves forward as candidates for the service of their communities. In a system that is based on voluntary voting, the issue about levels of voter participation is never far away, and I know there are people in this chamber who have had local government experience and I believe everybody here would like to get that voting participation percentage up, and we should do whatever we can to ensure we get the numbers out there.

I understand that, before the introduction of postal voting in 1997, voter participation rarely exceeded 20 per cent of eligible voters. In the 2010 elections, statewide voter participation was 32.88 per cent, a small increase in the 2006 figure of 31 per cent. I have already met with many councillors and I look forward to meeting the newly elected councillors in the near future.

#### **PREMIER'S STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT FORUM**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:05):** Supplementary: a question to the Minister for Local Government. Given his broad comments about local government, can he outline to the parliament why it has been over one year since the Premier's State/Local Government Forum has actually met, given that the 2014 election commitment was for that to occur three times per year?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:05):** In fact, the Premier's local government forum met just the other day. The minister would have been there, but he was unable to attend, so we have had that meeting. It was a very fruitful discussion. The President of the Local Government Association, Mr O'Loughlin, attended and the former member of this place, the Mayor of Onkaparinga, attended and it was a very agreeable discussion. We canvassed a range of matters that were put on the agenda by the Local Government Association. This is the commitment that we gave to upgrade the relationship between local government and the South Australian government by elevating it to the status of a premier's relationship with the heads of local government. It was an excellent forum and we look forward to the next one.

#### **MINISTERIAL STAFF**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:06):** My question is to the Premier. Will the ministerial staff who have been using personal email accounts to conduct government business, as identified by the ICAC, be required to submit these emails for attention under the State Records Act?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:06):** I think we actually traversed this territory yesterday afternoon, as I recall. As I said yesterday and I say again, it is my intention to speak with the ICAC commissioner to find out from him what it is in particular that he has in mind and what his particular concern is. I will then consider that matter, provide some advice in due course to the Premier and the cabinet, and



we will resolve at that point what to do about the issue, having by that stage hopefully understood the exact precise matter, whether or not there are many or a few instances of this, and exactly what he has got in mind. It is my intention to proceed in an orderly fashion, the first part of which is to ascertain what exactly we are talking about.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:07):** A supplementary question either to the Premier or the Attorney-General: could they explain to the parliament what action is being taken to ensure that the emails apparently used by one or more of the ministerial staff are not destroyed or deleted pending the further guidelines and advice that the Attorney-General proposes to take and give respectively?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:08):** All I can do is repeat the answer I have already given. The question of state records is quite a complex matter and you may recall that not that long ago, a few months ago—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will retire from the chamber for half an hour.

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** We had an instance a while ago—I cannot remember if it was in this parliament or the last parliament—with the issue of state records and what did or did not constitute a state record, whether those records were of the type that needed to be retained at all or could be destroyed, and whether or not, if they needed to be retained, for how long they needed to be retained. We had that conversation at some length previously and I would have thought—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** That was an attempt that was made some time ago that didn't end very well because this was—

**Mr Marshall:** Because you lost state records.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader and the Premier are called to order and the deputy leader is warned a first time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** As I said, the matter of state records is something we will consider and I will first of all find out what it is we are talking about. I will then seek advice from the Crown and I will then take whatever steps I consider appropriate.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** A further supplementary before time expires.

**The SPEAKER:** The time has expired.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** It hadn't when I asked.

**The SPEAKER:** The three minutes is the time on that last question.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** With respect, sir, the zero hadn't appeared.

**The SPEAKER:** It had; you are looking at the wrong monitor.

*Parliamentary Committees*

#### STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:10):** By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

*Grievance Debate*

**REYNELLA KIWANIS**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:10):** It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about the Reynella Kiwanis, a group formed in 1973. Sadly these days they are down to 13 members but they still manage to do a mountain of work. Like so many volunteer organisations, they are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit new members and, as they mature in years, a few have succumbed to age and health issues.

Despite these obstacles, the group has remained very upbeat and focused on delivering projects that they excel at. I would like to mention their major annual project, the Kiwanis Kids Fun Day, which has been run every year since 2007 with the exception of 2013. Having attended this year's event, I am not sure who enjoys it more, the kids or the Kiwanis volunteers.

The fun day was just that, and this year 300 kids were lucky enough to experience this heartwarming gesture. It was held at the movie cinema complex in Noarlunga with the movie *Rio 2* the feature of the day. The children and their families or carers come along, they have a barbecue, there is face painting, the movie of course, and show bags packed by the Kiwanis volunteers full of donated goods which they take them home at the end of the day.

I would like to share a story with you about one mother who was doing it tough and her four children. She called up at the last minute with car troubles and said that she could not make it, and the task of transporting her family to the cinema was far too great given that she did not have access to a vehicle. It was amazing to see the volunteers rally and, in an instant, they jumped in their cars, headed down and they would not let this family miss out. They headed straight to pick them up and made sure they enjoyed the festivities of the day. Seeing the family as they arrived, you could tell how appreciative they were.

The team includes Ray Wakeling, Brian and Lorraine Jolliffe, Trevor Lehmann, John Coates, Bill Thompson, John Adams and all their families and their extended families. They do a marvellous job of recruiting volunteers to help out with their endeavours. It must also be noted that the Governor of Kiwanis nationally is so impressed with this Kids Fun Day that he has been over from Victoria three times. The Reynella team is very proud of the fact that they show the Victorians and the whole of Australia how to get these things done.

I would like to acknowledge and thank them for all the work they have done over the years. Their projects do not end there and I would like to take this opportunity to list some of the other outstanding projects that the Reynella Kiwanis have been part of: South Coast Aktion Club, Noarlunga Downs Primary School breakfast program, ANZAC Youth Vigil catering, Smith Family Youth Support, just to name a few. They have also done a great job supporting Riding for the Disabled which has a key centre in the heart of my electorate.

With Christmas approaching, this group is now focusing on collecting toys for children who look like missing out on getting gifts during the festive season. The Kiwanis partner with another group of unsung heroes, Toymendous. The members of this group come from a number of metropolitan areas and use workshop facilities at St Paul's Gilles Plains on two or three Saturdays each month. The toys are then given to the Reynella Kiwanis and they go about distributing them. I wish them all the best for the busy time and season ahead.

So with the Reynella Kiwanis added to the other community groups that I have mentioned, it is an opportune time to talk about a small need for this community. As you would have noted, these community groups give great vibrancy to the area and they are a great part of the Mitchell electorate. They are people who work very hard to be self-sufficient. The countless volunteer hours and volunteers who get involved and who fight well and truly above their weight and give so much to their community all need to be commended. It is a pleasure to help and support these groups and to work with them to make the community a better place.

At the last election we promised to help bituminise the perimeter of the oval around the Reynella sports and social club to stop cars blowing up dust in summer and prevent boggy mud in winter for those who use it all year round. While this Weatherill Labor government has turned its back on this project I am continuing to work with the local council in an effort to make it happen. The Mayor of Onkaparinga Council and the CEO have been receptive, and they understand the benefit and the contribution that this sports and community group make to the local area.

I call on the government to come to the party and realise how important it is. Just recently they upgraded the wet facility after we helped create a grant for them a few months ago to get this area up and running. It is a key part of what makes this club tick, and I commend them for all the good work they have done to make this upgrade happen at their club. The bitumen has been an ongoing issue around the outside of the oval, and it is an issue that has been ignored for too long. I will continue to push and find ways to get this and other much-needed projects done in Reynella and across my electorate of Mitchell.

### EMPLOYMENT VULNERABILITY

**Mr PICTON (Karna) (15:15):** The chance to work, have a job and earn a decent income is a right that we should extend to as many people as possible, and I know it is one of the major driving forces for all members on this side of the house. We know that the benefits of work help drive improved family life, better physical and mental health and improved opportunities for children.

Unfortunately, right around Australia your chances to secure a good job depend largely upon where you live with those in outer suburbs far more at risk of economic shocks. The Centre of Full Employment and Equity at the University of Newcastle produces an employment vulnerability index which highlights which areas of Australia have the highest proportion of the types of jobs most at risk of economic shocks.

When it comes to Adelaide the figures are clear: it is the outer north and the outer southern suburbs where people's jobs are most at risk to an economic shock. This includes the Aldinga region in my electorate as well as neighbouring southern suburbs in the electorates of Reynell and Mawson, namely, Hackham, Hackham West, Morphett Vale West and Christie Downs—all of which are listed as red alert. The regions covering Seaford and Christies Beach in my electorate are listed as medium-high risk, or amber alert.

There are two reasons for this according to the report. The first is that some of these suburbs have an existing disadvantage—low levels of education and skills training, low incomes and high unemployment. The second reason is that many suburbs are classified as 'emerging disadvantage job loss localities', namely, Aldinga, Hackham and Morphett Vale West. The report says this means that people who live in these suburbs have been attracted to low interest rates and lower housing prices and hence face significant mortgage stress should a downturn occur. There are two main shocks that are currently putting these outer northern and outer southern suburbs at risk: the federal budget cuts and the federal government's abandonment of manufacturing.

It should be imperative of government to actively shield its most disadvantaged from the impact of drastic changes to funding cuts, yet this is not what we are seeing under the federal budget. We see from the recent University of Adelaide analysis of the federal budget that over 29.4 per cent of South Australian families stand to be worse off as a direct result of the federal government's economic policies by 2017-18.

Looking at my electorate in the outer southern suburbs you can see that the impact of the federal budget will hit the south hard. For instance, in Aldinga 63.9 per cent of families will be worse off to the tune of \$1,621 per annum in 2017-18, and in the Seaford region, 61.4 per cent of families with children will be worse off to the tune of \$1,740 per annum in that same year. For instance, single parents will be the ones set to experience the worst impact of these budget cuts with all but the top income bracket losing around \$3,700 from their annual disposable income. Couples with children in the lowest income bracket are projected to experience a loss of around \$2,780 and a reduction in disposable income of 6.6 per cent. The report shows that the impact of these budget changes will see some 7,000 fewer jobs created by 2017-18 in South Australia. This builds upon the federal government's neglect of manufacturing in this state.

Before the 2013 election you could not escape without seeing an image of Mr Abbott in a fluoro vest on a job site, but that is a distant memory as the Liberals have turned their back on manufacturing in Australia. Firstly, the Abbott government cut funding for car manufacturing in Australia that will see the entire industry close and Australia leave the list of countries that can design and build their own car. That will not only impact the northern suburbs where Holden is but a large number of car component suppliers in the south of Adelaide who supply Holden and Toyota, particularly in the Lonsdale region.

Now we see Mr Abbott apparently contemplating breaking his promise before the election and building 12 submarines, not in Adelaide at our advanced Techport facilities, but in Japan, putting at risk more jobs and manufacturing in Australia. The ability for an individual to keep their job should not be so dependent on their address. The most disadvantaged in our outer suburban areas deserve better than to be further disadvantaged as a direct result of the federal government.

#### DIWALI 2014

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The very well-behaved member for Hartley.

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:20):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. It is amazing how well behaved one can be when they are on two warnings. I rise today to speak on behalf of the Indian residents in my electorate and talk about the celebration of Diwali 2014, which will take place in Adelaide, and for millions around the world, at the end of October. Many of my constituents in Hartley are of Indian descent or identify with Indian people; in fact, that group is one of the largest multicultural demographics in my seat.

Diwali is an incredibly important religious festival for Hindus as well as for Sikhs, who celebrate Diwali to mark Bandi Chhor Divas. For members who are unaware, Diwali is the festival of lights, which symbolises the triumph of light over darkness or good over evil, and it is celebrated over many days. However, in Australia Diwali is more than just a religious festival; it is a celebration of identity, particularly for those from the subcontinent. All over Hartley preparations are underway in the community and in our local shops to prepare for the festival.

I would like to particularly acknowledge the work of many of the Indian associations in and around my area that do a fantastic job educating the next generation of Indians, sharing in cultural festivals, and passing on their traditions and language to the next generation. That includes, but is not limited to, the Punjab Aussie Association of South Australia and the South Australian Punjabi Association. In that latter organisation I would like to recognise Dr Kuldip Chugha, and Dr Rakesh Mohindra of the Indian Australian Association of South Australia, as well as the Sikh Society of South Australia and others who work tirelessly for their communities. The work they do is outstanding.

I will have the pleasure of attending the Diwali Mela 2014 in Thorndon Park, actually in the electorate of Morialta. I know that the member for Morialta is also a keen lover of Indian culture, food and dancing, and I look forward to participating in that festival with him. We look forward to supporting the festival and to meeting the good members of the Indian community who enjoy celebrating this important festival and acknowledging their cultural heritage.

I should also note that this festival almost did not go ahead, but I commend and thank the local council in the area, and especially its councillors, for agreeing to support the association. In the end common sense prevailed, and the festival was allowed to go ahead. It would have been an absolute travesty if it did not.

On the nation of India, specifically, it is worth pointing out that it is a very important country for South Australia, not only in terms of the potential for trade and growing South Australia's export markets—which we need to do and which is being addressed at the moment—but also because of the high levels of migration from the Indian subcontinent. That is a great thing. Immigration from the Indian subcontinent has brought enormous benefits to this state and to this country.

As the descendant of migrants, I perhaps have some deeper understanding and appreciation of the hard work and sacrifice that many of these migrants face when they arrive in Australia and South Australia. South Australia is a better place for the continuing involvement of the Indian community, and the strides they make to improve our society more generally. I would like to end my

remarks today by wishing all in the community a happy Diwali and, to all my Indian friends and all those who celebrate this terrific festival, I wish them all the very best for the future.

#### **PINK RIBBON DAY**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:24):** I too would like to wish all my constituents from the Indian community a happy Diwali. There would hardly be a family, a friendship group or a workplace untouched by cancer. Of course, our thoughts in this place at this time are very much with the family and loved ones of the late Dr Bob Such, whose passing reminds us that this dreadful disease does not discriminate on any basis. Cancer is a cruel thief of lives, young and old, men and women, regardless of background or present circumstances. It can unite us though in what must be a tireless search for a cure, in never-ending work for prevention and awareness and in providing support for those most directly affected.

While both men and women are affected by cancer, today I wish to highlight women's cancers in particular and the campaign this month organised by the Cancer Council. It is estimated that about 50 women are diagnosed each day with breast and gynaecological cancers, including ovarian, cervical and uterine cancers. A staggering one in eight Australian women will be found to have breast cancer by the time she turns 85.

The colour pink has become a worldwide symbol of the fight against breast cancer in particular, with sport being one of the most visible examples thanks to the work of the likes of the McGrath Foundation. Former Australian test cricketers Matthew Hayden and Andrew Symonds famously used hot pink grips on their bats, while US Masters golf champion Bubba Watson has been teeing off with a pink driver for several seasons as a breast cancer awareness statement.

But we do not have to be sporting professionals to show our true colours when it comes to this vital cause. October is the feature month for the Cancer Council's Pink Ribbon fundraisers, which raise money and awareness to support the thousands of women affected by breast and gynaecological cancers. This year, Monday 27 October is Pink Ribbon Day and I would encourage all members to consider how they might be involved in the effort. I look forward to joining with fellow community members volunteering at a Cancer Council Pink Ribbon Day stall at a shopping centre in my electorate of Torrens.

In addition to wearing a pink ribbon or volunteering on a stall on either the 27<sup>th</sup> or on Friday 24 October, there are many other opportunities to contribute: from ordering a Pink Ribbon box of merchandise to sell, donating funds, organising Pink Ribbon fundraisers, registering to host a Girls' Night In or making a Pink Ribbon Promise with someone close to your heart. The Cancer Council's aim is to slash the numbers of women in our community affected by breast and gynaecological cancers, through world-leading research, prevention programs, the best possible treatment and ongoing support.

The format for Pink Ribbon fundraisers or Girls' Nights In is only limited by the hosts' or organisers' imaginations. A Girls' Night In could bring together female friends, family, colleagues or club mates for a small fundraising event in a private home or a large event at a public venue. Apart from a Girls' Night In, a Pink Ribbon fundraiser could take the form of a breakfast, morning tea, lunch, high tea, BBQ, bake-off or raffle; the options really are endless. You could even hold a 'wear pink' day at the office or community group.

While the Cancer Council's campaign runs until the end of October, fundraising events can be held at any time throughout the year. For those interested in more information on Pink Ribbon Day or to register to volunteer or to host a fundraiser go to [www.pinkribbon.com.au](http://www.pinkribbon.com.au). This is not work we can afford to leave to other people. There is still plenty to be done. The Cancer Council has a target of \$9.47 million for cancer research, prevention and support and has so far raised \$416,946 towards this goal.

While all cancer cannot be eliminated by changes in lifestyle alone, the Cancer Council does recommend that all women take the following seven measures to reduce the risk of cancer: quit smoking, have a regular pap smear and mammogram, be sun smart, be active, limit your alcohol intake, maintain a healthy body weight and eat a balanced diet. Wouldn't it be great if we could all be part of the decline of women's cancers.

## INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:29):** I rise today to talk about industry development within my region and within my electorate. Right at the outset, can I say that by my comments here I do not seek to pass judgement on other efforts in different parts of the state but merely make a point about relative effort and relative outcome when it comes to state government investment and state government focus around industry development.

The main industries in my electorate are wine, tourism and food, and very much in that order. The wine industry in my electorate is huge. The best estimates that I can put together show that my electorate exports around \$250 million to \$300 million a year worth of wine. Tourism is a huge focus, and wine and tourism are very much intertwined. We get a lot of day visits from Adelaide and a lot of interstate visitation. We do not get as much overnight visitation as other regions, like the Riverland, for instance, but we are certainly one of the major tourism attractions in the state.

Food is a two-pronged sector in my electorate, from the fine food and dining experience through to small to medium food manufacturers that manufacture products that sell throughout South Australia, interstate and overseas. The Barossa in particular is a well-celebrated region and it brings a lot of people to South Australia and helps put South Australia on the map. Indeed, when I talk to winemakers who spend a lot of their time overseas, they say that there is probably greater recognition for the Barossa than there is for South Australia as a state.

I would like to congratulate the Labor government at this point on having done something right, and that is the Barossa. Be Consumed campaign. You will not hear me congratulate the other side that often, but the anecdotal evidence and some of the stronger evidence says that there has been around a 15 per cent to 20 per cent increase in visitation and spend since the introduction of the ad. I was very glad that the government put in about an extra \$2 million for the next 12 months to have that ad continue in key interstate markets.

As I mentioned in my maiden speech, the Barossa is a region that tends to look after itself. The people are resilient and very self-reliant and, as such, are often forgotten by government. In government, money is often given to this squeakiest wheel, money is given where there is the most media focus, and money is given to a crisis situation; and there is merit in that. We need to look after communities that have experienced significant shock. On that, obviously the previous speaker talked about the loss of the car industry, and there is a focus on the drought in the Riverland, and Kangaroo Island seems to have a focus on its commissioner. There are a number of sectors that this government has chosen to highlight; however, too often, I believe, we focus our industry development on trying to save jobs and working through crisis situations instead of looking to grow our economic base by reinforcing and picking winners.

If we are to look at the recovery of the state's economy and say that the regions are going to be very much a part of that recovery—and I do believe that most sincerely, and a lot of the economic data bears that out—we need to look at reinforcing our successful regions. What I am trying to do is make a plea for the Barossa in that the Barossa is an extremely successful region. It has strong capabilities, strong diversity, and offers a unique product that gets sold right around the world, and it brings people to South Australia. I contend that a dollar spent in the Barossa region reinforcing that success is worth as much as spending a dollar on crisis situations in other areas around the state.

There is strong industry development infrastructure in my region through various industry groups such as Tourism Barossa, the Barossa Grape and Wine Association, Barossa Food and the Barossa Regional Development Australia organisation, which is fantastic in coordinating a lot of efforts, and the Light, Barossa and Mid Murray councils. In those bodies there is a strong industry development infrastructure that the government could use and reinforce to help bring more strength and growth to the South Australian economy. It is not always that we need to lurch from crisis to crisis. Indeed, with better management and planning, and a better understanding of bang for buck, I believe that regions such as the Barossa could be more heavily supported to help bring about greater prosperity for South Australia.

## REFUGEES

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:34):** I rise to speak today on an issue that I believe should be of concern to all Australians, an issue of basic human rights, a situation for which we all carry

responsibility and cannot hide from. On 26 September, to the clink of champagne flutes, federal minister Scott Morrison, on behalf of the Australian government, signed a deal with the Cambodian government to arrange for refugees held on Nauru to be voluntarily resettled in Cambodia. Reports say that, at the time of this signing, protests on Nauru, which were into their fourth day rallying against the resettlement plan, culminated at about that very time with some asylum seekers apparently trying to take their own lives—truly acts of desperation.

I express deep concern at and disagreement with this deal and what has come and will come to pass. This is a matter that all Australians should be outraged with. It is a decision displaying little or no compassion and shuns our responsibility as a civilised society. This is a matter of human rights. It is a matter of the rights of those who have fled their homelands under duress. These refugees, otherwise known as people, like me and like you, have sought Australia's protection. How they arrived here is a separate issue, but the fact is they are here and deserve our care and protection.

I remind us all that a refugee by definition is a person who has been forced to leave their country in order to escape war, persecution or natural disaster. In this era of global unrest where we see record numbers of people forcibly displaced and around 87 per cent of refugees now being hosted by developing countries, it is critical that Australia does not shift its responsibilities to refugees elsewhere. Every country must play its part, and that includes us.

I happened to be in Phnom Penh soon after this agreement was signed and began very quickly to sense an embarrassment at being an Australian. Not once, not twice, but so many times I was asked by Cambodians why the Australian government had done this. Why would we not keep these people when they had already suffered enough? Why send them to Cambodia where life was hard? There had been protests outside the Australian embassy as Cambodians expressed their concerns at the plight of their lives which they believed now needed to compete with the pending refugees coming from Australia.

Cambodia, having been subjected to a heinous regime over 3½ years in the mid to late seventies, saw one quarter of the population killed, starved and die, and still carries these scars. It is not uncommon to speak to an adult who was directly affected by the Khmer Rouge. Eighty-five per cent of Cambodians earn less than \$3 per day. Health services are still developing and are sparse in areas beyond the capital. Apparently 20 per cent of the population live below the poverty line and the country remains the poorest in Asia. It is also a country where 37 per cent of children under the age of five suffer from malnutrition.

I found the Cambodians I met to be welcoming, but many had very little themselves. The streets were frantic with cars, trucks and a sea of motorbikes honking, darting, weaving and dodging one another from sun up to well after sun down. Motorbikes carried families, mattresses, plates of glass for windows, and livestock. It seemed that bikes outnumbered cars about 50 to one. This is a nation recovering and its people are doing what they can to work through this.

I for one do not support this agreement that our federal government has struck and would remind them that in the past Australia has remained a supporter of human rights—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I don't believe anyone is interjecting on my left.

**Ms DIGANCE:** —throughout international treaty negotiations and has ratified almost all major international human rights instruments, so this agreement makes me uneasy. To finish, I remind everyone that on Saturday 25 October we all have the opportunity to stand together, shoulder to shoulder, to walk and gather in unity in support of those who have come from across the sea, to say, 'You are welcome here,' and, 'Welcome to Australia,' to show compassion, respect and dignity for each other and every one of us.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Ministerial Statement***MURRAY-DARLING BASIN MINISTERIAL COUNCIL**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (From—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:39):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (From—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:39):** I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation set down for Wednesday 29 October 2014 take precedence over Government Business for one hour.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

*An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:*

Motion carried.

*Motions***REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr van Holst Pellekaan:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report on—

1. The review by the Health Performance Council on the operations of the health advisory councils in accordance with the Health Care Act 2008.
2. The current provision and plans for future delivery of health services in regional South Australia, with particular reference to—
  - (a) the role and responsibilities of health advisory councils and the benefits, or otherwise, of the removal of local hospital boards;
  - (b) amalgamations of health advisory councils in regional South Australia;
  - (c) trends in local community fundraising for medical equipment and services;
  - (d) how funds currently and previously raised by local communities are held and spent, with particular regard to authorisation and decision-making;
  - (e) timing of provision of finalised operation budgets in country hospitals;
  - (f) ownership and transfer of property titles of country hospitals;
  - (g) the process and timing of the hiring of staff for new and existing positions;
  - (h) South Australian Ambulance Service arrangements, including the role of volunteers, fees and fundraising and the benefits, or otherwise, to local community events;
  - (i) scope of practice of general practitioners to country hospitals and the provision of accident and emergency care;
  - (j) procurement by Country Health SA and the benefits, or otherwise, to country communities;
  - (k) mandated fees to DPTI for management of maintenance and minor works;
  - (l) the benefits, or otherwise, of all rural and remote South Australia being classified as one primary health network within the federal health system;
  - (m) the implementation of EPAS in country hospitals;
  - (n) integrated mental health inpatient centres for regional South Australia; and
  - (o) any other relevant matters.



which Mrs Vlahos has moved to amend by deleting the words 'this house establish a select committee to' and replace with 'the Social Development Committee'.

(Continued from 24 September 2014.)

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am calling the member for Schubert and I am going to protect him so that no-one speaks over the top of him because I know that is the sort of behaviour he endorses.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:42):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am certainly at your feet and in need of constant protection. I commend the member for Stuart for bringing this motion to the house. It is extremely important when it comes to the viability of our regional communities. I can think of nothing better than for there to be a select committee into the provision and plans for future delivery of health services in regional South Australia. There is obviously particular reference to quite a number of items.

First off, I will give a rundown of the hospitals in my electorate because it paints quite a good picture of the state of regional health services in my electorate. If we go to the furthest point, across at Mannum, and come back towards Mount Pleasant, those two hospitals are a great example of how co-located facilities in our regions help to bring critical mass so that we can actually keep a level of health services in our regional areas. In both those instances, the hospitals not only provide small amounts of accident and emergency beds but they also provide general practice services as part of it. They also provide quite significant acute aged-care facilities as part of those hospitals and various other services.

In the case of Mount Pleasant, it is a good facility because they were lucky enough to have invested and spent money before the decision to change from hospital boards to health advisory councils, and as such the facility is in pretty good repair. They may or may not have been worried about impending changes to the hospital board arrangements.

In Mannum, the facility is not as good. In Mannum, unfortunately, those high-care beds are not single rooms: they are double rooms. In fact, I happened to see a couple of the rooms when calling on a good friend and patient who lives there. One of the double rooms is actually a thoroughfare out to a sunroom, so these two people's only private space that they have in the world is used as a thoroughfare for other people. There was a plea when I went to visit my friend, from her and others, to upgrade the facility because that would be very high on their agenda. That said, the staff and people there were fantastic and I had only good reports, especially from those two facilities, during the times I was able to visit them.

We move a little bit closer to the heart of the Barossa and there is the Tanunda Hospital. The Tanunda Hospital was built in 1955, and I took my two-year-old daughter there when she slipped over on tiles and was unconscious for a good 20 seconds—the longest 20 seconds of my life. We were lucky that the journey took about 30 to 35 seconds from our home to the Tanunda Hospital. We are lucky that we live so close.

The service we got at the hospital from Dr Jack Irwin was fantastic. He was reassuring and calming and very quickly assessed that Ruby was nothing other than fine and that we as worried parents had done the right thing and there was certainly no need to worry. He did suggest that there was no worry in letting her go back to sleep, but that did not stop Amy and me sitting there and watching her quietly sleep for the first hour to make sure that she was still breathing and everything was okay.

The other facility in my electorate is the Angaston Hospital. The Angaston Hospital, believe it or not, was built in 1910, when the population of the Barossa would have been maybe a tenth of what it is now. Can I say that those two hospital facilities, with fantastic and good-hearted people in those two facilities, are not good enough. Since 1993, the member for Schubert—the member for Custance, or whatever seat it has been over the various times, Kavel or Rocky River, I am a little bit lost in history—has been calling for the merger of those two hospitals and the creation of a new health facility.

This is a 20-year campaign by this community to get the facility that it so dearly needs and dearly deserves. Every single report that I have read, from the 2006 business case to the

2010 business case, has said that this facility is no longer up to scratch and that any money spent on this facility will be wasted because they are only able to keep it at a poor level of maintenance and that a new facility is the best and, indeed, in my view, the only option.

This motion brought forward by the member for Stuart also goes on to talk about health advisory councils, and I will make a number of comments about my interactions with those in a minute.

I would also like to point to a comment the Minister for Health has made, especially during the estimates process. He refused to rule out hospital closures. He also refused to rule out regional hospital closures, which is a guarantee that we had understood was in place prior. That change from saying, 'Nothing is going to change with regional hospitals,' to saying, 'We are no longer going to rule anything in or out,' is a change that makes us in regional areas feel very uncomfortable.

If there are any attempts to close the Tanunda Hospital in my electorate, there will be a veritable army of people ready to mobilise and make sure that the Minister for Health understands that the people of the Barossa are not going to put up with not only not getting the facility they deserved 20 years ago but also having one of their hospitals closed. Just today, the minister said on radio, 'We've been rebuilding our health system over the past 12 years.' How long it takes, I am not sure, but 12 years seems like a long time. He said:

At the moment, we're looking at ways. We've got three clinical groups established who are going to be advising me on ways we can reconfigure our health system to make it work even better and to make it one of the best health systems in the world.

I would say that that is a fairly genuine comment and I would say that that is a fairly valid comment. What I would also say in furtherance to that is a select committee, such as the type that the member for Stuart is advocating, would fit into this review exactly. In fact, it would be a fantastic next step to go along with the other steps that have been taken to make sure that the health minister has all the information he needs in order to make the best decisions.

The motion goes on to talk about the roles of health advisory councils. I am lucky enough to sit on a health advisory council, the Barossa and Districts Health Advisory Council. The role of this council probably needs to be better defined. The health advisory councils are:

...consultative bodies that advise the Minister for Health on issues relating to specific groups or regions.

They are supposed to:

...facilitate discussions, advise and advocate on behalf of their communities, communicate and consult and engage with their communities.

They are great words. When I have sat around the table at my health advisory council meetings, I see genuine people with a genuine interest and understanding of the local health system wanting to help make a difference. These are people with varying degrees of clinical experience, varying from none, such as me, through to people with decades worth of experience. They are people who are earnestly there to do a good job, but they are severely hamstrung by not being able to have true call over the money that they are supposed to be administering. People who want to be able to reach out and broaden their scope and actually deliver for their communities are being stuck in these quite motherhood words of 'facilitate, advise, advocate, communicate and engage'. To me, none of those words mean really too much about doing something, and can I say that the people of the Barossa love nothing more than actually getting on and doing something.

Amalgamations of health advisory councils, which is something that the Premier has put on the table with his review of government boards and committees, is an area that this select committee could look at, because at the moment my HAC is, as they all are, listed under further reform and consideration of further reform, but nobody understands what that means. In fact, I have had a number of people call me asking, 'Stephan, what does this mean?' and I cannot give them a straight answer.

The member for Morphett has said in this house that the biggest country hospital in South Australia is the Royal Adelaide Hospital. As I said earlier today, in reference to another debate on a similar topic, the poor health services in the regions put pressure on nearby hospitals. In our case nearby hospitals are located in metro Adelaide, whether that be the Gawler Health Service or

whether that be the Lyell McEwin, and adding pressure to those hospitals by not having a good enough service in my electorate will exacerbate that problem.

With the 30 seconds I have left I would like to give you one statistic. Today is an unremarkable Thursday afternoon. I think the flu epidemic is waning and we are lucky enough not to have Ebola rearing its head in South Australia, but at 2pm today the Lyell McEwin Hospital had an average waiting time of 53 minutes. If we were to invest in our regional hospitals by looking at them through a select committee, I believe that we could get to some better outcomes.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:53):** I too rise to support the motion put forward by the member for Stuart and commend him for another outstanding motion. I think he is doing a great job in keeping the debate going, and on both sides of the house, too. This is a critical proposal put forward to establish a select committee in the House of Assembly to inquire into the current and future delivery of health services in regional South Australia with a revised draft terms of reference. I have gone past the exact terms of reference because there are many.

There are a couple of issues that I would like to touch on. I have five hospitals in the electorate of Chaffey and every one of those hospitals is critically important to the fabric of the towns they support, and surrounding towns. With my reasonably short time in this place, I have become much more aware of just how important these hospitals are. It is as though both my son and I have almost had permanent residency in either the Renmark or Berri regional hospitals over a number of years with sporting injuries and trying to live a bit of a daredevil life. However, I must say that the hospital is a fabric of a community. It is critical that those hospitals are provided with the necessary resources and that those hospitals are able to provide a service to their community and support base and, just as importantly, it is critical that those hospitals provide a service with a financial package behind it.

There is nothing worse than looking at a hospital that has been defunded, destaffed or almost had one leg pulled out from under it because the government has an agenda, that is, they are looking further afield at centralisation. This current Labor government is very focused on centralised services. I think this Premier considers it a badge of honour because his firm belief is that most of the services will be centralised here in South Australia. I think when he looks back in history, he will ponder his belief and see that centralising services has been a mistake.

The future delivery of health services in regional South Australia is critical. As I have said, in my communities in the Riverland and Mallee, the five hospitals I have are supported by health advisory councils. The benefits or otherwise of the removal of the local hospital boards was a very topical discussion and debate over a number of years. The hospitals have moved on and they have recognised that we cannot dwell on the past and we have to live within our means, and I think they have done a remarkable job.

The current HACs which are the eyes and ears of the hospital and the community's needs, I think, give good feedback. There was some talk of my five HACs being amalgamated into one and potentially more than the five into one in a larger region, and the Lower Murray would have come into the fray as well. I pay tribute to the five hospitals and their HAC presiding members and boards because I think they are doing an outstanding job.

Over time it has been realised just how important they are—as I said, the eyes and ears. However, it is as important to know that those HACs also generate interest within the community which leads to fundraising. They also keep people aware, they listen to concerns and, just as importantly, they feed back to government their needs and wants, as well as the issues in their hospital or health services within the region.

Before I go on I would like to acknowledge the presiding members and their hardworking committees: at Waikerie, Justin Loffler and his committee; Berri/Barmera, Josie Nelsson; Renmark/Paringa, Heather Burton; Loxton, Sally Goode; and in the Mallee, Kathleen Gregurke. I think they all do an outstanding job and they are supported by dedicated volunteers on their councils. I think they do a great job and I really do feel that in some way, shape or form sometimes the government overlooks the importance or the contribution that they put in.

I think that the HACs, the administration that they look after, the volunteer hours that they put in and, importantly, the interest that they generate around the auxiliary funds and fundraising to bring that extra budget into the hospital's bottom line is critically important to personalising the hospital and making it more strongly woven into the fabric of their community. I will go on. The primary functions of the health advisory councils are to:

- act as an advocate and promote the health interests of the community;
- provide advice to the Minister and Chief Executive about any aspect of the provision of health services in the Local Area by Country Health SA Hospital Inc. from the perspective of consumers of those services and in addition, carers and volunteers who interface with the services;

The HACs are volunteer based, and members contribute their time to benefit the community. As I said, those five hospitals manned by their HACs do an outstanding job. They constantly feel as though there is an agenda, and centralising seems to be a badge of honour for this Premier and his government and it has everyone on edge. It has the HACs on edge and it also has the confidence of the community doubting where the government is going. If we look at some of these hospitals that have a certain future, they have fundraising auxiliary money coming in. Hospitals that are controlled by the government have little faith, have little coming in, and I think that has been evident over a number of years, particularly in the electorate of Chaffey.

The HACs encourage volunteers to be involved with hospital work, local councils and with the media to spread the good stories and provide financial support for hospitals through fundraisers. There are donations and bequests, and they engage in training opportunities and carry out community surveys. I think that is quite critical for the running of a hospital and its continuation, and I know that with some of the hospitals in the electorate the accident and emergency sections have been wound back or had their doors closed. Operating theatres have been closed, services have been wound back, funding has been taken away, staff have been taken away, and nurses and specialised areas have been taken away from those hospitals. It makes you wonder just exactly what the future is. But the HACs, the community, will push forward and make sure those hospitals are relevant for many years to come.

The amalgamation of the advisory councils, as I said, was a contentious issue. One thing I pointed out to our regional country health manager was that, rather than attending every HAC meeting perhaps he could attend these meetings quarterly. He stated that attending every one of these HAC meetings within his area—all 10 of them—was taking up his free time. I said, 'Well, welcome to my world. That's what it's all about—it's about doing the job, making sure that you are running a nice, steady ship.' I hope that he takes on board my suggestion that he needs to look at meeting quarterly rather than monthly and keep the interest on those HAC boards. We need to continue the auxiliary money coming into country hospitals. It is critical that auxiliary money is put on the table and spent and not held back by the government to prop up the budget bottom line.

I thank the hospitals, the HACs, the staff, the doctors, all the medical people around the country in regional hospitals, and I look forward to the government supporting the establishment of a select committee in this House of Assembly to inquire into the current and future delivery of health services.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (16:03):** I thank the member for Stuart for bringing this motion before the house. Health services across all of regional South Australia are very, very important, not only to the region but also to people from the metropolitan area who go out into the country visiting their relatives and so forth. They are also a very integral part of the future growth that I see in the regions as the Minister for Regional Development and my travels across all the regions.

There will be a massive increase in employment and opportunities in the regions within the next two years. We need to make certain our regional health services are the utmost and working correctly. To have a review, as the member for Stuart has indicated, is a great idea. I have looked at the *Hansard* of other speakers in here, and what the member for Stuart is looking for is a select committee to look into the various opportunities that he has listed here on the *Notice Paper*. However, I also noticed the amendment coming through to allow a select committee to be formed but under the Social Development Committee.

The member for Stuart and others have been trying to get some investigation into this for some time. There is no time frame in the amendment to the motion that the government has put up, and therefore I cannot accept that amendment. I will be supporting the member for Stuart's motion as it appears on the *Notice Paper*.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:05):** Thank you to all those who have contributed to this debate. I value and appreciate those contributions, including those of the member for Taylor. I disagree with some of the things the member said on behalf of the government, but I value the fact that she did participate and had the courage to put those things on the record, things which, I suspect, in their hearts most members would not have actually wanted to say.

Country hospitals belong to their country communities. Sure, they are administered by the health department and by Country Health SA but, essentially, they are institutions that are the core fabric, just like schools and sporting clubs. They provide an incredibly important professional service, but at their heart they really belong to country communities. In general, centralisation across the state over the past 12 years is not improving the level of service that country people are getting, and health professionals working in country communities are telling me this themselves. This is not about trying to give doctors and nurses and all the other people who work in health in country areas a hard time; very often they are the ones coming to me and to other country members saying, 'Can you help us with this? Can you support us? We need your support so that we can do better work. We do not want the work we do to keep getting pared down.'

Contrary to what the member for Taylor said on behalf of the government, this would not be a witch hunt and, contrary to what the member for Taylor said about my comments on the Booleroo ambulance just being a bit cute and nobody knowing what was really going on, the reality is that since then, on that particular issue, the Minister for Health has decided not to sell that ambulance. Of course, I thank him for that enormously. There was nothing cute about it; it was a terribly important issue.

There are nine hospitals in my electorate of Stuart and dozens throughout country South Australia: Port Augusta, Kapunda, Eudunda, Burra, Booleroo, Jamestown, Orroroo, Peterborough and Leigh Creek in my electorate. Then of course my constituents also access hospitals at Walker, Quorn and Waikerie very regularly. So this is a very important issue. All these hospitals provide a vital service to constituents and locals as well as people from other parts of the state, including Adelaide, who travel to that area quite regularly. They provide a very good service, but we have to fight to keep that service as good as it can possibly be. We have to fight against a centralisation agenda that would shift resources from the country to the city. We have to work to keep it as excellent as it can possibly be, and even people working in health in the regions want us to do that.

We do value the recent investment in four significant regional hospitals in regional centres, but that cannot be at the expense of the far smaller hospitals, which also play an absolutely vital role. Without continuously improving health services in country areas we will not have significant valuable regional development. It just will not happen.

I appreciate enormously the comments from the member for Frome, the Minister for Regional Development, saying that he would not support the amendment. I think it is completely inappropriate for the government to say, back in 2011, that it would agree to have a motion just like this, an inquiry just like this, taken up by the Social Development Committee, but then refuse to allow it to go ahead—not by omission, but by deliberately thwarting it from going ahead—and then, when I ask for a select committee to look into it (because clearly that committee is having difficulty getting it onto its agenda), to be told again, 'No, look; just trust us. We'll send it off to the Social Development Committee and we'll get them to do it.' Well, Deputy Speaker, history tells me that unfortunately I cannot trust that commitment. The commitment was given before and it was not fulfilled. That is my only experience with regard to exactly this issue back in 2011 and that is why, unfortunately, I cannot and my colleagues cannot accept the amendment of the government. We want to hold to the initial motion and ask that this house establishes a select committee to look into these very important issues.

Amendment carried; motion as amended passed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Morphett, are you standing and wishing to speak?

*Parliamentary Committees*

**ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: REPORT 2013-14**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hughes:

That the annual report 2013-14 of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 17 September 2014.)

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:10):** I am, thank you, Deputy Speaker. I know what a passionate supporter you are of Aboriginal affairs in South Australia. It gives me great pleasure to speak on the annual report of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee 2013-14. Just looking at the smiling faces in the early part of that report showing the membership of the committee, it is interesting to see how things have changed. There we have the minister as the presiding member, which we know now is no longer the case, with the Hon. Tung Ngo as the presiding member. After eight years of pressure in this place and with the cooperation of the government my bill was passed which removed the minister as the presiding member of the committee. I think this committee is now able to work in a much more efficient manner. The minister was actually writing to him or herself as the presiding member and the minister was writing back. It was a ridiculous situation that went on for far too long.

Then we have the Hon. Russell Wortley, who is the President in the other place now, and the former member for Giles, Ms Lyn Breuer. Now, Lyn and I are good mates. You do not have too many friends in this place but I can say that Lyn and I are good friends. We did disagree on some things but we were honest with each other. She is a very passionate supporter of Aboriginal affairs and I know that the new member for Giles will be just as passionate about Aboriginal affairs as his predecessor was. I am enjoying working with the current member for Giles and also with the current member for Napier, who is a new member on the committee.

The former member for Reynell, Ms Gay Thompson, was there, as were the Hon. Terry Stephens, the Hon. Tammy Franks and I. So, members can see that this committee is a broad cross-section of the parliamentary spectrum of backgrounds and upper and lower house. It is a very good committee that works diligently to try to advance Aboriginal affairs, not just on the APY lands but right across this state.

As we heard today in question time, the APY lands has ongoing issues. The committee has visited the APY lands several times and we are continuing to try to assist the people on the APY lands, the Anangu, to have some level of self-determination so that they can live the lives we all want them to live, which is not, as in some cases there, in desperate poverty and, in some cases, I would say squalor, which is a shameful thing in 2014. The committee is determined to change these sorts of things.

The way this committee works though is we do it in a multipartisan way. We go and visit organisations. We have witnesses come in. We take the evidence. Most of that evidence is public evidence. We did have some evidence just recently from a former general manager of APY that was taken in camera because of some ongoing issues there. He felt that he needed to give this evidence in camera. That is not the way this committee has worked in the past. If people take the time to have a look at the report, and it is not a long report, it is only some 18 pages, you will see that the committee covers a very broad range of issues. It goes from Port Lincoln to Pipalyatjara to Gerard on the river, Point Pearce, Raukkan, we go all over the place.

I would very strongly encourage members in this place to get together, spend some of their travel, pool it on a charter flight and go to the APY lands. Have a look at it if you have never been up there; it is a place you should experience. It is in the state, yet it is like going into another world, where in many places English is a second language and Pitjantjatjara or Yankunytjatjara are the first languages.

It is the most beautiful country in this state, in many people's opinion. Mount Woodroffe, the highest part of the state, is there. Watarru, or Mount Lindsay (its English name), is about halfway between the coast and the Northern Territory border, just in from the Western Australian border, and

it is really beautiful country with big rock monoliths—a cross between Kata Tjuta and Uluru. Unfortunately, it is one of those communities that, on the last trip the committee went on, we could not get into. Although there is \$20 million worth of infrastructure, including schools, clinics, transaction centres, mechanic workshops, the community has been, for all intents and purposes, abandoned and, I understand, quite badly trashed, which is a shame because the traditional owners love that country.

I spoke to some of the traditional owners when we were last in Nappameriie and Amata. They want to go back to Watarru, but, unfortunately, it is just not feasible. These are the sorts of issues, the heart-wrenching issues in many cases, that members of this committee have to face to try to get good outcomes for Aboriginal people in South Australia. I know that the committee works exceptionally well. All the members on the committee are very cohesive in the way they work. They have full and frank discussions. We will continue to do that good work.

I am looking forward to seeing how the committee speeds up its output with the new structure. Certainly, with new members on the committee, who are full of enthusiasm and passion, it should be able to perform to the very best standards and to the expectations of Aboriginal people and this parliament. With that, I support the annual report of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee 2013-14.

Motion carried.

#### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2014-15**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 85<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2014-15, be noted.

(Continued from 2 July 2014.)

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:17):** It is with great pleasure that I address the matter of the final report on the emergency services levy 2014-15 from the Economic and Finance Committee to the house. In doing so, I foreshadow that it is my intention to move an amendment to the motion that this report be noted. I wish to move an amendment that this house reports back to the Economic and Finance Committee for that committee to have further consideration of the implications of the budget. The reason I want to do that is that each year the Treasurer is obliged, under the legislation—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before we continue, member for MacKillop, I am advised that you need to provide that to us in writing here at the table.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I foreshadowed it—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am just repeating the advice.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I will do that. I foreshadowed that I was doing that, Deputy Speaker, and I will make sure I have it with the Clerk at the time that I move it. The reason I foreshadow that I want to take that action is that, under the legislation, the Treasurer each year is to brief the Economic and Finance Committee on his proposal for the emergency services levy and the raising of funds under that act. The Economic and Finance Committee is then charged with reporting back to the house its analysis of his proposal and its looking into the matter within some 21 days, I think it is, in the legislation.

The Treasurer sent a brief note, I understand, to the committee on 6 June, and the committee held a public hearing on 12 June and reported to the house on the 29<sup>th</sup>. Funnily, when the report was tabled in the house and the motion was moved that the report be noted, the government member, who is the presiding member of the committee, merely did that—moved that the report be noted and made no further comment. That is probably the first time in my experience in this place when a committee report has been brought to the house's attention in that manner, when there has been no comment by the chairman of the committee. The reason, obviously, was that later that same day the Treasurer brought down his budget.

In the briefing that was given to the committee back on 6 June, where normally there is some information about the remissions, the committee's total information was that the remissions would be revealed in the budget. Obviously, if the committee sought to ask any questions on that matter the

answer was always going to be, 'You will have to wait until the budget is brought down for that information to be revealed.' The information, which was pertinent to the inquiry of the committee, was not revealed until after the final report was tabled in the house. As a consequence, I now move:

That the word 'noted' be deleted and replaced with the words 'referred back to the Economic and Finance Committee for further consideration in light of the 2014-15 state budget.'

One of the reasons the committee looks into matters is that it saves the house a lot of time and effort. Instead of each individual member having to do the relevant research, both the people from RevenueSA on a one-to-one basis to get some understanding of their analysis of the work that is done to come up with the figures of where the levy rate will be set, the committee does that on behalf of the house. However, under the circumstances I have described, one of the most important parts of the work the committee would have otherwise done on behalf of the house was not done because they simply were not given the information that the remissions were to be removed.

I want to remind the house of the difference between a levy and a tax: a levy is an amount of money raised to cover the cost specific to the levy. This is the emergency services levy and it is specifically designed to raise an amount of money to cover the cost of operating our emergency services. If any member wishes to go through the report of the Economic and Finance Committee—and I urge them to do that, and I urge them to also go through previous reports—they will see that quite a bit of work is done by RevenueSA to set a range of rates.

Once the levy is set, there are not just remissions but there is also a range of rates under which the levy is applied in different parts of the state. At the time this legislation came through the parliament way back in the late 1990s, that was specifically designed such that the amount raised from various industries and various sectors of the state—geographically and as per the land use—reflected the risk and, indeed, reflected the cost attributable to the land which was being levied.

That work was done specifically because this is a levy and not a tax. A levy is not about redistributing the wealth of the state amongst various people or sectors within the state; it is specifically about raising the money to cover the cost of the service. What I have found, with some analysis I have done on the scant information that has been available to me, is that certainly in regional South Australia the amount collected by the levy is going from \$21.2 million last year (net of the remissions) up to \$38.8 million this year—a \$17.6 million increase in the collection.

The interesting part is that in those same areas—zones 2 and 3, as referred to in the report—\$38.8 million is being collected but only \$25.6 million is actually being expended on the services, according to the information in the report that was tabled by the chair of that committee. I think there are a significant number of questions that need be asked by the committee of the officers from Revenue SA about how they did the modelling to come up with the figures that are being used to collect this year's levy.

I can tell the house that, on figures I have worked out, rural and regional South Australia has been paying a lot more than its fair share, even under the previous arrangement, but now that has got right out of kilter. Regional and rural South Australia is paying way above. As I have just pointed out to the house, I think 52 per cent more is being collected from zones 2 and 3 under this levy proposal than is being expended in zones 2 and 3 on costs attributable to fixed property.

It is my contention that the Economic and Finance Committee should look again at this matter, take further evidence from Revenue SA and report further to the house, because I think a significant imbalance has occurred with the removal of the remissions. I do not know whether that was deliberate or otherwise—I do not know—but it is something that can only be ascertained by this report being referred back to the committee for some further work. I seek the support of my colleagues in the house for my amendment to the motion to note the report such that the Economic and Finance Committee is able to fulfil its obligation to the house to have a fulsome inquiry into this matter and inform the house fully of what is happening with the emergency services levy for the current financial year.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:27):** I, too, rise to speak about the ESL increases. We have to acknowledge that it is not a rise in ESL fees; it is the removal of the rebate. This has hit every person in South Australia, particularly the asset-rich farmer. Any person who is a landowner, no



matter how wealthy or asset-rich they are, is bearing the burden of this increased ESL. It is a land tax and nothing more. It is a wealth tax and nothing more.

This government often preach to us that they are looking after the people who can least afford it. Well, let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, the people of regional South Australia have been through some pretty torrid times. The farming sector, agriculture, food producers—the economic drivers in this state—have been hit once again and they have been hit unjustly because in many cases they are the volunteers within emergency services. They are the hardworking rural sector of food producers and farmers, and they are now getting a double whack across the back of the head, not with a slap but with a bat. It is with a big stick and it is going to hurt every person.

It is not just about the people of regional South Australia who I keep on saying have been hit the hardest, it is about what it portrays about South Australia. To come to South Australia to do business it puts on another expense, another layer of regulation or another layer of tax. I have had many people come to my electorate office about ESL increases and I have a register showing that more than 150 people have concerns. Many of them came to the office with a forecast increase, knowing what the removal of the subsidy would be, and explaining to me what it was going to mean.

As I said, it has been a huge hit on households and business owners and it is at a time that they can least afford it. What the people of South Australia are now being forced to pay, as I said, essentially, is a land tax. It is another tax. I think the Premier and his government obviously did not listen to what the majority of South Australians want before they went to the state election, and that is no new taxes and no new levies. We are seeing vast amounts of increases and removal of subsidies, and it is hurting every South Australian.

Again, the ESL rise has added to the challenges of being in business and part of an SME here in South Australia. The government, again, seems to forget the contribution that these businesses make to South Australia's economy. Again, I go back to the agriculture, food and wine industries. They make an important contribution to South Australia's economy. They generate about \$15.5 billion in annual revenue, 11 per cent of gross state product; and wine currently contributes about \$1.7 billion in revenue to the state's economy. However, these agricultural industries (people on the land) have received ESL bills rising by more than 500 per cent.

I have heard of cases where these rises have been between 800 and 900 per cent. What sort of message is that sending to people who are contemplating expanding their businesses here in South Australia or, in some cases, people coming to South Australia to set up businesses? I know that a Loxton farmer's bill went from \$200 a year to more than \$1,000 year. Again, it is nothing more than a land tax.

The ESL bill of one of the major businesses in my electorate—Deputy Speaker, wait for this—has gone from \$240,631 and is up by \$57,589. Did you get that?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am probably the only one in the chamber actually listening to you, so there is no need to ask me.

**Mr Knoll:** 57½ thousand. I know.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** A \$57½ thousand increase—the member for Schubert is always listening—for one business here in South Australia. What is that telling you? Why would they be slapped across the face and continue to do business here? They are looking elsewhere to do business. Again, in 2014-15, rural South Australians will pay \$22.9 million towards the levy but emergency services in the area will receive a paltry \$9.4 million in direct funding. In regional South Australia, we are paying \$13.5 million more than we receive in services.

Many regional South Australians are asset rich and as a result are being hit hard by this rise. The people of South Australia did not vote for this and it should have been made clear before the election; but, of course, one thing that this current state government is good at is deceit and dirty tricks. Again, from the \$384 million worth of additional revenue from the ESL rise, there is only \$8 million worth of new emergency services programs in the budget. Taxpayers are already making up \$311 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure last financial year.

I think something that needs to be highlighted is that volunteer firefighters are some of the hardest hit by these levy rises because they all pay the levy as well as volunteering their time. In fact, farm fire units are probably the hardest hit. Besides volunteering their own time, they have their own equipment, fuel, running and maintenance costs, as well as being part of an emergency service group.

It is something that I am getting the message about at my electorate office. My staff are inundated with people coming in concerned about the increase in their bill, but firefighters are concerned about the message that it is sending. These volunteers are giving up their time, and in many cases they use their own money for their firefighting equipment on the back of their utes to help when there are fires in their area. They are just wondering where to next? Why should we bother? It really is a disincentive for these volunteers who do a magnificent job.

Export businesses face another cost in their bid to remain globally competitive, particularly the SMEs which are critical to our exports. We continually hear the Premier go on about his seven platforms of priority in the economy. That went out the window and now we have got the 10 commandments of how we are going to resurrect the South Australian economy. I sometimes wonder just exactly what the Premier's priorities are. I can certainly tell you he has priorities and his priorities are not where the economy is doing its best.

Sport and recreation organisations have been slapped with huge ESL rises due to being asset rich. For example, the Cruising Yacht Club of South Australia, based at North Haven, had its ESL jump from \$4,200 to \$18,530. That is an increase of around 340 per cent. That is unjust and it really does make you wonder how some of these businesses will continue because people are going to go elsewhere where it is cheaper. The Cruising Yacht Club will have to pick up that increase and to do that they are going to have to hit their residents even harder, so not only are those residents being hit at home but they are being hit down at the marina.

Some of the schools' ESL bills have gone up as much as 500 per cent. The independent schools association said it would be difficult to absorb so, again, the consumer is going to have to pick up their bill at home as well as when their kids go to school. They are going to have increased bills when their kids are at school.

Much of South Australia's future growth will come from regional South Australia, yet the regions have been hit hardest by this ESL rise. This is one of the sad land taxes that has been put onto South Australians. It is an unfair and unjust increase. It is an unfair and unjust increase in land tax that is going to impact on every household, every business and every consumer here in this state because all of those increased costs are going to be passed on and South Australia will be a poorer state for it.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:37):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak about the emergency services levy this afternoon, but I am saddened by the necessity of such a contribution. The fact that this state government has put an unprecedented burden on the families of South Australia in this year's budget by removing the remissions on the emergency services levy is an unmitigated disgrace. It is a burden on every family.

For rural communities and regional communities it is a great big farming tax because, of course, some of the most extraordinary burdens are put on the asset rich but cash-flow poor families in rural and regional South Australia. I can tell you, as a member whose electorate is on the metropolitan fringe going into the hills, there are a great many everyday South Australians in my community who have been hit hard and who cannot afford the rises of several hundred dollars in their emergency services levy on their homes and on their cars.

This is a government that came to office with not one skerrick of suggestion that part of their key policy platform going forward would be the effective imposition of a land tax on the family home, yet that is what they have done. That is what they have done with their changes to the emergency services levy in this budget. I can tell members opposite, particularly the Treasurer, hundreds of people in my community have written to me in the last few weeks, especially as their bills have been coming in, asking for action and asking for the state government to revisit this plan.

The reason why there is a budget crisis and the reason why the Treasurer has had extraordinary difficulty managing his budget is because of 12 years of Labor's mismanagement of

their budget. While there were years of rivers of gold through the GST providing hundreds of millions of dollars extra to the budget per year, each and every one of those years through 2002 to 2007, what did the government do? They spent it. They spent it all and more. This is a government that spent billions of dollars above its budget when the years were good and when the years were harder their response has been to cry poor, to blame everyone but themselves, and to whack hundreds of dollars of imposts onto everyday South Australian families, to almost every South Australian family, through this massive increase in the emergency services levy.

I am utterly appalled by it. I urge the government to accept the amendment that has been put forward to send this to the Economic and Finance Committee again for further action on this matter, and I once again state on behalf of my community, my deep disappointment at the way in which they have managed this matter.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

#### **SELECT COMMITTEE ON A REVIEW OF THE RETIREMENT VILLAGES ACT 1987**

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr McFetridge:

That the report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 17 September 2014.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:40):** Can I say that my two minute contribution today will come on top of my two minute contribution on 2 July and my four minute contribution on 17 September. Alas, I will have a further four minutes of contribution to make at a further point in time. What I reflected on in my last four minutes—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You actually have six minutes, member for Schubert.

**Mr KNOLL:** Except there is only two minutes left of committee business time.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I just did not want to cut you off if you wanted to know that you had six minutes; that was all.

**Mr KNOLL:** In the last sixty seconds, and not to rehash the recommendations that I went over in my previous speech, or to talk about some of the retirement villages as I did in my first speech, I would like to complete listing, or seek to complete in 45 seconds, some of the other brilliant retirement villages in my electorate. There is the Mannum Community Hospital, which I visited. There is a patient there called Joan who could give anyone of us a good elocution lesson. She is a lovely and engaging woman who lives in the part of the Mannum Community Hospital which has 32 low-care beds as part of their Aminya facility, with 13 high-care beds in the hospital itself. I was also lucky enough to visit a resident at the Mount Pleasant District Hospital—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** So you are going to seek leave to continue your remarks?

**Mr KNOLL:** —with 13 high care beds. With that, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### *Adjournment Debate*

#### **SOMERTON SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB**

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (16:43):** I rise today to congratulate the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club on being named South Australia's surf club of the year at this year's surf lifesaving excellence awards. Last Friday 10 October, I had the pleasure of attending the Surf Life Saving South Australia Awards of Excellence at Surf House, West Beach. It was an excellent evening, not too formal, not too casual, attended by His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, the Governor of South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister for Emergency Services and several other members of parliament.

It was a night of genuine recognition for the many surf lifesavers and clubs that give so much to South Australia's coastal communities. As a long-term patrolling lifesaver at Brighton, I am a passionate advocate for surf lifesaving, the service it provides and the community it helps to build. Surf lifesaving is a way of life and I believe that it spectacularly captures what it means to be Australian.

At the excellence awards on Friday night, the highly competitive awards were presented. I would like to congratulate the 2014 Surf Life Saving South Australia Club of the Year, Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, for capturing the title and, while I was sad to see my home club of Brighton relinquish the title after securing it in 2012 and 2013, I was delighted to see this prestigious honour stay with a club which is within the boundaries of my beautiful electorate. As club president, Scottish-born Mark Strachan stated when he received the award—

**An honourable member:** Is that relevant—Scottish born?

**Mr SPEIRS:** Absolutely relevant! The club's success is down to the culture it has built within. In fact, Mr Strachan said that 'culture is the new black' at Somerton. The club has made a sustained effort to build a strong, vibrant community which people are flocking to be part of. It is a family club with a strong emphasis on youth development but also one which connects and builds relationships with the parents of young people who are involved.

In recent years, the club's membership has doubled, and last season I was pleased to be able to attend the celebration at Somerton when membership topped 1,000 and members gathered to write the figures '1000' in the sand using hundreds of club members to form the numbers on the beach. An aerial image of this figure was taken, and this image is now found on the surf club's 2014-15 membership card.

While Somerton is the only club in South Australia to have 1,000 members, it is not all about the numbers, and the title of Club of the Year was not awarded simply because of rapid membership growth: it was much more than that. Clare Harris, CEO of Surf Life Saving South Australia, summed it up well when she said:

The club introduced a clear and precise strategic plan on membership, retention strategies for youth development (SomerSquad), embedded a strong culture and family atmosphere to engage their membership base. After many years of planning and improvement, Somerton continues to operate as a valued community service, across surf sports, patrols and community hub.

Ms Harris's comments regarding the SomerSquad are particularly important and underline the club's innovative approach to transitioning young people from nippers, and youth activities, into active senior members of the club. It is widely known in surf lifesaving that this transition is not traditionally done well and lifesaving sees a substantial attrition of its membership at this juncture. The SomerSquad has a real emphasis on providing activities for, and developing leadership potential of, members in their mid-teens.

Back in April this year, I was a guest speaker at the Rotary youth leadership program run by Adelaide's Rotary clubs. It was great to see two young guys from Somerton, Max Hoskings and Jack Millstead, attending this event as representatives of their surf club—a great example of the club investing in its young people.

I would like to pay tribute today to the club's executive, particularly the President, Mark Strachan; past president, Steve Miller; Vice President, Sponsorship, Brad Keighran; Vice President, Business Development, Mark Williams; Honorary Secretary (and marathon runner), Rob McBride; Club Captain, Ashlee Rebuli; Vice Club Captain, Maddy McBride; Club Registrar, Margie Brown; Chief Instructor, David Provis; Competition Officer, James McBride; junior coordinator, Gary Irvine; Honorary Treasurer, Graham Burfield; and the club's legal adviser, the wonderful Cathy Mayfield. These people are to be commended for their role in turning culture into the 'new black' at Somerton. Long may their success continue because their success makes our community a better place.

As well as recognising the success of Somerton Surf Club, I would also like to recognise Karen Wilmot of Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club who was named Surf Life Saver of the Year at the excellence awards. On top of that, I would like to pay tribute to Glen Patten, who was the recipient of the Surf Life Saving Australia President's Medal, which he received for outstanding and extended service to surf lifesaving in the areas of administration, lifesaving and surf sports.

Glen's commitment to the surf lifesaving movement in South Australia is phenomenal. His credentials include first becoming a member of Seacliff in 1977, which he continues to the present day, and being a member of Normanville from 1997 to 2007. He gained his bronze medallion in 1977 and has gained numerous awards to reach examiner level. He has been a club president for 15 years,

a vice president for three years, on the board of management for 24 years, and he has given extensive administrative service.

Glen has been a patrolling member for 35 years, a patrol captain for 10 years and has given more than 1,300 hours of service. He has been an examiner, assessor and trainer for 30 years. He has been a surf sports official for more than 30 years including roles as state and Australian carnival official and referee. He has held numerous positions within the club and state committees and panels, including the facilities management group. He received recognition as SA Volunteer of the Year twice and Lifesaver of the Year twice, and he was awarded the Australian Sports Medal in 2000 and National Volunteer of the Year in 2002.

Glen was awarded Seacliff life membership in 1991, Surf Life Saving South Australia life membership in 2007, and in 2013 he was awarded the Surf Life Saving Australia President's Medal. This was topped off (if a little bit backward) with South Australia's President's Medal on Friday night, so he became holder of the President's Medal nationwide prior to taking the South Australian title.

Surf lifesaving is an iconic South Australian movement, providing a vital emergency service to our community and nurturing strong connected places, and stories like the ones we have heard of Somerton and of people like Glen Patten serve to illustrate the character and quality of our state's surf clubs.

Members of parliament would recently have received an invitation from the member for Kaurana and me, inviting them to attend the launch of the Parliamentary Friends of Surf Life Saving, the parliament's newest friends group. Our lunch will be held in Old Parliament House on Thursday 30 October.

This bipartisan group will look for ways to build and nurture strong, enduring, bipartisan links between this parliament and the surf lifesaving movement in our state, recognising clubs and volunteers for their contribution to our communities. I hope many of our parliamentary colleagues will join the member for Kaurana and me, along with Clare Harris, members of the South Australian Surf Life Saving Board, and representatives from surf clubs to show your support for surf lifesaving in our state.

Once again, congratulations to all those surf lifesavers who won awards at the South Australian Excellence Awards, and I wish Somerton Surf Life Saving Club, its committee and its many deeply committed members, all the best in the national surf lifesaving awards coming up on Saturday 25 November in Sydney.

#### **DIWALI 2014**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (16:52):** Today I would like to acknowledge the Diwali, or Deepavali, festivals that are taking place across Australia in our Indian communities in the lead up to the special days next week. Marking the start of the Hindu New Year, according to the lunar calendar, this important commemoration is the most widely celebrated festival for people of Indian heritage.

Deepavali literally means 'rows of lights', from the Sanskrit 'dipa' for light and 'awali' for row or line. It is a festival symbolising the victory of light over darkness, good over evil, and knowledge over ignorance. The Hindu Council of Australia, a national body representing all Australian Hindus (more than 300,000 people) has been celebrating this festival of lights for the past 15 years on a large scale in Australia.

Though there are many legends behind this festival, the Hindu Council of Australia's Deepavali website notes:

in the current world what the festival of lights really stands for is a reaffirmation of hope, a renewed commitment to friendship, religious tolerance, spreading the word of peace and harmony and above all, celebration of 'simple joys of life'.

What a wonderful concept. As our society strives for peace and harmony, the underpinning philosophy of Deepavali provides a real example to follow.

During the festival people pray to the Hindu goddess Lakshmi, the goddess of wealth, duty, light, prosperity and wisdom, but also to Ganesha, the Remover of Obstacles and the Lord of

Beginnings. In India Lakshmi's statue and images are carried through the streets in processions. Dipa lights—made of clay and filled with oil and with a wick made of cotton wool—are placed outside the houses on floors and in doorways. Doorways and archways may be decorated with mango leaves and marigolds. Deepavali melas, or fairs, are enjoyed by Hindus, Sikhs, Jains and Buddhists alike around the world. During the celebration people exchange gifts and have fireworks, colourful sparklers and bonfires as well as festive meals.

I have really enjoyed getting to know the leaders of the various Indian communities in South Australia and within my electorate of Torrens, listening to their views and concerns. I am told by my friends from India, who have made Australia home, that it is the only time their children are happy to get up before dawn to begin their day. It is a colourful and happy celebration, with input from family members who prepare their homes and themselves for the many festivities that symbolise the victory of spiritual goodness and the lifting of spiritual darkness. Candles are lit and float in bowls of water and flower garlands are made, oil lamps are lit and lollies are shared.

Among my Indian friends in Torrens there are many celebrations and preparations taking place in this year's lead-up to the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of this month for the celebration. I have been invited by members of the Indian-born community in my electorate to join them at the Punjabi Association of South Australia Multicultural Diwali Mela on 19 October from 11am to 9pm at Thorndon Park in Paradise. It is free entry and I am told that everyone is welcome to come and share in the cultural performances, the entertainment, delicious Indian food and fireworks.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish all in the Indian community celebrating Deepavali a wonderful time with their families.

#### **PATRITTI WINERY**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:56):** I rise this afternoon to speak about a wonderful business in the electorate of Mitchell, the Patritti Winery. It came to my attention very early on in campaigning. I have also known about this winery for many years since moving into the area as a young teenager. It is a great family business and they do wonderful things. It came to my attention just after the election because one of their tourist signs on Morphett Road was blown over.

They asked the department to replace the sign and it was, coincidentally, knocked back. They have one of these signs pointing to their winery on Sturt Road, they had one on Morphett Road (that was the one that got knocked over) and they also had one on Seacombe Road. It was surprising that it was knocked back given that it is such a great winery and has such a great tradition. I have been working closely with the department and also the minister and I am hoping that we are going to get that replaced for them in the very near future.

This winery was established in 1926 by Giovanni Patritti in the heart of Dover Gardens, which as I said is in the state electorate of Mitchell, and his legacy continues today. It is the only fully operational, 100 per cent family-owned winery and cellar door located in an Australian capital city—unbelievably unique and quite astounding. It is right next-door to Bright as well, and I will be taking the member for Bright there for a couple of drinks at some stage. I say with a note there that the member for Bright does not drink alcohol, and I will explain more on that a little later. The five-acre property is less than 10 minutes from Glenelg and has 20 staff who work in the original 1930s Patritti family winery.

Giovanni's sons, Geoff and John, are directors and still work at the winery. The eldest son, Peter, is now retired but remains a vital board member. Giovanni's daughter, the delightful Ines Patritti, is the managing director and his grandson, James, is one of two winemakers. James and his colleague, Ben Heide, are passionate winemakers and continue to heighten the status of Patritti's premium range of wines through dedication, experimentation and commitment to small-batch, quality winemaking.

Giovanni came to Australia almost 90 years ago as a 25 year old. He could not speak. He landed at the port and he went straight to work. In fact, he began selling ice-cream at the gates of the Botanic Gardens on North Terrace and he started his business acumen then. He was a very sharp operator, Giovanni, and he was quick to note the lack of fine table wine and the dominance of beer in Australian society. He observed the abundance of sunshine and fertile soils south of Adelaide and immediately noted the land's suitability for quality wine production.

One year after arriving (an amazing feat), Giovanni, whose name had quickly changed to the more Australian John, was leasing vineyards in the Brighton district, now known as Dover Gardens, 15 kilometres south of Adelaide city, and made wine for New Australians.

By the early 1930s, Giovanni had built a winery with his best friend, Cristiano, who went by the name Jimmy, and by the late 1940s he owned a number of vineyards surrounding the winery. They began trading to customers in Adelaide and Melbourne. Until 1947, Giovanni (John) and Cristiano (Jimmy) ran a winery electricity-free. Can you imagine that: 1947 and their winery had no electricity. It is quite hard to fathom today.

From the late 1920s until the 1960s, they predominately made dry red table wine and fortified wines. Throughout the forties and fifties, large quantities of Patritti wine were shipped in wooden barrels to communities of Italian and eastern European migrants who sought European-style wine to consume with their meals. Patritti barrels could be found in regional towns such as Andamooka, Coober Pedy, Alice Springs, Griffith, the Queensland cane fields, and Melbourne.

In the 1950s, population growth and demand for housing around the winery meant that much of the land utilised previously for food and wine production (the area was known as the Garden of Adelaide) was converted to residential land. The vineyards were acquired to meet the needs of a growing community and to create the suburb of Dover Gardens. In 1960 the Patritti family purchased land in the McLaren Vale region. Their over 50-year-old vineyards in Tatachilla and Blewitt Springs are highly regarded, and the fruit is sought after by fellow winemakers in the region.

Giovanni passed away in 1968, aged 68. His family continues to honour his legacy and appears to have bottled his pride, courage and innovation and sheer hard work. In the 1970s the family business model changed quite drastically. Giovanni's three sons, Peter, John and Geoff, were entrenched in running the family business. The sons were in their late 20s and early 30s, and they were full of energy and inspiration.

Australians had now truly developed a taste for red table wine and white wine, as opposed to beer, spirits and fortified wines, and vineyard plantings soared. Exports of Australian wines were still minimal; therefore, Australia acquired a serious grape glut by the mid-1970s. Out of the need to diversify and continue growing their business, Giovanni's sons, John and Geoff, came up with an ingenious and resourceful solution, one that has remained Patritti's unique point of difference over the past 40 years.

Patritti began crafting 100 per cent natural non-alcoholic sparkling grape juice from their wine grapes, and that is what I will get the member for Bright to sample. The first batch of non-alcoholic juice was made in 1974, and it has since been shipped right around the world. Hundreds of containers go out every year. It has been an outstanding success and a hallmark of what they produce at the Patritti winery.

However, the young winemakers who have evolved have embraced traditional technology. Giovanni's grandson, James Mungall, began working as a winemaker, and he brought along his good mate Ben Heide, and their experimentation with single vineyard wines and obscure varieties began. Their obsession for high end, small batch winemaking has resulted in a five-star rating from James Halliday, with many 90-plus scores for current release wines.

The impressive part of this is that they had a tasting at the Marion Shopping Centre over the weekend, and people were super-impressed. It is not a high-profile brand, but can I tell you that it is a boutique wine and it is one to be savoured. There is something for everyone with Patritti wines; they are absolutely outstanding. Their innovation and story over the generations is to be commended. The wines they are creating at the moment are sensational; I have tried a couple. I tried the alcoholic varieties, and they were absolutely first class.

I look forward with great pride to continuing to help this business grow both in Australia and in their overseas exports. Their wines are absolutely first class and are renowned as such. I can highly recommend that, if you are looking to have a little tittle, this is worth while indulging in.

Ninety years on, they are still 100 per cent family owned and 100 per cent South Australian. They are an icon of the electorate of Mitchell.

At 17:04 the house adjourned until Tuesday 28 October 2014 at 11:00.