

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 13 November 2014

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

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 October 2014.)

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:32):** I have been looking at some notes in my files. On all these issues, as members of parliament we keep these files and, looking at my notes on prostitution reform over the years, I found the speech notes that were prepared for me back on 6 September 2012 and, unfortunately, I can read those again today. I have forgotten how many times we have had to deal with this issue in this place, and it is not going to go away, just like voluntary euthanasia and a lot of other conscience issues. This is the job of this place: this is the job of members of parliament, to debate these issues.

I encourage all members in this place, even if you do not agree with these issues, if you want to serve your constituents correctly (that is, reflecting their conscience, not your own), you should support this legislation through its second reading and then you have the opportunity in the committee stage to go through every clause and every line, and I am sure that the member for Ashford, and others in this place who are supporting this legislation, can then answer your questions.

You can thoroughly examine the bill and, if you do not agree with it, that is the time, because we do not get much time: we get 10 minutes to speak about this this morning, but in committee you get a much longer time to speak about this. To me, that would be the best tactic for anybody who has issues, queries or opposes this legislation.

This legislation has been introduced by the member for Ashford again, and I applaud her courage for this because, as a member of parliament, you need to stand up and be counted. I think I mentioned the other day that my wife received a letter telling her to pray for me because I am going to hellfire and damnation because I actually speak about these issues. I get up and talk about these issues.

Those sorts of insults to my family members I really object to. Do it to me: do not do it to my family. Come to see me, tell me what you are thinking and I will tell you what I am doing—and that is representing my constituents, the constituents of Morphett. If they do not agree with the point I am putting across in this place with this legislation, they are more than able to vote me out at the next election. I had an increased majority at the last election, so I must be doing something right. Even with those who might be considered to be conservative Christians in my electorate, we have a very good dialogue on many issues and they support my intent in representing them.

This particular piece of legislation, Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill, not to be confused with the 2012 one, is here again and it will keep coming. I understand that parliament is going to be prorogued, so today will not be the finalisation of this legislation. We will see it again, I hope. The member for Ashford will reintroduce it in the next session of the parliament and we will be able to debate it then and debate it to its full extent.

In the meantime, I encourage all those who have issues with this—who support it, who oppose it in any way, shape or form—to write to us. Write to us, phone us, email us, but do not try to do what has happened recently to the Fleurieu Milk Company and use a social media site to try to castigate and berate without any real knowledge and force people to retreat because of an overwhelming, unfair attack upon them. This will not happen in this case, though, I can guarantee that. We have the courage of our convictions in this place, and I hope that members stand up.

The Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill is an opportunity to bring the sex industry into the 21<sup>st</sup> century by considering it work like any other work. This provides those engaged in the industry a range of work and human rights provisions currently denied them. Sex workers are severely disadvantaged in the current circumstances while sex work is not considered 'work' and while those engaged in it are stigmatised by current attitudes.

They are less likely to seek assistance when they are at risk from unscrupulous clients or in some cases from those who are involved in the industry. I had some people come to talk to me the other day about the involvement of crime and the behaviour of some of the pimps. There are issues there that need to be sorted out, and this is why you need to be able to regulate these industries, as I was saying to one of my colleagues a few moments ago. You cannot just allow it to drift on the way it has in the past.

As to prohibition—whether it be alcohol, tobacco or sex work, in this case—you are never going to stop it, so you might as well grasp the nettle and make sure that you are going to protect people who could possibly be exploited as parts of this particular section of society.

Recently, New Zealand decriminalised the industry, and I note that the national government were re-elected with a record majority in their own right, so it obviously did not do them any harm. I tell the conservative members on this side of the place and any others in here to look across the ditch and see what happened there. The sky has not fallen in because of this change.

The New Zealand report of the Prostitution Law Review Committee on the Operation of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 reports that decriminalisation of the sex industry has not led to an increase in the number of sex workers operating in New Zealand. This is the other furphy, that we will have a brothel on every corner of every street; that is not going to happen. There are safeguards put in place to protect not only individuals but also the broader society.

The bill before the house does not allow younger people to enter the sex industry. The age of consent remains the same. This bill does not seek to promote under-age sex industry engagement; that remains the same: the age is 18. The bill does not permit those under 18 years of age to procure sex work services. The bill does not allow those under 18 to perform sex work. By decriminalising sex work, the bill provides for individuals to benefit from the rights afforded to other workers, including occupational health and safety provisions.

Currently, street-based sex workers are severely disadvantaged. They are more likely to be prosecuted than indoor workers. They are also subject to greater levels of violence and more likely, according to international research, to experience greater pressure to use unsafe sex practices than other sex workers. In some areas street-based sex workers are the most visible part of the sex industry, sometimes drawing strong reactions from some parts of the community.

Any estimate of the size of any sector or the sex industry is difficult, as activity in this area may be temporary or sporadic. New Zealand's decriminalisation of street-based sex workers has meant that sex workers and their clients do not have to be as wary of their activities. Workers are safer, their activities and negotiations are not hidden or clandestine.

By focusing on industrial issues and by protecting the rights of sex workers, we can ensure that owners and operators of sex work premises, including brothels, comply with relevant legislation. We can also require that sex work businesses display safe sex and health promotion messages, and that operators ensure only safe sex is practised. The bill will not allow sex work businesses to operate within 200 metres of schools, childcare centres and churches, and this will be further limited to 50 metres in the Adelaide Central Business District.

By moving to decriminalisation of the sex industry we are removing the need for prostitution-specific regulations imposed by the state. Existing statutes and regulations will cover employment conditions for other industries. Those involved in sex work have the same right and responsibilities as other workers (for example, paying taxes). From a pragmatic perspective, the sex industry will likely remain a constant in society, and on that basis it should be made as safe as possible for its predominantly female workforce. The continued criminalisation of the sex industry will continue to cause damage to the women involved.

New South Wales has decriminalised sex work; since 1995, New South Wales brothels have been able to operate like other businesses. Victoria controls the sex industry through a combination of planning processes and a licensing system. Western Australia prohibits all forms of prostitution; however, brothels have for many years operated under a de facto policy whereby, although technically illegal, they are free to operate.

The sex industry was legalised in Queensland in 1999. Sexual services can be provided by sole operators or in licensed brothels. The Prostitution Act 1992 in the ACT regulates certain aspects of prostitution. It provides for licensing of individual sex workers and brothels in certain circumstances. Its legal framework is one of partial legislation. The Northern Territory provides for licensing of escort agency businesses and regulates sex work.

In summary, it is time for South Australia to move away from a criminalised model to a more liberal approach, and therefore ensure greater protection for workers. I encourage all members in this place to look at this legislation. If they do not want to speak on it during this debate in this particular session of parliament, I advise them to go away and have a look at what the bill is about, speak to me or to the member for Ashford, who is the font of wisdom on this. We will be speaking to other people. We are continually being lobbied about the Nordic model—

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** I am the font of wisdom in theory.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** In the theory and the legislation behind the protection of sex workers. There is a need to look at all models, and I am looking at the Nordic model at the moment. I know there are some issues there. If that is one that is going to be acceptable to members of parliament, perhaps that is where we start. Then we can move on and make sure that the outcome we have is a long-term solution for a long-term problem. This has been going on for thousands and thousands of years, and anybody who thinks for a moment that they are going to prohibit or stop it is dreaming.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:42):** Sex workers in South Australia have endured many years of ostracism and marginalisation within our community. In this 21<sup>st</sup> century, sex workers should not still only be judged against moralistic principles which impact negatively upon the way they are considered and the opportunities afforded them.

Why do people enter the sex industry? While there are some research findings concerning Australia, overseas research, particularly from New Zealand, through the Report of the Prostitution Law Review Committee on the Operation of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003, published in May 2008, is helpful in understanding this phenomenon.

Like any industry, there is a combination of factors. For young street workers, there are instances of abuse and neglect, a breakdown in caregiving, school exclusion, homelessness, and a general lack of money. Other factors reported to draw people to work in the sex industry include excitement, encouragement from others involved in sex work, and a way of seeking affection. Of most importance is that sex work can offer more money than is available through other avenues. Other research regarding Australian sex workers shows that most had entered into the sex industry to support families, pursue higher education, pay off debts and to buy cars or houses. In this regard, people engaged in the sex industry are no different to other Australian citizens.

The bill before the house—the Statutes Amendment (Sex Work Reform) Bill—addresses a number of matters that bring the sex industry in line with the 21<sup>st</sup> century workplace provisions. It also seeks to redress the inappropriate and unfair administrative practices concerning the Spent Convictions Act 2009. This act has a general provision in section 8 that:

- (1) A conviction for an offence...is spent on completion of the qualification period for the conviction.

Members might need to be reminded that section 7 of the Spent Convictions Act 2009 gives direction regarding the determination of qualification periods:

- (1) Subject to this Act, the qualification period for the conviction of a person for an offence is—
  - (a) in the case of an eligible juvenile offence, other than where the person was dealt with as an adult—5 consecutive years; or
  - (b) in any other case—10 consecutive years, from the relevant day for the conviction for the offence.

- (2) If during the qualification period for a conviction (the first conviction) the person is convicted of another offence (the second conviction), the time that has run as part of the qualification period for the first conviction is cancelled and the relevant day for the second conviction becomes a new relevant day for the first conviction (and a conviction for a third offence within the period that then applies will have a corresponding effect on the first and second convictions, and so on for any subsequent conviction or convictions).
- (3) In addition—
- (a) if at the end of a period that applies under subsection (1) or (2) the person is a registrable offender under the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006 who is subject to reporting obligations imposed by Part 3 of that Act, the qualification period is extended so as to expire when or if those reporting obligations cease or are suspended under that Part; and
  - (b) if during the period of extension that applies under paragraph (a) the person is convicted of another offence, the conviction has the same effect on any previous conviction that is subject to the period of extension that a second or subsequent conviction has on a previous conviction or convictions under subsection (2).
- (4) For the purposes of subsections (2) and (3)(b), a conviction for a second or subsequent offence will be disregarded if—
- (a) the offence is a minor offence (including in a case where the conviction with respect to the minor offence is constituted by a finding under section 3(5); or
  - (b) the conviction is quashed; or
  - (c) the convicted person is granted a pardon.
- (5) A period under a preceding subsection may commence before the commencement of this Act and, in such a case, the qualification period will be completed—
- (a) on the commencement of this Act; or
  - (b) on the day on which the qualification period would have been completed if this Act had been in force continuously since the day of the relevant conviction,
- whichever is the later.

However, in practice, sex workers who have been convicted of an offence often do not realise the number and range of offences against them until they find themselves in need of a police clearance, whether that is to work in another area or even to assist with reading, perhaps, or other activities at their child's school or sports group.

Consider this case: a young woman takes a job at a health studio in the 1990s. She has no qualifications and is happy to take the position of receptionist. She is unaware that there are 'extras' being provided at this health studio. Police raid the studio and this young employee is holding the keys to the establishment because she has been charged with opening up the premises for business each day. She also takes moneys from customers for the massages they have received. The police charge her with being on the premises, living off the earnings of prostitution and keeping premises for prostitution.

Many years later, she finds that, although she has worked her way through a professional degree, she cannot find more than casual short-term work because her employer or employers are alerted to the history of her convictions and they are not in fact spent, as she had been led to believe. There is little, if any, chance of her obtaining work in human services and very limited, if any, potential in engaging in employment regarding children. Her ability to secure full-time work is affected even though she has completed her degree. Her credit rating is affected. She cannot secure a loan; it is very difficult to purchase a house or a car. If she wanted to establish her own business in other fields it cannot be assured that insurers will facilitate insurance coverage.

More significantly, it is important that we appreciate that while we do not recognise the sex industry as work there is no WorkCover for sex workers; neither is there provision for superannuation. Therefore, from the sex worker's time in the industry there are no nest eggs to draw on for post work financial support. We are therefore forcing this group of workers to be welfare dependent, possibly for housing and certainly for their pension.

This type of marginalisation is quite significant. However, I am advised women in these circumstances endure significant levels of stress, which in time contribute in many cases to a

deterioration in their mental health. Imagine not being able to share or disclose some part of your past and not applying for positions with better terms and conditions or payment because you are fearful that your unspent convictions will surface.

While we do not know the full range and extent of the number of women and men affected by this set of circumstances, we do know that many are not able to make their full and true contribution to the community in which they and we live. There are not able to fully participate in the economy and contribute as other workers do. We also deny them the opportunity to enjoy their full potential in our economy, in our community and society in general, and we certainly limit the options in many ways in many areas. A lot of doors are closed, despite the provisions of the Spent Convictions Act 2009. Therefore, it is really a matter of discrimination.

This bill provides for amendments to the Spent Convictions Act 2009 by changing section 16A to 'have convictions of a person for a prescribed sex work offence' to be 'taken to be spent'. I am clear the long-term ramifications for how we see and judge the sex industry, support people who have been convicted of sex industry offences and subsequently live peacefully within our community will have major benefits for all of us. In commending the bill to the house, I am advised that there will be a number of briefings arranged as with the last bill, so there will be ample time for people to understand and contribute to the debate.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (10:49):** I rise in support of the member for Ashford's Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill which seeks to enhance the working terms and conditions and subsequent standing in the community by recognising that this work should be afforded the protection that most of us in the community enjoy in our daily working lives. I commend the member for Ashford for again bringing this bill to the house.

There are members of the community and, indeed, of this house who claim that the bill actively works to undermine the status of women in the community by supporting the sex industry in which, those opposed claim, the people engaged are abused and exploited. I say that not addressing the matters is in fact making matters worse. Consider the following.

People in the sex industry, men and women, are subject to a range of marginalised processes by many parts of our community. It is not my intent to explore here today why individuals enter the industry. That has been canvassed by other members recently—as recently as just a moment ago. However, it is clear that, by defining the industry as 'work', we can provide some occupational health and safety measures that cannot always be assured at present.

The bill seeks to decriminalise the sex industry by allowing it to operate under a legislation model, and permit it, provided it is conducted in accordance with that legislation and regulations. By providing a way to manage the industry, and by bringing it under a legal framework, we enhance the situation in which such workers are found and, at the same time, we minimise the potential activity of those individuals or activities not supported.

Through decriminalisation, laws that prohibit, criminalise or restrict the act of prostitution are repealed so that sex work is seen as being equivalent to all other work; that is, we recognise that sex work has been and continues to be an inevitable part of our society. The objectives of specific regulation are to minimise harm to those involved in the industry.

It is time that the sex industry is recognised. I would say it is well past the time here in South Australia for sex industry workers and the sex industry to be recognised as a legitimate business and, as such, come under conventional employment and health regulations and be subject to standard local council business. Those involved in the industry will thereby have the same rights and responsibilities as other workers.

As mentioned in the member for Florey's contribution, or maybe it was the member for Morphet's, they will also be obliged to, as we all are, pay taxes for the work that they undertake. Sex industry workers argue that this type of model provides the best for their needs, as it removes the ongoing stigma of prostitution and subsequent discrimination and allows workers access to the rights and protections held by other workers in legitimate employment.

If we address a human rights perspective in which the core position is that women, regardless of the industry, have a right to work in any chosen field and be in control of their earning potential,

decriminalisation is therefore the best means to achieve the goals that I noted above. Recognising the sex industry as legitimate in its employment status allows sex workers to enter into legally binding employment contracts—a fundamental expectation of most in the Australian workforce but, to date, denied those engaged in the sex industry.

When prostitution is constructed as a criminal act, it prevents sex workers from reporting crimes and violence committed against them. The criminal nature of illegal prostitution has, in other states, been reported to be the target of harassment of those regulating, including police, and therefore establishes a distrust of those regulators.

Currently, sex workers, of both genders, are not protected. Worse, once convicted—and it was interesting to hear the member for Florey's contribution on this matter—South Australian sex workers are apparently discriminated against and marginalised for a very long period of time. Members of this house have been advised that the spent convictions provisions of the Spent Convictions Act 2009 are not applied uniformly, and individuals have reported that they have been surprised to find out that, on seeking a police check for any number of purposes, their transgressions have not been expunged and many subsequent opportunities afforded most in this community are denied despite industrious and diligent endeavours to live a model citizen's life in the interim.

Why must a woman, convicted because of her naïveté in taking, in her late teens, a receptionist position in a health studio that provides massages continue to pay for that decades later? It is not unusual for women in such circumstances to be denied opportunities for long-term permanent employment, despite the academic credentials achieved by some, and a credit rating of any sort. For example, how are they to secure a car, long-term accommodation or a mortgage?

Those in the community who are opposed to the sex industry say that sex workers should just get out and move into some other form of employment. How can this happen when they are faced with sustained, systemic discrimination and marginalisation? We should also remember that there are sex workers who prefer to remain in the industry. That said, should they be condemned to not having economic, social and work rights that the rest of the community takes for granted?

Previous speakers have mentioned the decriminalisation that has occurred in the sex industry in New Zealand and I want to make this point: we are seeing a very good relationship over there between the equivalent of SafeWork here in South Australia, WorkSafe; the health department; the police; and everyone who has undertaken their obligations in discharging their responsibilities under the regulations. What we have there is a much safer and more defined industry that is not only protecting those workers in the industry but, indeed, what we hope to achieve here in South Australia, which is protecting consumers of that particular industry.

As mentioned earlier, we have also seen that New South Wales has decriminalised the sex industry. Since 1995, as mentioned by the member for Morphet, brothels were able to operate like any other business. Throughout Australia, there have been moves to ensure that this industry is properly regulated, for the reasons that I and other speakers before me have articulated. It is certainly my view, and I believe it ought be the view of this house, that it is high time for South Australia to move away from an archaic criminalised system and to take on a more liberal approach, ensuring greater protection and inclusive community standing for sex workers.

In fact, I find it quite incredible that we are here again today speaking on this matter. It is high time that we remedy what is a glaring anomaly here in South Australia. The member for Morphet will tell me if I am wrong in what I say but, to paraphrase the member for Morphet, South Australia was once a leader in progressive aspects of our community and I think on this issue we have certainly been dragging the chain in addressing an issue that needs to be addressed. Quite simply, it is not going to go away. It is going to continue to operate within our community. There will continue to be those people who work in the sex system. Currently, they work in a sex system that makes their operations illegal.

We need to remedy this. We need to remedy it for a variety of reasons, not least of which is to afford those workers in the sex industry the necessary protection that they deserve through regulation, and to protect those consumers who will continue to seek those services, even if it remained a criminal activity. I urge every member of the house to support this bill and I again

commend the member for Ashford for her role in bringing this matter to the house for its consideration.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

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

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 October 2014.)

**Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (10:59):** It is my pleasure today to rise to speak on the Enforcement of Judgments (Garnishee Orders) Amendment Bill 2014, which has been proposed by my colleague, the member for Hartley. I think this amendment is a great example of a member of parliament going into the community, identifying a real issue that is facing members of our community and using our privileged position within this place to drive legislative change. The member for Hartley has been approached by many people in his community about debt enforcement—an issue which is particularly prevalent and damaging within the small business sector—and he wants to fix this problem. He is to be commended for that.

The enacting of garnishee orders would simply be providing our judiciary with another instrument in their toolkit, something to give them flexibility in the remedies that they can hand out and one which we can be more confident will deliver a fair outcome for the plaintiff and a just outcome for the guilty defendant. The government should not be in the business of covering for debtors.

If people have debts they should pay them. It is a basic principle of our modern society. It is a principle upon which business is founded and one which, if it did not exist, would see a fundamental breakdown in trade, commerce and civil society. If you have a debt you should pay it. That sounds straightforward, doesn't it? It sounds like the right thing to do. Our laws should encourage and deliver responsible behaviour rather than the opposite, and they should protect creditors and also provide compassionate frameworks for debtors to repay their debts.

Put simply, a garnishee order is a court order requiring the employer to withhold part of the wages owed to a particular employee (the debtor) and pay the amount instead to that employee's creditor or the court in satisfaction of a debt which is due. It is a method designed to ensure that the employee makes some payments towards the debt they owe. The instructions to the employer may come in the form of a letter, a notice or a writ issued by the court.

As the law currently stands, a garnishee order with respect to salaries can only be issued to the losing defendant if that defendant actually provides the court with consent. Obviously, this makes no sense, as it would take a fairly noble wrongdoer (I am sure we can acknowledge that there is something of an oxymoron present in the term 'noble wrongdoer') to decide to give consent to the garnishing of their wages, having drawn out a dispute to the point that it has reached court.

Garnishee orders create an option for a structured, manageable repayment program where people's ability to pay is constrained. So, in effect, garnishee orders create a legally binding payment strategy which will be compassionate enough not to overwhelm the debtor but ensure that those who are owed money can also have certainty that that debt will be paid. I think for the small business sector in particular and in the area of mum-and-dad investors, who might have investment properties where rent goes unpaid, the certainty and knowledge that that money will come through a structured enforceable strategy, such as the garnishee order, is incredibly important.

We know that small business in South Australia for many reasons is really up against the wall at the moment. There are significant struggles and barriers facing the small business sector, and anything we can do in our role in this place to make small business have more certainty, to give them ways of recovering their debts, we should be looking at and working towards.

The model proposed by the member for Hartley is flexible, appropriate and compassionate to all involved, both the debtor and the creditor. It solves a major problem within our courts, that being the court's ability to follow through with enforcement capacity. Currently, the court and the judges

involved can have a desire to solve a problem but do not have that enforcement capacity to follow through and ensure that the debtor can actually cover those debts.

I thank the member for Hartley for this contribution and urge members of the house to support what I reiterate I believe is a flexible, appropriate and compassionate model to debt collection in our state.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge the visitors in the gallery today from TAFE with their signer, so give them all a wave. They are guests of the member for Adelaide. We welcome them to parliament this morning and hope they enjoy their time with us.

*Bills*

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

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:04):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I will speak particularly slowly for the lady signing over there. This bill, the Enforcement of Judgements (Garnishee Orders) Amendment Bill 2014, put up by the member for Hartley, is a good piece of legislation, a good proposal, and should be supported by this house.

I ran a very successful veterinary practice south of Adelaide for over 20 years. In fact, it basically covered the area of Fisher. In most cases, the good people of Fisher paid their bills promptly, and they were very willing to allow me to provide treatments and remedies for their pets to the best of my ability, because they were able to understand that there were significant costs involved and they also accepted their responsibilities.

I was one of the very few veterinary practices that did not refuse people if they could not afford to pay their bills. Unfortunately, it is a fact of life now that because of the financial pressures on a lot of small businesses, particularly veterinary practices, a lot of vets do not give credit. Nowadays, with credit cards, it is less of an issue for many, but for a considerable number of people unexpected expenses such as a vet bill, particularly those for pets suffering severe injuries arising from motor vehicle accidents and that sort of thing, can be very expensive.

To have to refuse treatment because the owner of the pet could not afford it was something I struggled with, but in most cases we were able to give people credit. There were some cases where obviously people could never afford to pay back the costs, and I just said to them, 'Look, I'm sorry; if I go broke, I won't be here to treat all the other thousands of people who rely on me at the moment,' and that was often heart wrenching. Collecting debts and making sure the business was able to operate was something that I, and I think every small business owner in South Australia, was aware of.

The systems that have been in place and the current system allow for people who have no intention of paying their debts, or who for some reason think their debt is extravagant or who somehow want to avoid paying their debts. The current system has benefited those people and enabled them to do what is both morally and ethically wrong. This particular piece of legislation adds another arm of defence and an opportunity for those who have offered a service—in my case, a veterinary service—to recoup the costs if that person does not pay the bill. It is not onerous; it is fair. It is a fair piece of legislation, and we all need to put people on notice that they cannot avoid their debts.

Once, I put up on my noticeboard in my practice a whole lot of bounced cheques and listed the people who had not paid their bills. I was told that was against the privacy regulation, and I could actually be sued for that now. I was willing to take that risk because those people owed me money and I wanted to get paid for the services I had given in good faith. This legislation will avoid people



who are so frustrated by this, as I was, having to go down that path and possibly ending up in trouble themselves.

With regard to the need to be able to recoup your debts, there is an old saying in business that turnover is vanity, profit is sanity. You need to make a surplus, some profit, so that you can continue to expand the business, employ people and continue to deliver services. If you do not get paid, you cannot do that. What the member for Hartley has done is sensible and fairly straightforward even for me, as a humble veterinarian—and I am not a lawyer, and by saying that I am boasting not apologising—to understand what this is about.

I ask members in this place to look at it. I ask the government, particularly, to look at it, to assess it, and if they have issues with it then speak to the member for Hartley, so that small businesses in South Australia can be protected and go about their business with goodwill, as they all do, and receive their rightful fee, their rightful reward. I invite the government to look at this legislation, this proposal, and I hope that the house will support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Knoll.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (RIGHTS OF FOSTER PARENTS AND GUARDIANS) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October 2014.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:10):** I made the vast majority of my contribution last time I spoke. I was really imploring the minister to take a very strong look at this in a very practical common-sense way so that we can recognise the good work that foster parents and foster carers do in very difficult circumstances, and in the most difficult of circumstances, that is, in the advent of one of their foster children dying.

I understand that this matter is still under consideration by the minister, and I will use this opportunity to implore her to please, please take on board the grief, suffering and hardship that foster carers go through in these circumstances and assent to what is otherwise a very simple, very common-sense, very matter-of-fact change to the legislation in order to recognise foster carers. With that, I complete my remarks.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

### **CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (SIMPLE POSSESSION OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 August 2014.)

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:12):** I rise to oppose the member for Stuart's bill. The Police Drug Diversion Initiative announced nationally by the Council of Australian Governments in 1999 aims to allow people charged with simple possession offences to receive health intervention from health professionals to address their drug habit, rather than have them enter the criminal justice system. Statistics have shown that the majority of adults diverted under the scheme successfully undergo treatment and do not reoffend. Seventy-eight per cent of offenders are compliant with the diversion and 71 per cent of offenders are only diverted once. Statistics also show that the scheme is a success regarding appropriately treating people charged with simple possession.

The member for Stuart contends that diversions take up the administrative time of police. This is incorrect. Through discussions with SAPOL we know that they are in favour of the diversion scheme. We are often talking with people who are involved in these situations, and in fact the evidence backs our case. We are often told that people who have a serious addiction need a nest of things around them to recover and not reoffend. Imposing an arbitrary number on the number of times an individual can be diverted will not help.

Drug dependence is a chronic relapsing condition. Under the member for Stuart's proposed scheme, if a person who may have been diverted twice and has been clean for 10 years but then relapses again is caught, the diversion program that has been such a help to them in the first place would no longer be available to them.

While the government supports the diversion scheme and opposes the bill, we agree that something does need to be done to deal with people who are clearly abusing the system. For this reason, the government is exploring an alternative proposal involving the use of undertakings.

Currently, health professionals who treat individuals diverted under the scheme are able to compel offenders to enter into undertakings. Such undertakings would set out, for example, what treatment an individual is expected to participate in. A breach of an undertaking automatically results in the prosecution of the original offence.

The government's alternative proposal will enable the prosecution of offenders who do not properly comply with the diversion process or who are not making genuine efforts to get off drugs. The government's proposal will be introduced to the parliament shortly. For this reason, the government will oppose this bill.

I would like to talk a bit more about some of the things that this proposal talks about. We on the government side want to take an evidence-based approach to drug policy in this state that is led by clinical data as well as justice system information, and these diversions are well placed to provide support for people who are suffering from chronic relapsing drug use or abuse. Only a very small minority of people have been diverted three or more times since the inception of the program in 2001.

SA Health has been working with services and clinicians over the past three years to improve the delivery of the drug diversion health assessments and intervention, and standardised assessment tools and brief interventions are now in place across all services. To further enhance this work, SA Health is proposing to further develop existing policy initiatives, as I mentioned before. SA Police is thoroughly supportive of this approach and is working extensively with SA Health to implement this enhanced treatment approach for this group of recidivist clients.

An undertaking can outline the treatment that the person will undertake, participation in a program of an educative, preventative and rehabilitative nature, and any matters that will, in the opinion of the service, assist the person to overcome any personal problems that may tend to lead to, or that may have led to, the misuse of drugs. The undertaking is effective for a period established by the health service but cannot exceed six months. Such undertakings will always be available at a clinician's discretion. The proposed revised policy will enable this. As I said previously, the government opposes this bill and I put that to the house.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:16):** I have to say that I am very disappointed that the government will not support this private member's bill because I think it makes good sense. I am very disappointed that they will not support it essentially on the premise that supporting this bill would remove all the positives of the existing scheme, because that is not the case. It would not prevent the many people who do gain a great deal of benefit from participating in the drug diversion scheme from continuing to do so. It would only actually stop the people who are taking advantage of the scheme from continuing to do so.

The member for Taylor, on behalf of the government, says that allowing people to have two diversions but not a third is just arbitrary. No, it is not arbitrary: it is a number. It is a decision that has to be made, but the reality is that a magistrate could still allow an offender to have a third or fourth or fifth drug diversion program, if the magistrate thought it was appropriate. There is nothing arbitrary about this at all. There is nothing arbitrary about actually just making a decision and making a recommendation.

Keep in mind that we are talking about offenders. We are trying to help offenders get their lives back on track. That is what everybody here should be wanting. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent offenders who are likely to do so from having that opportunity. They could be diverted once; they could be diverted twice. The third time they break the law, a magistrate could decide that they deserve a third opportunity or a fourth or a fifth, potentially, but what this bill does is stop the people who are going numerous times.

As we know from the police report, one person has done it 14 times, one person has done it 32 times. The police annual report will come out perhaps today—or, if not, sometime next week—and we will find out how many other offenders have been taking advantage of the system. This is only about trying to take out of the system the opportunity to take advantage of the system. It is not at all about trying to take the system away from the people who use it responsibly.

This is about people who have broken the law and helping them get back on track, not the people who have broken the law and clearly just want to take advantage of the opportunities given to them and have no intention of getting back on track. The police want this to happen; the public wants this to happen. I would challenge any MP to look into their heart and say that somebody who continually breaks the law in this way deserves an unlimited, never-ending opportunity to just take a program rather than actually face the consequences of the law. The consequences include a magistrate having the capacity to decide that perhaps they need another opportunity or two.

This would provide very immediate, very positive impact for people who clearly are on the wrong path. It is not any sort of a draconian measure in any way whatsoever. It provides great flexibility for people to access the support they need but not to take advantage of that by self-opting to take unlimited opportunities.

It would save police resources and the police seek this support. I put this bill forward during my time as shadow minister for police based on consultation with the police, based on requests from the police. I am very disappointed that the government opposes the bill. I will also be very interested to see if the government shortly proposes something else very similar to the bill and tries to claim the credit itself.

Second reading negated.

### COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON ELECTORAL REFORM BILL

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 August 2014.)

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:21):** I last spoke on this matter on Thursday 7 August, so it has been a fair while, but I am delighted to be able to come back to this and support my leader who introduced a bill a few weeks before that to establish a commission of inquiry into electoral reform in South Australia. The reality is that we have in South Australia a system where the people of South Australia do not get the government they want; even worse than that, we have a situation where the people of South Australia, election after election, cannot get rid of the government that they do not want. That is the situation we have had both in 2010 and again in 2014. If we do not do something about it, the long-suffering people of South Australia will face the same dilemma in 2018.

It is, by and large, the people who live outside of metropolitan Adelaide who are severely disadvantaged by this gerrymander. I will call it a gerrymander because that is what it is. It is the people outside of the metropolitan area who are largely disadvantaged. Those people, time and time again, want a different government. They want a different set of policies but they just cannot achieve it; notwithstanding that right across the state, in the last two elections, we have had a majority of the people of South Australia who want to get rid of this government, and want a government of a different persuasion with different policies and different ideas and a different vision for the future of this state.

We do need a commission of inquiry, we do need to move on this, and we do need to deliver to the people of South Australia a system that allows them to vote for and get a government that they want.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:23):** I am very glad to rise to support this bill today and, in particular, support the comments by the member for MacKillop and the former member for Davenport. In discussions with the former member for Davenport he said this is an issue that is not going to go away and it is an issue that needs to be prosecuted over a long period of time. As someone in this place who is a bit younger and starting out, I am very happy to take up that mantle.

I will agree from the outset that, under the current rules that exist, the Labor Party won the last election. I think the fact that they sit on the other side of the chamber from where I sit is testament to that fact, and they were able to form government.

**Mr Gardner:** Well, they did get nearly one in three votes.

**Mr KNOLL:** Yes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No interjections!

**Mr KNOLL:** As an opposition, we need to look at where we went wrong and we need to look at reforming our strategies in the lead-up to the 2018 election. My comments today do not come from a place of denial about the 2014 election result. I am very keen to put that on the record because I severely dislike this debate being one of carping and whingeing on behalf of the liberal opposition—because it sincerely is not.

Instead, the question we need to ask and the question that this inquiry seeks to ask and have answers on is: what is the best system of government in South Australia, the best system of voting that delivers the most correct outcome in South Australia? The answer to that question is not a static answer; it is one that does evolve, and has evolved. I go into the old chamber from time to time and note the fact that there was a time when all the seats faced in the same direction, facing the Speaker, instead of having two sides of the house arguing in an adversarial fashion, which is a much more modern construct of our system.

It has been mentioned gleefully by members opposite in discussions inside and outside this place, especially from the members for Newland, Kaurana and Colton, about their marginal seat strategy and the fact that they campaign in marginal seats and give undue attention to marginal seats at the expense of the rest of the state. They are gleeful about the fact that they believe this would have helped them win the election on the day. There was a victory, but it was a very shallow victory because it did not put the needs of the state first, it put the needs of the Labor Party first.

On this point I would like to say that I do not blame the Labor Party for its actions. The current system incentivises marginal seat focus, and we have to ask ourselves whether that is the correct incentive for voting in South Australia. Is that the incentive the people of South Australia want to give their politicians? There is often much maligning of and discussion about the fact that politicians do, indeed, focus only on electoral results, and to that I say, again, that the system incentivises and encourages that. As politicians we merely rationally go about playing the game by the rules of the game that are then presented before us.

This means that there are 10 to 12 seats, mostly in the north-eastern and south-western suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide, that are considered marginal, and this is traditionally where elections are won or lost—although I do note the member for Mount Gambier's great contribution to the Liberal team at the last election. In a state of 1.6 million people that is basically saying that there are only 300,000 to 400,000 votes that matter, and I do not think that is democracy at work. This is not what Don Dunstan, who railed for at least a decade on what he then called a gerrymander, called one vote one value.

I look at many members opposite, and the fact is that it is not just country electorates such as the member for MacKillop's that are ignored, it is many areas of metropolitan Adelaide that are also ignored—in the north and the north-west. These areas also deserve equal and due focus. In attempting to bring youth culture into this place, a common saying is, 'Don't hate the player, hate the game.' In this case I do hate the game, and I do believe that we need to look at better models. That is exactly what this inquiry is seeking to do.

In this place we have previously spoken about a different system called the 'top up' system, a system that exists in many other jurisdictions around the world, most notably New Zealand and Germany. It is a system that, firstly, ensures that the party that wins the majority of the votes wins government. It is a system that is foolproof in ensuring that a majority vote leads to government. More importantly, I think, it will also reduce the incentive for politically-motivated economic decision-making. It means that a vote in Schubert, a vote in Taylor, a vote in Port Adelaide will mean as much as a vote in Newland, Colton and other areas of the state. It will mean that instead of focusing

attention on a core crux of seats, winning primary and two-party preferred votes all across the state becomes equally as important to lead into an overall result.

That is a very important thing. The people of South Australia, in attempting to push their politicians to make better decisions, can deliver them a system that incentivises them to make better decisions. Winning elections is about the survival of the government and doing what you need to do in order to win, and that is entirely rational. However, once the game is changed I think we will see decision-making based on merit and based on a whole-of-state approach, and that can only be good for the people of South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### *Motions*

## **SUICIDE PREVENTION**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:30):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the significant and unfortunate increase in the rates of suicide across the nation;
- (b) notes the motions of the member for Adelaide and the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins passed in this house and in the other place on 24 November 2011 and 6 April 2011 respectively;
- (c) notes the subsequent development of the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy;
- (d) encourages the efforts of all community organisations that are already working hard in this sector to continue their valuable contributions to suicide prevention throughout South Australia; and
- (e) urges the government to build on the work of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist by increasing support for the ongoing establishment of suicide prevention networks in local communities.

Today is a very important day: today's date is 13.11.14. For those who might not know, those numbers are quite significant: 13 11 14. I put to it the house whether anybody knows what those numbers are. Those numbers are Lifeline's telephone number: 13 11 14. So, it is quite ironic that I stand here today—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you had said '131', we might have had a chance.

**Mr BELL:** That's right: 13 11 14. I want to speak locally, about Lifeline South East. It provides a vital service in our region, yet it receives minimal funding. It is such an important service, yet people believe that it receives funding in the same way as the ambulance service, health professionals and the like but, alas, it does not. The entire Lifeline South East operates on a budget of about \$20,000, which is not a significant sum of money for the work it carries out.

The Suicide Prevention Network in Mount Gambier is committed to increasing awareness of suicide prevention and postvention services. Membership is made up of health professionals, business, consumers, carers, police, education and local government. Our Suicide Prevention Network meets monthly. It has developed an action plan for Mount Gambier, and it was the first in South Australia to lodge its action plan with our local government, the City of Mount Gambier.

The network continues to report on its achievements biannually, and there has been considerable activity in the last six months, including:

- the establishment of a Men's Watch program, which is a program solely for men. I attended the three sessions they had last month, when over 60 men came together to share their experiences and concerns in an all-male environment, which was really pleasing to see. It was good to see the support that exists in our community for men who have either experienced some type of suicide in their vicinity or were going through a tough time in their life;
- the development of an action plan for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities;
- liaison with other South-East districts in developing their own networks;

- an Out of the Shadows Suicide Awareness event, which is now firmly on the Mount Gambier calendar;
- mouse mats with a suicide prevention message developed for distribution to key agencies, including job networks, Centrelink, education departments and the like; and
- quick assessment tips for suicide, which has been developed for distribution to the wide spread of government, non-government sectors.

We need to continue to build on these initiatives to reduce stigma and to encourage people to seek help. One suicide is too many, and we all have a role to play in suicide prevention. The Mount Gambier City Council has endorsed the formal representation of the suicide prevention network as part of its strategic commitment to community wellbeing and a strong focus on building a healthy, connected community. Our council recognises that suicide prevention requires a whole of community approach. More than 2,000 Australians take their lives every year, according to ABS statistics. I just want to put that into context. In the Limestone Coast the rate of suicide for the period 2002 to 2012 was 12.7 per cent per 100,000. Then I thought: how does that compare with South Australia as a whole and how does that compare with other regional centres?

I was surprised to see that in South Australia as a whole the rate is 11.7 per cent per 100,000 and in rural South Australia it is 11.9 per cent per 100,000. So, the rate of suicide in the South-East per 100,000 is a higher percentage than South Australia as a whole or other regional areas. In my research what really concerned me was the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rate of suicide per 100,000. That jumped to 26.7 per cent, according to the same statistics, so well over double the worst area in our state, and that would be the South-East. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rate is far higher.

These losses obviously have a significant impact on families, friends, workplaces and communities. The network is concerned for the people behind the statistics. One suicide is one too many. Suicide prevention is recognised by the suicide prevention network as broad and far reaching. It involves all tiers of government, non-government and government emotional and physical healthcare services, schools, police, universities, prisons, workplaces, training organisations, sporting, social and service groups, media, family, neighbourhoods and communities. It is about inclusion, participation, connection, easily accessible information and looking out for one another. It is about recognising the social determinants of wellbeing, closing gaps and deficiencies and improving the strength and resilience of individuals and communities. In suicide prevention we all have a role to play.

Lifeline is an iconic service which began almost 52 years ago and is now a familiar and well-promoted service for crisis and suicide prevention. In the past 12 months, Lifeline has answered 750,000 calls. There is a call into Lifeline every 37 seconds. Suicide is discussed in 40 per cent of the crisis calls.

I just want to go through a couple of other points on suicide prevention in South Australia. Mental health and suicide are two completely distinct and separate issues. Not everybody who suicides has a mental illness, and we need to make sure that that distinction is made. Since June 2009, on average, one member of our South-East community is committing suicide every seven weeks—one member every seven weeks. If this was occurring on our roads our community would be, quite rightly, outraged and demanding that answers be found to the issue. This should be no different for the rate of suicide in the South-East—one every seven weeks since 2009.

Nationally, male suicides account for 77 per cent of deaths. As I said before, suicide is an issue the whole community must address as it affects immediate families and those who have come across a body. I have had many conversations with our local police and emergency services workers and their stories are quite harrowing.

If you have a teenager involved—and as a school teacher, unfortunately I have had students who I have known very well who have suicided—it affects the entire school community, particularly peers and friendships. Unfortunately I have also seen the taking of other lives on anniversaries where they were close to the person who originally suicided, so it has a ripple effect that can be massive amongst communities, particularly country communities. There has been an alarming trend of

suicides occurring amongst elderly males in our community, particularly in the 60 to 70 year age group, so this is a growing and alarming trend that we need to be aware of.

I will finish because I know there are many who want to talk on this very important issue. If you are worried about someone or yourself or if you are overwhelmed or concerned, it is really important to seek help and there are a number of ways. For a 24-hour support service for yourself or others dealing with suicide or suicide-related issues or any issues really, you can, of course, call Lifeline on the date or the number I indicated before, 13 11 14, or the Country Health SA mental health emergency services support line on 13 14 65.

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:41):** I rise to speak on this motion not only as parliamentary secretary to the Premier in the area of mental health and substance abuse but also as someone who has recently participated in the anniversary of the suicide prevention networks in South Australia and attended their conference. I also recently attended community cabinet at Strathalbyn, where we met the Strathalbyn suicide prevention network and talked to the boys who rode from Adelaide to Darwin on postie bikes in recognition of a cluster of suicides that have occurred in the Strathalbyn area over the last few years. I heard there was another one recently unfortunately, so it is something that is in the forefront of my mind as I go about doing my work. I thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing the issue to the forefront of the house on this date and the very clever way of using the telephone number with the date is a very good thing.

The government has a deep concern about the suicide rate in South Australia. The tragedy of suicide and the impact on the individuals and community left behind is devastating not only for the community but for the economy. Suicide, in fact, increases the risk of those surrounding the person who has left this world of suffering from suicide and mental health in the coming years as a ripple effect.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics has warned us to be cautious in understanding the increasing numbers in this area as this is due to improved reporting, and I think that is very true. We have known for many years that we have been under reporting suicides and not naming them for the tragedies they are, both in an epidemiological sense and also in a cultural sense of not wanting to talk about mental health in the media and the stigma attached to suicide. We are getting better at doing that without talking about it as a risk factor. We are becoming more mature in the way we discuss this.

The government is committed to the 'South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012-2016: Every life is worth living'. The strategy was developed following extensive consultation which involved over 750 South Australians. The strategy calls for a whole of community response in suicide prevention. The personal circumstances and experience that lead a person to attempt suicide are very complex and are not contained in one government sector. The solutions are equally diverse. The seven goals within the strategy are to articulate the elements that have emerged as important ways of preventing suicide in this state. The seven goals are:

1. To provide a socially inclusive community for individuals in supportive environments.
2. To provide a sustainable coordinated approach to service delivery, resources and information within communities to prevent suicide.
3. To provide targeted suicide prevention initiatives, activities and programs.
4. To address, as a priority, the issues that affect regional South Australians. (As the member for Mount Gambier highlighted before.)
5. To provide targeted postvention activities and programs to support the people who have survived suicide attempts and their families and loved ones who are now at increased risk themselves.
6. To improve the evidence base and understanding of suicide and suicide prevention.
7. To implement the standards and continuous practice improvements of suicide prevention.

The decision to take one's own life can lead to many different impacts on the people around them, and in fact there are many attempts. It is important that each one of us knows how we are to recognise and respond to the calls for help.

The suicide prevention networks in South Australia are making great works in the community and outreaching for all of us to understand that. Having recently participated in the R U OK? Day campaign, with the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place when the bus stopped in Adelaide, I found that there are many different mechanisms by which we can all reach out to support those we are worried about in the suicide prevention area. Raising awareness, breaking down the stigma and increasing community education increases the community's ability to respond and the ability of each of us to respond.

Towards this end, SA Health, through the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist, is working closely with stakeholders to establish suicide prevention networks in local council areas. The networks bring together a diverse group of individuals from business, community groups such as churches, senior citizens clubs, service groups, sporting clubs, industry, agriculture, non-government sectors, public sectors and high schools. The networks are in different stages of development around South Australia. There is one in Mt Gambier, Murray Bridge, Clare, Gilbert Valley, Gawler and Playford, and it will soon begin in Naracoorte and Whyalla.

Wesley LifeForce facilitates networks that are located in Port Adelaide, Strathalbyn and Port Augusta. The networks are supported by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist and are encouraged to share their action plans, which they did recently at their conference, and their activities with other fellow networkers, and share the knowledge and expertise experienced from around Australia. The government is committed to the community development networks and the way we will move the suicide prevention networks forward.

The government is also working with Lifeline and *beyondblue* to assist these networks and providing small grant programs to the suicide network prevention activities across the state. I think someone said before that one suicide is one too many to people in our community and our state and this is so true. The tragedy of losing one of our community is rippled throughout our lives. The South Australian government is committed to working with and alongside anyone who is happy to fight the scourge of suicide in our society and to prevent its rise. We believe every life—and I personally believe every life—is valuable to our community, and no-one should be left behind to suffer the scourge on their own. I thank the member for Mount Gambier for moving the motion.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:47):** I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Mount Gambier, which states:

That this house—

- (a) notes the significant and unfortunate increase in the rates of suicide across the nation;
- (b) notes the motions of the member for Adelaide and the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins passed in this house and the other place on 24 November 2011 and 6 April 2011 respectively;
- (c) notes the subsequent development of the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy;
- (d) encourages the efforts of all community organisations that are already working hard in this sector to continue their valuable contributions to suicide prevention throughout South Australia; and
- (e) urges the government to build on the work of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist by increasing support for the ongoing establishment of suicide prevention networks in local communities.

I pay tribute to the member for Mount Gambier for bringing up this very important issue, and certainly commend the work of the Hon. John Dawkins of the other place, he having done much work in the sector of suicide prevention and assistance in setting up groups. He certainly has been valuable in setting up the group in Murray Bridge, which was only launched recently, on 17 October.

Suicide touches every community, big or small, and sadly it touches close on 2,500 people who commit suicide across Australia annually. As the member for Mount Gambier rightfully said, if this was happening on our roads we would be absolutely outraged with this number of deaths—and we have too many deaths on our roads. It touches every community.



The member for Taylor indicated the issue she came across in Strathalbyn, and certainly it has been noted that there is too high a rate of suicide in the Strathalbyn area. I represented that area in my first term. Elsewhere on the Fleurieu Peninsula, at Goolwa, there have been far too many suicides.

When you come from a very small community like I do at Coomandook, and when there is just one suicide of someone you know—and it does not matter whether they move somewhere else in the country or even overseas, you always feel it if something happens and someone decides to take their own life.

In the past few years I lost a very good friend who was 70 years old and I never would have thought it. It is very hard to pick the signs but he was suffering from depression. I did not even realise that he was suffering depression. Most recently I attended a funeral of a lad who was only 39, and he had some personal issues that were going against him and, sadly, he thought that the only way out was to commit suicide, and those circumstances are very sad in which he decided that that was the only way out.

As speakers have already said, people need to reach out, whether to friends, neighbours, pastors or groups like Lifeline and beyondblue, to make sure that we can keep these people alive and making great contributions to our community over time, instead of feeling that desperate that they feel the only way out is to take their lives.

I have been involved in the set-up of the Rural City of Murray Bridge Suicide Prevention Community Network Action Plan and that has been ongoing for many months. The Murray Bridge Suicide Prevention Community Network was only launched on 17 October and it was opened by the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC, the shadow minister for suicide prevention and mental health. This was linked to the Murray Bridge Mental Health Expo and the guest speaker that day was former senator, Mary Jo Fisher (who I am told gave a very illuminating speech—I had to leave and sadly attend a funeral further away in the state).

I would certainly like to acknowledge the interim chair, Jessica Ziersch, of the Murray Bridge Suicide Prevention Community Network and Jessica presented the action plan to mayor Allan Arbon. It was a great launch and there were two of us involved who pulled strings and balloons came down from the top of the stage and they had cards inside them for the agencies that people need to contact if they are having these negative thoughts.

The action plan that was launched that day links with the Australian Suicide Prevention Framework, the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy and the Rural City of Murray Bridge Strategic Plan. I would like to note that the Rural City of Murray Bridge, in collaboration with Lynne James, Project Officer, Suicide Prevention, at SA Health have led the way in the formation of the network and that has created the suicide prevention action plan for our community. I really congratulate the work that Lynne James has done alongside our council in Murray Bridge in getting this plan up and going.

As indicated earlier, the launch was followed by the Mental Health Expo. The goals and objectives of the Rural City of Murray Bridge Suicide Prevention Community Network are:

Goal 1: We will enhance awareness and community capacity to respond to suicide.

- Objective 1. Grow the network to be representative of the entire demographic of Murray Bridge
- Objective 2. Capacity building and education across the community
- Objective 3. Developing partnerships that build up the existing events/activities in the community to raise awareness
- Objective 4. Facilitating the partnering of network providers and worksite/community groups to raise awareness.

Goal 2: To be responsive to those bereaved by suicide.

- Objective 1. Saturate the community with postvention information
- Objective 2. To support those bereaved by suicide in the community.

Goal 3: We will capture community and organisational learning from all of our activities.

- Objective 1. We will evaluate the activities the network are involved in and capture the learning for future activities and understanding.

Goal 4: To maintain a healthy and vibrant network.

- Objective 1. To ensure the health and wellbeing of members of the network.

I have quite a long list of members of the network who contributed not just to setting up the Suicide Prevention Network in Murray Bridge but also in assisting with the launch and the planning day. I would just like to acknowledge all of them: former mayor Arbon, Rural City of Murray Bridge; myself as the state member for Hammond; the Hon. John Dawkins, as mentioned earlier, from the other place; Jessica Ziersch, interim chair, RDA Murraylands and Riverland; Michael de Nieuwe, interim vice chair, Murray Bridge Youth Inc.; Faith Box, interim secretary, Rural City of Murray Bridge; Leah McFarlane, interim treasurer, Medicare Local; Frances Eltridge, public officer, Country South SA Medicare Local; Tracey Wanganeen, action plan advocate, Uniting Communities StandBy Response; Leah Colman, action plan advocate, ac.care; Ed Thomas, ac.care—Reconnect; Jen Hayes, Carers SA—Young Carer Program; Graham Ruwoldt, Uniting Communities StandBy Response; Yvette van Berkel, Uniting Communities; Senior Sergeant Peter Sims, SAPOL; and Simon Moody, Community Mental Health Service.

Others were: Ceara Rickard, Life Without Barriers; Susan Everett, PHaMS; Stuart Kenny, Murray Bridge High School; Janet Kuys, Silent Ripples; Peri Strathearn, *The Murray Valley Standard*; Graham Adler, Murray Bridge South Primary School; Heather Courtney, Rural City of Murray Bridge; Shane Thompson, Mid Murray Council; Simone Zrna, Rural City of Murray Bridge; Laine Wilson, ac.care—Reconnect; Tom Haig, Migrant Resource Centre; Trevor Smith, Silent Ripples; Michelle Chambers, APEX Murraylands/Rural City of Murray Bridge; Merv Schopp, Murray Bridge Men's Shed; Rachel Agars, Headspace; Clinton Williams; Michelle Currie, Murray Bridge South Primary School; Tara Attrill; Maggie Rodgers, Uniting Communities; Natalie Migliaccio, Headspace; Mick Loechenhoff, Men's Shed; Rachel Titley, foster carer; Ralph Fewquandie, SA Health; Annemarie Klingenberg; Philip Galley, Medicare Local; and Bonny Gibson, Closing the Gap.

Those were just 42 of the people involved, and there have certainly been lots of others involved in setting up the network. I congratulate all the people that have been involved in setting up this network to prevent suicide in the community. It is something we always need to look out for. What saddens me is that over time we do lose people who have no inkling at all, and you just wish they would speak out or wish that you had an inkling and you could have gone and spoken to them to show that they do have support in the community. Everyone has their dark days and there really is not the need to end your life, because it causes so much pain to so many other people you leave behind.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:57):** I rise to support the motion:

That this house—

- (a) notes the significant and unfortunate increase in the rates of suicide across the nation;
- (b) notes the motions of the member for Adelaide and the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins passed in this house and in the other place on 24 November 2011 and 6 April 2011 respectively;
- (c) notes the subsequent development of the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy;
- (d) encourages the efforts of all community organisations that are already working hard in this sector to continue their valuable contributions to suicide prevention throughout South Australia; and
- (e) urges the government to build on the work of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist by increasing support for the ongoing establishment of suicide prevention networks in local communities.

I congratulate the member for Mount Gambier on bringing this motion to this house today and also on the quirky little point he raised about today's date, which of course is 13 November 2014. As he pointed out, if you write the date, it is 13/11/14, which aligns with 13 11 14, the direct line to Lifeline, which of course is an organisation so important for those people in need. I will come back to that shortly. The Hon. John Dawkins in the other place needs particular mention in the debate on this motion, because he brought the same motion to the upper house a little while ago and has done so much work in this area. He is to be congratulated for it: thank you for that.

Suicide is a tragedy that can touch anyone. It can touch any family at any time, and I would suggest there is probably a good number of members in this place who either personally knew somebody who has taken their own life or at least has known somebody within their family group who has decided to make the ultimate choice of attempting to or committing suicide.

The rates are rising. There are, apparently, 2,500 people per annum across the country who take their own life. It is almost the road toll, which is quite extraordinary. We talk about road safety and the road toll and all the activity that goes into attempting to reduce that, yet it seems that we talk very little, publicly at least, about what we can do about suicide rates, the help we can give to people and the ways in which we can reduce the devastating tragedy that is suicide.

It has been estimated that there are 30 attempts per day around the nation by people looking to take their own life, which is quite extraordinary. Seventy-seven per cent of all suicides are by males. I think, without being too dark about this, they are probably better at it. It is quite simple. They have the strategies that are more successful to take their own lives, and they have the capacity to do it if they really want to.

Rural suicides are high—higher than the national rate and higher than those across metropolitan areas—and there are a lot of causes for that. It may be lack of support or increased isolation but, certainly, the figures amongst rural Australia are much higher. Suicide rates amongst minority groups are also much higher. Aboriginal people are over-represented. I suspect it is probably true for other minority groups, such as gay and lesbian groups, who do not have the opportunity to reach out to support when they really need it.

As I mentioned earlier, we have probably all been touched at some point in our lives in that we have known somebody who has attempted suicide or taken their own life. That has certainly been the case for me. In fact, one suicide was quite a close friend of mine, and the devastation it caused for the family and the broader quite small country community was quite incredible, really. Of course, we all asked afterwards, 'Why?' and we all asked, 'What more could we have done?' There are no real answers to those questions, only that it has happened and those around are left to pick up the pieces, which can take years, sometimes, and sometimes a lifetime.

I am going to take a few lines from the Hon. John Dawkins' speech in the other place because he has contributed many times on this particular issue. I picked up on a meeting that he had attended and was talking about, and it was in relation to an organisation created by Anglicare SA. It is a new organisation, and I think a passage he quoted is worth reading into *Hansard* in this place as well. It comes from a page entitled A Cry for Help and it is directly from Anglicare. It reads:

Anglicare SA, in conjunction with Flinders Medical Centre's emergency department, is developing a vital pilot program to support individuals and their families at one of the hardest times of their lives—after a first suicide attempt. When this occurs, we know that they can be shocked, scared and they don't know what to do or where to turn. That's where Anglicare SA will step in—we will hear A Cry for Help...

A Cry for Help is a holistic early-intervention program to support individuals and families, linking them with support services and providing them with a toolkit of what they might expect and where they can seek and receive help. Trained Anglicare SA caseworkers will assist them to connect with services—it could be help with communication, psychological support, financial counselling or increasing community connections.

It goes on to describe how the pilot program will work:

When an individual presents at Flinders Medical Centre's emergency department after a first suicide attempt, the hospital will offer to connect them with Anglicare SA's A Cry For Help. The hospital will only make contact after receiving permission. The next of kin—family or friends—will also be offered contact with A Cry For Help. Then the individual or their family will receive a phone call to start the process. After assessment, ongoing support will be offered over the phone, in person and through linking people into existing support systems. Where there is a gap in services Anglicare SA will strive to fill it. It is expected that the support will be offered over a six-week period on average.

My congratulations go to Anglicare SA on this initiative. Of course, it is just one of a number of groups that provides support. The motion is not just about suicide; it is about suicide prevention, early intervention, assistance when it is needed and, as I said, there are many attempts each and every day right across Australia.

I will go back to the beginning of my speech and again make a reference to Lifeline. It is an organisation which has been around for many years, decades probably, and they are readily

available at the end of a telephone line each and every day, 24 hours a day. The phone number, for those who take the time to read this *Hansard* or the broader publications, is 13 11 14, for those who need assistance in their day-to-day life.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:06):** I rise to speak in support of this motion. I predict that all of us here have been touched by a tragic event of suicide. When you find yourself involved in this tragic life event, it gives rise to reflection on the life of a person whose story was incomplete and potential was unrealised and unfulfilled. It gives rise to questions of what might have been, what could have been, why this event even took place, and what could I or we have done to prevent it?

In my life I have experienced the event of suicide and its impacts on many occasions and on many levels, both as a professional in my working life and, sadly, on a personal level. Not one person whom I have known to have taken their life has left me untouched. Interwoven with the pain of grief and loss is the unknown of 'why' and the 'if onlys'.

The World Health Organisation has identified that around the world over 800,000 people take their own life annually, and they point out that this does not include the attempted suicides. For every suicide tragedy there is the affected family, friends and community who experience the long-lasting effects of this one very sad and lonely event. While it is recognised that suicide occurs throughout the lifespan, World Health Organisation research shows that it was the second leading cause of death among 15 to 29 year olds in 2012.

The World Health Organisation report aims to increase awareness of this significant public health issue of suicide and attempted suicide events. It aims to make suicide prevention a higher priority on the global public health agenda and it seeks to encourage and support countries to develop and/or strengthen comprehensive suicide prevention strategies with a multidisciplinary approach on a public health level.

Suicide is not simply an occurrence affecting populations of high income countries, but it is a global phenomenon in all regions of the world. In fact, statistics from 2012 reveal that 75 per cent of global suicides occurred in low and middle income countries. Suicide is a significant public health problem; however, the good news is that suicides are preventable with timely, evidence-based and often times low-cost interventions.

In countries such as Australia, while the link between suicide and mental disorders is well established, many suicides happen impulsively in moments of crisis with a breakdown in the ability to deal with life stresses such as financial problems, relationship breakdown or chronic pain and illness. Also strongly associated with suicidal behaviours are situations which involve experiencing conflict, disaster, violence, abuse, loss and a sense of isolation. Vulnerable groups may also experience higher suicide rates—groups who experience discrimination, such as refugees and migrants; Indigenous peoples; lesbian, gay bisexual, transgender and intersex persons; and, prisoners. Noteworthy is the fact that by far the strongest risk factor for suicide is a previous suicide attempt.

Suicides are preventable. There are a number of processes that can be implemented at many levels to prevent suicide and suicide attempts. These include:

- reducing access to the means of suicide;
- responsible reporting by media;
- early identification, treatment and care of people with mental and substance abuse histories, chronic pain and acute emotional distress;
- training of health workers in the assessment and management of suicidal behaviours; and
- follow-up care for people who attempt suicide and the provision of community care.

The World Health Organisation identifies collaboration and coordination among multiple levels of society, including the health sector and other sectors, such as education, labour, agriculture, business, justice, law, defence, politics, local community and the media to be essential. There is no

doubt that suicide is a complex issue. Suicide prevention determinants require comprehensive and integrated efforts as no one single approach alone can influence an issue as complex as suicide.

In addition to this, I will briefly mention a piece of research undertaken by some Canadian researchers into those who left suicide notes. While the study can be viewed as a snapshot, it reveals a notable trend. There are also other studies that replicate these findings. The researchers examined 20 suicide notes written by people who attempted suicide with 20 suicide notes written by people who successfully killed themselves. The notes were evaluated on five dimensions:

- Sense of burden—'Would my loved ones be better off without me?'
- Sense of emotional pain—'How much suffering is in my life?'
- Escaping negative feelings—'Is death the answer to ending this pain?'
- Altered social world—'Is death the answer to my troublesome social relationships?'
- Hopelessness—'Is there evidence that life is going to get any better?'

What they discovered is of interest: the major difference was that the notes of suicide completers included much more detail about how they were a burden on other people and society at large compared to the attempters. Apparently, this sense of burden was the only distinguishing dimension of the suicide letters of these two groups. The insight this research provides is overwhelming, as it revealed that hopelessness, degree of pain and the belief that death will end that pain were common themes in the letters of both groups.

From this research, the conclusion was drawn that, in general, people do not commit suicide because they are in pain: they commit suicide because they do not believe there is a reason to live, and that the world would be better off without them. How sad. Suicide is sad, and the sudden loss with it has wide and long-lasting ramifications for those affected. We all have a responsibility to do what we can when we can to arrest this situation. I acknowledge the good work of our state government and also the good work of our committed professionals, clinicians and volunteers who work in this very critical area. Every life is worth living.

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:13):** I rise today to support the motion on suicide prevention and awareness, as put forward by the member for Mount Gambier, and thank him for doing so. Many of us have been touched in some way by the death of an individual who has taken their own life. Preventing suicide and the impact it has on individuals, families and the community is the responsibility of all.

As has been pointed out previously, suicide is a prominent public health concern. Over the past five years, the average number of suicide deaths per year is 2,415—significantly higher numbers than the national road toll—and more than 65,000 make an attempt at suicide. In 2012, 1,901 males and 634 females died by suicide—a total of 2,535 deaths, which equates to an average of 6.9 deaths by suicide in Australia each day.

For those of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent, the relative age standardised suicide rate is 2.5 times higher for males and 3.4 times higher for females than in the corresponding non-Indigenous population. Suicide rates in Australia peaked in 1963 at 17.5 per 100,000, declining to 11.3 per 100,000 in 1984 and climbing back to 14.6 in 1997. Rates have been lower than this since that year. The age standardised suicide rate for persons in 2012 was 11.2 per 100,000. Seventy-seven per cent of people who die by suicide are males and 25 per cent are females.

There is an unwritten rule in the media not to report suicides to prevent copycat situations. Given those numbers, perhaps this is something that needs to be re-addressed and/or re-explained. Because suicides are not reported in the media, it must be noted that it does not mean they do not happen. I know a sensitivity must be shown in these situations, but perhaps more public awareness is needed and something that could be considered.

In recent years, in 2008 to 2012, the highest state-based standardised suicide rates were in the Northern Territory at 18.1 per 100,000 and Tasmania at 14.1 per 100,000, followed by Western Australia at 13.5, Queensland at 13 and South Australia at 11.8 per 100,000. Below them sat Victoria, the ACT and New South Wales.

I would like to commend a lot of groups that do a lot of good work in this field as well. You can see from those numbers that it is not good, and improvement in this area is greatly needed. I would like to commend the people who organised the R U OK Day, which took place on 11 September this year. It is a day to increase awareness of suicide prevention and encourage people to ask 'Are you okay?' to all those around them. Feeling connected is an important part of suicide prevention, and it is crucial we help others feel they belong, as a step towards lowering the number of suicides worldwide.

The thing I note about R U OK Day is that it is a great thing to do, as we did this year on Thursday 11 September, but it is something that can be done every day. To bring that awareness to people to care for those around them, I think is absolutely exemplary. Wednesday 10 September was World Suicide Prevention Day. This year the international theme was Suicide Prevention: One World Connected. The theme seeks to encourage connections between individuals, support services and countries in an attempt to reduce suicide and seek help for those needing it.

Suicide is the leading cause of death in Australia for men aged under 44 years and women aged under 34. In fact, the numbers show that seven Australians take their own lives every day. For every suicide there are tragic ripple effects for friends, families, colleagues and the broader community, and I will talk about that in a few moments.

Just as a reminder, I know phone numbers have been thrown around, but if someone you care about is in a crisis and you think immediate action is needed, call emergency services on 000, contact your doctor or local mental health crisis services or go to your local hospital emergency department. Do not leave the person alone unless you are concerned for your own safety.

I mentioned some of the great groups that work in this area, R U OK Day being an example. Another group that does marvellous work in this area is the *beyondblue* group, which is headed by former Victorian premier Jeff Kennett. They make some really good points about understanding suicide. Some of the key factors associated with suicide are varied and complex. Predicting who will take their life is extremely difficult, even for experienced professionals, and it is why, I think, when it does happen—people in this house have mentioned today the experiences they have had, and indeed I have had those same experiences—you sit there and you always ask yourself the question 'Why?' In most cases you had no idea that it was on the agenda for the person who did suicide.

There are several common characteristics of suicide, including a sense of unbearable psychological pain, a sense of isolation from others, lack of belonging, feeling trapped and hopeless and a burden on others, and the perception that death is the only solution when the individual is temporarily not able to think clearly, due to being blinded by overwhelming pain and suffering. There are also excruciating negative emotions, including sharing guilt, anger, fear and sadness, and they frequently serve as the foundation for self-destructive behaviour. These emotions may arise from any number of sources.

The most common condition associated with suicide is depression, and that is something that people deal with daily. I must point out that depression is not like other medical ailments—for example, a broken leg. When you fit a cast to a broken leg, you generally wait six to eight weeks, do some physio and, more often than not, people move on and are back in the recovery phase.

The recovery process for depression is not necessarily that clear. There is not a beginning, middle and end as such. Some people will only experience one episode of depression or anxiety in their life while others may go on to have another episode or experience recurring symptoms of depression and/or anxiety. Staying healthy both mentally and physically is not a sprint or a fad diet: it is a long-term life plan which, for all of us, requires work each and every single day, and that is where some of those groups come in.

Again, the member for Mt Gambier cleverly gave the number for Lifeline as today's date, being 13 11 14, which is incredibly clever. Any way we can publicise these ways of communicating or enabling people to communicate with professionals is fantastic. Kids Helpline is another, ReachOut is another, there is Headspace, and I have mentioned *beyondblue*. The Men's Shed programs fit into this space as well. We have them in Trott Park in my electorate and also in Reynella in my electorate. They do a marvellous job just to allow people to talk and share their emotions and time.

I would also like to commend the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place. When campaigning ahead of the last election, I held a seminar at the Reynella East College on suicide prevention. We had 15 or so people come along. It was a great event at which to hear from people in the community and to enlighten people in the community about the help you can get, things you can do and ways you can have yourself heard and helped, which seems to be a very common factor in suicide prevention with people who are suffering and looking for that added support.

Speaking of support, something that needs to be mentioned in this as well are the people who are left after suicide. They should not be forgotten in this either. Often, support is needed for those people. When coping with the loss of a friend or family member from suicide, people often feel a sense of unreality and numbness and have nightmares, intrusive thoughts, feelings of guilt and failure that they could not prevent it, as I pointed out earlier, feelings of perceived failure in responsibilities and a sense of blame. The list goes on, but these points are very real:

- the feeling of rejection and abandonment;
- anger towards the person who has suicided;
- personal diminishment because of experiencing the suicide and a reflection of the quality of the relationship with the person; and
- a sense of shame and stigma that other people will think negatively about you and your family, as well as the person who died. Sometimes this can result in feeling alone and wanting to withdraw from others.

Suicide bereaved people need compassion, as well as recognition and validation of their experience. In summary, if you are dealing with someone you are supporting in this situation, it is important to be non-judgemental in your support and offer an opportunity for them to tell their story. Sometimes, they will need to tell it over and over again to put them in a good space and help them grieve their loss. A safe and supportive environment is also needed, and it is also important for the person to be deeply listened to and heard and to express their grief in their own way.

In concluding, again I commend the member for Mount Gambier for bringing this motion before the house. Suicide is a very serious and real situation for the whole of the community, not only people who are feeling depressed. Any way we can help over time is vitally important.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:23):** I would like to thank all members for their contribution today, and especially commend the work of John Dawkins in the other place. I urge the house to support this motion, and I close the debate.

Motion carried.

## MURRAY RIVER

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:24):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of the River Murray to South Australia;
- (b) acknowledges the contribution from irrigated agriculture to the economy;
- (c) values the important role of the River Murray in sustaining the environment; and
- (d) commends the introduction and the rollout of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

Obviously the River Murray has been a passion of mine for many years. It is a platform that my electorate relies on. It is the lifeblood that my business relied on for a quarter of a century. The River Murray has been very topical forever, but particularly in this place through its relevance and our need to rely on the Murray since the drought, which started in about 2000.

I will give a little bit of history before I go on. The reason we have an economic base is that in about 1914 the River Murray Waters Act was passed. It was passed to create a River Murray commission. The vision was to fill the river valley with valuable water as a commodity to create jobs, build an economic base and to grow food. Water that once flowed out to sea would now be captured

and would create an opportunity to grow food. It created jobs, particularly after World War I and World War II.

In South Australia, we started at Blanchetown and built Lock 1 in 1922. That continued through to 1930 when Lock 6 was completed up at Murtho. Of course, the barrages were completed in 1940 to complement the damming of water in South Australia, to create an industry that this state desperately needed, particularly after those wars, as I said. There are many different types of structures and many different reasons for those structures being put where they have been put. I have been lucky enough to watch the building of a weir at the Chowilla Floodplain and it is an amazing feat of construction to put coffer dams in and to build a structure across the river not only for the purpose of environmental and economic benefit but also to sustain the assets that come away from the river.

I am hoping that members on both sides will make a contribution today, because of the importance of the river to all South Australians—the 640 kilometres of river that flows into the state, from the border down to the mouth, and what it represents from kilometre No. 1 to kilometre No. 640. Obviously, the River Murray is one of the state's most important natural resources and it is the main source of water not only to Adelaide but to the greater state of South Australia. We have the Morgan to Whyalla pipeline and the continuation of the pipes to the Eyre Peninsula, we have the pipes from Tailem Bend down into the South-East, but we also have the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline that puts water into our reservoirs.

The River Murray is of importance particularly to Adelaide because in a normal year it provides about 60 per cent of the city's water supply, and in a dry year it provides up to 90 per cent of the water supply to people right across the state. The river is also important to the regional communities that it supports and the economic base that it provides, and is the lifeblood of my electorate of Chaffey in particular. The river provides for about one-third of the national food supply.

I will be quite brief and broad about the statistics of the importance of the river, because there are so many stats, so much importance and so many economies that come away from the River Murray. Of course, the River Murray is the main source of irrigation for about 4,000 small businesses, particularly in the electorate of Chaffey, but it supports more than that. It supports businesses in the electorates of Stuart, Schubert, Hammond, and MacKillop. It also supports a water security base for the majority of South Australia.

I do not think we can forget the importance of the River Murray, particularly during the drought. The reason I have put up this motion is that during drought, the economic base, the irrigation communities, gave up their water for the people of Adelaide, for the greater country communities, to have a water supply, so that when they turned on their tap there was water. In doing so, it really did destroy many financial bases in river communities.

Many businesses were cash-strapped and many went broke. Many businesses decided to throw the keys on the bank manager's table and move on to other pastures. It really was a very sad state of affairs. From listening to the member for Mount Gambier's previous motion, there were many suicide events, there was a lot of depression, and huge family structural adjustments were made to deal with the drought and turning off water on properties.

Many people treated their properties like a part of their family, so to turn off water on sections of their property was almost like turning off the lifeline to one of their family members. It is something I think all people in this chamber should recognise—that those river communities gave up their lifeblood for the benefit of their cousins in metropolitan Adelaide, in industry and around country South Australia, to make sure they had a continuous water supply.

The Murray-Darling Basin, as a bigger picture, is home to approximately two million people and supports almost three-quarters of irrigated agriculture in Australia. Agricultural production from the basin represents about 41 per cent of the national output from rural industries. It is not just about rural industries; it is about industries in South Australia, in metropolitan Adelaide. Many of those industries were not affected by the drought because, as they know, industrial water was not restricted.

People had water restrictions in their homes, but the restriction was not about production. It was about having to restrict water for their gardens and having to shower at certain times of the day.



It was about being responsible and being challenged on how to use water more wisely. People did learn: they changed their garden watering and their showering techniques, they changed their nozzles and they changed a lot of infrastructure. People learnt very quickly how they could do more with less water.

The environmental and social value to South Australia is huge. I think some of the irrigators in the river communities need to be commended for being great guardians and managers of the environmental assets that come with the river and that come with the responsibility of using the river water and it is important that they be acknowledged. The tag of irrigation as environmental vandalism is a furphy, as these irrigators and irrigation groups are great custodians of the river and of the environment they manage and look after. They are the eyes and ears of the river.

Let's face it, some of these minority groups come out and look for more water and want more rights for the environment, but I ask: how many times have they ever been out and done a bird count? How many times have they ever been out and done fish counts? How many times have they ever been out and done tree counts and endangered species counts? When do they ever go out there and actually get their hands dirty on the ground like the river communities, like the irrigators and like the community groups do? The irrigators go out there and they are the eyes and ears of the environment around the river, so again I commend them.

The River Murray supplies about 40 per cent of the water needs of all South Australian communities, and much of this water is delivered through pipelines. The Riverland alone contributes about 60 per cent of South Australia's wine grapes, 95 per cent of the state's citrus, 90 per cent of stone fruit and 98 per cent of the state's almond industry. I would like to touch on the almond industry, which is booming at the moment. It is one of the saviours within the economic base in river communities because it is really going along nicely.

I commend the industry for what it has done over the last number of years to be in such a strong position. It is a small player on the world market, but the South Australian almond industry is a world leader in efficiencies and growing tons per acre. Once upon a time, growers would see one ton to the acre as instrumental to the wealth of the industry, and nowadays we are looking at four tonnes to the hectare, so that is a huge win for that industry.

I will move on a little bit, but when acknowledging the importance of the river I must just reflect on the reason that South Australia capped its take: it was an agreement. Back in the early seventies, South Australia's allocation was about 1.25 million acre-feet, which in today's language is about 1,500 gigalitres. They negotiated to have some storage in the newly-built Dartmouth Dam and they would then be reallocated 1,850 gigalitres, which is South Australia's entitlement. Along the way, we hear about how well South Australia has done with efficiency gains and how great it has been with water use. The reason is that we were capped way back then, so we have had to do more with less water. I commend the government of the day and I commend the water users and irrigators over time.

One of the important industries on the river is tourism: the Riverland, \$142 million per year; the Murraylands, \$97 million a year; 1.2 million visitor nights in the Riverland alone, and the Murraylands represents about 655,000 visitor nights. It is a very important industry. There is recreational fishing and houseboating. We go up there for the river experience, for food and wine and the golf courses. All that industry is a great boon for South Australia and so again the river generates another economy. It is not just about irrigation and it is not just about supporting communities: it is about what it means to our economy.

I have talked briefly about the drought and the impacts of the drought—what it means to the environment, what it means to the communities and what it means to the economy. Many South Australians are not aware of this but, as we speak, we are looking at the Murray Mouth having to be dredged. It is a sad indictment, particularly in South Australia, that we have been rolling out this basin plan and while governments (whether they be federal governments or, particularly, state governments) are taking away our economic base and taking water away from our communities and irrigators, they have achieved nothing when it comes to environmental works and measures.

When we look below Lock 1, nothing has been achieved. We had the opportunity to put a scoping study in place to put more environmental works in train. It is a highly-regulated river system

in South Australia, so continuing to engineer our waterway is the only way we are going to better manage it. We look at the impacts at the Coorong and the salinity impacts at the Lower Lakes, particularly at Lake Albert, we look at the mouth silting up and we look at the barrages being old.

The state government has done nothing: they are all about political spin. I did not want to have to bring any politics into this, but it really does grind my gears that we have a Premier who spends \$2 million of taxpayers' money but today has achieved nothing. Not one piece of engineering or environmental works below Lock 1 has been achieved—not one thing. When we have our next dry, which we are about to embark on as we speak, nothing will have been achieved. They have planted a few trees and that is about it. I think it is a very sad indictment.

Just quickly, before I run out of time, I am sad to hear the minister in another place say that we want to continue to buy back water and not improve our infrastructure. That is a sad indictment of this minister's thinking. I will continue my remarks at the closing of this motion.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:39):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of the River Murray to South Australia;
- (b) acknowledges the contribution from irrigated agriculture to the economy;
- (c) values the important role of the River Murray in sustaining the environment;
- (d) commends the introduction and the rollout of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan; and
- (e) recognises the leadership of Premier Weatherill in bringing together industry and the community in the fight to achieve the basin plan which will ensure the future health of the River Murray.

As residents in the downstream state, South Australians have long recognised the importance of a healthy River Murray for our communities and our environment. The prosperity of the region and the long-term viability and productivity of river-dependent industries is linked to the environmental health of the river system. That is why our government, under Premier Weatherill's strong and visionary leadership, stood together with industry and community to fight relentlessly for a final Murray-Darling Basin Plan—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We have a point of order from the member for Morialta.

**Mr GARDNER:** The member for Reynell keeps referring to her leader by his name, which is inappropriate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members need to be referred to by their seat, not their name.

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana has a point of order.

**Mr PICTON:** I think the same goes for the member for Morialta as well; he needs to refer to members by their name.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure he will. The member for Reynell has the call.

**Ms HILDYARD:** It was through South Australia's collective efforts that \$1.77 billion was secured to recover 450 gigalitres more environmental water than was initially intended—

**Mr Whetstone:** No, he said 4,000 or High Court challenge.

**Ms HILDYARD:** —and to address constraints to delivering that water.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms HILDYARD:** The basin plan will help support the delivery of critical human water needs during drought, help secure the quality of our River Murray water supply, improve the effectiveness of the water market, help keep the Murray Mouth open, and provide environmental water—

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HILDYARD:** —to internationally-important River Murray—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sit down; I am on my feet! The business of the house is to continue in decorum and quiet. It is out of order to interject. All members will be offered the ability to speak in a silent chamber. I ask you all to cooperate. Member for Reynell.

**Ms HILDYARD:** The basin plan will provide environmental water to internationally important River Murray wetlands and flood plains.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

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

**Ms HILDYARD:** And let us not forget that as a result of South Australia's campaign, our government secured around \$445 million in commonwealth government funding for water recovery, industry development, regional development, regeneration, environmental works and measures projects that will provide benefits for both the environment and our irrigation and regional communities.

We have already made significant progress in implementing the \$265 million South Australian River Murray Sustainability Irrigation Industry Improvement Program, with the member for Cheltenham announcing in July that grants totalling more than \$100 million would be delivered to almost 100 South Australian River Murray irrigation and industry projects.

A further \$25 million has also been allocated in support of the \$12.5 million Regional Development and Innovation Fund, the \$5 million Industry-led Research Sub-Program, and the \$7.5 million Loxton Research Centre Redevelopment. To add to this, our government also secured an allocation of \$25 million from the \$100 million Murray-Darling Basin Regional Economic Diversification Program.

**Mr Pederick:** Yes, and what have you done with it?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned for the first time.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Of this fund, \$5 million has already been committed to the Murray Bridge Racing Club for the development of a multipurpose conference and convention centre at Gifford Hill.

**An honourable member:** Thank you.

**Ms HILDYARD:** It is a pleasure. To improve environmental outcomes under the basin plan, \$155 million has been secured for environmental watering infrastructure on the Pike and Katarapko River Murray flood plains near Berri.

This package of projects will support our premium food and wine industry and the irrigation sector into the future. Importantly, this activity will be built on a clean environment and a healthy river system. Our current challenge is to effectively implement the basin plan and ensure all of its objectives are realised. Our government will continue to work with industry and communities and will remain proactive and vigilant to ensure that the basin plan is successfully implemented and that other basin states also meet their obligations.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:45):** Deputy Speaker, can I move a further amendment?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you have it written down, of course you can.

**Mr KNOLL:** I certainly do. I move that the motion be considered in an amended form by deleting all words after 'That this house—' and replacing them with:

- (a) recognises the importance of the River Murray to South Australia;
- (b) acknowledges the contribution from irrigated agriculture to the economy;
- (c) values the important role of the River Murray in sustaining the environment; and
- (d) commends the introduction and the rollout of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is the original motion; it is not an amendment.

**Mr KNOLL:** It is an amendment to the amended motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, you are speaking to the original motion and we would like you to speak now.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Schubert has the call, and I do not want to hear another voice.

**Mr KNOLL:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Most people affiliate rivers of wine rather than rivers of water with the seat of Schubert; however, my seat does extend from the Barossa to the borders of the River Murray, from the south-east of Mannum to just south of Blanchetown, and I am pleased to have about a 100-kilometre stretch of the 2,500-kilometre river in my electorate.

In fact, this weekend we have the inaugural 'All Steamed Up' Engine, Blacksmith and Boat Festival at Mannum. There is a whole weekend worth of festivities. It will be happening on the banks of the Murray River and the Mannum Dock Museum. I encourage all of you, especially on Saturday, to get along there if you can. There will be a freshwater classic from Arnold Park to Caloote; the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the recommissioning of the PS *Marion*, a very beautiful vessel that graces my stretch of the water; a captain's dinner; and short cruises along the river.

Something many South Australians and many Barossans have grown up with is a pastime called going to the river, or going upriver—which I have done on a number of occasions—for weekends or day trips, to just chat around a campfire, responsibly enjoying a couple of alcoholic drinks (most likely Barossa Shiraz), getting behind a ski boat, staying at shacks just relaxing or enjoying catching up with friends. It is a pastime that many South Australians do.

These weekends or day trips up the river are significant to our local economy. Indeed, South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) research into the value of regional tourism has found that for the three-year annual average to 14 June, tourism expenditure in the Murraylands was \$97 million and \$142 million in the Riverland, in the great seat of Chaffey. Seventy-eight per cent of visitors to the Murraylands and 76 per cent of visitors to the Riverland are intrastate visitors. What we are seeing here is the ability of South Australians to be tourists in their own state. I think it is very important, as we compete in a national and an international tourism market, that these two regions are able to keep people here in South Australia spending their money.

If we compare this \$97 million from the Murraylands to the other part of my electorate, the Barossa, there is \$150 million a year in expenditure. So when we think about the Barossa as one of the real icons of tourism in South Australia, the Murraylands and the Riverland combined, the river, competes very well. In fact, it is a larger part of our tourism economy. In the Barossa, only 58 per cent are intrastate visitors. The river provides water for the state's production of wine grapes, potatoes and onions.

The Riverland itself and the Murraylands hosts the largest family-owned business in South Australia. It contributes \$2.2 billion of the state's estimated \$15 billion food and production with focus around fruit, milk, vegetables, meat and grain production and processing. The Murraylands and the Riverland areas provide a lot of return to our state, and the river is very much central to that.

The Murray-Darling Basin Authority figures tell us that irrigated agricultural production in the basin accounts for 49 per cent of Australia's irrigated produce: almost half of Australia's irrigated produce relies on the river; nearly 100 per cent of Australia's rice; 94 per cent of Australia's cotton; 74 per cent of Australia's grapes; 60 per cent of Australia's hay; and 59 per cent of Australia's production of sheep and livestock.

However, apart from the tourism element, apart from the broader irrigated agriculture element, one little-known way that the river has been instrumental to the growth and success of the Barossa economy has been through the Barossa Infrastructure Ltd Scheme. This is a scheme where grape growers got together and invested in their own pipeline, in their own water infrastructure and bought Murray water licences in order to get a more secure supply of water to the Barossa Valley.

Currently, approximately 50 per cent of the water used to grow grapes in the Barossa (inarguably the best grapes in the world) comes from River Murray water. Without this source of

water we would see a greater reliance on underwater and surface water resources which are increasingly becoming saltier and are increasingly coming less reliable. The Barossa would not be what it is today without Bill and without the ability to get water from the river. It is an essential part of the Barossa economy.

The river is also very important to our environment, and the basin plan that we celebrate aims to increase the amount of water for the environment of the Murray-Darling Basin, ensuring sufficient water for all users. There are numerous initiatives under way. I read on 28 October in the *Murray Valley Standard*—and the member for Chaffey talked about this before—the dredging of the Murray Mouth will likely be necessary this summer as the condition of the mouth has deteriorated very rapidly. I commend the federal government and the Murray-Darling Basin states for agreeing to commit \$4 million to ensure that the Murray Mouth does not close completely. I know that is something very dear to the heart of the member for Hammond.

The argument we have today should not be around the environment on one hand and agricultural users on the other. In fact, Senator Birmingham, who has charge of this area in the federal government, said in a speech last year:

Debates about the future of the Murray-Darling Basin should not and cannot be reduced to a choice between the environment and agriculture.

That statement is extremely true and those who understand it best are the farmers who work with the river themselves. As I travel my electorate and talk to farmers, and also tourism operators, they are all very keenly aware of the health of their river. They can see it; they live amongst it and they work with it. They are invariably the best custodians of it because they live and breathe it and it is very much the basis of their livelihood. I say, in moving forward, that we need to move beyond this simplistic debate and realise that we need to have a coordinated approach to looking after the health of the river.

The Murray-Darling Basin Plan itself was an historic milestone. It was supposed to be 4,000 gigs or a High Court challenge, it can return 3,200 gigs to the river. The benefits include supporting the delivery of critical human water needs, keeping the Murray Mouth open, flushing salt from the system and providing environmental flows to precious River Murray wetlands and flood plains.

This motion is extremely important because of the importance of the River Murray to this state. It is also important to bring this to the attention of the house because we are at the bottom end of the system. We are the ones who are invariably the beneficiaries or the ones who are punished by decisions that are made upstream. We are the ones who have to deal with the consequences of the oftentimes poor management, over the history of this country, of the River Murray. Again, I thank the member for Chaffey for bringing this to the attention of the house. It is extremely worthy and extremely important and I have been very glad, on behalf of the people of Schubert, to have been able to contribute.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond—and I will make sure no-one speaks over the top of you.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:54):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker; I really appreciate—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That means you.

**Mr PEDERICK:** —your much-needed protection, and hope that members on the other side will take heed. I acknowledge the motion moved by the member for Chaffey, that this house recognises the importance of the River Murray to South Australia, acknowledges the contribution from irrigated agriculture to the economy, values the important role of the River Murray in sustaining the environment, and commends the introduction and the rollout of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

I acknowledge the attempted amendment of the member for Reynell, inasmuch as I was very pleased to hear the acknowledgement of the diversification fund, the \$100 million fund across the four states of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. It is interesting to note that the three other states have got on with this funding program, as far as I am aware, yet here in

South Australia we have not seen that \$25 million rolled out. However, what I was pleased to hear in the member for Reynell's contribution is the fact that she mentioned that Gifford Hill at Murray Bridge was still to get that \$5 million. I am pleased to hear that, because I have been hearing so many rumours about that \$5 million.

I would like to acknowledge our federal government, in particular the minister and member for Mayo, Jamie Briggs, in announcing that that money would be made available to Murray Bridge, and especially to the racing club development. That was made before the state election this year. In line with that, those of us on this side of the house, as far as the state Liberals go, had paired another \$5 million as a grant and \$10 million as a loan to that project. I believe that project, over 30 to 40 years, will stimulate at least \$1 billion in investment in the local region around Murray Bridge.

Some people have asked me why I support racing so much, but it is not so much about the racing industry, with this project, but about getting the racing club out to a track—the actual new track is being developed—and there is also going to be a 3,500-allotment housing development there over time as well as a school, and potentially a tavern. It will be like a major suburb of Murray Bridge. So it is about regional development, and I would like to know whether the regional development minister has been making any comment about this with his Labor friends.

It is a big project, and it is in limbo at the moment because it is still awaiting these federal funds. I am fairly hopeful that the state government will match the funding commitments that we made in opposition, going into the last election, because this is something that will be a dynamic proposal if it can just get a little help to get going. There has been about \$50 million already expended on the site, the track is in place, there is a tunnel to get the horses through the centre of the track, and there is the potential for an artificial track so that racing can be held when other places are rained out. That is all in the planning stage to go there, and the built facilities—the grandstand and club house facilities—need to be built as well.

So there is a lot of potential there, and I just want to see the government look at a project like this and see what it can do as far as contributing to a regional economy that has really suffered during the drought. I can assure members that the period from 2006 to when the drought broke in about September 2010 was a very, very trying time not just for the state but also for river communities like mine and like those in the seat of Hammond, which were heavily impacted when the river dropped by about two metres. I thank you for your protection today, Deputy Speaker, and seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debated adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—Annual Report 2013-14 [Ordered to be published]

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency—Annual Report 2013-14

Country Health SA Local Health Network Inc—Annual Report 2013-14

Department for Health and Ageing—Annual Report 2013-14

Health Advisory Council—

Balaklava Riverton Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Barossa and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Berri Barmera Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Bordertown and District Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Ceduna District Health Services Health Advisory Council Inc

Annual Report 2013-14

Central Adelaide Local Health Network Annual Report 2013-14

Central Adelaide Local Health Network Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Coorong Health Service Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Country Health SA Local Health Network Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Eastern Eyre Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Eudunda Kapunda Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Gawler District Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Hawker District Memorial Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Hills Area Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Kangaroo Island Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Leigh Creek Health Services Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Lower Eyre Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Lower North Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Loxton and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Mallee Health Service Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Mannum District Hospital Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Mid North Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Millicent and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Mount Gambier and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Naracoorte Area Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Northern Adelaide Local Health Network Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Northern Yorke Peninsula Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Penola and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Port Broughton District Hospital and Health Services Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Port Lincoln Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Port Pirie Health Service Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Renmark Paringa District Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

SA Ambulance Service—Volunteer Health Advisory Council  
Annual Report 2013-14

South Australian Medical Education and Training Health Advisory Council  
Annual Report 2013-14

South Coast Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Southern Adelaide Local Network Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Southern Flinders Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Veterans Health Advisory Council Annual Report 2013-14

Waikerie and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Women's and Children's Health Network Health Advisory Council Inc  
Annual Report 2013-14

Yorke Peninsula Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner of South Australia—  
Annual Report 2013-14

Health Performance Council—Annual Report 2013-14

Lifetime Support Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

Northern Adelaide Local Health Network—Annual Report 2013-14

Pharmacy Regulation Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

SA Ambulance Service—Annual Report 2013-14

South Australian Community Visitor Scheme—Annual Report 2013-14

South Australian Public Health Council—Annual Report 2013-14

Southern Adelaide Local Health Network—Annual Report 2013-14

Women's and Children's Health Network—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Chief Psychiatrist of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14  
Controlled Substances Advisory Council—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Adelaide Festival Centre—Annual Report 2013-14  
Adelaide Festival Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14  
Adelaide Film Festival—Annual Report 2013-14  
Art Gallery of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14  
Carclew—Annual Report 2013-14  
Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2013-14  
History Trust of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14  
JamFactory Contemporary Craft and Design Inc—Annual Report 2013-14  
Libraries Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14  
South Australian Museum Board—Annual Report 2013-14  
State Opera of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14  
State Theatre Company of SA—Annual Report 2013-14  
Windmill Theatre—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Council for the Care of Children—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Police (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Hydroponics Industry Control Act 2009—Annual Report 2013-14  
Protective Security Act 2007—Annual Report 2013-14  
South Australia Police—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

The Department for Correctional Services—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Road Safety (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

South Australia's Road Safety—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Defence Industries (Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith)—

Defence SA—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2013-14

*Ministerial Statement*

**SUCH, HON. R.B.**

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I rise to advise the house that an event celebrating the life of Bob Such will be held at Flinders University on Sunday 23 November, between 10.30am and midday. Members of Bob Such's family will be speaking at the celebration, and it will be my pleasure to join them to share my reflections on Bob's contribution to our fine state. Members of the community



will also be given the opportunity to speak about their relationship with Bob and his life's work. This will be followed by a morning tea.

There will be a notification in the *Southern Times Messenger* and a funeral notice will be placed in *The Advertiser*. Invitations will be distributed shortly by the protocol unit in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. These arrangements have been made in accordance with the wishes of Lyn Such. I look forward to joining members at the celebration.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT**

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:07):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am pleased to inform the house that a very short time ago I received the official results of the ballot for the Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement: Salaried 2014. The results show that 71.95 per cent of those voting supported the new agreement. This is a clear endorsement of the government's approach to reforming public sector employment arrangements.

The WPEA Salaried Agreement applies to approximately 37,000 employees in a range of salaried occupations, such as general administrative employees, legal officers, correctional officers, professional officers (such as librarians, architects and engineers), allied health professionals (such as physiotherapists, radiographers and social workers), medical scientists, operational employees (such as youth workers and residential care workers) and technical officers.

I am delighted that an overwhelming majority of South Australian public servants have voted in favour of this agreement and I appreciate the work of the PSA in reaching this outcome. My thanks go to the public servants who took time to consider the proposed agreement and voted in favour of our proposition. This government is committed to fundamental reform as detailed in the 'A Modern Public Service' policy issued before the state election.

The centrepiece of the new agreement is the introduction of a new redeployment, retraining and redundancy policy which focuses on the redeployment and retraining of excess employees covered by the proposed enterprise agreement. This will play a crucial role in supporting the government's vision of a modern public sector that works together with citizens, businesses and communities to deliver results for South Australia. Once the agreement is approved by the Industrial Relations Court, we will be able to implement the reforms that will allow us to develop a more modern and efficient Public Service.

#### *Members*

#### **DAVENPORT BY-ELECTION**

**The SPEAKER (14:09):** I inform the house that last week I wrote to the Electoral Commissioner consulting her about suitable dates for the Davenport by-election. The Electoral Commissioner gave me suggestions as to the timetable, but the decision remains mine alone under the Electoral Act.

I have resolved that the writ will issue on 3 January, the rolls will close on 13 January, nominations will close on 16 January and polling will be on 31 January. On that timetable, the writ should be returned and the new member able to sit when parliament resumes in the new year.

#### *Question Time*

#### **NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the reports today by SASMOA that the Noarlunga emergency department had no doctor on a Saturday night last month, will the minister rule out any suggestions that he or his department is considering only opening the emergency department between nine and five on weekdays?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10):** I think it would be highly unlikely that we would be moving to a nine to five operation for the emergency department at Noarlunga.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I have seen the reports from the doctors union into Noarlunga Hospital. I am concerned about those reports. My understanding is that the chief executive of the southern area local health network has had a meeting with SASMOA to discuss these reports, and I will be looking to get a report back on those allegations as soon as possible.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, leader.

#### NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** Is the minister saying that it is highly unlikely but not impossible that the emergency department will not be either closed or scaled down?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11):** I am saying it is highly unlikely what the Leader of the Opposition alleged, that is, that we would operate the emergency department at the Noarlunga Hospital on a Monday to Friday nine to five basis.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, leader.

#### NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** Is the minister prepared to rule out the possibility of scaling back the emergency department at the Noarlunga Hospital?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11):** We have been through this all this week and I have consistently said I am not playing the rule-in, rule-out game.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary.

#### NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** What is the minister's response to the SASMOA report which was released today that highlights that the safety of patients in Noarlunga Hospital relies on access to emergency department doctors after hours and, and I quote, 'It is no longer necessarily a safe or predictable environment'?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:12):** I answered that in my response to the first question if the Leader of the Opposition was listening.

#### NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My supplementary, therefore, is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General indicate to the house whether or not he will be implementing the recommendation of the report which states that SASMOA seeks the intervention of SafeWork SA on receipt of this report to conduct a formal investigation into these matters?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:12):** If the doctors union has forwarded this information to SafeWork SA, I would imagine SafeWork SA will deal with it in the usual manner.

### MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:12):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Will the minister inform the house of any recent analysis of the importance of the resources sector?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, can you help us?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:13):** I will do my very best to inform the house, sir. By now, I am sure, I hope, that most members know of the importance of harnessing our state's rich resource potential. That is why the Premier has made expanding our resources sector the first of our economic priorities for South Australia.

Our state is blessed with an abundance of minerals, oil and gas, and renewable energy resources and for the first time in our history, we are in the right place at the right time. We are no longer cursed by the tyranny of distance, and we are now poised to capitalise on our proximity to growing markets in Asia. For decades, through bipartisan support for this sector, we have established highly-regarded geoscience initiatives, an internationally respected regulatory framework and a highly-skilled workforce to realise the opportunities presented by our resource potential.

However, in the current global economic climate, South Australia faces challenges in expanding its resource sector. The government recognises we can and we must do more. We need to support new technologies, address the difficulties of deep cover and drive down extraction costs through innovation and partnerships—partnerships formed by a strong government working with industry, academia and, of course, the community.

We know we will only unlock our resource potential if we have the right infrastructure and access, and we will only maximise the benefit of these resources if we develop the mining and petroleum services as an industry in South Australia. We need to leverage the employment opportunities for downstream suppliers to the resource industry, our Indigenous communities and our regional communities.

This government's commitment to the state's resources sector could not be stronger. The sector will find no greater ally as we seek to partner with industry and community to maximise the benefits for all South Australians. We are not alone in recognising the importance of this vital sector. It was pleasing to see a new report prepared by PwC that found that one of Australia's highest value-adding industries is the oil and gas sector.

The contribution of the industry to the nation's economic output is expected to double to \$67 billion by 2030. PwC has found that for every dollar of production the oil and gas sector adds 70¢ of value-add compared to an average of 49¢ for all other industries. APPEA Chief Executive David Byers has said that the analysis:

...showed why encouraging investment in the oil and gas sector should be a key focus for government.

He went on to say:

It is further evidence that natural gas is one of Australia's great strengths, with a higher relative contribution to the economy than almost every other industry.

He goes on to say:

It is crucial, therefore, that calls for policy interventions that seek to force non-commercial outcomes continue to be resisted.

There are those in our community who claim that they support our economy. They claim to support investment in our state and they claim to support employment: yet, what we get from them is extremist rhetoric from the extreme fringes of the movements which try to engage in the political system. I urge all members to stop putting investment in this state at risk and to follow the government's lead, show some leadership and have their reckless motion withdrawn.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** My congratulations to the ministerial assistant for not violating standing orders.

### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house how his green paper on tax reform will differ from the report of the Economic and Finance Committee into the South Australian taxation system that was only handed down in this place earlier this year?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:17):** It will adopt a different process than was adopted by the parliamentary committee. It will seek to raise awareness in the broader South Australian community about the challenges that we face as a state and it will involve the broadest possible cross-section of the community in deliberation on what the taxation system should look like. So the process that we will adopt will be different.

The principles that we will seek to apply to the report will be the principles that we have already outlined, that is, that the sustainability of our revenue base will be front and centre in our considerations. At the moment, we have a tax system which is prone to quite volatile fluctuations, given the transactional nature of the taxation system that we have.

We will also be looking to have a taxation system that does not punish productive investment so it does not provide a disincentive to productive activity and, indeed, encourages productive investment in productive activity. Thirdly, it will reflect Labor's principles about a fair go, that is, making sure that the burden of adjustment falls fairly across the South Australian community.

It will also have in scope something which the parliamentary committee I don't think looked into in great detail, which is the use of user charges such as network charging for public transport and road infrastructure, something that we have raised in debate; in fact, it emerged during the course of the election campaign. While we have ruled out tolls, we haven't ruled out imaginative ways in which we could raise capital for the investment in public infrastructure. I think we also need to be clear that this particular exercise speaks in furtherance of our priority—our economic vision; our vision for South Australia—which is that South Australia is the place where people and business thrive. We say that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We use that vision—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We use that vision advisedly, sir, because it speaks to both people and the livability of South Australia, and business and the prosperity of South Australia. It deliberately uses those twin objectives in that way because we believe that South Australia's future prosperity is inextricably linked to its livability. We believe that those two things must progress hand in hand. It not only reflects our analysis about the success of our state within this nation but it also reflects our values system. We are not going to sacrifice the livability of South Australia in order to achieve—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —some narrow economic goal. Can I say this, Mr Speaker: much of what we enjoy in South Australia in terms of our livability has come about because of our public investments. Those public investments and that public consumption in South Australia is higher than exists in other states, but that is the reason we enjoy the level of amenity we do in this state. That is something that we should be proud of, not something that we should be trying to compare ourselves with other places and seek to shrink away from. So, we will have a system that delivers for our people but will also be a place which guarantees our future prosperity.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the leader asks a supplementary, I call the member for MacKillop to order for two bouts of forced laughter, and—

**Mr Williams:** I can't help it when we have got stand-up comedy like that, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop can leave us for the next half-hour under the sessional order.

**Mr Williams:** Can you make it longer, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I will make it an hour; thank you.

**Mr Williams:** Thank you, sir; I am relieved.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order; the member for Chaffey is warned a first time; the member for Morialta is warned a first time—Stalin did not have visions, he had five-year plans; Teresa of Avila had visions—the member for Heysen is warned a first time; the member for Hartley is warned a first time and a second time; and the member for Hammond is warned a second time, having accrued warnings before question time from the Deputy Speaker. Leader.

### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** Supplementary: is the government committed to actually reducing the taxation burden on South Australian businesses and households?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22):** I think, necessarily, the review will have to consider the incidence of taxation on the activities which are productive and income creating. That is one of the principles I outlined before. So, the answer is yes, it will seek to reduce the burdens on those activities in the South Australian economy which are creative of production and which are creative of investment. The truth is we have a system at the moment which provides certain disincentives for those activities, and we need to review our system with a view to avoiding, as far as we possibly can, any taxation system which discourages that activity.

Of course, a taxation system is only one element of the objective that we laid out on Monday of this week, which was to make sure that South Australia is a great place to do business. It also depends on a whole range of other elements. The truth is our public investments also create an attractive business-cost environment. The fact that we have a city which is easy to navigate and get around is an element of the cost environment. So, the cost competitiveness of South Australia is related to the public investments we make; it is not simply about the taxation arrangements.

Our planning system can create a cost-competitive environment. The way in which our bureaucracy administers regulations creates a cost-competitive environment. The regulations themselves can create a cost-competitive environment. Just the general culture of the community and the way in which it is supportive of productive investment can make a positive cost-competitive environment.

We have got much to be proud of in certain sectors. We need to make sure this can be said of every sector. Oil and gas is a classic example. We have created a cost-competitive environment for investment in infrastructure. We have created a political environment which is permissive for investment in oil and infrastructure. I know there are those opposite who are taking steps which could jeopardise that environment that we have created—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Shame.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —and we ask them to retreat—

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order for shouting 'shame'.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —from that course. It is more than taxation, but certainly taxation has to be part of the equation.

### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** A further supplementary.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is warned a first time.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Does the Premier stand by the comments that he made before the election and I quote:

I'm not prepared...to hand over some tax cuts which I actually don't think are going to make [any] difference...I just don't see the direct connection between that and the creation of jobs[?]

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:25):** It looks like we are going to rehearse the election. I remember the fateful day. It was a few moments after I think I called out the Leader of the Opposition for being a fake and then, all of a sudden, what was produced was a massive tax cut for about 6 per cent of the South Australian taxpayers. That's what was produced for 6 per cent of South Australian taxpayers, and the rest of us were going to have to shell into our pockets to actually pay for the privilege.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** This is not a revivalist meeting. The Treasurer is warned a second time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Quite what that had to do with productive infrastructure and getting the state going again, what that had to do with taxes which are punitive in relation to economic activity, quite what it had to do with that I can't presently see. It was just a hand back to a certain section of the community—a rather small section of the community—and then hoping. The last time I heard an economic analysis like this laid out to us was actually in Judith Sloan's speech to the 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary—

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** What a hit that was!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —of Business SA, and wasn't that a hit! I can remember that the deputy leader was there. You could have heard a pin drop when she was making her point. It basically went like this: get out of the way, cut taxes and hope against hope that something might turn up. Now, nobody in the room found it persuasive.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: the Premier is drifting away from the substance of the question. The question was about comments that the Premier made, not the comments that Judith Sloan made, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen to the Premier's remarks carefully, but it did seem to me that it was a fairly tendentious question and the Premier is giving it a tendentious answer.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Just to draw the link back, the leader was asking a question about my criticism of his tax policy, which was to hand back a large slab of tax to a very small section of the community, and that was advanced as something that might get the state's economic activity running. I was simply comparing that with a contribution that was made in almost identical terms by Judith Sloan at an important business event. It received no support from the assembled throng of the business community. Indeed, I think she was just about booed off the stage, but what I say about it is that what we are advancing in terms of tax reform is much more sophisticated than just shovelling out some money to a small group of taxpayers and hoping that something might turn up.

I will end with this little observation. I can remember that, after that speech that Judith Sloan made, I spoke to another conservative leader not to be named, and the person said to me: 'You know what happens in a small economy when government gets out of the way?' She said, 'Nothing; that's what happens.'

The challenges we have in this state are for us to step up and take a lead, not to simply mindlessly cut taxes to a small group of people and hope. Our tax reform agenda fits within the context of 10 priorities for South Australia, which is directed at a vision which is about our prosperity, which is about our livability and which is about offering a future for our children and for their children.

#### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary. The leader queried my use of the term 'tendentious' and queried whether it was part of the English lexicon at all:

Tendentious...*adjective* derogatory, calculated to promote a particular cause or viewpoint, having an underlying purpose...

**Mr MARSHALL:** You've had far too much time on your hands. My supplementary is, of course, to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that the proposed freight network charge on trucks will not increase costs for the trucking industry in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:30):** Mr Speaker, let's just go back to what the trucking industry has said about this. The objective is to increase the productivity of the trucking industry so that it will actually reduce costs. And, why do I say that? Well, the trucking—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Let's just travel back to actually understand where—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is an instant away from being removed from the service of the house.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Mr Speaker, let's just reflect back on how this debate has developed. The road transport industry have been out there for some considerable time urging the government and the opposition to impose tolls. The reason, presumably, they have been advancing the imposition of tolls was to fund new infrastructure. That was the proposition that was advanced to both the opposition and to the Labor Party.

Both parties ruled out tolls in the course of the last election. We ruled them out on the basis that they were not practical and did not suit the South Australian network and, in any event, we were philosophically opposed to them being applied to motorists, but in relation to the transport sector—the road transport sector, the commercial sector—we didn't believe that they would work appropriately. The idea of industry making a contribution to allow further productive investment in road infrastructure is something that we have supported and continue to investigate and are discussing actively in relation to some mining infrastructure. We are interested in opening up that discussion in relation to network charging. The reason why industry are proposing those network charges—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Is that the meat industry I can hear there? They move things on trucks as well. The truth is that the reason why industry is proposing that there be some user charge is because they want an improved road network, which in turn will increase productivity, which in turn will reduce costs. That's why they are advancing it. That's why we are exploring it. We're not interested in building new roads to carry trucks just to create work. We are doing it because it will make an increase in the productive infrastructure of the state, increasing productivity, reducing costs, and so, of course, that's the objective of that initiative.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time.

#### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32):** Supplementary: given that the Premier has said that this is a direction that the industry wants to go, why is it that there has been an avalanche of criticism from the industry over the Premier's recent discussion regarding the implementation of a freight network charge here in South Australia?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

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

**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) (14:33):** I can understand why there would be a large groan from the Leader of the Opposition at the prospect of being reminded about the policy backflip that his opposition has taken with regard to the taxation of the heavy vehicle industry.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: he is not responsible for the Leader of the Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the member for Unley's point of order. Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I'm certainly aware that there has been concern raised in one quarter of what is a large and diverse industry about what is the potential for a much improved and better way of taxing the heavy vehicle industry. At the moment, we've got an industry paying, not limited to but including, registration charges to the state government and fuel excise charges to the commonwealth government.

There is, in particular with respect to the taxes paid to the commonwealth government, a lack of transparency about the amount of money which comes back and is available for investment in the upkeep and in the construction of new roads. We have consistently as a government promoted better ways of taxation across the economy, and this is just another example. What we haven't done is gone to the election committing to a position of introducing no tolls, and then within 100 or 120 days completely back flipping and changing the position of whether to toll the heavy vehicle industry, which is precisely what the opposition has done. What an outrageous position to be advocating, the reduction of taxes—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** Again, the minister is not only entering debate but he is also not responsible for the opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point of order.

#### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** Supplementary, sir: the minister has indicated that the SARTA response to the introduction of the freight network charge is just one quarter of the responses that the government has received. Who are the people who are actually strongly in support of the government's plan to introduce freight network charges in South Australia?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

**Mr Marshall:** Name them. Name them all. Read them all out. We've got plenty of time.

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

**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) (14:35):** I am happy to. In May, all transport ministers attended their six-monthly transport ministers' conference. A program of heavy vehicle charging and investment reform was put to all ministers, which was endorsed, which would commence a large body of work into the future about trying to prove up whether this, along with other heavy vehicle charging and investment options, could be brought to fruition across the country.

The Australian Logistics Council has been pushing this very strongly. This is something that their members are very much in favour of. The idea of using in-vehicle telematics to be able to log the distances that heavy vehicles take across the country, not just on particular roads but across all roads, and also log the amount and weight of freight that is being transported across those roads and make a determination about the costs involved in transporting that freight and contributing those calculations, and that information towards coming up with a better charging regime for the heavy vehicle industry is something that has been around for many years and in some quarters—I did not say 'a quarter'—but in some parts of the industry, this idea is very well supported. This is the direction that the technology available in heavy vehicles—

**Mr Marshall:** Who are they? Who are these people?



**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I just said, the Australian Logistics Council.

**Mr Marshall:** That's one group. You said there were not just—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You mean a national representative group—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will not respond to interjections and the leader is warned a first time.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** There is support for the investigation of these matters and, as I have made clear, both in discussions with industry and also publicly, including yesterday in the media, the first step, the necessary step, is a detailed investigation of this, whether it is an offline trial or by some other means. This is a worthy thing to be investigated. This has the potential to unlock significant efficiencies within the heavy vehicle industry, quite opposite from the Liberal Party position of imposing an additional extra tax on the heavy vehicle industry. I understand the Liberal Party wants people to pay more for bread, more for milk and more for eggs—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order!

**Mr PISONI:** The minister is not responsible for the Liberal Party.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order, and I also welcome to the house a distinguished former member of the other place, Andrew Evans.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The SPEAKER:** Leader.

#### TAXATION REFORM

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38):** Does the minister acknowledge that requiring trucks to monitor and report on the kilometres travelled and tonnes carried will add significant costs to the industry?

**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) (14:38):** I certainly acknowledge that the Leader of the Opposition has obviously not listened to the answer I have just given to the house where I explained how this information is captured.

#### CRIME PREVENTION

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:38):** My question is to the Attorney-General.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Ms BEDFORD:** Thank you, I was about to seek your protection, sir. Can the Attorney-General inform the house about new ways the government is helping communities tackle crime?

**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) (14:38):** I thank the honourable member for her question. Today I am pleased to announce a new \$2 million closed circuit television grants program.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** Oh, excellent.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes. This program aims to help reduce local crime rates and improve community safety. It will fund the installation of CCTV systems, securing lighting and other initiatives to improve safety in identified crime hotspots. Applications for the 2015 program are now open and \$500,000 will be available each year for four years to local councils, with councils required to make matching co-contribution to the project funding.

This new program is on top of our successful Crime Prevention and Community Safety Grants program. This program makes grants available up to the value of \$50,000 to community

groups, local government and not-for-profit organisations to keep our community safe. Funding is now also available for these grants for one-off local crime prevention and community safety projects, with an additional stream of funding allocated to graffiti prevention projects. These programs fund community safety projects that tackle crime, graffiti and antisocial behaviour at their roots.

Over the last four years, the Crime Prevention and Community Safety Grants program has funded 71 projects worth approximately \$2½ million. This year, we expanded our grants program by including CCTV so that we can assist local councils implement locally based projects to improve our community's capability of reducing fear of crime in targeted locations. Applications for both programs are now open. For more information about the grants application process and guidelines, please visit [www.agd.sa.gov.au](http://www.agd.sa.gov.au).

### JOB CREATION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** My question is to the Premier. Is the government's announcement today of 5,000 new jobs in addition to the government's 2010 promise of 100,000 new jobs by 2016?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:41):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Today what we did is we launched the second of the 10 economic priorities for South Australia and set out in more detail not only the reason why we chose that as our focus (this one on unlocking the potential of our mining and energy industry), but also within that document we set out some of the success stories that we've already achieved, some of the initiatives that we are pursuing but, importantly, we set out objectives about where we want to be as a state in three years' time. So, before the next election we are setting out for ourselves published goals about what we want to achieve for South Australia.

These are ambitious goals. They have a clear time line in relation to them. We have no doubt that we will be held to account for those commitments. One of the commitments, amongst a number that exist in relation to the mining industry, is the commitment for the creation of an additional 5,000 jobs in that sector. There is no doubt that it is going to be a stretch be able to achieve that.

**Ms REDMOND:** Point of order. The question was about whether the 5,000 jobs announcement was in addition to the 100,000 jobs promised in 2010 and thus far the Premier has gone nowhere near even touching on an answer to that question.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully to see if the Premier joins up his remarks.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** If the member listened carefully she would realise that it is a much more specific and detailed analysis of a sector of the economy, rather than an estimate of what we seek to achieve across the whole of our economy.

**Ms Redmond:** You promised 100,000 jobs.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, no; I will go to that in a moment, Mr Speaker. The 5,000 commitment that we have made in relation to the mining and energy sector is where we expect to be in 2017. That is a specific commitment that we are putting in place which we will be judged against before the next election. The truth is that the commitment of the creation of 100,000 jobs was given in the 2010 election and it wasn't a commitment that could be judged before the 2014 election because the time line was, indeed, stretched beyond the 2014 election. We are doing something—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned and the member for Heysen is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We are doing something much more accountable and much braver than those opposite would ever have dreamt about doing. We are putting in place a target that exists which can be judged before the next election.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** If those opposite want to talk about the 100,000 job target, I am more than happy to do that. The 100,000 job target was announced in 2010, and it was a stretch target. It was judged to be a target we would seek to achieve by 2016. There was the small matter of the global financial crisis and the way in which that intervened—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, it wasn't. Unless they rewrite history, at that point we were in the full blush of the stimulus that was occurring at a state and a national level. Everybody had believed that we had managed to get through the global financial crisis without having seen the wash-over effects on the international economy which emerged. So, that has been a difficult challenge for us, there is no doubt about that. Our objectives on this side of the parliament have always been to create jobs, first and foremost, and that is why we are the only party with a detailed and clear plan for the future to create jobs.

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is called to order, and the Minister for Education will not make gestures in response to the opposition. The leader.

### JOB CREATION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** Thank you, sir. Given that the 100,000 job commitment the government made was first a promise, then a target, then a stretch target, then an aspiration, can the Premier perhaps update the house: what is the status of the 100,000 job commitment that was made in 2010? Has the government let go of it completely?

**The SPEAKER:** No, I think we've got the question. Do you have anything to add, Premier?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:46):** It's always our objective to pursue jobs, and the 100,000 target that was announced in 2010 is something that we pursue. Of course it's going to be difficult to achieve, given the objective circumstances we face as a state. Absolutely, it is going to—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —be difficult within the time line that was set out, but we have an ambition to grow the South Australian economy to create jobs, and we are the only party that actually has a plan out there to achieve it.

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** For those opposite to criticise us for putting more detail—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert the second time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —in the plan and for being more specific about how we will achieve growth in jobs in our economy—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir: the Premier is not responsible for those opposite. He continues to speak on behalf of the Liberal Party, and he—

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully to what the Premier is saying in response to the question.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** We continue to pursue jobs as the central and driving force for the purpose of this government. It has always been that way, and it will always be that way for this government and any government that I lead.

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I am proud of the fact that we are putting in place for the South Australian people specific plans to allow us to achieve our objectives in relation to jobs growth. I ask those opposite: instead of cynically criticising what have been challenges in the South Australian economy, lift your gaze and be part of the solution, not part of the problem.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is?

**Mr GARDNER:** It was going to be debate, but he has finished, sir.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. Supplementary.

### JOB CREATION

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** I would like some clarification from the Premier: is he saying that the original jobs commitment, for 100,000 jobs by 2016, is now going to be replaced by a commitment of just 5,000 jobs by 2018?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:48):** It looks like we're going to have to do this the long way. Back in August, we made an economic statement about the future of South Australia. It drew on the collective wisdom of 2,500 South Australians, from business, academia and the broader community. All of those people asked us to do a number of things, and one was to set out an economic vision for South Australia, which we did.

It asked us to also be clear about the priorities we sought to achieve, which we did. Now we are taking each of those priorities and putting more meat on the bone of those priorities by putting very clear stakes in the ground about where we want to be in three years' time. In each of the 10 areas, there will be objectives that we are going to pursue. We have five sectors: the mining sector, the health sector, the food sector, the tourism sector, the international student sector. They will have job targets in each of them. They will have objectives about how we want to change and grow those sectors. All of those things, all of those discrete components, will come together to allow us to achieve our objectives.

This approach we are seeking—an active approach for government working in partnership with industry and academia—is one that has been urged upon us by no less than the Business Council of Australia, which is urging this approach on all governments across our nation. We are listening. We are listening to the result of the election, unlike the opposition leader who seems incapable of realising that he actually lost the last election.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is not responsible to the house for the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, but if he could just perhaps stop bleating while I am giving a contribution it would allow me to develop my answer. To answer the opposition leader's question directly, of course it is not simply an objective of 5,000 jobs. There will be a series of objectives across each of those priorities. They will all be directed at the underlying purpose of job growth in the South Australian economy because we believe that jobs give dignity, they give purpose and they give an economic capacity for people to realise ambitions for themselves and their families. That's why we are the Labor Party. That's why jobs are at the centre of our project.

### AUSTRALIAN OF THE YEAR AWARDS

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:50):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the 2015 SA Australian of the Year Awards?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:50):** I thank the honourable member for her question. It was my great pleasure to attend, with a range of members of parliament, including the Leader of the Opposition, the 2015 South Australian Australian of the Year Awards at a superb ceremony in the beautiful Adelaide Oval's William Magarey Room. It was an honour to join the Governor in acknowledging an outstanding group of South Australian finalists who have been nominated for the Australian of the Year Awards who have excelled in their chosen fields, whether at home, interstate or, indeed, abroad.

Last night we heard the achievements of some 16 South Australians and their particular contributions to our country. It gives me great pleasure to advise the house that Dr Gill Hicks MBE was awarded the 2015 Australian of the Year for South Australia. She is a most worthy recipient. One only needed to hear her contribution last night to know what an extraordinary story she tells.

Dr Hicks was severely injured in the 2005 London bombings, where she was the last survivor rescued from an underground train carriage. Dr Hicks had both legs amputated below the knee and was not initially expected to survive. Her injuries were so severe that paramedics could not initially identify her gender. Not only did Dr Hicks survive, but at that moment she made a miraculous choice that would change her life forever. Most of us would think that Gill had a right to live her life angry about what had happened to her, but not Gill Hicks. Instead, she made the remarkable choice of using this devastating experience for the good of humanity.

Dr Hicks went on to establish the organisation Making a Difference For Peace, making it her life's mission to address the issue of radicalisation head on. She did this through talking and listening, particularly to young men of Islamic faith who are on the verge of radicalisation. She did this through seeking to create an understanding for what these young men are facing in their lives and for them to see the consequences of their actions. Gill Hicks is an inspiring motivational speaker, author, curator and trustee for several cultural organisations. She is an incredibly worthy winner of the 2015 Australian of the Year Award for South Australia and, I might say, an excellent candidate for Australian of the Year.

Last night, other outstanding South Australians were also honoured. The winner of the 2015 Senior Australian of the Year for South Australia was John Swan. He is well known in the rock and roll scene, for all of those rock and rollers opposite like the member for Hammond. Swanee is also a co-founder of the Autism Music Fund, and his Swags for Homeless charity helps people who are sleeping rough. He has donated much of his time, offering his musical performances as a way to raise funds for a range of causes, particularly the families of children who are seeking funds to pay for surgery.

Kristin Carson was announced as the 2015 Young Australian of the Year. Kristin is one of the youngest ever senior medical research scientists at The QEH and is responsible for more than 40 projects. Finally, Vince Coulthard was acknowledged last night as Australian of the Year, Local Hero for 2015 in South Australia. Well known to many of us in this house, Vince led the development of South Australia's first native title claim over the Flinders Ranges, which was awarded in 2009. Vince has been a servant of his community, as Director of Umeewarra Aboriginal Media Service in Port Augusta for two decades, and a regional councillor for ATSIC for nine years.

I am sure that everybody will join with me in congratulating these 16 finalists and winners of the 2015 South Australian of the Year Awards.

#### **SUBMARINE PROGRAM**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:55):** My question is directed to the Minister for Defence. Minister, could you update the house on what recent action the South Australian government is taking in relation to our state securing maximum benefits for the build and sustainment of the future of our submarines?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:55):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I know that there are many working in her electorate in this industry. Achieving the best possible outcome for South Australia on the design, build and sustainment of the next generation of Australian submarines is an issue vital to every single South Australian family and small business. Without significant involvement in all stages of the construction and sustainment of the new submarines, South Australians will be sold short and robbed of future job opportunities.

I returned this morning from the Submarine Institute of Australia's Centenary Conference in Fremantle. I had the opportunity to meet with representatives of the Defence Materiel Organisation, senior ADF officers, academics and all parties who have expressed to the commonwealth an intention to tender for the next generation of submarines.

In doing this, I had the opportunity to put forward South Australia's case as being the best location for the build, sustainment and ongoing support of our new submarines. All of these discussions were positive and I have been encouraged by the efforts of the companies who have expressed an interest in tendering for the project, their positiveness and their can-do approach.

I met with the French company DCNS, the German company TKMS, and the Swedish potential tenderer Saab. In furthering the case, the South Australian government will continue to push the commonwealth on undertaking a competitive tender process and to maintain their pre-election commitment to build the new submarines in Adelaide. It is important for our nation's defence and economy that all elements of the project be carried out here in our own country.

Maintaining a sovereign capability has a huge range of strategic, military and economic benefits for our country. Our submarine and shipbuilding industry is a vital strategic and economic asset and we must not allow it to wither and die. Confirmation at the conference by defence minister Johnston that no military-off-the-shelf (MOTS) option exists is a positive step but one which requires clarification. This only relates to existing designs. A modified overseas-designed submarine could still be purchased, so we are a long way from a commitment to build in Australia based in South Australia as promised.

Sustainment is the work that is vital to the future of our industry. As I have advised the house previously, economic and budgetary modelling has demonstrated the best overall decision is to carry out as much of the work as possible here in Australia. Therefore it is important that the build portion of the project is undertaken right here based in South Australia. If this does not happen, South Australia will lose a significant number of high-skilled jobs forever, just as we seek to recover from the collapse of the automotive sector.

Without a significant amount of the building work taking place in South Australia, any commitment to ensuring maintenance of future submarines in South Australia is at risk. With the commonwealth Treasurer and Minister of Defence this week publicly stating that no matter where the submarines are built South Australia will benefit from sustainment, it is clear others do not see it that way.

Western Australia's emergency services minister, Joe Francis, told the meeting that he believed that it made sense for all submarine maintenance to eventually be carried out in Fremantle. If we have not built the submarines here in Australia, the case for sustainment in South Australia is extremely weak and we will lose that work. Given the commonwealth statements that we will get sustainment work, I am asking them to rule out moving maintenance to Western Australia. Without a defence industry capability we have no defence capability. The defence industry is vital to South Australia and the government will continue its efforts to secure it for the future.

### OIL AND GAS SECTOR

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister advise if relevant prior operating history is a prerequisite to successfully tender for a petroleum exploration licence?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:59):** Mr Speaker, this is a pretty grubby question by the member for Stuart, trying to imply—

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will not comment on the status of the question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. Mr Speaker, what the member for Stuart is talking about is Ambassador exploration. He raised these questions yesterday in the Auditor-General's examination. He is talking about Mr Tino Guglielmo, who was the person who executed the application documents for Ambassador Oil. For the opposition's benefit, Mr Guglielmo had many years prior extensive experience in the oil and gas sector, including 20 years at very senior levels in Santos, then as managing director and CEO of Stuart Petroleum. This is the gentleman he is talking about, Mr Speaker, when he says 'any prior involvement'.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Mr Speaker, I did not talk about any person in my question.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart will leave for the next half hour because, of course, that is not a point of order: it is an impromptu speech. You will go out under the sessional order for half an hour.

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

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir: 127, imputing improper motives.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will also go out for half an hour. That's not a point of order, either.

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

**Ms REDMOND:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: the relevance of the answer, because the member for Stuart's question simply asked whether there was a process available and the minister's answer to date has been entirely about a particular person who was never mentioned.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Mr Speaker, just for the opposition's benefit, Mr Guglielmo has had many years of experience with Santos and, of course, has been chief executive of Stuart Petroleum. All these decisions are delegated to the department. It is not the political elected executive who makes these decisions. The tender process is done at arm's length from government, so much so that I am not even informed who is tendering for tenements or petroleum retention licences. I am told at the conclusion of the process.

What the opposition is attempting to do, in my mind, is try to cast doubt on this process. This process is world's best practice and, quite frankly, I am sick of the opposition attacking the oil and gas sector.

**Mr GARDNER:** That was debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the leader asks a question: the opposition can ask questions. Ministers have a great deal of scope in answering them. It is not appropriate for the opposition, if they are offended by the answer, an answer that is otherwise within standing orders, to stand up and give an impromptu speech in reply under the cover of a point of order. If any member does it, they will be departing the chamber. The leader.

#### OIL AND GAS SECTOR

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02):** Thank you. Supplementary, sir: given that the minister was talking about the tender process, can the minister advise that prior operating history is a prerequisite for the tender situation that we have here in South Australia?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:03):** Mr Speaker, first and foremost, I will give the opposition leader the benefit of the doubt. The tender process is done independently of the executive. That is, all my statutory powers in the ability to grant petroleum retention licences, extensions or cessation of these licences is done by the department. Why? I do not have the expertise to be able to assess these bids. They are done by experts in the field.

The assessments are headed up by Mr Barry Goldstein, who is the head of the petroleum and geothermal branch within the Department of State Development, who is internationally recognised and recognised by the industry as being a world-leading expert within this field. Within the industry—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Ms REDMOND:** The question wasn't about separation of powers. The question was clearly about whether the prior operating history is a relevant consideration for whoever undertakes that assessment.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully to what the minister says.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Within the industry, companies are formed, companies fold and they are acquired. What is taken into account is a number of things. Not only, I am advised, is it prior operating history, but also the people who are employed who are operating the company.

As an example, hypothetically, let's just say Mr David Knox starts another company one day when he leaves Santos and applies for a petroleum retention lease with a new company that has no trading experience. Is the Liberal Party really saying that the regulator should not allow that person to have a petroleum retention licence because the company he formed two weeks ago, and has got capital backing him, has never actually dug a well before? Are we just going to ignore his prior experience in Santos? Is that what you are saying? Of course not, Mr Speaker! That is the business experience of the Leader of the Opposition, sir; that is why he doesn't back business!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That is why business have turned their backs on the Leader of the Opposition!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is out of order.

#### OIL AND GAS SECTOR

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:05):** Supplementary, sir: how many oil and gas exploration licences have been granted in the last four years to companies without relevant prior operating experience?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:05):** Like I just said, sir, that is, in my opinion, a loaded question. What he is attempting to do is cast aspersions on people who may or may not have won a petroleum retention licence on the basis of prior—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get an answer, Mr Speaker, but I would not be surprised if it is only very few. Again, the Cooper Basin—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Inexperience, Mr Speaker—reckless interjections. What—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will not comment on the attributes of the Leader of the Opposition; he will answer the question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, Mr Speaker. The government takes into account the history of the people making the applications, regardless of the company's past performances, whether they be many or none. The reason we do so is because companies are formed all the time, and the people that they take on their boards and the people they put in their field—the explorers, the geologists, the managing directors, the CFOs—come with vast experience, and we take that into account also. But, I will get a detailed answer to the anti-gas, anti-business Leader of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir—

**Mr MARSHALL:** I would ask the minister to withdraw those remarks.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, they are not unparliamentary; they are just out of order and unnecessary.



**Mr GARDNER:** Sir, given that you have previously ruled that the Treasurer will confine himself to the relevant answer and he is on two warnings, can I ask you, sir, whether there is any further action to be taken under 137?

**The SPEAKER:** I am on the minister's case.

#### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:07):** My question is to the Treasurer. Given the government's backflip and absorption of the \$1.3 million football transport levy, or fun tax, where will the government recoup these funds to meet the budget?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Point of order: the question contained argument. The member referred to the transport development levy as a 'fun tax' and I ask you to rule the question out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** If the member does that again I will simply withdraw leave or skip him on the list.

**Mr WINGARD:** If, I can, with indulgence, reword the question then sir—

**The SPEAKER:** No, we will take it as it is, minus the comment.

**Mr WINGARD:** Thank you.

**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) (15:08):** I assume the member for Mitchell is referring to the agreement which has been reached by the two AFL clubs (Port Power and the Adelaide Crows), the SANFL and the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority to directly contribute towards the cost of providing, on the day, free public transport services for football fans for the 2015 AFL season.

I know it has been a matter of particular interest to the member for Mitchell. The member has asked me questions both during question time and also in estimates about it, and in fact as recently, I think, as the last sitting week. Each time those questions have been asked, I have been at some pains to explain the policy behind the legislation—legislation, I should point out, which the opposition supported within the budget bills—and, that is that the government thinks it is reasonable that those people who benefit from the provision of public transport services on the day for football matches at Adelaide Oval make a contribution towards it.

I have made it very clear that in the arrangements for commercial events of above 5,000 attendees, such as the AFL football games at Adelaide Oval, we expect the venue manager to negotiate with government about how best to make a contribution towards the costs of providing those public transport services.

I have been at pains to say that it won't necessarily be the case that the full costs of those services will be paid by the ticketholders who go along to those events as attendees. It may well be the case, and I think it's a reasonable expectation, given that both sides of politics have supported the legislation, that those organisations who derive a commercial benefit out of holding these events make a contribution towards the costs of delivering tens of thousands of fans, each and every week, to those events, as is the case with these AFL games at Adelaide Oval, and that's exactly what we have seen.

We have seen the commercial operators of these events—Adelaide Crows, Port Power, the Stadium Management Authority and the SANFL—make a contribution. That's a good thing; that's something that we foreshadowed time and time again. It's a great thing for fans, it's a great thing for the Oval and it's a great thing for the 2015 AFL season.

*Grievance Debate*

#### **CHERRY FARMING**

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:11):** I am very pleased to advise members that the cherry season has begun in the Hills, but I wish to talk a little bit about some of the challenges confronting cherry growers in my electorate at the moment.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** There are a couple of ministers laughing at that. There are some concerns that they would do well to reflect on. However, I was very pleased that, on Monday, I was able to bring in a five kilo box of Australis variety cherries from Cowlings Cherries to share with the Liberal joint party room. I would encourage members opposite who wish to share in these cherries by saying that they are welcome to join us any day of the week.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** Any day of the week, you can join us. If you come into our party room and vote with us, then you too may have some cherries in the future from Norton Summit. It is one of the joys of my job to get that email in late October or early November from Cowlings Cherries. The first one this year was on Friday 7 November advertising the Empress dark red to deep mahogany sweet and juicy cherries, and the Early Burlat red to dark red, medium to large size, high quality for early-season cherries. It is a fantastic moment.

I pay tribute to the cherry growers in my electorate. There are seven orchards that are regularly open for sales at the door: Cowlings Cherries, Kirsch Hill Cherries, Bandiera Cherries in Norton Summit; Lennane Orchards, Montacute Valley Orchards and Smith Gully Orchards in Montacute; and Marble Hill Cherries at Ashton.

But there are some sincere issues that I wish to bring to the attention of the parliament and, in particular, to SA Power Networks. Cherry farming is a joy. It is a very special part of our community, and it is something I am very privileged to be close to every year. I try to attend every weekend during the summer months at least one of the orchards in my electorate to pick up some cherries and share them around.

The reality of running a cherry orchard is that, of course, your entire profit, your entire sales are in that six to eight week period during the year. It is predictable. It is the same time every year: some in November, all in December, some manage to get through to January. That is when they can make profits, and it rolls around at the same time every year.

In 2012, I got an email from Cowlings Cherries. I have been going to Cowlings Cherries for probably 28 of my 35 years and John and Gill have been running it the entire time, so I go back a little way with these people, but this affects the other orchards as well. In 2012, Cowlings Cherries approached me, having just received notification from SA Power Networks that electricity would be unavailable on Sunday 23 December from 8am to 3pm—the busiest weekend in the year for cherry growers when they sell all their Christmas cherries.

What would Christmas in Australia be without cherries, I ask you? There were 88 properties going to be affected, and the 10 to 15 people at Cowlings and all those other people at the orchards around there would also be affected because they would be unable to pack cherries, have access to the coolroom or commercial generator or use the EFTPOS facility or cash register and scales. Picking, packing and sales would have to cease, and it would just really shut them down and massively eat into their viability.

On that occasion on 23 December, we raised the issue with SA Power Networks. We asked that they delay it a couple of weeks until early 2013, and we pointed out the impact that such maintenance had on the cherry orchards on Old Norton Summit Road. SA Power Networks denied it on the ground that the high voltage line was considered a fire risk. Given that, it would have been handy to do the work perhaps before the fire season.

At the time, I contacted the Treasurer, who was then the minister for energy, as he is now, and to my pleasure on that occasion he was responsive and tried to help, to no avail. As it happened, the work did not take place because it was too hot for SA Power Networks to undertake the work, so it did not cause the problem.

Fast-forward two years to this week and we have the same problem again. At the time, we pointed out to SA Power Networks, 'You know this is going to happen every year. Do your work before the beginning of the cherry season. Do the work in January through to October.' There is plenty of time then, but for six to eight weeks there is a massive proportion of the local economy wrapped up in selling cherries, and when the electricity is cut they cannot do that work.

So, we now have an issue that tomorrow, Friday 7 November, SA Power Networks are moving in and they are going to shut down our electricity again. We spoke to them, and it is to be done for bushfire preparation, which is important work, and the authorities have given them until 15 November to do it. I would ask the minister and anyone responsible for these authorities to take this into consideration. I would ask SA Power Networks to take it into consideration. For the love of God, get the work done before the cherries are to be sold.

### UNCONVENTIONAL GAS PROJECTS

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:16):** I rise to clarify for the house the history and positioning of myself, as the member for Waite and in other capacities, on the issue of fracking and unconventional gas because there has been some misrepresentation or, shall I say, incomplete representation of what has occurred.

I want to make it clear that I said when I became an Independent that I would not use work from my period as a member of shadow cabinet unless I was attacked, misrepresented or, through questions, was required to refer to it, and I have honoured that, but I have been put on the spot by the opposition in this case, so I am going to use it. I am going to make sure that everyone knows the truth, including those members who were not a member of the party room in the lead-up to the last election.

I am going to refer them to a submission I took to the joint party room of the Liberal Party on 9 September on a bill by the Greens in the upper house on fracking that clearly said it should be resisted. I refer them to a draft policy I prepared for shadow cabinet on 12 November that made it very clear there was to be no parliamentary inquiry and that the existing arrangements were adequate. I refer the house, and particularly members opposite, to a very clear party room position I took to shadow cabinet on 30 January that said:

The state Liberals need to be firm and clear in their public positioning on this issue. If we are to fix the economy, support jobs and small business in the regions and back business to grow employment, take the handbrake off investment and growth in the mining and energy sectors, we will need to be supportive.

And it went on, and I made a very clear recommendation and provided a draft letter to the community, which was then sent out, explaining that the existing arrangements were adequate and that decisions should be made on the science, not on emotion, etc., etc. That was on 30 January. I am going to refer members opposite to a submission from the Hon. David Ridgway in the upper house to the joint party room on 31 January, where he led a charge to basically institute the arrangements that presently exist in New South Wales in South Australia.

It would have effectively supported the Lock the Gate movement and interposed a moratorium on fracking throughout the state, and I think he said during debate 'south of the Goyder line'. His paper made it very clear. He went on about the New South Wales policy, indicated that five million hectares of residential and agricultural land were now protected from coal seam gas activity and wanted a two-kilometre buffer zone. The recommendations in Mr Ridgway's paper are very clear.

There was a push within the Liberal Party to go with the Lock the Gate campaign and to impose a moratorium. That would have been a disaster and it would have resulted in condemnation from wide sections of the business community. I resisted it successfully. I took a further paper to the party room on 11 February, where again I reiterated that we needed to stand by the energy and mining sector and we needed to be firm and clear in our public positioning. I particularly mentioned there should be no moratorium on fracking and sought confirmation of our earlier position.

What happened was that, during the election campaign, some polling was done in the seat of Mount Gambier, and the Leader of the Opposition came to me with his chief of staff, quite concerned, and I was asked to develop some options and put them back before the leader, which I did. They were simple: stick with the policy I had enunciated, go with the Lock the Gate campaign and another option was some sort of a compromise around a parliamentary inquiry. That is the one the leadership group wanted.

It never went to the party room, from my recollection. It might have gone to a shadow cabinet meeting. I did not want it, but I was asked to come up with a solution that would save the seat of Mount Gambier and I put it before the leadership group. That was the one they wanted, and I was then directed to go and sell that message. I got on a plane and went down to Mount Gambier and worked with the member for Mount Gambier arguing for a parliamentary inquiry.

So, while it is true that it was my job as the spokesperson for the Liberal Party to carry that message forward, what has been omitted in this debate was that I was directed to find that solution by the leadership group. What was omitted from that debate was that this debate was raging within the opposition and that there was a group that wanted to impose a moratorium and lock the gate, which would have been a disaster. That would have been a worse alternative.

Can I just say that throughout this the member for Mount Gambier has been completely straight and up-front. The committee works in Mount Gambier and I think he is doing the right thing for his local area, but I have to share with the member for Mount Gambier—because he was not part of that party room—that there was this debate raging and that if he asks for those papers he will see the history of it.

Whilst it is true that it was my job to serve the party and argue that position, it was with reluctance and it was as a result of a request from the leader to do so during the election campaign to save the seat of Mount Gambier and for no other purpose. I never had complete faith in the position. I have always had the view—and it is clearly enunciated in my papers—that the existing arrangements are right: if we want to get this economy back on track and create jobs, we have to support mining and energy investment. We are not in a position to pick and choose.

### **SOUTHERN FIELD ARCHERS**

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:21):** I rise today to speak about the Southern Field Archers on Majors Road in O'Halloran Hill in the delightful electorate of Mitchell. I had the pleasure on the weekend of having a good look around one of the two courses they have on 17 acres of national park in the rolling Adelaide foothills. The Southern Field Archers has magnificent views over Adelaide and the southern beaches. It really was an outstanding afternoon in Adelaide and a fantastic place to be, a real hidden treasure of Adelaide, South Australia. I recommend that everyone get along and have a look. The views, as I said, from O'Halloran Hill are outstanding.

It was great to meet Kym, Jeff and Alby and I was able to do a round with Kym and Jeff, two seasoned campaigners, and, as it turned out, Kym had an outstanding day. I might have been his lucky charm: I think he scored 388 or 386 out of 400, one of his best performances, so he might get me back there again soon. As I mentioned, there are two ranges which take advantage of the beautiful terrain providing a multitude of challenging uphill, downhill and cross-gully shots. In fact, the gentleman who set the targets on the weekend set a couple of very tricky ones where you had to shoot through some long grass even to hit the target. It was quite fascinating.

There are 3D targets and a mix of American and Australian targets, ranging from rabbits to water buffalo. The Southern Field Archers shoot ABA paper targets, FITA, IFAA and 3D events, as I mentioned, and they are predominantly from unmarked distances, so you have to calculate it manually and work out how far you think the distance is when you are challenging yourself. There is a fully functional clubroom with a dining facility, workshop and practice area, as well as ample parking for everyone.

The targets in natural bush settings add an extra challenge. Shooting in natural settings and walking to the next target makes this a pleasant and interesting way to do archery. In fact, it is a lot like golf—as you move around the 20 targets, the arrows point towards the next target so that you take the right path. If you take the wrong path, you do not want to walk across someone else shooting, obviously. It is a whole lot of fun and a beautiful way to spend the afternoon. Walking from target to target, archers can really enjoy the great outdoors and some of those beautiful views over the city and get a bit of exercise in the process.

I also learnt a bit more about the bows; there are recurve bows and compound bows, but crossbows are not allowed. I did inquire about the cost of some of these bows because they are relatively high tech. The compound bows are a bit more expensive, costing up to \$1,000, and they have a few tricks on them to help you with your sights. The recurve bows are the more conventional

ones you would remember from the olden days; the people who use them do a marvellous job, as it is a very highly skilled operation.

The Southern Field Archers encourage people of all ages. It is a great family sport. If you are coming along for the first time, the Southern Field Archers asks that you contact them so they can have someone free to set you up with the right equipment and get you started. It is a great way to spend a Sunday and you might just discover a new passion. Interestingly, a lot of younger women are getting into archery, having seen a lot of movies on TV, and there are a couple of young women doing some outstanding jobs with the Southern Field Archers.

The Southern Field Archers can also help you with equipment, instruction and as much advice as you can stand. If you do not have any equipment, do not worry, the club has bows and all the equipment for beginners for a small charge. It is a good idea not go to out and buy a bow until you understand what sort of shooting you wish to do. As I mentioned, there are different types of bows and you can decide whether you want to go with the more rudimentary bows or with something a little bit more high tech. It is really up to you which way you want to go.

The members are wonderfully friendly. As I said, I got to meet quite a few on the weekend. They are a great bunch and they really do enjoy a wonderful day out. They start you off on the range with some safety instruction and coaching and they give you the chance to learn about all the equipment, the technique, form, range rules and safety procedures, and before you know it you will be ready to shoot your own round.

The SFA has been host to a number of big events as well: the Australian Junior Nationals 2014, the Australian Masters Games 2011, the Australian Senior National Games 2009, the Australian Junior Nationals 2008, the World Police and Fire Games 2007, the Australasian Masters Games 2007 and the 3D Australian Masters Games 2005. Interestingly, some of the competitors who have come from overseas and then gone back, I have heard stories about people bumping into friends in New York and across Europe and they still talk about this wonderful facility and this great part of South Australia at O'Halloran Hill where you get these superb views and great facilities for archery.

Check out their website for upcoming events. The SFA is able to boast a comprehensive annual shoot calendar. On 16 November there is a 3D shoot and on 7 December there is a Christmas shoot. So, check out their website, or if you go to [coreywingard.com.au](http://coreywingard.com.au) there will be a link on that website as well.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am just wondering if there is a green uniform. Member for Giles.

#### **PETROL PRICING**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:26):** I rise today to speak about two issues in my electorate, the first of which is that perennial bugbear, the price of petrol and especially the difference in price between the metropolitan area and many regional communities. It has been a source of legitimate complaint over the years. A number of organisations, including the RAA, have stated that the degree of difference in price is not justified and I know that many people in my electorate feel they are being ripped off and that in areas such as Whyalla there is virtually no competition.

Average weekly prices in Whyalla during a 40-week period ending in August 2014, saw petrol prices move roughly within a range of \$1.54 to \$1.56 a litre and there was barely any difference between the service stations when it came to price. The situation in Port Lincoln was even worse when it came to elevated prices. Port Augusta has experienced a drop in prices over the last few months and is now significantly cheaper than Whyalla and Port Lincoln.

Petrol prices in many regional communities will rarely match what is found in the metropolitan area and there are understandable reasons for that. One factor is transport costs, with some estimates suggesting that the transport of fuel to Whyalla adds up to 4¢ a litre to cost, with more distant communities hit even harder. The metropolitan area clearly has a much larger market, more competition and a cycle of fuel discounting. Regional service stations often have lower sales volumes but similar fixed costs. The competitive strategies of large nationally owned outlets also has a greater impact on price in the metropolitan area.

So, there are legitimate reasons for the price differential but the issue for a number of regional communities is the degree of price difference and whether that degree is justified. I know the people who I speak to feel ripped off and I know that a number of credible organisations have stated that petrol prices in a number of regional centres are too high and cannot be justified. On behalf of consumers in regional centres, I think it is time that we had a close look at the factors that are at work.

The other matter I want to raise is the impact of electricity prices. It is another area of serious concern and it is especially concerning for people who are getting by on low incomes. Recent figures indicating a doubling, over a four-year period, of the number of households that have had their electricity cut off is a real wake-up call. Over 10,000 households cut off in South Australia is not acceptable. It has been estimated that the privatisation of electricity assets in South Australia has added up to \$2 billion to our electricity bills.

It is surely time that the regulatory framework governing the operation of the electricity market is reviewed and seriously reformed. As a basic service, electricity should be affordable, reliable and clean, and it should be affordable for all South Australians. It is the interests of consumers and the environment that should be put at the centre of the regulatory framework, not the interests of energy incumbents, which is not to say that there should not be a reasonable return on essentially monopoly assets; the return at the moment is not reasonable.

Any review should take into account the rapid growth of distributed generation and, on its heels, storage, and the real potential of emerging technologies to put power back into the hands of consumers. Should we be looking at an orderly shift from the traditional 'hub and spoke' approach to electricity to a more flexible distributed approach to generation and supply?

Average household savings due to the installation of rooftop solar is approximately 60 per cent. Regional South Australia has embraced rooftop solar: in the member for Stuart's community, where he lives in Wilmington, 23 per cent penetration; Port August, 26 per cent; Port Lincoln and surrounding areas, 22 per cent; and, in my community of Whyalla, over 37 per cent. We need to ensure that low-income households in the public and private rental markets do not miss out on the benefits that solar can offer.

### PORT OF THEVENARD

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:32):** First of all, I congratulate the member for Giles on bringing to the house a couple of issues that are particularly pertinent to regional communities. If I may pick up on one, the price differential we see in Port Lincoln is particularly galling, given that the product is unloaded at the wharf facility there. It is a mystery to me.

I rise to pick up on a couple of things the Premier mentioned a few times during question time, and that is the importance of productive infrastructure around this state and its importance in developing economic activity and providing jobs. I want to talk particularly about the port and wharf facility at Thevenard. Thevenard, of course, is the port for the Far West Coast of South Australia. It is, in fact, the second busiest port in the state, second only to Port Adelaide. Many people are surprised to discover this but, over a 52-week period, there are, on average, 2½ ships per week berthing and loading at Thevenard.

A range of products are loaded at the wharf at Thevenard. Gypsum is the biggest tonnage by far. That gypsum is mined out of Penong, trained into Thevenard, loaded onto the boats and taken mostly to the eastern seaboard. Interestingly and importantly, Genesee & Wyoming, which operate the track there, are about to invest \$15 million in upgrading the track from Thevenard to Kevin railway siding near Penong, so congratulations to them. They obviously have confidence in the long-term viability of that industry. The gypsum deposit at Penong is quite extraordinary in both its quality and size.

Mineral sands, of course, are mined by Iluka out at Jacinth-Ambrosia, road trained into Thevenard and loaded onto ships that mostly go the other way, around to Western Australia, where it is processed and used in a whole range of high-quality products. Salt is mined out towards Penong as well and is loaded at Theyy and, of course, there is the grain industry. The grain farmers are harvesting at the moment. It is drawing to a close, I understand, in the far west, and it looks like being

quite a good, solid harvest once again. The grain from the far west is mostly loaded onto ships at Thevenard.

It has been highlighted in the last couple of weeks that there is a significant disparity between the price that producers achieve in Thevenard as against those further south on the peninsula at Port Lincoln. There has always been a port differential in wheat, usually between \$7 and \$9 a tonne. That, in essence, is a two-port loading facility. Just to explain, because the channel at Thevenard is relatively shallow the growers are charged an extra few dollars a tonne so that the boats can load fully at a deeper port and it is known as two-port loading. But barley this year was \$25 a tonne difference and I can see that that quite simply is the road freight to Port Lincoln.

The wharf at Thevenard also provides for fish unloading. Unfortunately when the berthing is fully booked by the bigger ships, the fishing boats have to make other arrangements. Sometimes it means travelling all the way south to Port Lincoln and, of course, this is at great cost and great frustration to the fishing industry.

A couple of years ago we almost got to the point where we had federal government funding, along with state government funding, to inject into a fish unloading facility to be built on another site. I urge the government now to pursue this once again. The opportunity is there, particularly when the cabinet is in the far west in just a few days' time. I urge them to visit both the wharf at Thevenard and the fish unloading facility to see how inadequate these particular structures are for current demands and certainly for any future demands.

It is important that this investment in productive infrastructure is maintained for the long-term viability of all the businesses on the West Coast that are reliant upon it. The opportunity is there now to address this situation once again, and for the benefit of the far west and the whole state, I urge all those involved to work together, work on a submission, and get some development going in the port of Thevenard.

#### **CHRISTIE DOWNS FUN DAY**

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:36):** I rise to speak about an outstanding event held on 2 November created by the Christie Downs community and, importantly also, the collective passion for bringing Christie Downs people together which underpinned this event, a passion steeped in the deep desire of Christie Downs' community members to have their suburb valued, build a strong and active community, and to value and support one another.

We hear much about the need to ensure communities are engaged, have a strong voice and are able to lead on what matters to them. I am an avid advocate for this and am proud that the Christie Downs Fun Day embodied genuine community empowerment. It was community led by the members of the Christie Downs Better Together group, a group which is supported by passionate Community Development Officer, Leonz Sevier, and the City of Onkaparinga Community Development team, but which was initiated by community members and has grown and deepened its ties with many in the suburb as its community leadership continues to flourish.

The Better Together group is highly inclusive, empowers its members and is relentlessly focused on supporting individuals and the broader community to unleash the best that they have to offer. In a suburb where, for many, things have not always been easy and which has, from time to time, been spoken about or treated in a disparaging way, this event celebrated the diversity, inclusivity, creativity, resourcefulness, kindness, resilience and camaraderie inherent in Christie Downs.

Lonsdale Heights Primary School hosted the day where Better Together is housed in its shed. It was attended by around 1,000 people. It was unique and it connected people, groups and organisations. In its every aspect it allowed community members and groups to shine.

Alongside the Southern Weavers group, made up of a group of extraordinary local Aboriginal women, the Lonsdale Heights kids sang their beautiful hearts out. Henna tattoos, face painting and hand massages were enjoyed next to the car boot sale. The skate ramp was a hub of activity and the Vertical Freedom parkour group was breathtaking. Community members drummed while kids enjoyed iceblocks and their parents enjoyed a round of croquet, the tug-of-war and home-cooked Mesopotamian food.

Amongst many highlights was the inaugural Shopping Trolley Derby in which I entered our Reynell Rampage team. In the Shopping Trolley Derby sporting code, teams of four have one member in the trolley, one pushing from behind and one pushing from each side of the trolley, and race quickly (or in our case not so quickly and rather erratically) around an obstacle course, with the winner being those who arrived first intact at the finish line.

Reynell Rampage were helmeted, determined, but spectacularly unsuccessful, and along the way we managed to injure a staff member to the degree that he was attended to by the very generous St John's Ambulance volunteers. Thankfully he is okay and we are intending to derby for the first place trophy next year.

Recently I read an article about a Melbourne suburb that has latched onto 'yarn bombing' which is helping their inner city suburb to become even more hipster than it apparently is. I was happy for them but also reflected on how the creativity of Christie Downs community members who have been 'yarn bombing' and 'colouring-in' Christie Downs since August 2013 should be celebrated.

Around Christie Downs, community members of every age have taken their craft to the streets with artistic knitted cosies as street art covering trees, vehicles, fences, posts—anything. Complementing it, around 50 Stobie poles are painted in Christie Downs including many painted by local kids who, through painting, have expressed what makes them happy. Like many public places in Christie Downs, the entrance to the fun day was a work of 'yarn bombing' art, and local southern institution, Colleen the Caravan, was entirely 'yarn bombed'.

Monique and Jeremy Garrod, Carly and Ben Squires, Anton and Bec Rook, Shelley Ryan, Angela and Luke Beauchamp, Sharon Russell, Jan Mann, Molly Wakeley, Monica Kharui, Bonnie, Belinda and Simon Uphill, Linda Mann, Hayley Munro, Janet and Graham Whitten, Louise McDonald, and Rasha and her mum were driving forces. I thank each of them for their extraordinary vision and capacity to work together to bring the fun day to life.

I acknowledge and thank Christie Downs Community House for their ongoing leadership in the area and their role on the day. I acknowledge and thank the City of Onkaparinga team, Wakefield House, Elizabeth House, Uniting Communities, Communities for Children, the Fleurieu Cancer Network and the Southern Domestic Violence Community Development Network for their involvement.

I also thank the very generous and community-minded local businesses who contributed. Through the fun day, the big hearts, open minds and sheer resourcefulness of the people of Christie Downs shone. I wish them all the best with their nomination for the City of Onkaparinga Australia Day Event of the Year Award.

### *Bills*

## **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ENERGY CONSUMERS AUSTRALIA) BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 October 2014.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:42):** I advise the house that I will not be the lead speaker on this bill. Today I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Energy Consumers Australia) Bill. It seeks to amend the Australian Energy Market Commission Establishment Act 2004, the National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996 and the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008. I note that this bill was introduced by the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy on 15 October 2014 and the intent of the bill is to establish a national energy advocacy body, Energy Consumers Australia or ECA.

I note that SACOSS is supportive of the establishment of Energy Consumers Australia and, in terms of the cost to consumers, it believes that it is good value for money, and the savings to consumers achieved from the establishment of Energy Consumers Australia are likely to outstrip the cost so that would certainly be a good thing if that is what prevails into the future.



SACOSS did advise that it is important that the reference committee which advises the board as part of this proposal includes representatives from groups such as SACOSS to ensure that the interests of the most vulnerable people in our electorates are fairly represented. What we understand is that the Small Business Commissioner is broadly supportive of the proposal to establish the ECA and note that he would like to see representation from the small business sector on the board.

I note that, in relation to the definition of 'small business' in the bill, it is the same as described in the national energy retail law and the associated regulations. A small business customer has the same meaning as a small customer. There are upper consumption thresholds for determining whether business customers are small or large customers. A business is considered a large customer if it consumes more than 100 megawatt hours per annum and below this threshold it is considered to be a small customer. By way of comparison, the average annual South Australian household electricity consumption is approximately 6.4 megawatt hours for metropolitan customers and just over 7 megawatt hours per household for rural and remote customers.

In relation to any costs that will come about if this bill becomes an act, the same cost will apply to both residential customers and small businesses and it is expected to be approximately 64¢ per year based on the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) methodology for collection of the fee.

I note that in regard to this legislation the whole Council of Australian Government Energy Council agreed to establish Energy Consumers Australia as an important pathway and step towards increasing consumer advocacy on national energy market matters of strategic importance or material consequence for energy consumers. The establishment of Energy Consumers Australia will be as a company limited by guarantee. A constitution will instigate that it will be governed by a single member and the South Australian minister responsible for energy and a skill-based board comprising of four directors and one chair.

The objective is to promote the long-term interests of consumers in regard to energy with respect to price, quality, safety, reliability and security of supply of energy services by providing and enabling strong, coordinated, collegiate, evidence-based consumer advocacy on national energy market matters of strategic importance or material consequence for energy consumers. This is certainly mainly in regard to small business customers and residential customers. This is to make sure that in representation in national energy matters all energy consumers will be represented, and that is why the ECA is being established.

Given that, in the main, most customers are not always able to be represented on a sufficiently well-informed analytical basis to influence national energy policy developments or outcomes of regulatory determinations that have a large bearing on consumers' energy prices, part of what will happen if this bill becomes law and Energy Consumers Australia is set up, is engaging with consumers and existing consumer advocacy groups in regard to identification and resolution of national energy issues, and this will increase the overall effectiveness of building national and jurisdictional expertise and capacity through the management and funding of research and representation activities in creating new avenues for consumers to be able to express their opinions, so that any issues that concern them regarding costs or delivery of energy can be expressed.

The name of the bill is the Statutes Amendment (Energy Consumers Australia) Bill 2014 and it makes amendments to several bills including the national electricity law and the schedule in the National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996, the national gas law and the schedule in the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008, and the Australian Energy Market Commission Establishment Act 2004. In this legislation, there is currently a body that advocates for consumers, the Consumer Advocacy Panel, and that existing body will be abolished if this bill comes into law.

The Australian Energy Market Operator will provide the funding for Energy Consumers Australia. In regard to rules in relation to Energy Consumers Australia, it is noted that the South Australian minister will be responsible for making initial rules, and they will include provisions for its funding and other consequential matters. I have not seen this, and it may be in other legislation, but it is interesting to note that after the initial rules are made the minister will have no further power to make any more rules.

The bill will provide the Australian Energy Market Operator with the ability to consider the appropriate methodology for recovering future consumer advocacy funding. There will be sufficient flexibility for the Australian Energy Market Operator to prepare a transitional schedule indicating how the funding is to be recovered from the electricity market customers until the end of the current participant fee determination period.

As I said, the South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS) is generally in favour of what is happening under this bill to ensure advocacy for all electricity and gas consumers and to make sure that the most vulnerable in our community can get representation. I note that as at the end of June 2014 the South Australian small customer electricity market served around 845,000 individual connections. That generates \$1,400 million in retail sales from 5.2 terawatt hours of electricity, and it works out to approximately 40 per cent of state demand. This goes against the large-customer market, where around 7,000 customers provide around \$1,000 million in revenue from 7.6 terawatt hours of electricity, which equates to around 60 per cent of state demand.

**Mr Treloar:** You know your numbers.

**Mr PEDERICK:** It's great when you've got good notes. Of the small customer group, around 90 per cent are residential, providing revenue of around \$1,100 million per annum from four terawatt hours (4,000 gigawatt hours, or 30 per cent of state demand) of electricity. Around 10 per cent of small business provides revenue of around \$330 million per annum from around 1.3 terawatt hours of electricity, or approximately 10 per cent of state demand.

As I said earlier in my initial comments about this bill, it does seem to be a reasonable administrative bill, but I will be interested to hear other contributions in this house. I believe the shadow minister may have some questioning in committee? No, he does not think so. I would think that this bill will have a fairly straightforward progress through this house.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:54):** I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Energy Consumers Australia) Bill. On 15 October 2014, the Minister for Mineral Resources introduced a bill to amend national energy legislation to enable the establishment of a national energy advocacy body known as Energy Consumers Australia (ECA).

A national energy consumer advocacy group was first proposed in November 2012 as part of the Standing Council on Energy and Resources energy market reform package. In January 2013, that standing council appointed Dr John Tamblyn and Mr John Ryan as expert advisers in energy regulation and policy to look to establish an effective model for this body.

As it progressed, on 30 April 2013 the final report detailing the body's objectives, principles and functions was presented to the Standing Council on Energy and Resources. The state government have agreed to implement this body in accordance with the recommendations. The objective of the ECA will be:

To promote the interests of all Australian energy consumers over the long term, with respect to their access to the supply of efficiently priced, reliable and safe energy services, by presenting a strong, coordinated consumer advocacy voice on national energy market matters of strategic importance and material consequence for all energy consumers, in particular for residential and small business customers.

That was one sentence quoted from that report. The need for a national energy advocacy group came from concerns that the large majority of energy consumers, both residential and small business, actually have minimal representation under the current arrangements on national energy matters.

Analysis has found that large business energy consumers and consumers on low incomes and in hardship are relatively well represented under the current arrangements—both those two groups at either end. Large businesses tend to have the financial resources and knowledge base to represent their own interests on energy market matters, and grants to local advocacy groups fund representation for consumers on low incomes and in hardship.

There is obviously a large body of people and consumers in the middle. A national energy advocacy body that solely represented residential and small business consumers was considered, but it was decided that an advocacy body that represented large, medium and small businesses gave

the added benefit of providing a holistic consumer view but should have the focus on the interests of residential and small business consumers.

The bill abolishes the Consumer Advocacy Panel—a body that has facilitated consumer advocacy in the past through a series of grants to local and regional advocacy groups. Our advice is that these grants will continue but transitioned into the ECA and will not be reduced during this process. Good examples of local and regional advocacy groups are the South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS), which is obviously well known and which I will refer to again in a moment, and St Vincent de Paul, sometimes known colloquially as Vinnies.

The scope of the work by the ECA includes potential implications for energy consumers associated with the various national energy legislation, any proposals for reform or change to the market arrangements under that legal framework, and matters arising from the operation of the energy markets across the supply chain. It is proposed that the ECA be structured as a company limited by guarantee, governed by a constitution with a single member—the SA minister responsible for energy—and a skill-based board advised by a reference committee drawn up from a broad cross-section of consumer advocacy bodies.

The total budget for the ECA would be around \$6.2 million, which would comprise salaries and on-costs of \$2.2 million, capacity building and project grants of around \$2.5 million and other costs of \$1.5 million. The Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) would collect an industry levy from retailers which would then be passed on to consumers at a rate of less than 65¢ per residential customer per week.

SACOSS, which I referred to earlier, is supportive of the establishment of the ECA. In terms of the cost to the consumers, it believes that it is good value for money, and the savings to consumers achieved from the establishment of an ECA are likely to outstrip the costs.

SACOSS advises that it is important that the reference committee which advises the board is part of this proposal and includes representatives from groups such as SACOSS to ensure the interests of vulnerable people are fairly represented. Our advice also is that the Small Business Commissioner is broadly supportive of the proposal to establish the ECA. Understandably, he would like to see representation from the small business sector on the board.

Of course, there are a few definitions that need elaborating. One that is often referred to in the briefing papers is 'small business'. A small business customer has the same meaning as a small business. There are upper consumption thresholds for determining whether business customers are small or large customers. A business is considered a large customer if it consumes more than 100 megawatt hours per annum. Below this threshold is considered a small customer. By way of comparison, the average annual South Australian household electricity consumption is approximately 6.4 megawatts per hour for metro and just over seven megawatts per hour for rural and remote.

Interestingly, my second son has taken a flat in recent weeks. He is working at the Viterra site at Kimba. He has a flat in Kimba for 85 bucks a week, plus power. At 19 he has signed his first energy agreement, and he asked me what we were paying for power. I think he said he is paying 32¢ a kilowatt; so there you go—fair and reasonable.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** I bet he enjoys it.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I bet he enjoys it. He is not using a lot of power, member for Stuart.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** The lights are off a lot.

**Mr TRELOAR:** The lights off a lot; working long days. The development of Energy Consumers Australia is a particularly positive step, as the national market evolves and respective states transfer their powers to the commonwealth. With those few words, we commend the bill.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:01):** I advise that I am the lead speaker, but I will not take much of the house's time. I thank my colleagues for filling in and going first, and they have no doubt ably covered most of the issue. I also direct anybody who has an interest in this issue to the minister's second reading speech, which is very straightforward, direct, succinct, and explains the issues very well, too. There is no need for me to go over too much of that other than to say again

that this is an initiative which the Council of Australian Governments and their Energy Council is looking at doing. With South Australia being the lead state for energy, it is the first to try to implement it, it is something that has been agreed nationally across other states and it is something that the opposition supports. It does seem to be a very positive step forward.

As I heard the member for Flinders mention, it is generally believed that across the range of electricity consumers the very large consumers—while of course their bills are gigantic and they feel, perhaps, the greatest burden—do probably have the greatest capacity to represent themselves. For the very small and possibly the disadvantaged end, while there can never be enough support for people living with disadvantage, there is a range of organisations and services who advocate on their behalf. It was felt that the very large group of people in the middle, essentially households and small businesses, were not getting enough representation, and that to swap from the Consumer Advocacy Panel to Energy Consumers Australia would be a positive move, and that does seem to be the case. Of course, I am sure that people at the larger end and the smaller end would always think that they could do with some more representation, but that logic seems to be pretty sound.

The cost of this scheme is, of course, an important issue. It does not come for free. I had a very positive briefing from the minister's staff and was assured that, to the best of their knowledge, 65¢ or less would be the cost of the scheme. Their advice was that the average cost per customer represented by the ECA would be approximately 64¢. It is not possible for them to know exactly what it will be, but I think that that is reasonable, and certainly other representatives whom I have spoken to think that is reasonable as well.

Again, there is always a debate: electricity prices are going up and up and the burden of bills is higher and higher all the time. Every little bit does make a difference, but if you stand back and take a look at it, 64¢ per year per customer does seem like a very fair cost to have this sort of advocacy done well on your behalf.

That view is supported by the Small Business Commissioner. I wrote to the Small Business Commissioner and received advice from him, and I am sure that the minister and his officers would have received exactly the same advice, that essentially he is supportive of this. He thinks it is good value and he thinks it is a positive move. SACOSS as well came back and said that they were also very supportive of the move.

Both of them said it was not perfect but they did say that they did not have significant suggestions to put forward for trying to improve it and they were very comfortable that the government is on the right track heading this way, as are all other governments across the nation. Of course, that gives the opposition a great deal of comfort as well. They did also both raise, though, not a concern but an interest in the make-up of the board. In the minister's second reading speech, he said:

Energy Consumers Australia will be established as a company limited by guarantee, governed by a constitution with a...skill-based board comprising of one chair and four directors.

Both SACOSS and the Small Business Commissioner expressed a desire that they—and I am sure they meant them or their organisation—could actually have a role on that board within South Australia.

I did want to ask the minister about this specifically at the committee stage, but when I hunted through the bill, I could not actually find anything specifically about the board, so there is not really a clause to investigate. I ask very directly of the minister whether, in his summing-up remarks, given that it was included in the second reading speech, he would be able to respond to the desire of SACOSS and the Small Business Commissioner to actually play a part themselves in the skill-based board that will advise the statutory body.

Most importantly, their question is: will there be people who have a genuine understanding of small business and a genuine understanding of people who require social services? Will people with that knowledge and with those skills be able to participate actively in the board and have a seat on the board? If the minister is able to comment on that in his summing-up, that would be good because, as I said, there is nothing specifically about it in the bill itself that I could point to during the committee stage.

In terms of the existence of the grants that are here at the moment, the Consumer Advocacy Panel has an overall operating budget of \$6.2 million per annum and that includes grants of \$2.5 million per annum, which are essentially given to organisations who might advocate for particular groups of customers. That is a very positive thing. I have assurances from the minister and his office that the level of those grants is expected to just roll right on and stay the same, so that ECA will have the same level of grant funding to offer to the broader group of advocates who would like to work in this space, as the CAP currently does. That is very positive.

It does not matter what topic you are dealing with, there is always concern that it might get more expensive over time than is currently forecast or that the grants might start to diminish over time. I have no doubt that the intention is for it to be exactly the same and I also know that the minister would not be in a position to make commitments for years down the track. I just put on record that that is obviously a very understandable and genuine concern that the broader public has.

While 64¢ on average per customer across all customer groups appears to be very fair, you would not want that to start to grow and, while transferring the same level of grant funding that exists at the moment from the Consumer Advocacy Panel to Electricity Consumers Australia seems very fair, they would not want that to start to reduce over time either. They are very important questions and I support those. I accept the fact that the minister probably cannot make any commitments with regard to that at all.

A very important area which I was able to get advice on from the minister's office in the briefing was with regard to: what classifies as a small business? What is a small business? There are a lot of definitions. Some go by number of employees, some go by turnover, there are a whole range of issues. I was advised that the definition of small business used for this bill would be, essentially, consumers using less than 100 megawatt hours per year.

As I think I heard the member for Flinders say, to give it some context, a household is using six to seven megawatt hours per year, so that gives you some scope of what a small business might be considered to be up to. There is no doubt that, in the context of this particular bill (energy consumption and advocacy), judging a business by its electricity consumption would be a much smarter way to go than by its turnover, its number of employees or any other measure you might use, because that is the core of the issue.

So, I am very comfortable with the bill. I would be grateful, if the minister has the opportunity, to put forward some comments with regard to the broad make-up, which I ask on behalf of those two organisations and the opposition. It may well be, in fact I expect they would have given exactly the same advice and asked the same questions directly to the government. I will finish up with that, Deputy Speaker. The opposition is very pleased to support the bill.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:11):** I too rise to speak about the Statutes Amendment (Energy Consumers Australia) Bill. I want to put on the record my support for any reform that will assist to reduce the cost of living pressures on families and businesses when it comes to the use of power, particularly when the power component is one of the major costs of businesses. I want to reflect a little bit on the cost of power particularly to lifting water, pressurising water and the efficiencies that are now costing those irrigators by being some of the most efficient water users. It is having an adverse effect on the cost of power, so it is really having a huge impact.

It is important to acknowledge that the burden placed on farming irrigators these days was once a cost that was just part of running a business; nowadays it is the major input cost in irrigation. Once upon a time, we would always put a third a third a third: the running costs, the cost of labour and the cost of renewing and taking something off for putting food on the table; nowadays the cost of power (in some instances) is up over 40 per cent with the cost of production. So, I guess particularly Riverland irrigators are effectively paying for that water efficiency. It is not only lifting water from the river by pump into a pipe, it is about pressuring the water into a pipe and lifting it.

Many of the highland irrigation settlements are between 30 and 60 feet above the river and it is a growing concern to put water into a pipe and pressurise it and to remain efficient irrigators, We are now losing that advantage when it comes to the bottom line in competing with our interstate counterparts. I must say that while South Australia is rubbing its fist on its chest and saying how efficient it is, the other states are now looking at us saying, 'What a wonderful system we have here

using gravity and not having to use that power,' and they are reaping the rewards. Sadly, while we talk about efficiencies within water delivery, we are losing our competitive edge in a very significant manner.

I said a little bit about while the Premier has claimed to have fought for South Australia's efficient water use and recognise that during the basin plan he campaigned to gain more water, sadly, the Premier and the government are still sitting on their hands and South Australian power consumers, particularly in small business have suffered as a result—and I acknowledge the member for Stuart's description of what is a small business. I think that any small business that uses any amount of power is feeling the effects in relation to the impact on their bottom line.

The Murray-Darling Basin Plan will require more electricity here in South Australia, and it will require more electricity usage on irrigated farms to enable the communities to remain efficient and viable. As I have said, we have lost that efficiency and viability, and it continues to grow. I do not see the cost of power levelling or reducing any time soon; it seems only to be increasing. In relation to the power providers, whether they are gold plating everything they own, it is coming at a huge cost to those irrigation settlements and communities.

As some examples, I want to talk a little about the Central Irrigation Trust, which is responsible for the management of about 12 districts. It is a private company that has its headquarters located in Barmera, and it operates irrigation systems on behalf of those 12 districts. It services about 15,500 hectares of horticultural crop, which is all irrigated. It also provides drainage services to about 1,400 farms as well as nearly 3,000 domestic households and industrial sites. Over the past four years, CIT's energy bill has doubled, in round figures: it has gone from about \$2 million to over \$4 million. This year alone, CIT is forecasting an increase of 16.2 per cent in its power costs.

One of the other burdens that particularly the Riverland is paying for is the exporting of power across the border. In relation to exporting power out of South Australia into Victoria, the marginal loss factor of that is about 6 per cent, particularly for CIT; that is costing that business about \$100,000 a year. While that power is in the lines here in South Australia, for it to be exported into Victoria is costing that one business about \$100,000 a year. The loss in subsidies is being picked up by Riverland power consumers. I think it is outrageous that particularly the irrigation sector is picking up the burden for shipping South Australia's power interstate.

The CEO of the Irrigation Trust said, 'We've looked at all sorts of other and diverse options, such as solar power,' but it just does not stack up, with irrigators, particularly in relation to demand. When you hit a button, you have to start up. Nowadays, they are not large pumps. There are many multistage pumps, soft start, variable speed. They have invested significant amounts of money, but we continue to see those power bills skyrocket out of control.

If we were to do anything with renewables, it would have to be done remotely, particularly with photovoltaic cells, to try to run pumps, which means that we would have to put back into the network grid, and we would be charged for that privilege. We continue to look for alternatives and ways in which we can do it better and to make our costs cheaper.

The Renmark Irrigation Trust is a community-owned service provider, which was founded in 1893. It has 600 properties, with 4,500 hectares of horticulture on irrigated land. Its increased supply charges from SA Power Networks has been a major issue, and they are being forced to pass that cost onto the consumer, particularly at peak periods. Many of you would understand that, nowadays, we use efficient techniques for irrigating, such as drip irrigation. Drip irrigation is about water on demand, that is, when the plants need the water, they have to be watered, where, once upon a time, with flood irrigation and broadacre sprinklers, you could water through the night and you could saturate the land. Nowadays we water small root zones and we irrigate them on demand, so we cannot just irrigate off peak. We have to irrigate when the plant needs it and that is usually in the heat of the day.

One thing that we have set up in the Riverland is a Riverland energy association and it is made up of 14 large members who represent a variety of industries. Their Chair is the manager of the wine group in Loxton, Trevor Davidson. Wineries consume a lot of power and they have cooperatively worked to reduce energy costs. That is in its infancy. Plans include the possibility of

creating a new energy provider but, obviously, the first steps will be to conduct studies of energy usage across the region and how we can buy power collaboratively.

In closing, family and small businesses in the electorate are being severely impacted by the cost of power. It has become a huge part of the input costs of a business. I hope that formation of Energy Consumers Australia will provide some relief in this area. I have 8,736 families in my electorate, according to the latest ABS, and the median weekly household income is \$821, so we have many low-income earners who just simply cannot afford it.

This week I saw a new report that shows South Australia has the highest rate of power disconnections in the nation, and that is more than doubling the 10,000 in the past four years. With a very hot summer predicted—many air conditioners, all the pumps running—energy usage will be high, so I support the establishment of a national energy advocacy body. However, time will tell as to its influence on current skyrocketing power prices. South Australia must do something to reduce the cost-of-living burden to families and small businesses. I hope that supporting the Energy Consumers Australia Bill will give some credence to power prices and I welcome any way that we can reduce those power prices or stem the increase.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:22):** I would like to thank the opposition for indicating their support for this bill. It is fair to say that this bill was born through the former process of the SCER, which is now the resources ministers' Energy Council, spearheaded by Mr McArdle, the Queensland energy minister, who wanted to have a bit more expertise and consumer advocacy on behalf of electricity users.

It is fair to say that the former federal minister, Mr Ferguson, took that on board and it has been seen through by the current minister, Mr Macfarlane. I think it is fair to say that I have the highest regard for Mr Macfarlane and Mr Ferguson, probably two of the finest commonwealth ministers the resources and energy sector has ever had. Those two people have worked cooperatively together and have a very good understanding of the industry and I am happy to do my part to help reforms that will give greater voice to consumers.

Often electricity reform can be quite difficult and cumbersome. It can take a long time and other jurisdictions, which are in the midst of election campaigns, are often quite relieved that South Australia is a lead legislator in this field because they can rely on us to get the legislation through relatively quickly to implement those reforms, so I thank the opposition for the position they have taken.

In terms of what is meant by a skill-based board comprising of one chair and four directors, the constitution of Energy Consumers Australia Limited will provide for the board to be selected by a determination of the Energy Council, having regard to the skills matrix set out in schedule 1 of the constitution, which I will go into in a moment. That matrix set out in schedule 1 details the role of the board, the general skills and experience that are required and a desirable level of mix. In addition to that, specific roles are required, and specific skills, knowledge and experience required for the Chair. A version of the constitution has been publicly released on the COAG Energy Council website, so I refer members to that website.

The role and skills of the board under principle 1 of the ASX Corporation Governance Principles are set out, and I understand they are generic ones for all board directors; I could be wrong, but that is my reading of it. It states:

In addition, the role of the Board of the ECA must include:

- Ensuring processes are in place that provide stakeholders with opportunities to input into strategic planning for the organisation.

That means governance from the concerned sector and of course energy users and energy retailers.

- Establishing an effective, independent national energy consumer advocacy body, in accordance with the law and the company's Constitution and Objectives.
- Establishing the corporate governance agenda and ensuring that it remains properly focused and balanced across all areas requiring consideration by the Board.

Obviously, the role involves 'developing a risk management strategy that addresses risk appetite and preparedness to take informed and strategic risks' and interacting with stakeholders, active engagement with the chief executive and a whole other raft of requirements.

Getting on to general skills and experience, I am reading directly from schedule 1, General Skills and Experience:

The following general skills and experience are required by all Board members.

- Strategic expertise—the ability to constructively set and review strategy.
- Corporate governance—

that is important, as are accounting and finance and legal, managing risk, and:

- Collegiate style and the highest standards of integrity and ethics.
- Excellent communication skills.
- No material commitments or affiliations that may conflict with the interests of ECA.
- Credibility [a very important criterion] with key energy market stakeholders and participants.

One of the big issues we have had in this state is that some of the people who were the regulators had very low standing amongst the energy retailers and distributors. Under Specific Skills and Experience are consumer advocacy and legal knowledge, as well as:

- Knowledge of legislation and legal issues associated with energy markets, including the National Electricity Law, National Gas Law, National Energy Retail Law and associated Rules and Regulations [and, of course] knowledge of the Australian Consumer Law, as well as the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 [the commonwealth act] as relevant to the economic regulation of Energy utilities (at least two to three Directors).
- Accounting and finance—

which are obviously very important, as is grant administration, and I know the member was talking about the grant lines. The budget, I am advised, would be approved by the energy minister's council, but the way that money is spent will be decided by the board. Obviously, I would like to see grants always being made available to the consumer sector so that they can advocate but, of course, that would be a matter for the board, I am advised. Specific Skills and Experience include experience within the energy industry, economics, public policy and regulatory experience, and at least one of the directors must have that. Desirable skills include:

- A demonstrated commitment to, and/or experience in, furthering the long term interests of consumers—

which is very important, and:

- Energy industry knowledge, including the operation of the National Electricity Market, Australian gas markets and the Western Australian and Northern Territory electricity market—

which are not connected to the national electricity market. It continues:

- Understanding of Energy consumer issues, including small business, residential, remote and regional and indigenous consumer issues, in addition to associate policy and research needs.
- Understanding of the environment in which ECA operates, including the Council of Australian Governments and Standing Council on Energy and Resources reform agenda and government and political processes in the energy industry.
- Experience managing, mentoring and developing senior executives.

The chairperson, who will be very important, is expected to have the following specific skill set, knowledge and experience:

- Experience in Chairing boards, committees, industry associations or other similar bodies or organisations.
- Strong corporate governance skills.
- Dispute resolution skills.
- Credentials to represent the Board externally with a broad range of senior stakeholders as required.



And, most importantly, no conflicts of interest. I hope that goes some way to answering the concerns of the opposition. I commend the department for their tireless efforts and hard work in preparing this bill and I hope it has a speedy passage through both houses of parliament—and, of course, my ever-diligent ministerial adviser, Mr Antonopoulos.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:30):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION) BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

*Members*

**EVANS, HON. I.F.**

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (16:31):** With the indulgence of the house, I would like to make a few comments about the former member for Davenport. Now that he has left us—in fact, I would have been happy to say it before he left us, I should point that out—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is he listening?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** I am told he will be here very shortly. Certainly, his recent leaving has given us—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair acknowledges the former member for Davenport.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He still is, that's right. He still is the member for Davenport, and we welcome him to the house this afternoon.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** It is a good chance to pause to reflect on his time and, certainly, he has been here a lot longer than I have. I certainly enjoyed working with him in my time in this house and as an adviser before that to both the former treasurer Kevin Foley and former minister Paul Holloway. I found him to be a very decent man and a good operator, and I say that in the best possible way—someone who knew how to get things done.

He has a very good policy and political brain, and I think that will be missed because it is a rare combination to have that good mix of a really good grasp of policy and a good grasp of politics as well. As I said, he is a very decent man and a man of his word, and I found him very easy to deal with—but he is certainly more than capable of putting his point of view, sometimes very forcefully but always politely and well, I should say.

I remember once attending, on behalf of the Premier, the opening of an art gallery in the seat of Davenport, and the former member was there, along with his wife. She said something to him which I did not hear and he smiled, and my wife, who was with me at the time, remarked, 'Gee, he's got a really beautiful smile.' What I hope for in his retirement is that he is able to smile like that more and that his wife sees it. That will be a wonderful thing because there is life after politics, and my observation of people who have left politics is generally it is a good life and they seem to enjoy it and, certainly, they smile more than they do when they are in here, and that is a good thing.

Recently, I was on a field trip to the salt pans north of Adelaide with the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. A number of birdwatchers were there, and they remembered the work Iain had done in his time as environment minister and they were very grateful

for it. They were obviously very keen for that to continue. I think it was particularly around an attempt to get it made a Ramsar site.

Iain is also very fondly remembered by sporting shooters, and he was able to make sure that not only did they have a venue in which to go shooting but that they actually owned that land, and that is a very important thing. There was some delay in that, and Iain was able to make sure that that did not affect the club financially and that they were able to come out of that as they were originally meant to. They were very grateful for it, as am I, being a sporting shooter. It goes to show that he is a man who is prepared to actually get things done and is well remembered for doing them, so he must have done them in good style.

With those few words, I wish Iain all the best. I hope his business is very successful, seeing as he is working around exports for the state. It is very unlikely that the state could have too many exports, so I hope he has a very successful business and a very enjoyable time in retirement.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:35):** I rise to acknowledge the effort by the now retired member for Davenport (Hon. Iain Evans) and note that he is in this place. I note that Iain was elected to the seat of Davenport in 1993, after the end of his father's 25-year political career. During his career, Iain held many positions. As minister, he was a member of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council, and coming from the seat of Hammond, I am obviously very interested in anything to do with the Murray-Darling.

Iain held the ministerial portfolios of industry and trade; correctional services; emergency services; police; environment and heritage; and recreation, sport and racing, and he was also Australia's first minister for volunteers. We all know that the value of volunteers to this state and the nation is something you cannot really put a dollar figure on, and I certainly do not think any government, either here in this state or federally, would be able to afford the massive contribution that volunteers make to keep the state and the nation going.

Iain was the leader of the opposition from March 2006 to April 2007, and some would say that he formed an unlikely political marriage with his then deputy, Vickie Chapman (the member for Bragg). I want to acknowledge a couple of things that Iain achieved during the period when he was leader. One was the position he took in regard to a freshwater recovery for the River Murray. It was a position I was hammering fairly hard, and it was certainly something that hung heavily in the party room.

Even in opposition, we were aware that we needed to make sure that Adelaide had critical human needs water, and we also had to make sure that we did the best we could for the environment and irrigators at a time when the river levels below Lock 1 dropped around two metres. It was a very trying time, and I commend the leadership that Iain showed during the initial stages of the drought that went through to September 2010. It was during that time, in January 2007, that Iain launched our policy for the 50-gigalitre desalination plant, which at the time would have only cost the state around \$400 million and which was developed after we had done some research on the desalination plant in Perth.

In regard to other positions Iain held in opposition, I think it would have been easier if I read out portfolios that Iain Evans had not been involved with, either in government or opposition. The shadow portfolios he held were: treasury, WorkCover, industrial relations, small business, consumer affairs, gambling, red tape reduction, volunteers, youth, families and communities, early childhood development, social inclusion, government enterprises, education and children's services, federal/state relations, public sector management, economic development, sustainability and climate change, transport, environment and planning, and finance. If I have missed any, Iain, I apologise.

**Mr Williams:** Sport, rec and racing.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Sport, rec and racing? Hang on, I will just go back. I have got that as a ministerial portfolio. He may have done it as a shadow. I thought I had done my homework, but anyway.

What I will speak about, and obviously it has caused a lot of controversy recently, is the marine protected areas. I would just like to acknowledge that Iain Evans put the first sensible plan in

place for South Australia's marine protected areas. It was a sensible plan that, if it had been rolled out completely, would have taken a lot more notice of our industries and our regions.

He has always been a valued and vital contributor to the parliament and the electorate of Davenport. Seeing Iain on his feet, I really think he challenged governments over time, and government ministers and premiers, with the way he could be an attack dog, really get onto a subject and take it right to the hilt. It was always entertaining if Iain was delegated an attack grievance. It was great to be in here to hear him put the point of view.

He has given great service to this state. He is a sharp debater and has also been a great support during some of the tough times in politics. He will be missed in this place. I wish Iain, Fiona and his family well in retirement after 21 years of valuable service to this state.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:41):** I think Iain Evans was a good leader of the opposition. I have to say, given my position, I suppose people will take it with a pinch of salt, but I mean this sincerely. I was with Iain Evans at a Good Friday commemoration at St George. I think it was the last public event he went to as leader of the opposition. I pride myself on getting to church early. When I got there, he was already there and I thought, 'Bugger, this guy wants to win.'

Matthew Abraham said that Labor always says, 'He was the most dangerous leader.' When you get rid of the next one, we say, 'He was the one we were really afraid of.' But the truth is this: if you ask any ministerial adviser and any public servant in government, when it came to opposition briefings, the one person who asked a question they were never prepared for was Iain Evans.

Why? He had a curious mind. He has a very good mind, a very political mind, a mind used for the Liberal Party's benefit and which will now be put to good use for his family and the people of South Australia in another field—growing our exports—which is good.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** Fiona is smarter than him.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He is not interjecting from the Speaker's Gallery, is he?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Fiona is very smart. I ran into Iain and his wife after the election. He was taking his staff out for a meal with his family because that is the type of person he is. We had a drink—Peter Malinauskas, Iain and myself—and it is fair to say he was not happy about the result. I tried to be as courteous as I possibly could without rubbing his face in it.

**Mr Pederick:** You would have worked at it, Tom!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, because I genuinely believed at the time it was not his fault. The election loss was not his fault. I think he has been uncharacteristically fair to people who talk your party down. I think we are all guilty of internal politics—all of us—but there has to be a time when common sense prevails, and I think Iain talked about that in his farewell address to the nation in the parliament.

I really enjoyed working with Iain. When I first got elected in 1997, he was one of the first Liberals to approach me and just say hello. We had a conversation. He was just someone who was being polite. As I watched his rise through the parliament, he was very good in question time as a minister. A lot of you might not have seen him as a minister; I did, and he was very good. I do not remember us ever laying very many gloves on him, and, trust me, we tried. Once we had been elected, we were just waiting for the time when he would become leader of the opposition, because we knew he was ultimately going to be next. Rob Kerin (lovely man) probably felt robbed in the 2002 election. The Liberal Party showed extreme discipline to keep him in place for the period of time that they did, which was a mistake; but that was their decision, and then they made the decision to go to Iain.

I have to say that at that point in time I was not a minister; my job was campaign tactics. My job was to work out how to win elections, what seats to target, who to keep busy, who not to keep busy, where to put resources and that sort of fundamental work, and what seat groupings we wanted to attract. I mean this with the greatest of respect: we were not happy he was leader of the opposition—not happy—because we were worried that this guy is a policy guy and he would have

kept his cards very close to his chest and drip-fed policies, and he probably would have done a very good job, but we will never know. We will never know what it would have been like.

I can tell you that I would not like to have seen Iain Evans in a debate with any premier on TV for an hour. Debating is hard as it is. You watch it and think, 'I could do that.' Trust me, it is not easy. I tell you that the one thing I would never want to do is stand in front of a camera debating Iain Evans for an hour. It would not be easy. He thinks fast on his feet, he is dangerous. He comes up with good language, and he knows how to string a sentence together that makes complete and utter common sense to anyone listening, and it is very hard to fight back on. You can see it in the radio transcripts, that the guy has very quick movement in his mind. For whatever reason, the Liberal Party chose a different path and never went back to him.

When he was shadow treasurer in the lead-up to the election campaign, I remember him remarking to me that shadow treasury gets no extra resources, and he had to carry all of you lot with preparation for his funding announcements, and he did that. I could tell there was a little bit of tension, because I was watching very closely on TV for a bit of nervousness. There was a little bit there, but not as much as Joe Hockey's in 2013, when he lost about five kilos in sweat when he was doing his budget costings. So, he is a class operator—class, class operator—and dangerous.

People reading this will probably think I do not particularly like him very much; I do. The member for Newland talked about trust. When I first came here there was question time and then there were the real relationships that went on behind the scenes. There was a time when politicians from both sides of politics could talk about things and solve problems. I learnt that from the current Speaker, the former premier, the current Premier, the former treasurer, treasurer Foley, and I learnt that from people like Iain Evans. You need to have lines of communication that are open, where you can trust each other. I do not particularly like any of the member for MacKillop's policies, but he has my mobile phone number, and every now and then he rings me up and says, 'Can you fix this?' He does that not because he is trying to get a political point but because it is the right thing to do. And they remain, those lines of communication.

What is happening now from Canberra down is that we have become so partisan that we cannot even talk to each other about any issue, and I think that is what I fear the most with Iain's departure. I think he should have stayed. I think he should have seen out the term for two reasons: the people of Davenport voted for him and he owed it to them to stay, but his family come first, so he has gone to do work for them. I think you will miss him. I think the Liberal Party do not realise who has walked out the front door. Walking out the front door is not the same as being on the phone when they need advice. He will not be in the caucus room, he will not be in the shadow cabinet, and from my perspective that is a very good thing, but your loss—his gain, our gain.

So whatever Fiona and Iain do from now on, my door will always be open for people like Iain to come through and speak to the government. He has already given me a call and offered me some free advice, and it is bloody good advice. I hope he remains that type of South Australian patriot, regardless of who is in office, and be available to give advice, because he has a wealth and depth of knowledge that needs to be passed on. I hope there are people in the Liberal Party who just do not stop speaking to people, because I realise, when you leave this place, the worst thing that we will suffer is the silence.

There are people who have come before us who have done a lot of good for the people of South Australia, and Iain is one of them. It is to your detriment if you do not take his advice. I am sure he will pop up somewhere, knocking on my door, asking me to do something completely outrageous for some client he has, and I will say, 'No.' I will only do it if it is the right thing to do. I just think the house has lost a fierce advocate.

We never got a chance to see him in his prime in question time and that is a great loss to the parliament. You saw snapshots of it in his grievance debates. I would be upstairs always listening. I never stayed to watch; I always left, because he focuses on you and he gets you to interject and it gets the juices going, so you do not want to do that. You go upstairs and listen, and he made some very good points.

I am not sure how involved he was in the global campaign within the Liberal Party. I took guesses, I thought about where his influence was and where it was not, and I will probably show him

my notes on the election and ask him whether he was involved in this decision or that decision to judge whether I got it right or wrong. He has a lot of time for some members in this house and none for some of you. That probably includes some of us, but he is too polite to say all of that.

Congratulations to Iain on a new part of his life. Congratulations to Fiona for surviving 20 years in politics. It is tough on families. It is very tough on our families and I think we all know how tough it is, especially when you have young families and that is all they know. It is very difficult. Keep an eye, young Stephan, on your family when you are in this business. It is not easy, but I think Iain did it well.

Iain, congratulations on your retirement. I hope an Independent gets up in Davenport so we can prove the error of your ways for leaving. I hope the Liberal Party keep on making mistakes because they have not listened to you and I hope you do not advise them ever again, because they do not deserve you.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:52):** It was probably several months ago now that I took a phone call from Iain and he told me that he was about to announce his retirement. My initial reaction was one of great disappointment and I will explain why, but I fully support his decision. As the Treasurer has just said, it is a tough gig and, after 20 years, I think somebody who has served that length of time in this place has probably given a fair dose. I support his decision, but I was very disappointed.

Iain Evans, I think has been a consummate politician in every sense of the word. Iain has a strong philosophical base. He knows what he stands for and he knows what he believes in. Quite often, I come into this place and hear members get up and speak and you wonder on what basis they make the sort of comments they do. I never wondered that about Iain, because I think Iain always knew the fundamental behind what he was saying. He knew what he believed in.

He was a team player, and the Treasurer has said a bit about Iain's game and made the contrast between the way Iain played the game within his team and the way some of the members of his team responded. I have never, in the time I have been here, seen Iain not play the team game and he was damn good at it. I think he could be forgiven if he had not played the team game as well as he did because he was not always rewarded for it.

Iain had a fantastic political mind. Again, others have mentioned this. If anything, I think his political mind was overactive: he never stopped thinking about politics. You might be out somewhere at a social occasion with him and all of a sudden he would say, 'Hey, what about such-and-such? Maybe we should be doing this.' He never switched off from politics. Being brought up in a household with a father as a politician, he probably has not known anything different from politics for the whole of his life.

Iain's analytical assessment of every question was fantastic. He would invariably pick up some nuance which the rest of us, probably on both sides of the house, had not seen—we use that term 'unintended consequences'. Most times we were debating a question and Iain would come up with three or four possible unintended consequences where the rest of us just wanted to bulldoze ahead.

Iain was incredibly diligent, particularly in his electorate. Quite often you will see people come into parliament who are really good on the policy front, say, or really good in the parliament but maybe neglect their electorate a little bit and they are not so good there. As I said, Iain was consummate. He was always doorknocking in his electorate. He would initiate little campaigns about a pothole, for example.

There was one story, and I cannot remember the details, of when he was talking about the amount of delay on a pedestrian crossing somewhere up at Blackwood or Belair. He made the argument that there was not enough time for the older folk to get across the road before the cars almost started knocking them over. Iain would not just go along and talk to the relevant authority to try to fix it up; he would create a mini campaign and generate a couple of hundred letters to the immediate neighbourhood.

He was really good at managing the electorate and ensuring that everybody in the electorate knew that he was thinking of them and their issues on a continuous basis. Of course, by generating

those mail-outs, he would harvest the responses and then have a database for later use. Terry Stephens, Iain and I were at a function one night, and Terry introduced Iain and I to a mate of his who was an old Whyalla boy. He commented to Iain that he was a constituent of Iain's. Iain said, 'What was your surname again?' He repeated his surname and Iain said, 'Oh, yeah, you live at such-and-such,' and told him his address—street and number.

**Mr Treloar:** Scary!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It is scary.

*Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. G.G. Brock.*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** As a parliamentarian, I contend that Iain had no peer in this parliament, or at least in the last parliament, and probably in the one before. Since Iain gained his seniority in the political world, since his experience as a minister, probably since the 2002 election he was perhaps the best performer in the parliament on both sides of the house. As I said, his political antennae were always acutely attuned. He never missed a thing that was going on.

His ability to dissect other people's argument and at the same time assemble his own was without peer. His cutting wit and theatrical sense of timing were combined with a dogged determination, where he would leave no stone unturned to carry through all the things I have talked about: his team play, his electorate work and the policy positions he developed. With all this, in the house I think Iain was in a class of his own.

Likewise, in our party room he was a valuable contributor and applied the same sort of political awareness that stood him out amongst his colleagues. I happen to agree with some of the comments made by the Treasurer about what might have been. He has been a great mentor. He was always generous with his advice (as the member for Kavel said the other day, even when it was not asked for). He was especially generous with it sometimes when some of us had done something which he thought was not quite the right thing or was not the smartest thing to do.

When I first came into this place in 1997, and it was the same day as the Treasurer, Iain was just, I guess, hitting his straps. I think he had just become a minister at that time. At that stage, he was a lowly minister sitting over on the curved bench and I was sitting on the crossbench behind him. As the member for Hammond said, he had a number of portfolios, but I think he really hit his straps when he got the environment portfolio. I suspect that Iain Evans (and the member for Colton might not agree with this) is probably the best environment minister this state has had in a long time.

He did upset some of his colleagues in the Liberal Party. Saving the purple spotted gudgeon by banning mining in the Gammon Ranges was probably not the easiest thing to achieve in the Liberal Party.

**Mr Goldsworthy:** The yellow-footed rock wallaby.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The yellow-footed rock wallaby. He probably did not get high praise from Graham Gunn for a couple of these, but he took on those hard issues in the environment portfolio and, I think, made the environment portfolio a key part of the Liberal Party's policy area. We do not have a reputation of being the best environmentalists, I do not know why, but certainly when we had somebody like Iain in charge of that portfolio I think it was an absolutely false accusation that the Liberal Party did not have a good handle on the environment and the issues therein and, indeed, made the right sort of decisions.

The marine parks have been mentioned. Iain was the original architect of the move towards establishing marine parks. He quipped with me one day in the house only a few weeks ago, I think the two issues of the week, and probably of the month, were marine parks and the emergency services levy, and Iain said, 'That's a bit ironic, isn't it? I introduced both of those.' We had a bit of a chuckle about that. Things like the declaration of the leafy sea dragon as the state's marine emblem was something that Iain did.

One of the other things Iain did, and I just checked with him a few minutes ago, was greenways recreational trails. Again, this was a pretty solid argument in our party because it was not universally agreed or accepted with some of our party members. I said to Iain, 'What happened about that? Where did it get to?' He said, 'Well, we got the legislation through but the regulations have

never been promulgated, so nothing is happening.' It is at least 12 years ago, 12½ years ago, that the bill went through to establish greenways recreational trails, but there has been 12 years of neglect by the current government to bring those into being.

The member for Hammond mentioned that Iain was the minister for recreation, racing and sport. Iain turned around the relationship between government and the racing industry in South Australia. He was responsible for changing the legislation under which the racing industry operated and, again, that would not have been an easy thing to do from the Liberal Party's point of view. I suspect a former Labor minister for racing, one Michael Wright, was sorely disappointed at the changes Iain made because Michael was always wanting to become the minister for racing and by the time he got to be the minister for racing the relationship was much different to what he would have expected.

On a personal level, one of the things that disappoints me—and I think I mentioned this the other day—is that when I came in here, I was obviously much younger and Iain was much younger, and a lot of our colleagues were probably the age that I am now, or even older, and a lot of those colleagues on my side of the house, at least, used to call me 'young Mitch'. Iain is the last person around this place who, almost on a daily basis, called me 'young Mitch' and I will miss it. Next time I get called 'Young Mitch' in this place I will know it will be in a mocking fashion. So, I will miss that.

There are strange relationships formed and not a lot of trust is built up in this place, but Iain is one of the people in whom I have had absolute trust. I have always totally enjoyed not only his integrity, his work ethic and his thoroughness but he has been an inspiration to me as somebody coming along behind. I have thoroughly enjoyed working with Iain, and the way he has applied himself not just on behalf of the Liberal Party but on behalf of his constituents and the greater community of South Australia, and I have particularly enjoyed being able to call him a friend.

I wish Iain and Fiona and their family all the best for the future. I am absolutely certain that he will be able to do things now that he has not had the time to do because of the amount of dedication he has always put into his job. I will sadly miss him, and I do already. I sit here by myself at the moment, and it is not a lot of fun. The best thing that happened to me today was when the Speaker asked me to leave, so I went and had a cup of coffee, again by myself. So, I wish Iain all the best for the future. I am sure that Fiona will be greatly relieved to have him out of politics, but a lot of us will miss him sorely.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:07):** I rise to be very brief in paying my congratulations to Iain Evans on his retirement and not just his retirement but on the very outstanding contribution he made over 20 years to this parliament, to the people of Davenport and to the people of South Australia. I think he and his family have lots to be very proud of in respect of Iain's contribution. I agree with a lot of what 'young Mitch' said—I beg your pardon, the member for MacKillop—with respect to quite a few things.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** That is a first.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** That's right. I remember speaking to some of the new people who came into parliament on both sides of the house, and without providing gratuitous advice said, 'Look, for what it's worth, I think the best thing you can do is sit down for a while, soak it all in, learn how the place operates, look at the people who you know have been here for a while and the way they operate, and learn from them. Learn about how this place operates.' I said that because in my first four years here from 2002 to 2007 that is exactly what I did. I spoke as many times as I could, learnt about how people operated, determined who were the good operators and who were not the so-good operators, and tried to emulate those who were good.

One of the things I learnt very quickly was that Iain was very, very competent at what he did, and I agree with the Treasurer that he, probably in my time, was very hard done by in not once being able to lead his party to the election, because he was an outstanding contributor and an outstanding leader of the Liberal Party during his time. It is a credit to the man that it would have been easy to drop your chewy, spit the dummy and say, 'Well, I've been done over'—like so many of you have been on that side—and take the bat and ball and go home. To his credit he did not do that.

**Mr Knoll:** That's coming from you, Paul.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, I am still here too. I certainly think that that is a sign of the quality of the person, one who continued to contribute to the party in which he believed and which he served so well.

Anyway, getting back to those first four years, I do remember that something I did not quite enjoy too much was some those late nights and the battle between Iain and Michael Wright at that time. I remember saying, 'What the bloody hell are we doing here at 4 o'clock?' You went home, and the birds were chirping. Of course, it was a payback for that period of time when I was not here, when Michael had done exactly the same thing. It was a lesson to those people who were sitting there, that if you have something to say, say it in a more concise way and not use so many hours.

The other thing I learnt from Iain too related to sitting down here and interjecting. You can tell who is a good operator. You would interject, thinking that was pretty funny, but it really was not, it was quite stupid, because for the next 15 or 20 minutes you would be the focus of attention during the contribution of Iain Evans, with his referring to how stupid was your interjection. So, again, sit back, be quiet—and I learnt that very quickly—and do not give people the quality of Iain Evans the opportunity to reinvigorate the debate through focusing on something that was nothing more than an inane interjection. There is a saying, 'Don't poke a sleeping bear,' or 'Don't poke a snoozing bear,' and I have certainly learnt that about Iain.

During the first four years, from 2006 to 2010, when I was fortunate enough to be a minister, the day came when premier Rann said, 'We're going to change your portfolios through a reshuffle. You'll get agriculture, food and fisheries, but I want you to do industrial relations as well.' It is safe to say that I was very happy and pleased to become the state's industrial relations minister, but I was less than pleased that the opposition shadow spokesperson happened to be Iain Evans because, out of all the people on the other side, the one you did not necessarily want was Iain, because of the forensic nature and intelligence of the man.

But I also found too that you were able to do business to a great extent with Iain, that if an idea was a good idea, he would support it. He was a man of his word, and he remained so throughout his career. If there were things he disagreed on (for example, the transfer of powers to the commonwealth, something he has been consistent about over a period of time), you were left in no doubt about his views on those particular matters.

Of course, subsequent to that, I was minister for water. I thought, 'Bloody hell, I've got Iain again,' and that was with respect to SA Water and all those type of things. I would often provide and offer briefings to people, but I never had to offer them to Iain because he knew exactly what it was that he would like to be briefed on. There was no doubt in my mind, and no doubt in the mind of the public servants and my advisers who might have been there, that they had to be bloody properly prepared for a briefing that was being provided to Iain because there were questions I am sure even the department had not necessarily thought would be asked.

I was lucky enough to have responsibility for quite a few portfolios that Iain had during his period of time, such as environment minister. I agree with the member for MacKillop with respect to marine protected areas. Had Iain become premier or remained the environment minister, I, unlike the member for MacKillop, expect that we would have got the outcome we have today, which is a very good representative marine park system which is going to preserve those areas without having a detrimental effect on those people who forge a living out of the marine environment. It was sound policy when it was introduced by Iain, but it was then subsequently, for whatever reason, changed significantly by the party that had committed to the way it was when Iain was the environment minister leading into 2002 and the then premier, Rob Kerin.

The other thing I want to say is that I spoke to some people recently, and I acknowledge the comments that were made by Iain in relation to Allan Holmes, which I fully support. Allan Holmes was an excellent public servant, and all public servants should implement what the government of the day says is its policy, and Iain highlighted that with respect to Allan.

What I did learn through my time with the environment department is that Iain was very supportive of the promotion of women to senior positions within the department, and I congratulate Iain for that. We still have women within our department who might not have had that opportunity if



it was not for the fact that Iain promoted people on merit, and fortunately a lot of those people who deserved those positions were women. That is feedback I got from someone about Iain just recently.

I am going to say to Mrs Fiona Evans: congratulations, you have your husband back. You never not had him but you are going to have him in a different form. Iain did great work for the people of South Australia while he was in parliament. I imagine that it was frustrating from time to time. I do not know how frustrating it is to be in opposition but I expect it is, because this is where the action is over here. Iain was one of the few people who tasted what it was like to have your hands on one of the steering wheels and to be a shining light in that area.

I think his decision to retire from politics, from Iain's perspective, was a wise one. His contribution was significant. I also believe that, as the Treasurer said, family comes first and that was one of the determining factors but I also believe that the contribution of Iain Evans will be of greater value to the people of South Australia through the role that he is undertaking now than he could have possibly ever achieved with another four years on that side. To that extent, I congratulate Iain and look forward to the contribution that he will make to the economy of South Australia in his role in private industry.

I will conclude. Again, I say to Iain: congratulations on your contribution; it was outstanding. I think there was a lot more you could have done had circumstances been different. You can hold your head high and be very proud of what you have achieved.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:16):** I rise today to make a contribution to the valedictory speeches for the former member for Davenport. I know it is probably not protocol or appropriate to mention people in the Speaker's Gallery but it is great to see both Iain and Fiona here today. Welcome along for this last hour or so.

I have a feeling that the member for Davenport may have called me 'young Pete' from time to time. I am younger than the member for MacKillop, and slightly younger than the member for Davenport, but really not that young at all, but it was nice to be called 'young Pete'.

Many of us who have watched politics from a distance over a period of years all knew of Iain Evans. We all knew of the member for Davenport. He was always at the forefront of public life and public debate in this state, and it was a real thrill for me when I was a candidate in 2008, 2009 and early 2010 to slowly get to know Iain. I did not get to know him well at that stage but there was an occasional phone call and an occasional word of advice and we, as candidates, really appreciated that.

Of course, I then had the privilege of being elected as the member for Flinders and had the privilege and honour of serving with Iain for a full term of four years and a bit of this year. There was a lot to admire about the way Iain went about his job, and much of that has been referred to already today. From my point of view what struck me in the first instance was particularly in the party room. I know it is not necessarily right to talk about what happens in the party room but what Iain was able to do during those debates in the party room was to cut to the chase, always. He got to the nub of the problem, often very early in the discussion and he made everything clear and made so much sense with his contributions.

I saw that as one of his great abilities. He was good on his feet in this place. I saw him as a shadow minister and some saw him as a minister in a previous Liberal government and he was always good on his feet. He was a good speaker, so much so that I would use the word 'orator', quite seriously. Iain, I saw you orate an occasional griever and it was marvellous to hear.

He told me once that he could debate any point, any point of view, any position. I think that was a skill that was honed over many years. Digging down a little bit, I think that was probably something that came from his family life and his parents' family life in politics. That was probably part of the honing of that ability. Iain referred to that in his valedictory speech but he also shared with me a couple of years ago that, as a boy (as probably quite a young boy) he would lie in bed at night and rather than read *Phantom* comics or Enid Blyton books, he actually read *Hansard*. That is probably quite telling, I guess.

**Mr Williams:** Child abuse.

**Mr TRELOAR:** Child abuse—but it was his choice to read *Hansard*. He probably did not realise at the time how good *Hansard* made us all sound but, anyway, it was really beginning a political life.

He has been incredibly loyal to his constituents, he has been incredibly loyal to his party and he has been incredibly loyal to his family all the way through, without question. In fact, with regard to him representing his constituents, I have a former constituent of the member for Davenport in my electorate now. I suspect he votes the other way to us, but he had nothing but praise for Iain Evans and it was praise for him as a local member and the fact that he was so diligent in his constituency work. We like to give the impression that we are everywhere all the time and, from what this fellow was saying, Iain was. He was such a good local member, but also a valued member of the party and the parliament.

From 1993, Iain, it has been 21 years—an extraordinary chunk out of your life and an extraordinary contribution to this parliament. I have been reading your profile, three pages in relatively small font, of all that you have achieved. I know the member for Hammond ran through a few of those things, but it is an extraordinary parliamentary career. He has been the leader of the Liberal Party, he has been a deputy leader, he has been a minister, he has been a shadow minister, and has sat on many, many committees in this place.

I had the privilege of sitting, for a little while at least, on the Economic and Finance Committee of this parliament with Iain. When I first arrived on that committee, an overwhelming number of papers arrived in my pigeonhole and he said, 'Young Pete, always do your reading,' and Iain did. He was always well researched and always had his questions ready. It was that little bit of mentoring, nothing too deliberate or offensive, that he gave all of us as new members all the way through and 'always do your reading' was good advice.

Aside from mentoring it was simply the example that you gave us, Iain, as new members. The member for Colton mentioned the fact that when you arrive you look at some members and watch the way they do things and try and learn from that and Iain was certainly one of those.

Iain, you have chosen to retire now. That decision is right for you. We are going to lose a lot of corporate knowledge from our party and from this parliament but, as I said, it is the right decision for you. You said in your valedictory speech that way back, when you first fought pre-selection, you told the assembled members that you were a family man, a businessman, a team man and a Liberal and you stayed all of those things, and I would suggest, Iain, you can continue to be all of those things, and that is what we would expect. We wish you all the best for the future and it has been a privilege to work with you. Thanks, Iain.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (17:22):** I am very pleased to be able to contribute to this debate because in the time that I have been here, both when we were in opposition and also in government, I have had an opportunity to see the member for Davenport in action in this place, but also, when I had the privilege of being the social justice minister, actually working with him on different, very tricky constituent issues.

I was really impressed with not only his stamina in those issues but also his absolute determination to try and come up with maybe not the solution that the constituent was looking for, but certainly making sure that there was some solution. I have to say that all of us try and do that in our electorates, but Iain really did stand out in my view. Having the sort of portfolios I had as social justice minister, which included child protection, disability, ageing, youth affairs and the status of women, it was really important I think to see him in action.

Also, I must compliment the Davenport staff. I have always found them to be really helpful and I know they were a very good team in the electorate office, and the staff in the Ashford electorate office wanted me to say how helpful they had found the Davenport staff. Although we might be in different parties, I always encourage the staff to talk to people in other electorate offices, and if there is an issue we could work together on then let's do it. I have to say that with Davenport, amongst some of the other electorates that are represented in here on the other side, we tried to come out with an outcome.

There were also a number of occasions when people my husband or I met socially had issues and we found out that they lived in Davenport. I remember a couple of occasions with Kevin's walking

group, where some unfortunate things happened to one of the walkers. One of the walkers died, and I said, 'Look, I really think you should ring up the Davenport electorate office.' This was to the wife of the walker. We had to work through getting a coroner's report, and I must say that this particular woman was very grateful not only for the support she got from Iain and his staff but also for an outcome. That is just one of the many examples I can cite where, with all of us working together, we could actually get some results.

The other area in which I enjoyed working with Iain was on committee issues. Of course the most recent was the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. I still think that a natural disasters standing committee is a good idea, despite the fact that I will be very unpopular on this side by saying that. I still think that is something we should aim for. I think the whole committee structure—and I know that Iain agrees with this—needs to be redrafted and looked at again so that it is up with 2014 in the sorts of issues and priorities we now have.

Also on the environment committee, when I first came into this place I had the pleasure of being on the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, and it was interesting to note the work that Iain did as a minister in that area. I think he is probably a secret greenie (and I am talking about before the Greens came into any prominence); I think he is secret greenie.

The other thing I find interesting about the Evans family is that apparently the Evans boys and the Key boys went to the same high school, and I understand that my brother, who is a plumber, is also in the same business as Iain's brother. Amongst the Liberal Party they share clients with regard to who does their plumbing; I think the member for Heyden made it very clear that she is very much in the Evans camp as far as getting plumbing and hardware advice, and other members (who I will not mention) go to the Key plumbing service.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** No; I am pleased to say that my brother does not vote Liberal. I know that they have a great respect for each other, but there is this interesting competition in the Hills plumbing area.

I also understand that Iain's father and my mother served on many committees in the Adelaide Hills. My mother, Steve Key (her real name was Sheila but she is actually called Steve Key), was very well known in the Hills because she was the health worker up there. She was also very involved with the 1983 bushfires as the social worker who coordinated some of the support that was needed for people who were affected by that terrible tragedy. I guess, because of that, I do understand the concerns that have been raised about natural disasters. My husband's house was burnt in that fire. Fortunately no-one was killed in his particular street, but people got out really only by the skin of their teeth. The issues that have been raised about disaster management, and even traffic management, with regard to the Adelaide Hills, in particular, are still of ongoing concern, and I thank Iain for the submissions he made to the Natural Resources Committee on that and a number of other issues.

As far as social issues are concerned, I think it would be fair to say that probably Iain and I had opposite points of view. I do not think that any of the private members' legislation that I have introduced or intend to introduce would be supported by him, but I guess the good thing is that he was always happy to debate those issues with me.

There were a number of private members' issues, particularly to do with smoking and what we might do about people who smoke nicotine in particular, and I think some of the initiatives that he had are ones that probably need to be revisited in this place, so I will keep in touch with you, Iain, on those ideas that you brought forward.

On behalf of the electorate of Ashford, and certainly the staff in Ashford and my family, I would like to thank you very much for your contribution. You will be greatly missed and I hope that we do see you around the place. I wish you and your family all the very best in the future.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:30):** I, too, rise to congratulate Iain for an illustrious career, not just as a South Australian politician, a South Australian MP, but as a well-rounded person, a well-rounded bloke, I think we could describe Iain as. He is a great example of someone who is dedicated to what he sets his mind to doing. Twenty one years as an MP in Davenport, and the people in

Davenport who I have spoken to and listened to are very proud to have a proactive member of parliament representing them. But really his biggest supporters are obviously his wife Fiona and his four children, Staten, Fraser, Alexander and Allison. I think they have aspired to watching their father be a great person.

I know that many people have told stories about Iain in this house, in this parliament, as an MP, but I think there is more to Iain than that. He is a good family man, a good politician and a good representative. I have noted that Iain has not only been active as an MP and as a representative of a community but he has also been active right from day one as a local community person.

He was the youngest ever state and national president for Apex. I think it has been pretty well documented that he rode a push bike from Adelaide to Perth to raise funds for the Royal Flying Doctor Service. I think that that is a prime example that, essentially, it is not about Iain, it is about the people he represents, it is about his mission and his statement in life that, when he puts his mind to something, he attacks it with gusto based on his principles in life.

I must say that he is a passionate supporter of sport, and in the early days I used to always see him at football and local cricket. I note that his young fellow, Fraser, is playing for Sturt so I think Iain and Fiona would be very proud. I know Fraser is a very good lad and a friend of my son as well.

I also thank Iain. On entering this place, Iain was one of my paired seats and he gave me great advice and financial help. I am not one of those people who goes to anyone in particular and rattles and asks lots of questions. My grandfather always told me that you have two ears and one mouth—twice as much listening and half as much talking—so that has always been my motto and that is something that I have followed intently. Whether it is in the corridors, whether it is in the party room, whether it is out and about at functions, I have always intently listened to Iain and the way he approaches the discussion.

I have worked with Iain for 4½ years. I have not always had a very close relationship with Iain, but in listening to Iain I think I have had a closer relationship than perhaps I give myself credit for. Again, he is a deep thinker. I have noticed that he is always willing to listen, always willing to be a part of the discussion, but he listens first then speaks later. Obviously he is part of the conversation, part of the debate, but he makes the contribution once the debate or the conversation has been had. As the member for Flinders said, he cuts to the chase, he gives his view and always states why he is giving his view. That is something I have noted with great interest since coming into this place.

We have said many things about Iain, all of which I think have been well documented: that he is a great MP, a great representative, but it is all about Iain Evans' brand, brand Iain Evans. As a state MP, as a representative for Davenport, he has a strategy with everything he does. Whether it is wearing the same clothes so that people recognise who he is, that is his brand; whether it is making a campaign around traffic lights or the Scout hall, whether it is a campaign around any strategic exercise, he does it with intelligence, and that is another thing I have put into my memory bank.

I have noted that he has dealt with more than 40 portfolios in government and opposition, so he is a very rounded person as far as how this place runs. I have picked up, with my new shadow portfolio of investment and trade, sport, rec and racing, all of which Iain has held, that he is held in such high regard. People always in conversation make reference to Iain Evans—when he approached them or met with them—and there is always that reference to his being a strategic thinker. He listens with interest, he talks with interest and he advises with interest. One could say that his political antennae are always fully extended and are always in constant mode.

In our last sitting week I sat with Iain and Fiona and they shared some of the great stories of events they had been to, and things that have happened over time. Iain and Fiona work together as a bit of a two-stage act sometimes. I picked up that Fiona has a memory just like Iain's—just like a steel trap, absolutely. That was very evident. Iain, I wish you well in your next chapter; Fiona I wish you well in Iain's new chapter, you being a closer part of it. Obviously your next chapter is all about having an export life, so good luck with your Chinese language lessons, and gambei!

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:37):** I also rise today to pay tribute to Iain Evans in this series of valedictory speeches. One thing is for sure: the next member for Davenport certainly has big shoes to fill. We heard today and last week about the fierce advocate that was Iain Evans, about the strong campaign brain Iain Evans has, and about the plethora of portfolios, both in government and in

opposition, that Iain has held. It is great to see him here in the chamber today and great to see that so many of his friends and family were present the last time we spoke about this issue.

To complement the speakers today, I wanted to draw on two real-life examples of my interaction with Iain Evans. One was the very first time that I met him, and one was towards the end of the last campaign. He probably does not remember this, but I do. Iain Evans was the first MP I met in real life as a year 7 student at Rostrevor College. I think the local member was Joan Hall, and it was probably the Coles electorate back then, before it became Morialta. I remember Iain like it was yesterday. Iain was a much younger man; obviously I was a child. I have a few memories from that day that really stand out, and one was how Iain Evans was telling us all why he ran for politics. He told us that he did it because he felt extremely strongly about his community and he wanted to make a difference.

I remember him saying, like it was yesterday, that he came from the hardware industry and he was not a political hack. He came from the business sector. He decided to run for politics not because the money was good—the money was great in what he was doing—but he ran for politics to make a difference. That was the standout issue, from my point of view. It is also a take-out, I suppose, for members here: you have to be careful what you tell kids and students because one day they might run for either your job or one of your colleague's jobs. I cannot help but think a little bit of Iain Evans rubbed off on me that day. I also remember that he was extremely passionate about campaigning and the strategy of campaigning, and that, to this day, has certainly stuck in my head.

The second memory I wanted to speak about, in particular, occurred during the campaign in Hartley. I remember it was about 30° and Iain came to the electorate. By the way, he always made himself available to talk to a community club or sporting club in the electorate. That was Iain. It was about 30° and I remember we were on Glynde Corner. I think we had just had a sandwich and were talking to some business owners. We were walking and saw this guy's car had run out of gas or the battery was flat. I said, 'Iain, what do we do?' and Iain said, 'Let's go over and give him a push.' It could have won me the election, there were that many people on the Glynde Corner that day. The next thing I remember is that we rolled our sleeves up and pushed this car, right in the middle of Glynde Corner, onto safer ground.

That, to me, is symbolism for Iain Evans. Iain Evans was not afraid to do the heavy lifting for this party, for the state and for the people he represented. He did it as a government member and he did it as an opposition member. As a new member, for the first couple of party room meetings I did more listening than talking, and Iain Evans is one of these guys who, when he spoke, you thought, 'You know what? That's a really good idea.'

He has always been a fantastic strategic brain. He never rested. That day when he visited me in Hartley, but also along the way, he had great campaigning sense, and we have heard examples of that today. I know, in my time with him, he was never slow to come up with some kind of strategic way of thinking or a way to amplify an issue to your advantage in the electorate. In a marginal seat, it was certainly great to have him around. Especially as a younger colleague, I always appreciated that. In my office I have an Iain Evans shopping bag and an Iain Evans stubby holder. Iain Evans understood branding, as we have heard, and he understood campaigning, and he certainly set a great example for younger members in campaigning.

I would like to thank Iain and also Fiona for her support of Iain throughout the years. I know there are some family members in Hartley so I will be doing my best to make sure that we continue to represent them well. I wish him all the very best in his future endeavours and all the best of health, wealth and happiness in the next part of his journey.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:43):** I will be fairly brief because much has been said. Unlike Iain, before I got involved with this work, I had never had anything to do with politics or the Liberal Party. I had been a Liberal voter all my life but I did not have any of that background, so I came in and met a whole range of new colleagues, quite a few of whom I had met through the election campaign, but Stuart is not right around the corner so I had not met the majority of people and certainly had not got to know them well.

I think Iain's great strength is being so well rounded. Much has been said about the details of abilities, etc., but the fact that Iain Evans grew up in a political family yet at the same time had led

a genuine, real life and was involved with the community and in business and he had done a very wide range of different things while growing up in a political family, and had done those things before coming into politics directly himself, I think is really the secret. I think the secret to what Iain Evans has had to contribute is the fact that he grasped the full extent of what is involved in politics, and that has come from the fact that he has all this other experience.

As the member for Hartley just said, at the same time as he was the shadow treasurer, which is one of the most difficult jobs that anyone could ever take on, and while he was travelling the nation talking to premiers, treasurers and people all around Australia trying to get advice and develop policies, check things and get numbers that were not readily available to him directly in South Australia, he was helping push cars that ran out of fuel off the street. That should be an instinct that anyone in this place has. Not one of us should ever forget how important those little things are: important from the fact that what we do is about helping people and supporting a community, but also not missing the point that, on a very busy corner on a hot summer day, it would not be the worst thing in the world to be seen helping that person.

Never ever losing touch with the wide realm of things that contribute to this work I think comes from his background beforehand, and that is represented by the fact that he has retained a strong, loving, special family around him, and members here know that that is not always the case. It does not always work that way. Often, it does not, and so I think that is probably your greatest achievement, Iain. Not that it was necessarily a problem or necessarily hard or anything, but when I look at you, and I have said a few things to you quietly as a friend, I think that is your greatest achievement: that you have come here and done all the things that everybody else has spoken about and, through all of that time, you have raised a family. You are close to your family, and when you were all there the other day, it was very clear that all of the things that have been spoken about in this chamber today and a couple of weeks ago when people were contributing—that's this much. Well, family is that much—it is much, much more. I think that is a great credit to you.

I am especially pleased to see you going on to what will be another whole phase of your working life. I do not see you moving on, dabbling around in something, messing around for a little bit, maybe making a little bit of money and then saying, 'That's good, I'll put my feet up.' I think that you have spent 21 years or whatever it is in here; well, there might be another 21 years of your work life ahead of you in a different realm. Your family will be with you all the way, grandkids will be there, and you will be the same person contributing the very best that you possibly can to whatever you are doing at the time. It is lovely to have achieved so much, but you are not nearly at the end of the road, so congratulations.

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (17:47):** I rise today to speak as well in the valedictory of Iain Evans, and I will be brief. I only worked with Iain for a very short period of time, having come in at the last election, and, as you can hear today in all the words that have been spoken about his reputation and the respect and high regard in which he is held, it is just a credit to the man and what he has achieved.

The story I would like to tell is of Iain's retirement. At the time, in our party someone else had left in different circumstances. I had not been in politics long when this happened and it was one of the most incredible things I had ever seen, and not in a good way. This person had left and, to my mind, shown no loyalty to the party or the team. Coming from a sporting background, loyalty is very big where I am from. After that, I heard Iain Evans in his retirement speech, and I have been fortunate enough in a past life as a journalist to have been at a lot of retirement speeches by very highly qualified athletes, athletes who have achieved great things, and other people in this world who have achieved great things. I have heard a lot of creditable, emotional and honourable retirement speeches in my time, but to hear Iain Evans' speech was one out of the box. It was the best that I had ever heard in the way he summed up party and team.

Iain Evans was very much a team player, and it was evident on that day when he gave his speech. I walked away from that realising how important team is and being a unified team, and Iain Evans exemplified that in his retirement speech. I would just like to commend Iain for that because at the time he was still working out where he was going to go.

From the outside looking in, Iain made a very brave, courageous and team-oriented decision to step away at that time to allow a change to come through, given that there was already going to

be another change. He could see that making his decision for the betterment of the team was going to be very stabilising and beneficial to the team, and that is the key thing I will take with me from Iain Evans in my time in this house. I think it is imperative that we learn something from that.

It was with great pleasure that I was able to say I was there. I was not there at the start, but I was there at the end. I hope that some of the man I saw and the way he presented himself on that day can rub off on me because if I can walk away from this place singing the same tune Iain Evans sang on that day I know that I will have given a lot to this parliament and, hopefully, we would have had success as well. Again, to Iain, Fiona and your family, thank you for that.

The final thing I will say is that when Iain did that, and moved his seat in this chamber, as a result he perhaps helped me get a promotion into the position I have today. Knowing that Iain was there, and knowing that he will always be there on the phone and that we can contact someone with that great experience, is very reassuring to me. Trust me, Iain, I will be on the phone.

**The SPEAKER (17:51):** Iain Evans joined the parliament in 1993 or, rather, he took his seat in 1994 but had been elected as part of the landslide against my party in the 1993 election. Of course, the seat of Davenport is a strong Liberal seat and so I do not think there was any doubt that Iain was going to be elected, whatever the outcome of the general election.

I had long admired the Evans family machine. I spent quite a bit of time at Brighton Parade at Blackwood because my aunt and cousin lived there; in fact, my cousin joined the Young Liberals in the Blackwood area merely because that was the best place to meet young men in the late 1960s and early 1970s. She now hands out Labor how-to-vote cards on the Unley booths. I always remember reading the local rag, the *Courier*, and up there in what they call the 'ears', the top left-hand or top right-hand corner, would be a picture of Stan Evans and the slogan, 'Fight inflation and socialism.' You just do not get slogans like that anymore.

I was always impressed by Iain's accounts of the state district of Davenport being the family business. Everyone was expected to serve in the family business, so if Iain wanted to borrow Stan's car on a weekend he would have to do so many letterboxing areas beforehand—and that is no mean feat in the Hills. I always tried to apply that in my own family, with almost no success. Iain achieved an outstanding primary vote in Davenport and an outstanding two-party preferred vote, and I think he and I had a common interest in keeping first the Democrats and then the Greens out of the state district of Davenport.

My message to the Labor Party and those who may come after me is that there is absolutely no interest for the Labor Party in turning Liberal seats into Greens seats, even temporarily; it would very much be a Pyrrhic victory. I think with Iain's absence from Davenport that the seat will revert to not quite such a safe Liberal seat. I would not say that the Labor Party has any chance of winning the by-election, but it is not quite as good as it looks for the Liberal Party without Iain Evans.

I attended his father's testimonial at the Blackwood Football Club. I put my bike on the train at Croydon, changed trains in the city, went up to Coromandel station and then rode my bike to the Blackwood Football Club. Indeed, I was the only Labor Party person there, I think, and I was certainly the only Labor Party speaker. It was a very good night and I learnt quite a lot from Stan's personal assistants on whose table I sat.

Obviously Iain and I profoundly disagreed about the case of Thomas Easing and that caused some estrangement between us but all that is on the *Hansard*. Whenever Iain rose to ask a question in question time, a frisson of fear went through the government front bench and one hoped it was not for the minister but for some other colleague who was going to cop it. One had to listen to the question very carefully because it was always tricky. There was some catch in it and, if it was simple, we did not see it as such. We were always looking for the catch.

After the Labor Party used raising a matter of privilege to devastating effect against Graham Ingerson, when the Liberal Party were in office—and I think a matter of privilege had not been used for many years before that incident—I think Iain was determined to level the score. Iain was very good with matters of privilege, in particular I think he rattled John Hill early in John Hill's ministerial career by raising a matter of privilege that went to a privileges committee, and I think John felt that his career hung in the balance for quite a long time.

I think one of Iain's specialties was to say the minister must have known something because it was in some document that would be in the minister's office or on the minister's desk. I know with me during the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account, Iain pursued me month after month—indeed, probably year after year—saying that in my incoming minister's brief which was about 2,000 pages at page one thousand seven hundred and something in a dot point table of administered funds in the Attorney-General there was a dot point that said 'Crown Solicitor's Trust Account' and I had told the Auditor-General honestly when he asked me, 'I have never heard of this account.' I remember Iain on radio with one of the afternoon programs saying, 'He will know about it. All ministers, all politicians, are voracious readers.'

Iain was an outstanding parliamentarian and has been an example to all members of the house. I wish him well in his next career and I look forward to walking those streets in Davenport that he walked as a teenager some time in late January.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Tuesday 18 November 2014 at 11:00.